The Evaluation of Regional Water Balances Using Different Hydrometeorological Datasets

by William B. Bennett **III**

B.S. Civil and Environmental Engineering Carnegie Mellon University, 2001

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL **AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING IN** PARTIAL **FULLFILMENT** OF THE **REQUIREMENTS** FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF **SCIENCE IN** CIVIL **AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING AT** THE

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY POR ASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE

SEPTEMBER 2003

© **2003** Massachusetts Institute of Technology. **All** rights reserved.

BARKER

The Evaluation of Regional Water Balances Using Different Hydrometeorological Datasets

by

William B. Bennett III

Submitted to the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering on August **15, 2003** in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Civil and Environmental Engineering

Abstract

This study attempts to use available hydrometeorological datasets to compute water balances over various regions of North and South America. The **NCEP** Reanalysis-1 and **NCEP** Reanalysis-2 are used as the primary sources of data, in addition to secondary datasets of precipitation and runoff. Time series of precipitation, evaporation, moisture flux, runoff, change in precipitable water and change in surface storage are generated from these sources and used in equations for the atmospheric and surface water balances.

Several different schemes are studied in order to utilize the available hydrometeorological data most effectively. These include various methods of calculating moisture flux, runoff, and change in surface storage. For both the atmospheric and surface balances various sizes and shapes of control volumes are studied including control volumes which are boxes of **7.5** and **15** degrees on a side, and basin sized control volumes resolved at 1 degree resolution varying in size from **318,000 km^{** 2 **} to 4,620,000 km^{** 2 **}. In between 60° N and 60° S the entire globe is broken into** control volumes of **30, 15,** and *7.5* degrees on a side, and the atmospheric water balance is evaluated for each control volume.

A general lack of ability to close regional water balances over land is found, specifically over a box of **7.5** degrees on a side. The integrity of the reanalysis data is simply not good enough to complete such a balance reliably on either the atmospheric or surface levels. Particularly unreliable are the moisture flux and runoff variables. There is some success in calculating the moisture flux **by** known methodologies, but this is largely in **15** and **30** degree control volumes. The runoff methodologies developed in this study were limited **by** the resolution of the data, and not terribly successful. **A** major recommendation of this work is that global hydrometeorological datasets such as the reanalysis should take into account the water balance at finer resolutions when deriving its product.

In addition, this work uses the Wang et al. **(1999)** methodology to compute global ground heat flux. This is part of a larger effort to create independent global energy flux maps that can refine our knowledge of the global energy balance. An original method for the calculation of the thermal inertia parameter necessary for this calculation is presented along with a new global ground heat flux product.

Thesis supervisor: Rafael L. Bras Title: Bacardi and Stockholm Water Foundations Professor

Table of Contents

Figures Index

Figure 4-32: Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface NRMSE Monthly and **Surface.................... 79** Figure 4-33: Correlation Plots for NW Brazil **-** Precipitation Comparison Monthly Atmospheric **... 8 0** Figure 4-34: Correlation Plots for NW Brazil **-** Precipitation Comparison Yearly Atmospheric **80** Figure *4-35:* Correlation Plots for **SEUS -** Precipitation Comparison Monthly Surface **.......... 81** Figure 4-36: Correlation Plots for **SEUS -** Precipitation Comparison Yearly **Surface............. 82** Figure 4-37: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Absolute Error Monthly and Yearly **... 8 3** Figure 4-38: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Bias Error Monthly and Yearly **... 83** Figure 4-39: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Absolute Error Monthly and Yearly **...** 8 4 Figure 4-40: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Bias Error Monthly and Yearly... 84 Figure 4-41: L. Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Regression Slope Monthly and Yearly **... 8 5** Figure 4-42: L. Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Correlation Coeff Monthly and Yearly **... 8 6** Figure 4-43: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric NRMSE Monthly and Yearly **..... 86** Figure 4-44: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface Regression Slope Monthly and Yearly **87** Figure *4-45:* L. Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface Correlation Coefficient Monthly and Yearly **... 8 7** Figure 4-46: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface NRMSE Monthly and **Yearly........... 88** Figure 4-47: Correlation Plots for NW Brazil **-** Large Precip Comparison Yearly Atmospheric **89** Figure 4-48: Correlation Plots for Arkansas Basin **-** Large Precip Comparison Yearly Surface. **89** Figure 4-49: Correlation Plots for Mississippi Basin **-** Large Precip Comparison Yearly Surface **... 9 0** Figure 4-50: TRMM Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric **AE** and Bias Monthly and Yearly **... 9 1** Figure **4-51:** TRMM Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface **AE** and Bias Monthly and **Yearly..... 91** Figure 4-52: TRMM Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmos. Regression Stats Monthly and Yearly92 Figure 4-53: TRMM Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface Regression Stats Monthly and Yearly **... 9 3** Figure 4-54: Correlation Plots for Rondonia - TRMM Precipitation Comparison Monthly Atmos. **...** 9 4 Figure 4-55: Correlation Plots for Rondonia – TRMM Precipitation Comparison Monthly Surf. **...** 9 4 Figure *4-56:* Time Scale Comparison **-** Atmospheric and Surface Absolute Error and Bias Error **... 9 5** Figure 4-57: Time Scale Comparison **-** Atmospheric, Surface, and Total Regressed Slope and R2 **... 9 6** Figure 4-58: Time Scale Comparison **-** Atmos, Surface, and Total Corr. Coeff. and NRMSE... **96** Figure *4-59:* Correlation Plots for East Brazil **-** Time Scale Comparison **Atmospheric........... 97** Figure 4-60: Correlation Plots for **SWUS -** Time Scale Comparison **Surface.......................... 98** Figure **4-61:** Correlation Plots for Rondonia **-** Time Scale Comparison Total Balance **........... 98** Figure 4-62: Storage Method Comparison **-** Absolute Error and Bias, Box Control Volumes **... 99** Figure 4-63: Storage Method Comparison **-** Surface Regression Stats, Box Control Volumes **100** Figure 4-64: Storage Method Comparison **-** Surface Correlation Stats, Box Control Volumes **101**

Figure *4-65:* Storage Method Comparison **-** Total Regression Stats, Box Control Volumes **.... 101** Figure 4-66: Storage Method Comparison **-** Total Correlation Stats, Box Control Volumes.... 102 Figure 4-67: Storage Method Comparison **-** Absolute Error and Bias, Basin Control Volumes 102 Figure 4-68: Storage Method Comparison **-** Surface Regression Stats, Basin Control Volumes **... 10 3** Figure 4-69: Storage Method Comparison **-** Surface Correlation Stats, Basin Control Volumes **...** 10 4 Figure 4-70: Storage Method Comparison **-** Total Regression Stats, Basin Control Volumes.. **105** Figure 4-71: Storage Method Comparison **-** Total Correlation Stats, Basin Control Volumes. **105** Figure 4-72: Correlation Plots for **SEUS -** Storage Method Comparison **Surface..................... 107** Figure 4-73: Correlation Plots for Larger **US -** Storage Method Comparison **Surface.............. 107** Figure 4-74: Correlation Plots for Miss. Basin **-** Storage Method Comparison Surface Runoff **108** Figure 4-75: Correlation Plots for P. Velho Basin **-** Storage Method Comparison Surface Runoff **... 10 8** Figure 4-76: Correlation Plots for Miss. Basin **-** Storage Method Comparison Reanalysis Runoff **... 10 9** Figure **4-77:** Correlation Plots for P. Velho Basin **-** Storage Method Comparison Re. Runoff. **109** Figure **4-78:** Control Volume Comparison **-** Atmos. and Surface Absolute Error and Bias Error **...** 1 11 Figure 4-79: Control Volume Comparison **-** Atmos, Surface, and Total Regressed Slope and R2 **...** 1 12 Figure 4-80: Control Volume Comparison **-** Atmos, Surface, and Total Corr. Coeff. and NRMSE **...** 1 12 Figure **4-81:** Tropical Volume Comparison **-** Atmos. and Surface Absolute Error and Bias Error **...** 1 14 Figure 4-82: Tropical Volume Comparison **-** Atmos, Surface, and Total Regressed Slope and R2 **...** 1 14 Figure 4-83: Tropical Volume Comparison **-** Atmos, Surf, and Total Corr. Coeff. and NRMSE **...** *1 15* Figure 4-84: Tropical Correlation Plots **-** Atmospheric Regression **.. 115** Figure 4-85: Tropical Correlation Plots **-** Surface **Regression... 116** Figure 4-86: Tropical Correlation Plots **-** Total **Regression... 116** Figure **5-1:** Eastern Brazil Reanalysis-1 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances **................ 126** Figure *5-2:* Eastern Brazil Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances **................ 126** Figure **5-3:** Eastern Brazil Different Sources of Yearly **Precipitation.. 127** Figure 5-4: Eastern Brazil Reanalysis-i Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances **............. 128** Figure **5-5:** Eastern Brazil Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances **............. 128** Figure **5-6:** Eastern Brazil Selected Yearly Water Balances **.. 129** Figure **5-7:** Eastern Brazil Selected Monthly Water Balances **... 130** Figure **5-8:** Larger Rondonia Reanalysis-i Yearly Atmospheric and Surface **Balances............ 132** Figure **5-9:** Larger Rondonia Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface **Balances............ 132** Figure **5-10:** Larger Rondonia Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation **................................. 133** Figure **5-11:** Larger Rondonia Reanalysis-1 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface **Balances....... 133** Figure *5-12:* Larger Rondonia Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface **Balances.......** 134 Figure **5-13:** Larger Rondonia Selected Yearly Water **Balances.. 136** Figure 5-14: Larger Rondonia Selected Monthly Water Balances **... 136**

Figure B-74: **15** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **.......** 414 Figure *B-75: 7.5* degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **......** 415 Figure **B-76: 30** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **...........................** *415* Figure **B-77: 15** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **...........................** 416 Figure **B-78: 7.5** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **..........................** 416 Figure **B-79: 30** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly................** 417 Figure B-80: **15** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly................** 417 Figure B-81: *7.5* degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **...............** 418 Figure B-82: **30** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly...........** 418 Figure **B-83: 15** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly...........** 419 Figure B-84: **7.5** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly..........** 419 Figure **B-85: 30** degree Regression **RA2** Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly...................** 420 Figure **B-86: 15** degree Regression **RA2** Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly...................** 420 Figure **B-87: 7.5** degree Regression **RA2** Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly..................** 421 Figure **B-88: 30** degree Regression **RA2 1:1** Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **............** 421 Figure **B-89: 15** degree Regression **RA2 1:1** Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **............** 422 Figure B-90: 7.5 degree Regression R^2 1:1 Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly 422 Figure B-91: **30** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly.......** 423 Figure B-92: **15** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly.......** 423 Figure B-93: **7.5** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical **Monthly......** 424 Figure B-94: **30** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **.................................** 424 Figure **B-95: 15** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **.................................** 425 Figure **B-96: 7.5** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **................................** 425 Figure **B-97: 30** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **.............** 426 Figure **B-98: 15** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **.............** 426 Figure B-99: **7.5** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly **............** 427 Figure B-10 **: 30** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly. 427 Figure B-101 **: 15** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly. 428 Figure B-102 **: 7.5** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly 428 Figure B-103 **: 30** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly.....................** 429 Figure B-10 4: **15** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly.....................** 429 Figure B-105 **: 7.5** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly....................** 430 Figure B-10 6: **30** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly **........** 430 Figure B-107 **: 15** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly **........** 431 Figure B-10 **8: 7.5** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly **.......** 431 Figure B-10 9: **30** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly **............................** 432 Figure B-l1(): **15** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly **............................** 432 Figure **B-11** L: **7.5** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly **...........................** 433 Figure **B-II** 2: **30** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly.................** 433 Figure **B-II 3: 15** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly.................** 434 Figure B- **¹¹** 4: **7.5** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly................** 434 Figure B-1 **5: 30** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly............** 435 Figure B- **¹¹ 6: 15** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly............** 435 Figure B- I1 *7:* **7.5** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical **Yearly...........** 436 Figure B-118: 30 degree Regression R^2 Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly 436 Figure B-119: 15 degree Regression R^2 Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly 437

Tables Index

1. Introduction

Large-scale land changes have occurred all over the world in the last few centuries. One example is the deforestation of the South American continent, particularly in the Amazon River Basin where rain forest is being changed into pasture and grazing land. Such changes have large-scale environmental impacts, including impacts on the water environment. Key to understanding the water environment is the quantification of the water balance over areas of interest. For the purposes of this work, the water balance is defined as a time series of the different water fluxes in and out of a control volume, which make up the hydrological cycle for the control volume. These fluxes include precipitation, evaporation, atmospheric moisture flux, and runoff, as well as the changes in atmospheric and surface water storage.

All of these fluxes are or available or can be derived from the **NCEP** Reanalysis in order to compute the water balance (Kalnay et al., **1996).** These datasets are based on most available historical data, and therefore are more reliable over areas with dense hydrometeorological monitoring (such as the United States and Europe), and not as accurate over remote areas like South America. Additional datasets pertaining to other water balance fluxes are also available.

This study attempts to use available hydrometeorological datasets to compute water balances over various regions of North and South America. The **NCEP** Reanalysis-1 and **NCEP** Reanalysis-2 are used as the primary sources of data, in addition to secondary datasets of precipitation and runoff. Several different schemes are studied in order to utilize the available hydrometeorological data most effectively.

The first chapter of this study will discuss the background and relevant previous studies. Chapter 2 will discuss the different types of data used and Chapter **3** will discuss the procedure followed in analyzing data in this study. Chapters 4, **5,** and **6** will deal with the data analysis of water balance variables while Chapter **7** will deal with the data analysis of the ground heat flux. Concluding remarks will be made in Chapter **8.**

1.1. Background on the Water Balance

The equations and the schematic of the water balance are given below:

Figure **1-1:** The Water Balance

For a given area of land, two control volumes are constructed. The atmospheric control volume contains all of the air above of a given area. The surface control volume contains everything below the air/surface boundary. The amount of water in each control volume at a given time is defined **by** the quantities W and **S,** which stand for atmospheric water vapor and surface storage respectively. The change of W and **S** with time must be equal to the net fluxes through the control volume. Equations **1-1** and 1-2 are the atmospheric and surface water balances respectively. The atmospheric water balance has inputs of Evaporation **(E)** and Moisture Flux **(Q)** and the output of Precipitation (P). Moisture flux is the moisture which moves into or out of an area of air over a land mass over a time period. In the surface water balance precipitation is an input while evaporation and runoff are outputs.

In this work we use a different time series of (P, **E,** *Q,* R, dW/dt, dS/dt) to evaluate the water balance over selected areas of the world. Monthly or yearly time periods are used. The time period (dt) over which we conduct these tests is either a month or a year. With six different variables in the water balance and a number of ways to arrive at several of the variables values, there are many alternative ways of computing the water balance.

1.2. Previous Relevant Studies

1.2.1. Rasmussen

One of the original and most complete water balance studies was undertaken **by** Eugene Rasmussen in the late 1960's in a series of three papers (Rasmussen **1967, 1968, 1971).** These references will be mentioned extensively throughout our study, as they are our study's foundation. Rasmussen uses precipitation, evaporation, runoff, surface storage, and pressure level wind and specific humidity data. Pressure level, specific humidity and wind data are used to calculate moisture flux.

The purpose of Rasmussen's study was to compute the two water balance variables for which no measurements typically exist: evaporation, and change in surface storage. Large control volumes were created over major hydrological regions of North America (such as the Mississippi River Basin), and atmospheric sounding data and observational datasets from the early 1960's were used. The resolution of the *2.5* degree data in Rasmussen's study is the same used in the modem Reanalysis. Rasmussen's basins covered larger areas of North America than the areas used in our balances.

1.2.2. Model Based Studies

Model derived water balances have as much of a history as data based balances starting with Baumgertner and Reichel **(1975)** and Willmott *(1985).* More recently Nicholson et al. **(1996)** used a model to compute the surface water balance over Africa using precipitation as a data input and land based parameters applied to a model to derive evaporation, storage, and runoff at **1** degree resolution. This data product is similar to that generated **by** Willmott **(1985),** a product which provides a fifty-year dataset of surface water balance variables on a **0.5** degree grid. Betts **(1998)** also used a model to produce a climatology, inputting precipitation for control volumes which are each part of the Mississippi River basin. **A** set of reanalysis data is used which yields good results on monthly time scales.

Lenters et al. (2000) used the NCEP-Reanalysis model in order to create a surface water balance climatology over the continental United States. The climatology is based on data from **1963- 1995.** The study utilized precipitation as well as other near surface variables and inputs. The study mentioned that the reanalysis precipitation is unfortunately "weakly constrained" **by** physical data. The **NCEP** Reanalysis surface water balance is classified as poor and the seasonal cycles for all variables are not consistent.

Oki et al. (2001) used modeling to generate a limited climatology for the Amazon River Basin. He took precipitation and broke it down into its surface balance counterparts (runoff, evaporation, and deep drainage). Several interesting concepts are used here including the use of an original simplified one degree runoff routing model called the TRIP pathways. Biases were analyzed and monthly runoff peaks were found to be shifted on the order of two to four months from precipitation peaks.

1.2.3. Data Based Studies

Recent work on regional water balance studies includes Higgins et al. **(1996).** An early version of the Reanalysis dataset was used to compute a moisture budget climatology for the Central United States, using data from **1985-1989.** The study used Rasmussen's techniques of calculating moisture *flux,* and found biases in the water balance that were on the same order of magnitude as moisture flux. These problems were attributed to the poor quality of the reanalysis over mountainous regions.

Mo et al. **(1996)** studied the atmospheric water balance on a regional basis using two preliminary reanalysis datasets, again to form a climatology for a number of years **(1982-1994).** Large discrepancies in tropical moisture transport were found, which are attributed to uncertainties in the divergence of winds.

Gutowaki et al. **(1997)** also used the Rasmussen moisture flux methodology, and as before used the Reanalysis for a number of years to create a water balance climatology of relevant variables. Here the surface water balance was integrated into the data analysis, while in the previous two studies only the atmospheric water balance was considered. This allows a comparison of the total water balance, or a comparison between moisture convergence and runoff, when storage terms can be reduced and eliminated over longer periods of time. Their study discussed the requirements for a control volume. Basin control volumes are used which must be large enough to have many grid points **(23** to **25** in this case) and moisture convergence is found over these volumes. The Moisture convergence is then compared to runoff, for which there is only one point, the discharge of the river basin.

Also discussed in Gutowaki is the idea of lag time as there is an observed difference between the peak cycles in moisture convergence and runoff in the absence of storage adjustments (which are eliminated for the climatology). Lag times are observed on the order of **30** to **60** days. Variability of the moisture convergence was found to be lower in areas such as the United States where the data quality is better.

More recently, Chen et al (2001) used Rasmussen's methodology of moisture flux calculation to produce a time series of water balance variables over a rectangular control volume in South America **(5 N 15 S, 70** W **50** W) in order to study the circulation patterns associated with Amazon deforestation. Specifically the moisture flux is calculated **by** Rasmussen's method and plotted along with precipitation and evaporation thus in effect yielding an atmospheric water balance. The study found an increasing trend in both moisture flux and precipitation over the control volume from 1948 to present.

Roads et al (2002) provided one of the most extensive water balance studies involving a reanalysis, in this case the new Reanalysis-2. Both surface and atmospheric water balances are computed as well as energy balances. **A** variety of different control volumes are investigated in different parts of the world each with unique land features. Like in many studies balance nudging terms are used to force the balance into compliance. In terms of magnitude the greatest residuals are found over the Amazon Basin, however the variables of the water balance (precipitation, evaporation, etc.) are highest here.

1.2.4. Precipitation Data Analysis Studies

Precipitation is a very unique quantity as it is, along with evaporation, a link between the two distinct atmospheric and surface water balances. Likely non-coincidently, precipitation datasets of the type used in our study are common and numerous. Although precipitation is only one variable in the water balance it is likely the most important because it is an exchange between the atmospheric and surface control volumes. Evaporation follows a fairly regular seasonal cycle and remains fairly even over a number of years, while precipitation varies.

Many of the existing precipitation datasets will be utilized in our study and discussed in detail in Chapter 2. Xie et al (1994) was one of the first studies involved in comparing globally resolved precipitation datasets on a monthly timescale. The study compared satellite and gauge based global precipitation datasets and observed many differences between different datasets. It is observed that gauges have a tendency to underestimate precipitation when aggregated over a larger area (gauges are point measurements), thus gauge datasets present a systematic bias. It was also determined that *5* gauges must be present in a *2.5* degree box in order to estimate precipitation within **10 %** for that box.

Janowiak et al **(1997),** analyzed the Global Precipitation Climatology Project **(GPCP),** comparing it to the precipitation dataset derived from the **NCEP** Reanalysis. This task relies heavily on the data assimilation of the **NCEP** Reanalysis which contains a precipitation field. The Reanalysis precipitation shows a very regular pattern, while the **GPCP** shows a more realistic and random pattern. Observations made **by** Janowiak include very poor temporal agreement over South America and Africa (remote areas), but good over the United States, Europe, and Australia, a clear byproduct of poor data in remote areas with few observations. There is global precipitation agreement in these datasets, despite the regional differences.

Rudolf (2001) discussed a 1 degree precipitation global monthly precipitation dataset, derived from *2.5* degree information, and the importance of satellites in this process. Satellite studies such as the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (current) and Global Precipitation Mission (proposed) are encouraged and satellite data is said to be especially important over the oceans.

1.3. Motivation for Study and Discussion

Although there have been many water balances studies using various hydrometeorological datasets, these studies have had various limitations. Some of these studies use a time series of data of multiple years, but condense this data into a climatology only yielding a water balance for a typical year. Other studies calculate one or several of the water balance variables **by** solving the balance for that variable or deriving the variable from a model. Thus, the balance is forced. Most recently, Roads (2002) uses data for all variables in the water balance equation, and then adds an additional nudging term as needed to correct for imbalance. None of these studies evaluate a mutli-year monthly or yearly water balance using only data for each variable, and evaluate the imbalance of the water balance instead of correcting it.

At first water balances were tested over remote control volumes in South America in which long term climatological changes in the water balance were suspected. The **NCEP** Reanalysis could provide all of the data fields necessary to produce such a balance, but the various balance tests themselves, on both the monthly and yearly time scales yielded results far from correct. Errors were on the order of magnitude of the variables going into the balance. These findings begged the question of whether it was possible to complete a regionally sized water balance over a remote location. The idea of creating a water balance study for any region on the planet, inhabited or not, requires using remote sensing technologies to obtain fields where land based measurements are not available.

The **NCEP** Reanalysis-1 and **NCEP** Reananlysis-2 are integral parts of our study because they contain all necessary water balance data for each grid point globally. These datasets are based on all available hydrometeorological information, which may not be plentiful in remote areas. Therefore, in addition to choosing study areas over remote areas of South America it is also important to include areas where land based measurements are more prevalent. The United States is such a place, and contains areas that are large enough so that regional water balances over the United States can be compared to those in South America.

The flaw in the design of the water balance is that it is a measure of consistency in data and not accuracy. As long as the data used in the water balance provides a balance at each time step, the water balance is solved. However, if two or more water balances variables are incorrect the equation may still yield good results, if the errors are equal and opposite. In the case of an imbalance, it is also difficult to determine which water balance variable is off in the equation, or which is off **by** the most. In some cases this is easy to detect **by** common sense. Attention must be paid to false balances, but one reassuring thought is that if it is so hard to compute a truly balanced water balance, it is likely harder to compute a falsely balanced water balance. The key is to complete the water balance so as to insure the integrity of the data used.

1.4. Relation of Energy Balance to Water Balance (Ground Heat Flux)

The energy balance and water balance are linked **by** the evaporation term and as shown in the Roads' (2002) study. Similar methodologies can be used to balance the energy and water balance.

Consider here the surface energy balance:

$R_{net} = G + SH + LH$

The NCEP-Reanalysis provides each of these fields. Traditional methods of obtaining energy fluxes are complex, as measurements at several levels are generally necessary to estimate fluxes at a point for a given time. Wang et al. **(1998, 1999)** have derived ways to obtain ground, sensible, and latent heat fluxes from a time series of the relevant variables (generally temperature) at a point. In the case of ground heat flux, only ground surface temperature or skin temperature is need. In the case of sensible heat flux, only air temperature is needed, and in the case of latent heat flux only air temperature and humidity are needed. Additional information based on land type, which is typically time invariant, is also utilized in these methods. The Net Radiation term can be computed or directly measured using well known methods.

This work uses the Wang et al. **(1999)** methodology to compute global ground heat *flux.* This is part of a larger effort to create independent global energy flux maps that can refine our knowledge of the global energy balance. Chapter **7** presents these results.

2. **Datasets**

The primary source of data for our study is the **NCEP** Reanalysis, which provides many useful hydrometeorological variables. **All** variables used in the water balance except precipitation and runoff, are provided or derived from the reanalysis. There are several large efforts to compile long term gridded and station oriented precipitation data sets. Precipitation is a very important component of the hydrological process, yet it is found that differing datasets provide very different estimates of mean monthly and mean annual precipitation for the study areas chosen. Independent precipitation estimates are all the more important because the reanalysis precipitation is solely model derived.

Our study considered monthly data through December 2002. Almost all of the datasets used are gridded for either part of or the entire globe. The size of the grid varies from *0.5* degree to *2.5* degree spacing depending on dataset. The distortion of the curvature of the earth is taken into consideration in all calculations. Its effect is very small in tropical regions.

2.1. NCEP Reanalysis

The **NCEP** Reanalysis is derived from a combination of land surface, ship, rawinsonde, aircraft, and satellite data, as well as other sources, and uses state of the art data assimilation and modeling techniques (Kalnay, **1996).** The dataset is available monthly from January 1948 to present. Each variable is assigned a classification based on the methodology through which it is derived. **A** list of these classifications for relevant fields is given in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1: Reanalysis-1 Data Classification (Kalnay, **1996)**

The humidity and wind fields, which are used to calculate the moisture flux, are classified as fairly reliable (Class **A** and B). It stands to reason that this analysis would be more accurate over the United States than over more remote areas where there is less observed data.

While alternative global precipitation datasets are easy to find, alternative evaporation data sets are generally unavailable. It is argued that for the purposes of our study the evaporation estimates for the reanalysis are fairly reliable because of the nature of evaporation. Evaporation data exhibits a fairly seasonal cycle with only small variations. Thus changes in the water balance are more likely to be the result of the other terms in the atmospheric water balance, like the precipitation for which there are many sources, and the moisture flux which is supposedly derived **by** fairly accurate data.

The data to be used for the surface water balance includes only variables derived from the model, class **C,** including precipitation, evaporation, runoff, soil moisture, and snow cover. The reliability of information on water balance data for water moving through and along the land surface is small. This work uses various alternatives to quantify runoff in order to improve the ability to close a surface water balance with reanalysis data.

The global resolution of the datasets refers to total amount of points provided **by** the dataset. The wind velocity and specific humidity fields are gridded every **2.5** degrees, while fields that are model derived are gridded approximately every **1.9** degrees in both latitude and longitude. The resolution of the data necessary for the moisture flux calculations is therefore very sparse. The reanalysis provides both wind and humidity data at **8** atmospheric levels over the entire globe, and this data is necessary for calculating moisture flux.

2.2. **NCEP Reanalysis 2**

Recently, a second reanalysis data set has been released entitled the **NCEP/DOE** Reanalysis-2. This dataset has all the features of the original reanalysis that are useful for the water balance. There are many improvements made to the data assimilation techniques including: fixing cloud tuning and snow properties, implementing new simpler rainfall assimilation for soil wetness, updating the precipitation parameterization, fixing of the snow cover analysis, and removing the nudging of deep layer soil moisture (Kanamitsu et al., 2002).

The altering of the soil moisture nudging term is of particular interest due to the problems that have been observed with change in surface storage. The Reanalysis-I used a **60** day climatology nudging term which caused a very high seasonal cycle, and this is improved in the Reanalysis-2. Also actual observed precipitation measurements are used in this dataset when the ground is not frozen.

There were improvements in several important fields including the soil wetness fields, winter time precipitation and tropical precipitation, and equatorial divergent winds (used for calculation of moisture flux. The tropical precipitation is improved but still classified as problematic. This dataset is only available for **23** years from **1979** to 2001. However, because data collection over remote areas has been more common in recent years, the overall water balance using Reanalysis2 data should be much better. Future plans include extending this dataset back to the 1950's thus allowing for a full comparison with the first reanalysis.

2.3. The Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP)

The Global Precipitation Climatology Project is one of the largest efforts directed at developing a global precipitation dataset. Data is incorporated from a variety of sources including low-orbitsatellite microwave data, geosynchronous-orbit satellite infrared data, and rain gauge observations. The original **GPCP** (version **1)** was gridded on a **2.5** degree resolution thus its original component datasets are gridded at this resolution for consistency. The dataset originally spanned the time period of July **1987** through December **1995.** The newer version of the **GPCP** has increased its resolution to **1** degree. The dataset now starts in January **1979** (around the time of the first remote sensing), and runs through the end of 2001. Since the dataset is on a 1-degree **by** 1-degree grid, each month of the dataset is composed of a **180** x **360** grid of the globe. This dataset classifies satellite data as useful, but it is improved a great deal using rain gauge data in its algorithms (Huffman et al., **1997).**

2.3.1. Components

In the derivation of the global precipitation climatology project several different precipitation datasets were created from independent data sources. It was the hypothesis of the **GPCP** that the combination of these data sources would yield the most accurate global precipitation dataset. However, the use of these products independently for a water balance can highlight the usefulness of each dataset. The **GPCP** states that each dataset is useful in a unique way. For instance one dataset may accurately predict the month to month variations in a water balance, while another may be a very strong annual predictor but have seasonal deficiencies. As stated above there are three major components of the **GPCP:** gauge based data, geostationary IR data, and microwave data. Each of these sources has different temporal and spatial variations, but each result in a gridded monthly dataset. In the following we discuss the gauge component and the geostationary IR component. Because the microwave estimates are based on **SSM/I** data, an initially independent precipitation dataset, it is discussed in detail in later sections.

2.3.1.1. GPCC Gauge

The **GPCC** is the land based gauge component of **GPCP.** It is a gridded 2.5-degree dataset of precipitation based on the interpolation of **6700** gauge stations onto a lat-long grid using SPHEREMAP developed **by** Wilmott et al. *(1985).* Because it is based on rain gauges this dataset has the potential for high accuracy, however it uses point sources of data, which are **highly** variable from point to point. The time coverage of this dataset is currently Jan **1986** through December **1996,** which allows it to be used in the water balances with both reanalysis products, for all land based control volumes. Quality control technique with the **GPCC** involves first comparing data to regional means, and pulling out anomalies, and then studying each of these anomalies considering known relief and catastrophic events. This dataset is as a very important component of the **GPCP;** however it is also important to consider this dataset as compared to other gauge based datasets, especially the precipitation reconstruction dataset discussed later (Huffman et al., **1997).**

2.3.1.2. Global Precipitation Index

The global precipitation index is a subset dataset of the **GPCP,** which is derived almost exclusively from geostationary satellites specifically the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellites **(GOES)** from the United States, the Geostationary Meteorological Satellite **(GMS)** from Japan, and the Meteosat from the European community. The satellites collect infrared imagery on a **3** hour basis which is integrated into a monthly time scale. When geostationary data is not available, **NOAA** polar orbiting satellites are used instead. The resolution is a **2.5** degree grid, consistent with **GPCP,** and the data is only available in the tropics from 40 degrees north to 40 degrees south. Thus, for some regions **GPI** data isn't available exclusively from geostationary satellites. The **GPI** is used in deriving one of the TRMM products discussed later. The time coverage of this dataset is January **1986** through the present. The major pitfall discussed pertaining to the **GPI** is that in cases where the satellite nadir point is far from the region of interest rainfall is overestimated (Huffman et al., **1997).**

2.4. Precipitation Reconstruction (PREC)

The precipitation reconstruction dataset is likely the most complete gridded monthly precipitation dataset based completely on rain gauges. Two major gauge sources are included, the Global Historical Climatology Network **(GHCN)** and the Climate Anomaly Monitoring System **(CAMS).** The result is information from over **17,000** stations, far more than the **GPCC.** The dataset is gridded on a **2.5** degree grid and runs from January 1948 to November 2002 for all land points. As is the case with other gauge datasets, the gathering of data often takes a few months and therefore at the time of data gathering for our water balance study the last month of 2002 was not available. Several different data assimilation techniques are evaluated in the process of preparing this dataset. Also included with this dataset is the number of gauges used for each grid point. Thus, for each control volume the amount of gauges can be tracked using knowledge of how many gauges per unit area are available for a given control volume (Chen et al, 2002). **A** graph of the number of precipitation gauges per area in some of the selected control volumes used in this work is given in Figure 2-1. The big differences occur between points in Brazil and the United States especially early in the study period. Recent rain gauge data is severely reduced due to the amount of time required to process rain gauge data and the recent switching to remote sensing technologies.

Figure 2-1: Rain Gauge Density in Selected Areas of Interest

2.5. **CPC Merged Analysis of Precipitation (CMAP)**

The CPC Merged Analysis of Precipitation combines multiple sources of data including gauge data and several different types of satellite data (the Global Precipitation index (GPI), the OLR Precipitation Index, two types of SSM/I, and a microwave sounding unit, MSU). All of these datasets with the exception of the microwave sounding data are analyzed as independent datasets, which are available individually. The CMAP dataset is similar to the GPCP in that it combines many sources of information. In addition, a second dataset is derived combining all sources and also using a model. The two products are referred to hereafter as CMAP and CMAP2 (model). Again the data is gridded on a *2.5* degree basis. An observation made in the documentation of the CMAP is that modeled precipitation is often calculated poorly in the tropical regions (Xie et al., 1997).

2.6. CAMS/OPI

CAMS/OPI is another global precipitation product gridded on a *2.5* degree basis. This dataset's goal is to produce a monthly precipitation that can be generated in real time. Products such as the GPCP and CMAP typically take a few months in order to collect the gauge data and combine it with other data sources to provide monthly means. This dataset combines a gauge and satellite dataset that are available shortly after the conclusion of a month. Rain gauge totals come from the Climate Anomaly Monitoring System (CAMS), and satellite estimates are included that are derived from outgoing longwave radiation (OLR) for the OLR Precipitation Index (OPI) (Janowiak et al., **1999).**

Two data subsets from the **CAMS/OPI** product are used in this work, the independent OPI estimates (OP12), and the combined **CAMS-OPI** dataset (OP13). The combined **CAMS-OPI** dataset is based on a CMAP climatology from **1987** to *1995* and therefore may be biased towards the CMAP dataset. The actual **CAMS** dataset is a gauge dataset similar and probably less accurate than other gauge based datasets and therefore is not included. The producers of this dataset warn about its use in studies such as the water balance study being conducted here and recommend the use of the **GPCP** or CMAP datasets. However, this dataset is unique in that it can be derived in real time and its effectiveness in water balance studies should be evaluated.

2.7. SSM/I

The special sensor microwave imager is a satellite based remote sensing device. It has been used from July **1987** to the present and one of its products is a global precipitation dataset. The dataset is **1** degree, gridded globally. Two separate procedures are used to retrieve data over land and ocean. When processing the **SSM/I** time gaps were discovered. Some of the record prior to **1992** is incomplete which results in missing data in both the monthly and yearly resolutions of the water balances computed. There are several other sources of precipitation to apply during the time period of **SSM/I.** In addition one of the three products of the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission discussed in the next section is a **1** degree gridded **SSM/I** global dataset, which is likely more reliable than it's predecessor if for any reason, because it's data is more recent. The absolute magnitude of the **SSM/I** rainfall is found to be too high **by** the datasets producers, a hypothesis that can be tested **by** water balance analysis (Ferraro et al., **1996).**

2.8. The Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM)

The Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission, is a project undertaken **by NASA,** to measure precipitation in the tropical regions of the globe (between 40 degrees north and 40 degrees south), for use in hydrologic research projects such as this water balance study. The need for tropical precipitation measurements is considered important because of its magnitude and relative importance to the global water cycle. The mission also allows for a much closer look at precipitation in the Amazon rain forests where primary sources of data are not available. The TRMM products are available from January **1998** to present.

Our study does not attempt to discuss the actual process and retrieval algorithms of the TRMM satellite or any other precipitation satellite. It rather discusses the difference of processes used in producing datasets and evaluates these processes through the water balance methodologies. Unfortunately it is impossible to apply the TRMM precipitation datasets to a basin control volume because runoff data for the basins studied is only readily available through **1996.** Many other precipitation sources such as those described earlier are included in the TRMM analysis, most of which are incorporated in dataset 3B43 which is of primary interest for application to water balances. The following three datasets were derived as products of the TRMM mission and are used in this work.

2.8.1. Data Product 3A46

The 3A46 TRMM data product is the **SSM/I** monthly tropical rainfall estimates from the TRMM project, gridded on a **1** degree **by** 1-degree basis providing a monthly grid of data **180** x **360.** The record extends from January **1998** to August 2001, and is no longer being updated actively. The entire series of available monthly rainfall data is analyzed here.

2.8.2. GPCC_TRMM

An additional component of the TRMM precipitation dataset is the continuation of the gauge based analysis from the Global Precipitation Climate Center. This dataset is given as an independent product of TRMM and numbered 3A45B. It is in essence an extension of the **GPCC** Gauge precipitation dataset from January **1998** to the present, however the dataset at processing was only available (as PREC) until November 2002. The resolution of the data is increased to 1 degree to be consistent with other TRMM products.

2.8.3. Data Product 3B43

The 3B43 TRMM data product takes the rainfall information from the TRMM satellite and merges it with other satellite and gauge data to produce a TRMM data product on a 1 degree grid. This dataset uses the actual TRMM data in combination with 3A46 and additional gauge based data including 3A45B, and is likely the best estimate of precipitation of a monthly basis from the tropical rainfall measuring mission, and the best estimate for gridded monthly precipitation over it's time period **(1998-2002),** and it's spatial coverage (40 **N** to 40 **S).**

2.9. USGS Runoff

The **USGS** website contains extensive historical monthly runoff data for almost all of the significant rivers in the United States, especially those that would be useful in conducting water balances at a regional scale (http://www.usgs.gov). Two stations are used from this resource, one near the end of the Arkansas River and one near the end of the Mississippi River. The corresponding site numbers for these data sets are **0725800** and **0728600** respectively. Unfortunately from this source the runoff data isn't updated frequently, although a comprehensive dataset is available from (1948 to **1996)** for the Mississippi River and from 1948 to **1993** for the Arkansas River. In order to better compare water balances, the Arkansas River runoff is extended to **1996** based on the given historical data.

2.10. RivDIS Runoff Data

A very useful dataset is the LBA-HydroNET version 2, (available at http://lbahydronet.sr.unh.edu/database.html). This dataset includes a comprehensive river gauge network of South American Rivers, with good temporal resolution. This data allows for the study of basin water balance studies on two scales, specifically the Madeira River which flows through Rondonia, Brazil, and the Amazon River, (Oki **1998,** Chen 2001). Recently this dataset has been updated over South America giving runoff data for major rivers on the continent for about thirty years in most cases, while the original extent for these two stations was ten years. This new data resource is very valuable in conducting a regional water balance analysis. The sites used are site id **13022** for the Madeira River and *13065* for the Amazon River. Data is available from **1970** to **1996** for both stations.

2.11. Total Runoff Integrating Pathways (TRIP)

This dataset is an **ASCII** grid of runoff directions for all land points on the globe on a **1** degree and *.5* degree grid. It was derived through two major processes. The first involved the use of a digital elevation model converted to a coarser resolution in order to find the lowest neighbor and steepest slope between grid points. This methodology then had to be modified subjectively **by** adjusting the data with an atlas. Basins are eventually derived for major rivers across the globe (those with a significant enough drainage basins that can resolved on a 1 degree or **0.5** degree grid, thus the **0.5** degree grid picks up more rivers.

The primary purpose for creating this dataset is to help in global circulation models and water balances studies such as this one. The documentation states that other water balance variables such as precipitation, evaporation, and soil moisture are now becoming available on a global basis, thus necessitating an accurate way of routing runoff across land through such models. The dataset also provides a method of finding runoff per unit area of a control volume or a basin, which is the form in which runoff is evaluated at in our water balances. Both the *0.5* degree resolution and 1 degree resolution are used in separate applications. The **0.5** degree data is used with a gridded runoff database, while the **1** degree data is used to derive the shape of the basin control volume.

2.12. Missing Precipitation Data

One the major advantages of the reanalysis precipitation is it is seamless temporally and spatially. Unfortunately most of the precipitation datasets used are missing data either spatially or temporally. In most cases these missing values don't affect the ability to conduct water balances for the selected regions; however in some regions certain precipitation datasets can't be used. Table 2-2 outlines these errors in terms of the regions being studied. When the individual control volumes are analyzed separately in Sections 4.2, precipitation availability will be looked into in more detail.

It should be noted that although temporal gaps exist in the **SSM/I** dataset it is possible to use the **SSM/I** data for a monthly water balance. The Spatial coverage of **SSM/I** is flawless.

Table 2-2 Temporal Resolution of Precipitation Data

3. Procedure

The object of this study is applying the datasets described previously to a simple water balance model, and evaluating which datasets produce the best water balances. The exercise relies heavily on the **NCEP** Reanalysis, which contains all necessary fields. Only precipitation and runoff will be obtained from non reanalysis sources. Evaluating the water balance derived from the **NCEP** Reanalysis data, while using different methods and sources of precipitation and runoff will elucidate the value of information.

In this chapter the principles of a water balance are described and discussed in more detail than in Chapter **1,** and the methodologies **by** which each variable in the water balance is obtained is discussed. Lastly, the data analysis tools used to evaluate the various water balances are described.

3.1. A Water Balance

The general principle of a water balance is very simple and was outlined **by** Rasmussen in the late 1960's (Rasmussen **1967, 1968).** These early investigations came up with a methodology for the United States where data for such a balance was first available. Two storage equations can be set up, one for the storage of atmospheric water vapor (the precipitable water), and another for the storage of surface, soil moisture, and groundwater. These equations are given below:

Figure **3-1:** The Water Balance

A schematic of the control volume is given in Figure **3-1.** The first equation, or the atmospheric water balance, equates the water coming in and out of the atmosphere, and refers to the top portion of the control volume drawn in Figure **3-1.** The second equation, or the surface water balance, equates the water coming in and out of the ground surface, and refers to the bottom portion of the control volume drawn in Figure **3-1. All** terms in these equations are time averaged values either monthly or yearly in this study.

In water balance calculations we use two types of data, spatially averaged data and boundary flux data. This has an effect on the manner which certain fields are calculated over the control volume. In this study the data is primarily gridded at a resolution less than that of the control volume. Spatially averaged terms include precipitation, evaporation, change in precipitable water, and change in storage. **All** these terms can be found **by** simply averaging the gridded data. Because the data is gridded **by** latitude and longitude, distortion effects are taken into account as a function of latitude.

Precipitation and evaporation can then be directly applied to the water balance equations. Change in surface and atmospheric storage can also be found **by** spatial averaging, with differences of values approximating time derivatives. Because runoff and moisture flux come and go through the actual boundaries of the control volume, different methodologies must be analyzed to determine the best way to utilize gridded datasets to obtain these values. Such methodologies are outlined later.

3.1.1. Box control volume

The reanalysis as well as a number of monthly global precipitation datasets are presented in gridded latitude longitude boxes of varying sizes. In order to utilize these datasets in a regional scale water balance, the datasets are spatially averaged over a control area, which in its basic form is a rectangle with four coordinates. The programming developed finds the average value for a variable inside the coordinates.

In the case of moisture flux calculations one point is used to estimate the flux through a boundary that is approximately **250** km wide. In order for the flux through the side of a control volume to be accurately computed it is important to use more than one data point. Taking three points on each side of the control volume as a minimum yields a box **7.5** degrees on a side. This allows for a meaningful average flux to be calculated across that boundary. It is also a small enough region over which significant land surface change can be observed in the past **fifty** years. Additional balances were performed for two cases using **15** degrees latitude and longitude on each side, as a comparison tool. Theoretically a better balance can be achieved over a larger control volume due to greater spatially averaging. It is also possible, however, that a larger control volume will cause already error prone data to become increasingly problematic.

Figure **3-2** shows specifically the eight box control volumes which were selected for this study. First, three control volumes were chosen of the **7.5** degree size. They represent three different stages of deforestation in the Amazon rain forest. The Eastern Brazil control volume is an example of already deforested land, the Rondonia control volume is an example of land currently being deforested, and the Norwest Brazil control volume is an example of land not yet deforested. In order to make comparisons, a control volume was chosen over the Southeast United States as a control. It is an area which in theory should have a good water balance since there is good observation data in this area. Also included at this smaller size is a control volume over the Southwest United States, a dry arid region, which we would like to contrast against the more tropical control volumes.
The Southwest United States and Rondonia control volumes are enlarged to form the Larger **US** and Larger Rondonia control volumes which are **15** degrees on a side. The comparison is again over an area in tropical remote South America, and a drier more detailed North America. Only two distinct control volumes can be formed over these continents as land masses of **15** degrees on a side are hard to find especially in the Western Hemisphere. An additional control volume over the East Coast of the Untied States was originally included to try and compute water balances over a land and sea area. This later proved to be an impossible task, so this control volume is included only in discussing the moisture flux methodology, nowhere else.

(a)

Figure **3-2:** (a) Selected Box Control Volumes of the Reanalysis Land/Sea Grid, **(b)** North American Box Control Volumes, (c) South American Box Control Volumes

Table **3-1** denotes the different land areas of the box control volumes selected. The total vertical dimension of the control volume is any height through which water passes horizontally assuming no water enters of exits the top or bottom of the control volume. The total control volume is then broken into two control volumes at the air surface boundary, creating the atmospheric and surface control volumes. Although two standard control volume sizes are used **(7.5** and **¹⁵** degrees on a side), the land areas of these control volumes are slightly different because of latitude distortion. Rasmussen states that moisture flux calculations should be used only on a scale appropriate to the data given. In Rasmussen's last study in **1971** volumes were used between **500000** km^2 and 4200000 km^2 (similar to the scale used in this study). Specific dimensions of the box control volumes are not given here because there will be two slightly different versions of each of the box sized control volumes, as will be discussed in the Section 3.2.4, Moisture Flux Methodology Coordinates.

Control Volume	Land Area (km^2)	Control Volume	Land Area (km^2)
East Coast	$2,106,000$ km ^{γ} 2	Northwest Brazil	692,000 km 2
Eastern Brazil	655,000 km ²	Rondonia	678,000 km 2
Larger Rondonia	2,725,000 km ²	SEUS	558,000 km ²
Larger Untied States	2,027,000 km ²	SWUS	539,000 km ²

Table **3-1:** Box Sized Control Volume Land Areas

3.1.2. Basin Control Volumes

In order to use an alternative source of runoff data for this study, a method was devised to create a control volume in the shape of a basin. An example of such a control volume is shown below for the Arkansas River Basin. The process **by** which these control volumes are derived and used is discussed in Section **3.3.2.2** Basin Type Control Volumes.

Figure **3-3:** Arkansas Basin Sized Control Volume

3.1.3. Global Analysis

The programming devised for this study provides a time series of different water balance variables from different datasets based on four input boundaries: north, south, east, and west. Because datasets of a resolution applicable to this study are generally global in coverage, it is possible to input any four coordinates into the program and find the applicable water balance statistics. Although some precipitation and obviously all runoff datasets are limited only to land masses, full atmospheric water balances can be analyzed and calculated globally.

3.1.4. Units

The units that will be used for the remainder of this study are kg/m^2-month. Yearly data will therefore be presented as average monthly data, in order to make the magnitude of the monthly and yearly water balances comparable. Thus, water balance variables will be spatially averaged over the entire control volume. Normalized quantities will contain these units in both the numerator and denominator and therefore will be unitless.

3.2. Atmospheric Water Balance

The governing equation for the atmospheric water balance is:

$$
\frac{dW}{dt} = -P + E + Q \tag{3-1}
$$

Spatially averaged precipitation from a variety of sources and evaporation from both reanalyzes are included in various analysis of the atmospheric water balance. The calculation of the time series of moisture flux and change in precipitable water require additional calculations of the reanalysis data.

3.2.1. Atmospheric Change in Storage

As described before, the **NCEP** Reanalysis contains monthly precipitable water. The control volume in an atmospheric water balance is the air mass above a designated plot of land. The amount of water stored in this control volume is called the precipitable water or the total amount of water vapor present which could potentially be rained out of the sky. The change in precipitable water (dW/dt) can generally be assumed to be zero on a year to year basis, although monthly changes may be significant.

The equation used in this research for change in precipitable water is the average change in precipitable water between a time period before and a time period after, where **AT** is a month or a year:

$$
\frac{dW_t}{dt} = \frac{W_{t+1} - W_{t-1}}{2\Delta T}
$$
 Eq. (3-3)

3.2.2. Moisture Flux Calculation

Rasmussen devised **a method** of calculating the moisture flux through the boundary of a control volume. This method requires wind and specific humidity data at different levels, which is provided on a 2.5-degree grid **by** the Reanalysis-i and Reanalysis-2. The moisture flux can be divided into an x and **y** component **by:**

$$
Q_u = \frac{1}{g} \int_{p_u}^{p_s} q\overline{u} \, dp = \frac{1}{9.8m/s^2} \int_{300mb}^{1000mb} q\overline{u} \, dp
$$
 Eq. (3-4)

$$
Q_{\nu} = \frac{1}{g} \int_{\rho u}^{\rho s} q \overline{v} \, dp = \frac{1}{9.8 m/s^2} \int_{300 mb}^{1000 mb} q \overline{v} \, dp
$$
 Eq. (3-5)

The moisture *flux* terms are given **by** the integral of specific humidity times wind velocity from ground level atmospheric pressure to an atmospheric pressure where water vapor transport is negligible. The **NCEP** Reanalysis provides specific humidity u-wind velocity, and v-wind velocity data points at **8** pressure levels: **1000,** *925, 850,* **700, 600, 500,** 400, and **300** mb. Above **300** mb specific humidity is very low and therefore its horizontal movement through the atmosphere is negligible in these calculations.

The flux at each point that is relevant to the control volume is found **by** a numerical integration technique. The pressure difference between two points is multiplied **by** the average value of the wind multiplied by the specific humidity for the two points being considered. The result of this numerical integration is a mass flux of water vapor through a point in kg/s per m of length through which the flux passes.

Regardless of methodology, considering a rectangular control volume, the moisture flux will enter the cube on each of its four faces, north, south, east, and west. The north and south fluxes are found **by** the equation for Qv. Qu gives the east and west fluxes. The total moisture flux for the control volume is the sum of the contributing moisture fluxes of each border.

$$
Q = QW - QE + QS - QN
$$
 Eq. (3-6)

Q is positive when moisture is flowing into the control volume. The units of this calculation are then multiplied **by** the length of the perimeter to obtain the total **kg** flux per time, then converted to monthly units and divided **by** the area of the control volume. This results in the units of kg/m²-month, the standard units used for the other aspects of the water balance.

3.2.3. Moisture Flux Methodologies

Two methods for defining the moisture flux of a box control volume are investigated in this study (see Figure 3-4). The data points given **by** the reanalysis are gridded at a resolution of every **2.5** degrees. One method chooses the border so it aligns with this grid and thus the control volume is aligned on points as shown on the right side of Figure 3-4. The accuracy of the measurement therefore is dependant on using actual points. However, using this method a border that is *7.5* degrees long (approximately 834 km) is represented **by** only **3** data points.

Moisture Flux Methodologies for Box Control Volumes

Figure 3-4: Moisture Flux Methodologies

Alternatively, if the control volume is selected between the points on the data grid, the flux can be calculated as the average of the two closest points to the border and for the same length of control volume border **6** data points are used, however each data point is a significant distance from the actual border. This method is shown on the left of Figure 3-4. Both methods are used for each control volume.

3.2.4. Moisture Flux Methodology Coordinates

The control volumes that were selected for this study coincided with the gridding of the pressure level specific humidity and wind velocity in one of two ways. Data points for the gridding scheme in the reanalysis followed a **2.5** degree grid stating at **0** degrees East longitude and **90** degrees North latitude. Table **3.2** provides the coordinates of each of the box control volumes used in this study. Each control volume has two sets of boundaries for moisture flux methods 1 and 2. The control volume is shifted slightly **by 1.25** degrees between methods. In the interests of keeping these control volumes over land boundaries so as to be able to calculate a surface and an atmospheric water balance, it wasn't possible to move all control volumes in the same direction.

Table **3-2:** Coordinates of box control volumes for the two different moisture flux methodologies

3.3. Surface Water Balance

The general surface water balance equation is given as:

$$
\frac{dS}{dt} = P - E - R
$$
 Eq. (3-2)

Again, spatially averaged precipitation from a number of sources and evaporation from the reanalysis is used with this equation for each time step. For all control volumes both runoff and change in surface storage can be derived from the reanalysis, however in the case of a basin sized control volume there is a much more accurate alternative source of runoff, actual stream gauge data.

3.3.1. Surface Storage Term

Rasmussen **(1967)** defined the storage term as the change in surface water, soil moisture, and groundwater. It is also stated that in a land based control volume, with a land area of at least 15000 km², that the change in surface water will be minimal over a month or year unless there is the presence of a lake of similar scale, or part of the control volume is over the ocean. However, for all regional water balance analyzes in this study, change in surface water is seen as a factor, perhaps because in the reanalysis surface storage is such an important balancing term.

Soil moisture and change in snow cover are taken to be the primary cause in change of surface water storage, which is derived from the shallow soil moisture **(0-10** cm) and deeper soil moisture (10-200 cm) data points of the **NCEP** Reanalysis, as well as snow cover. Soil moisture fields in the Reanalysis are given as a water level including the height of water in the soil. Water can only reside in the pores, which are assumed to be **30 %** of the total space. Therefore the height of water in a "reservoir" (the surface and subsurface) is arrived at **by** multiplying the soil moisture **by .3** and the snow height **by .1.** Snow is assumed to be **90 %** air and **10 %** water. The height of surface storage in cm can be converted to kg/m².

The change in storage for a month was found **by** using one unit future and one unit past data.

$$
\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{S_{t-1} - S_{t+1}}{2\Delta T}
$$
 Eq. (3-7)

3.3.2. Runoff Methodologies

The **NCEP** Reanalysis provides a gridded runoff dataset with the same units as the precipitation and evaporation. **A** gridded runoff dataset is counterintuitive as runoff is typically measured at a point. **A** gridded runoff dataset will likely include many points of runoff leaving the grid point in many directions, if it is of any significant size. However, given the constraint of a box control volume it is impossible to identify all point runoff fluxes which flow through the control volume boundaries, as these points are numerous and for the most part not gauged. Therefore the gridded runoff dataset given **by** the reanalysis is useful, but methods must be devised to determine the routing of the runoff. These methods include the use of Oki's TRIP pathways.

3.3.2.1. Uses **of TRIP Pathways in combination with Reanalysis Runoff**

In order to determine the runoff flux through the selected control volumes the reanalysis runoff and the Oki TRIP pathways are combined. Figure **3-3** (a-e) shows a series of diagrams outlining this combination.

Figure **3-5:** Derivation of the Runoff Routing Methodology For the Boxed Control Volume

Figure **3-5** (a) shows the integration of the datasets involved. The larger green box indicates a hypothetical control volume for which the water balance is being taken. The red boxes indicate the gridded **NCEP** Reanalysis runoff values, which have a resolution of slightly less than 2 degrees on a side. Each red box through which the green control volume boundary passes through represents one runoff value in the Reanalysis. The center of the control volume is not gridded because these runoff values are unnecessary in finding the flux of runoff through the control volume's sides. The blue lines represent the TRIP pathways network at .5-degree resolution. In the dataset, each node represents a direction over which runoff flows from the node (as in a river network), and these directions are used to route the gridded Reanalysis runoff (red), through the boundary of the control volume (green).

To better illustrate the procedure used to apply the runoff data to the control volume, two reanalysis runoff grid boxes are isolated in Figure **3-5 (b).** As can be seen here, each Reanalysis runoff grid has several TRIP directions in it, which can be used to determine in which direction this runoff value is traveling in the larger box. If all of these directions indicate that runoff is flowing out of the control volume for a certain box, then the full runoff mass is added to the runoff total of the control volume. **If** the runoff directions indicate half of the water in the area is flowing in and half is flowing out, then there is no mass of runoff through the control volume boundary. The reanalysis runoff value for the red gridded boxes is given as an average over an area, and with the grid area known, this value can be converted into kg/month. This mass can then be multiplied **by** the fraction of this runoff, which is traveling outwards from the control volume based on the TRIP pathways. This fraction may be negative if all directions point inward. Summing the masses of water exiting the control volume and subtracting the mass of the water entering the control volume yields the total runoff mass per month, which can then be spatially averaged over the control volume so that it's units are the same as the other properties in the water balance.

Because the runoff data available is gridded at a much coarser resolution than the routing data available, this study evaluates three separate methodologies for the use of the routing data, which are shown in Figure **3-5** (c-e). It is impossible to route runoff data at a coarser resolution than that which is used here because too many "rivers" are lost at such a coarse resolution. Each method involves using a certain number of the available routing directions within the runoff data grid in order to determine how much of the runoff runs through the control volume boundary. Runoff directions, which run perpendicular and outward from the control volume, are weighted with a value of **1.** Runoff in the opposite direction is weighted with a value of **-1.** Runoff directions which are parallel to the control volume boundary are weighted **by** zeros, since they don't run through the control volume boundary, and directions which run diagonal to the boundary are weighted either **.5** or **-.5** depending on whether they are oriented partially outward or partially inward to the control volume respectively.

The difference between methodologies lies in the directions that are used to determine how much runoff is passing through the control volume boundary. Diagram (c) indicates the first method, the area method. **By** this method the directions of runoff at all of the nodes in the area of the gridded runoff piece of data are used to determine the routing of that runoff value. There are usually about sixteen directions in such cases. Diagram **(d)** indicates the second method the point method. In this method only one point, the point in the runoff data box which is closest to the center of the runoff grid in one direction and closest to the control volume boundary in the other direction. Diagram (e) indicates the third method the linear method. In this method only routing points through which the control volume boundary passes are used.

It is proposed that the linear method is the most accurate way to route the runoff through a control volume boundary. **By** this method the TRIP pathways which are used are the ones which are closest to the control volume boundary. This is really the only place we care how much runoff is passing through. Although the runoff data itself is coarse, the routing of the data can be accomplished in a more precise manner around the boundary of the control volume, and it is the directions around this boundary which we are most interested in. The point method doesn't use all the data available, and the area method uses runoff routing that can be up to **100** km away from the control volume boundary. The point and area method, however may be more effective in certain cases and therefore should at least be considered.

3.3.2.2. Basin type control volumes

In order to better utilize the alternative source of runoff data an alternative method was derived for the creation of a control volume in the shape of a basin. Four of these control volumes were created for the Mississippi River Basin, the Arkansas River Basin, the Amazon River Basin, and the Madeira River Basin. The Madeira River Basin is gauged at, and from here on referred to, as the Porto Velho Basin. The Porto Velho and Arkansas River Basins were chosen because of their comparable sized to the **7.5** degree on a side box control volumes, and the Mississippi and Amazon River basins were chosen as being comparable in size to **15** degree on a side control volumes. Additionally we have a contrast of data rich and data poor areas as well as a contrast between tropical and non-tropical areas. Table **3-3** gives the approximate land areas of these control volumes based on the runoff data used. The basins are derived from a one degree grid and are drawn out in later Figures **3-6, 3-7,** and **3-8,** as their derivation is described.

Control Volume	Land Area (km^2)	
Amazon River Basin	4,620,000 km ²	
Arkansas River Basin	318,000 km ²	
Mississippi River Basin	2,350,000 km ²	
Porto Velho River Basin	954,000 km ²	

Table **3-3:** Basin Sized Control Volume Land Areas

Figure **3-6** shows the evolution of the basin sized control volume. **A** number of different datasets are combined here to compute the water balance over an area that in theory has one runoff outlet, a gauged point on a large river. The reanalysis is used again for evaporation and moisture flux calculations as well as all relevant storage calculations. Precipitation is altered as before over a dozen alternative precipitation datasets. Runoff can also be calculated for this control volume **by** the reanalysis, however given the coarser resolution of the runoff grid and the finer resolution of the border of the basin, the reanalysis calculated runoff may not be as accurate.

The procedure for the derivation of a basin control volume is as follows. First a river basin must be selected that can be resolved reasonably well over the one-degree resolution TRIP pathways. The one-degree resolution of the TRIP pathways is used in this case in order to make the boundaries of the control volume a reasonable size for the gridded 2.5-degree moisture flux calculations, and is acceptable for river routing because the rivers which are being studied are large enough so that they can be resolved **by** a one degree grid. The TRIP pathways, which converge to this point, are then found. For the Madeira River basin, which is gauged at Porto Velho, Brazil in the RivDis dataset this layout is given in Figure 3-6(a). The basin is then drawn in Figure **3-6 (b)** including all the grid points that lead to the outlet where runoff is known. The pathways are removed in the diagram so the actual shape of the control volume can be seen in Figure 3-6(c). In Figure **3-6 (d)** the control volume is split into boxes, the coordinates of which can be input into the programming developed for this study, which receives four boundaries, a north, south, east, and west face.

(c) Outline of the Basin Control Volume **(d)** Component Rectangular Control Volumes Figure **3-6:** Derivation of the Basin Sized Control Volume for Water Balance Calculations Madeira River through Porto Velho, Brazil

The moisture flux and runoff in and out of each control volume is summed and then divided **by** the area of the basin. Moisture flux calculations for the smaller control volumes that make up basin control volumes often have coordinates that are not consistent with either Method **1** or Method 2 of the moisture flux methodologies outlined earlier. In other words the border of the control volume contains points neither on points of the **2.5** degree grid or directly between points of the **2.5** degree grid. In this case the nearest points to a control volume border are used to calculate the moisture flux across that border. Because the basin control volumes are gridded on a one-degree basis, a situation does not occur in which the boundary of such a control volume is equidistant between two points.

(c) Outline of the Basin Control Volume **(d)** Component Figure **3-7:** Derivation of the Basin Sized Control Volume For Water Balance Calculations Arkansas River (d) Component Rectangular Control Volumes

Figure **3-7** shows the same evolution for the Arkansas River Basin. This basin was chosen because it was similar in size to the Porto Velho River Basin. Similar control volumes were found for the Mississippi and Amazon River basins **by** using the trip pathways, however these basins are too large to draw out in such detail, and are presented from graphics available at the TRIP website (Figure **3-8). A** more detailed coordinate schematic was derived **by** hand. Note that the actual basins used are smaller because the runoff data used for the balances comes from the point indicated **by** the black dot in Figure **3-8.** In the case of the Amazon basin, the actual basin used does not include the drainage directions for much of the far eastern part of the basin.

Figure **3-8:** Basin Sized Control Volumes for the Amazon and Mississippi River (Oki, **1998)**

3.3.2.3. Potential Adjustments in Storage and Lag Time

While water vapor moves through a regional control volume fairly quickly over the course of a month, water in the surface and subsurface likely moves more slowly. Therefore it is conceivable that in a month precipitation water does not completely travel through the control volume and produce corresponding runoff. The process is lagged **by** a number of days or months.

In an attempt to improve the surface water balance, the change in storage term was removed and instead lag times of **0, 1,** 2, **3,** and 4 months were tested to satisfy the surface water balance, in addition to the analysis with the change in storage term. Given $L = \log t$ time in months, and t as an arbitrary time the mass balance equation becomes:

$$
-P_{t-L} + E_{t-L} + R_t = 0 \tag{3-8}
$$

3.4 Data Analysis

3.4.1. Residual Analysis

Residuals are the resultant of a water balance calculation that theoretically should be equal to zero. Solving the atmospheric and surface water balance:

$$
P - E - Q + \frac{dW}{dt} = residual \tag{3-9}
$$

$$
-P + E + R + \frac{dS}{dt} = residual
$$

Smaller residuals are desired for a better balance. Residuals are calculated for all surface and atmospheric water balances in this work and analyzed in two ways, bias and absolute error.

3.4.1.1. Absolute Error

For the atmospheric balance the mean absolute error is:

$$
AE_{\text{atmos.}} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \left| P_t - E_t - Q_t + \frac{dW_t}{dt} \right|}{n}
$$
 Eq. (3-11)

For the surface balance the absolute error equation is:

$$
AE_{\text{surf.}} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \left| -P_t + E_t + R_t + \frac{dS_t}{dt} \right|}{n}
$$
 Eq. (3-12)

The variable n stands for the length of the dataset, and t stands for the time index. The absolute error preserves the magnitude of the error calculation throughout the time period of the water balance. This is especially important on the monthly time scale where seasonal departures from the zero balance in opposite directions may give the illusion of a good balance in the bias calculation.

3.4.1.2. Bias

Bias refers to the long-term average of the residuals. The equation used for this term is as **follows:**

For the atmospheric balance:

$$
Bias_{atmos.} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} (P_t - E_t - Q_t + \frac{dW_t}{dt})}{n}
$$
 Eq. (3-13)

For the surface balance:

$$
Bias_{surf.} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} (-P_t + E_t + Q_t + \frac{dS_t}{dt})}{n}
$$
 Eq. (3-14)

The bias is a measure of the agreement of the water balance averaged over the entire time period. Because this study relies primarily on the length of precipitation and runoff datasets, the bias is a good evaluation of how these datasets fit into a water balance for the time period for which they are being collected.

3.4.1.3. Normalization

In this work residuals are found for a number of different datasets and a number of different hydrological conditions around the globe. In order to compare residuals for different water balances, the absolute error and bias statistics, as well as the root mean square error of the correlations terms are normalized **by** the average precipitation of the given water balance. Precipitation is taken as a normalization factor because it is the most basic component of the water balance. For this normalization the statistic is simply divided **by** the average precipitation of all points used for the particular balance. The equations for the normalized residual statistics are shown below.

For the atmospheric water balance:

$$
Normalized AE_{\text{atmos}} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \left| P_t - E_t - Q_t + \frac{dW_t}{dt} \right|}{n \times \overline{P}}
$$
 Eq. (3-15)

$$
Normalized Bias_{atmos.} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} (P_t - E_t - Q_t + \frac{dW_t}{dt})}{n \times \overline{P}}
$$
 Eq. (3-16)

For the surface water balance:

$$
Normalized AEsurf. = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \left| -P_t + E_t + R_t + \frac{dS_t}{dt} \right|}{n \times \overline{P}}
$$
 Eq. (3-17)

$$
Normalized Bias_{surf.} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (-P_i + E_i + \nabla Q_i + \frac{dS_i}{dt})}{n \times \overline{P}}
$$
 Eq. (3-18)

In cases when only one control volume is being analyzed, the normalization is not necessary and regular bias and absolute error terms can be used.

3.4.2. **Correlation Analysis**

Solving for P-E in the atmosphere and land surface balances equations **(3.1** and **3.2)** results in the three elements of **Eq. 3-19.**

$$
P - E = Q - \frac{\partial W}{\partial t} = R + \frac{\partial S}{\partial t}
$$
 Eq. (3-19)
(1) (2) (3)

Although each of the three comparison terms are actually comprised of two terms each, the change in atmospheric storage and surface storage terms are known to be smaller in nearly all cases as compared to moisture flux and runoff respectively. Likewise, the evaporation term follows a more regular seasonal and yearly cycle than precipitation. In each of the comparison terms one variable is clearly more dependent (precipitation, moisture flux, and runoff) at the time index and particular data set used than the other variable (evaporation, change in precipitable water, and change in storage).

In theory each of the three quantities outlined above should equate to each other for each time step in the water balance. Taking any two time series and plotting the quantities against each other a **1:1** scatter plot should result. **Of** course, this theoretical plot is never obtained, and we must use comparative statistics in order to evaluate how well the theoretical relation is met. Three comparisons are possible, an atmospheric balance comparison (terms **(1)** and (2)), a surface balance comparison (terms (2) and **(3)),** and a total balance comparison (terms **(1)** and **(3)).** The comparison can be plugged into a linear regression, and additionally a correlation coefficient and the root mean square error can be calculated for all three comparisons. Such correlations can be hereafter referred to as the atmospheric regression or correlation, the surface regression or correlation, and the total regression or correlation.

3.4.2.1. Linear Regression

A linear regression of a two sided water balance can be conducted to produce a slope, intercept, **RA2,** and **RA2 1:1. The** lesser-known predictor is graphed on the y-axis and regressed against the actual value on the x-axis. Unfortunately, in this work there is no actual known value, and we can only assume one set of data is more reliable than the other. This study makes this classification based on the ease **by** which sides of the balance are calculated. This classification is altered based on whether a box sized control volume or a basin sized control volume is being used.

For the box control volume water balance the classification is as follows:

1) P-E 2) **Q -** dW/dt **3)** R **+** dS/dt

Thus, P-E is always taken as the actual value, and the moisture flux term is taken as the actual value when the total regression is performed. Although precipitation and evaporation are considered class **C** data products in the reanalysis, they are derived **by** simple spatial averaging. The moisture flux is derived **by** a less direct method, which has been documented, and therefore its term is ranked second. The runoff is derived **by** a methodology original to this work, and therefore is likely the most experimental and variable term, thus is ranked last.

However, when the basin sized control volume is used the rankings are changed. In this case, runoff data is considered the most reliable because actual river runoff data is being used, with spatial averaging only in the change in storage term. Conversely, the moisture flux is considered to be the least accurate measure due to the fact that is derived from the combination of a number of smaller control volumes, where it is inferred that less points on the boundary of a control volume produce a higher probability of variability.

For the basin control volume water balance the classification is as follows:

1) R **+** dS/dt $2)$ $P - E$ **3) Q -** dW/dt

Linear regressions are performed for the three comparisons (atmospheric, surface, and total), and from these regressions, a slope, intercept and R^{^2} value corresponding to the slope and intercept are found as well as an \mathbb{R}^2 1:1 value, which is an \mathbb{R}^2 measure fitting the data to a 1:1 line. The slope of the regression is theoretically one and on the monthly scale. The slope should be a good indicator of the seasonal strength of signal of one side of the water balance compared to the other. The term signal refers to the amplitude of various peaks and troughs of the time series of each side of the water balance being considered. **A** slope greater than one indicates the y-axis property has a stronger signal, while a slope less than one indicates the y-axis property has a weaker signal. Signals also exist on the yearly scale, to a lesser degree.

The intercept of the regression is another check of bias, and is useful in checking regressions for large errors and inaccuracies. The R^2 value is a similar analysis tool. It measures the tightness of fit to the regressed line, but is a good measure only if the slope and intercept of the regression make sense. The perfect R^2 value is 1, and at zero it becomes meaningless. The R^2 1:1 value is in theory a very good metric for this study because it tests the fit of the regression to a **1:1** line. Unfortunately, the regressions in this study are rarely close to **1:1,** causing this metric to become very largely negative in most cases. However, in some cases the statistic is still useful.

3.4.2.2. **Correlation Coefficient**

The correlation coefficient is a useful metric like the RMSE because it allows for the comparison of two independent variables, either of which may be faulty. The coefficient is the off diagonal term of the covariance matrix obtained **by** comparing a time series of two water balance variables (i.e. **A,** B) and is found **by** the formula:

$$
CorrCoef = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \left((A_t - \overline{A}) \times (B_t - \overline{B}) \right)}{\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \left((A_t - \overline{A})^2 \times (B_t - \overline{B})^2 \right)}}
$$
 Eq. (3-20)

The correlation coefficient is a normalized relationship of the linear relationship strength between variables independent of slope or intercept. The correlation coefficient will vary from **-** 1 to **1,** with 1 representing a perfect linear correlation, **0** representing no correlation, and **-1** representing a perfect inverse correlation. The linear regression analysis finds the slope and intercept of the relation to find the differences in the regression from the predicted 1 to **1** regression. Unfortunately in this study good linear correlations, and correlations to the **1:1** line are rare, and it is more useful to look for any correlation possible as evaluation tool for the potential faulty data. Because this coefficient is normalized between **-1** and **1,** the evaluation statistic is more under control for some of the potentially volatile data that will be looked at in this study. In some it is important to simply see if a correlation exists at all. The normalization in this case is performed based on the actual data rather than the precipitation magnitude, which is an added advantage for the use of this statistic.

3.4.2.3. RMSE

The root mean square error gives an error term to the two independent data sources:

RMSE =
$$
\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} (A_t - B_t)^2}{n}}
$$
 Eq. (3-21)

The root mean square error is a standard comparative statistic that gives a good representation of the magnitude of the error between two sides of a water balance. Because the resulting statistic has the same units as the water balance variables themselves, the term can be normalized, so different control volumes may be compared. The measure is most like the absolute error and bias measurements used before in that it gives a magnitude of error, therefore it is normalized **by** precipitation.

$$
Normalized RMSE = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} (A_t - B_t)^2}{n}}}{\overline{P}}
$$
 Eq. (3-22)

4. Data Analysis of Water Balance Methods

In this Chapter, differences in water balance methodology will be discussed for all of the control volumes. This initial analysis will indicate which methodologies are more effective when computing regional water balances. Therefore, where applicable, normalized data analysis tools will be utilized. In order to analyze which methods are best suited for the computing of water balances a set of default characteristics must be given, so that they may be held constant while other characteristics are altered. Table 4-1 lists the characteristics which will be studied, the possible alternatives, and the default conditions.

Table 4-1: Water Balance Methodologies

For moisture flux methodology Method 2 is assumed as the default method. This is the aligned method, which is also used for the global analysis, and is the more conventional method using the actual grid of the reanalysis. The default runoff methodology used is the line methodology. As discussed before, this is theoretically the best way to calculate runoff. The default surface storage methodology uses the dS/dt term in the equation and no time lag. The Reanalysis-2 is used as the default primary source of data for the water balances while studying methodology. Also used as the default precipitation dataset is the Reanalysis-2 precipitation. As will be shown in the precipitation analysis data section the Reanalysis-2 provides generally the best closure for water balances over its duration. Unfortunately, this precipitation dataset is known to have its problems. Alternative precipitation datasets will be looked at very closely to find their advantages.

There will be two additional sections to analyze the time scale used in the data analysis contrasting the monthly and yearly time steps with all default conditions in place and the size and shape of control volumes used. There are four distinct types of control volumes used: **7.5** degree box, **15** degree box, small basin, and large basin, and each of the types of control volume are represented in North and South America. The final section will give a sense of how the balances compare to each other and lead into the following Section 4.2, where each control volume will be studied independently.

4.1. Moisture Flux Methodology

As discussed in the procedure section two methods of obtaining moisture flux through a boundary are investigated for a box control volume. Because of the coarse resolution of the data it is hypothesized that it may be more effective to compute a water balance in between grid points (Method **1),** as opposed to aligned with grid points (Method 2).

Figure 4-1 shows monthly and yearly normalized absolute error and bias contrasting the two moisture flux methods. **A** normalized error of one indicates error on the order of magnitude of precipitation and therefore a magnitude of error on the order of **6** or **7** would be completely useless. Problems develop in the atmospheric water balance computations of the Southwest **US** and in the Larger **US** control volumes, which contain similar areas. The mountainous nature of these control volumes may contribute to poor balance.

For the first three larger *(15* degree) control volumes the aligned Method 2 has a larger absolute error over both time scales. The bias for Method 2 is also slightly larger (more non-zero) for these three control volumes. Mixed results are found for smaller control volumes in terms of absolute error. Bias calculations are consistent across monthly and yearly time scales as the bar graphs on the bottom left and the bottom right are almost identical. The bias of the water balance should be the same regardless of time scale because it is measure of the aggregate water balance, and the yearly time scale is simply the aggregate of the monthly time scale. Bias results are in general agreement with absolute error observations.

Figures 4-2 and 4-3 show the regression statistics and other statistics for the comparison of the flux through the bottom of the atmospheric control volume (P-E) with the flux through the sides of the control volumes (Q-dW/dt). **All** of the statistics computed in the study are shown for this analysis for both monthly and yearly time scales. For the majority of control volumes (excluding the SWUS and Larger **US** control volumes), the regressions are fairly good and therefore all regression statistics are useful. No clear conclusion can be made from these plots as to which flux computation methodology works better.

Figure **4-1:** Moisture Flux Method Comparison: Absolute Error and Bias

Figure 4-3: Moisture Flux Method Comparison: Yearly Correlation Statistics

Figure 4-4 shows the regression of monthly water balance data for Rondonia, the properties of which appear as the sixth column of each of the figures in 4-2. The bottom portion of Figure 4-4 shows an example time series of the two correlated properties plotted against each other. As is the case with most control volumes there is little difference between methods. **^A**difference can be seen between time series plots of **Q +** dW/dt in the bottom portion of the Figure 4-4 for the given four year period. The P-E term will be the same for each case. These correlations are rather good in both cases. As shown in Figure 4-1, a positive bias can be seen for this control volume, as **Q** is in general underestimated and therefore the average residual is positive.

Figure *4-5* gives a yearly contrast of moisture flux methodology regressions for the Larger Rondonia control volume. The regression is better for a number of reasons. The control volume area is increased **by** a factor of 4, and balance is found each year not each month. There is again little contrast between methods. In general, the accuracy of this water balances are good **by** both methods in most cases, and it therefore could be said that both methods work. This is surprising considering the uncertainty of using only three data points on each side of the control volume.

Figure 4-4: Correlation Plots for Rondonia **-** Different Moisture Flux Methods, Monthly

Figure 4-5: Correlation Plots for L. Rondonia **-** Different Moisture Flux Methods, Yearly

4.2. Runoff Methodology

Three methodologies have been presented for calculating the over ground runoff through the sides of a box control volume: point, area, and linear. Only the land surface water balance is relevant here. No discernable pattern is seen in the absolute error and bias calculations between these methods for calculating the surface balance, shown in Figure 4-6.

Figures 4-7 and 4-8 show the results of a regression of the surface balance for each scenario. In this case P-E is regressed against the runoff and the change in storage. As we look at methodologies to compute moisture flux in the previous section and runoff in this section we can get a sense of the ability to close the relevant atmospheric and surface balances respectively. While for the majority of the atmospheric balances relevant to moisture flux methodology we were able to find desirable regression properties, such properties may not be found for the surface water balance which is relevant to this section. Different runoff methodologies work the best over different control volumes with no systematic patter. Looking at the correlation coefficient the point methodology is consistently the best method. In general over all evaluation the point methodology shows consistently more desirable results.

Figure 4-7: Runoff Method Comparison **-** Correlation Statistics **1**

Figure **4-8:** Runoff **Method** Comparison **-** Correlation Statistics **²**

Figure **4-9:** Correlation **Plots** for **E** Brazil **-** Different Runoff **Methods, Monthly**

Figure **4-10:** Correlation Plots for Rondonia **-** Different Runoff Methods, Yearly

Figures 4-9 and **4-10** give examples of the regressions whose statistics are tabulated in Figures 4- **⁷**and 4-8. For the monthly case we refer to Figure 4-9 which shows the monthly correlation for the Eastern Brazil control volume for the three different runoff methodologies. While the P-E quantity remains constant, the runoff is altered and combined with the also constant change in storage. The overall trend of the seasonal cycle is preserved for each of the methods and the water balances well. The slopes of these regressions are all below one indicating the seasonal cycle of all of the runoff methods isn't as strong as the corresponding precipitation cycle. The yearly contrast is given as an example in Figure 4-10 for the Rondonia control volume. In this case there is no regular seasonal cycle therefore the slope statistic isn't as useful a tool, and what is more important is the correlation of the water balance as well as the bias and absolute error. Each of the three runoff methods provides a different level runoff that matches the precipitation signal reasonably well. It can be seen here that the point methodology for the Rondonia control volume, and in general, results in a more accurate overall magnitude of runoff

In the analysis of runoff methodologies it is useful to combine the seven control volumes for the various statistics outlined, so that the methods can be contrasted directly. The seven control volumes represent a sample of the possible control volumes in the northern and southern hemisphere at varying resolutions **(7.5** and **15** degrees), and have comparable statistics across the board. In other words there isn't one control volume with particularly large or small errors that would bias the averaging of the properties across each methodology.

Figure 4-11 shows the monthly and yearly atmospheric error and bias averaged over the seven control volumes. Both atmospheric error and bias error are shown on a monthly and yearly scale. The differences between the different runoff methodologies are very small for both statistics. The bias discrepancy looks misleadingly large, because the departure from zero of bias is very small for all methods. This result is encouraging because it indicates that given the sample of control volumes combined, the resulting bias is nearly zero. **High** and low biases cancel each other out over all control volumes selected.

Figures 4-12 and 4-13 show the regression and correlation statistics for the three runoff methodologies, averaged over all seven control volumes for both monthly and yearly time steps. Again the slopes and intercepts are consistent with what we are looking for with slopes around one and intercepts around zero. The point method is slightly better on the monthly time scale in terms of regression statistics, but not on the yearly time scale. The $\mathbb{R}^2 \cdot 1$ at the scale in this case is uninformative as it is negative for both time scales and all methods. However the correlation coefficient indicates good agreement between the two sides of the water balance, with an advantage given to the point methodology. The NRMSE is just about the same across each method, with errors on the magnitude of **50 %** of the precipitation values.

Figure **4-11:** Runoff Method Comparisons **-** Absolute Error and Bias Avg. Across **All** CV's

Figure 4-12: Runoff Method Comparison Regression Statistics Averaged Across **All** CV's

Figure 4-13: Runoff Method Comparison Correlation Statistics Averaged Across **All** CV's

No strong conclusion favoring a runoff estimation procedure can be reached that is applicable to all control volumes. The point methodology has a slight advantage based on this evaluation, but this conclusion does not have a strong theoretical backing. Hence, throughout the rest of this section the linear method will be used as a default because its theoretical basis is sounder.

4.3. Reanalysis

Alternative sources to the reanalysis are unfortunately limited to a number of precipitation and runoff datasets. However, there are two separate reanalyzes, whose differences are discussed in detail in the data section. While the Reanalysis-2 is used in most of the methodology studies because it is assumed (and **by** most evidence is) more accurate, the Reanalysis-1 covers a much larger period of time, which is more valuable in conducting climate studies. In this section the components of the water balance are extracted as a time series for each reanalysis, and the adherence to balance is compared between the reanalyzes. The duration of each dataset is tested in full, thus *55* years of the Reanalysis-1 are compared to **23** years of the Reanalysis-2.

Figure 4-14 shows the absolute error for the monthly and yearly time scales for both reanalysis datasets. For both time scales in the atmospheric balance about half of the control volumes favor each reanalysis. For the surface balance on the monthly time scale the Reanalysis-1 yields generally lower absolute error, but for the yearly time scale the Reanalysis-2 yields lower absolute error. The Reanalysis-2 has a consistently higher surface balance bias (see Figure *4-15)* for most control volumes, indicating differences in the total amounts of surface water balance variables (runoff and change in storage) between the two reanalysis. The Larger **US** control volume is the only one which does not show the higher bias for the surface in the Reanalysis-2.

Examining Figures 4-16 and 4-17 for the monthly time scale, statistics tend to favor the Reanalysis-2. Correlations are clearly better for the Reanalysis-2, for both surface and atmospheric balances, as shown by the slope, R^2 , and correlation coefficient statistics. The NRMSE looks very even for both atmospheric and surface balances. Yearly properties are presented in Figure 4-18 and 4-19. For both reanalysis products in both the atmospheric and surface balance the correction relationships are not found for the **SWUS** and the Larger **US** control volumes. Each of these control volumes contain high relief regions not present in any other control volume which may interfere with moisture flux calculations. Precipitation is also sparser and extreme over these regions, but it is odd these problems persist in the Reanalysis-2. There are no general statements for the reanalysis contrast based on the yearly atmospheric water balance. The correlations are better with the Reanalysis-2 for the yearly surface water balance but only for a limited number of control volumes.

Figure 4-14: Reanalysis Comparison - Absolute Error Monthly and Yearly

Figure *4-15:* Reanalysis Comparison **-** Bias Error Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-17: Reanalysis Comparison **-** Monthly Correlation Statistics

Figure 4-19: Reanalysis Comparison **-** Yearly Correlation Statistics

A more detailed look at the reanalysis contrast for specific control volumes is shown in Figures 4-20 through 4-23. In Figure 4-20 the East Brazil control volume is shown for the atmospheric and surface monthly time scale. For the atmospheric balance there is little change in the general shape of the regression. However, there is increased correlation and signal pick up in the case of the Reanalysis-2, as not just the yearly cycle is picked up, but smaller month to month peaks are reproduced in the time interval shown in the bottom portion of the figure. In the surface balance, the Reanalysis-2 appears to be a slightly worse balance as the seasonal signals are not as resolved.

Figure 4-21 shows the NW Brazil control volume's yearly atmospheric and surface balances. For the atmospheric balance, the yearly signals have good consistency, though a large portion of the Reanalysis-1 balance is off in the middle of the yearly time series, a time period not covered well **by** the Reanalyis-2. The Reanalysis-2 atmospheric balance looks better and is more tightly correlated. For the surface balance, both reanalyzes fail to close the water balance well. Since precipitation and evaporation lead to a well balanced atmospheric cycle, the conclusion is that the runoff and surface storage data is flawed. NW Brazil is a fairly remote area for which there is little hydrometeorological data, which may account for these problems.

Figure 4-20: Correlation Plots for Eastern Brazil **-** Reanalysis Comparison Monthly

Figure **4-21:** Correlation Plots for NW Brazil **-** Reanalysis Comparison Yearly

Figures 4-22 and 4-23 look closely at the Rondonia control volume on the monthly and yearly time scales, respectively. On the monthly time scale the observations made for the Eastern Brazil control volume still hold. The poor correlation seen in the Reanalysis-1 surface balance is due to points which aren't visible in the example plot. One important observation about the original Reanalysis-i water balance over Rondonia is that the runoff data was vastly improved over the last five years of the balance, but wrong everywhere else. This leads to good behavior in the last five years as shown in the bottom panels of Figure 4-22, but a fairly bad regression overall.

Figure 4-22: Correlation Plots for Rondonia **-** Reanalysis Comparison Monthly

Interestingly in Figure 4-23, on the left hand side, the atmospheric water balance for the Reanalysis-1 has a small overall bias when compared to the Reanalysis-2. However, though badly biased, the Reanalysis-2 water balance correlates better as the signals in the water balance are very well aligned (the peaks and troughs). In the surface balance a weaker overall correlation is found than in the atmospheric balance with smaller differences on the yearly scale than on the monthly scale.

As expected the Reanalysis-2 tends to close water balances slightly better than the Reanalysis-1 in general for the sample box control volumes. Imbalances arise in the surface balance for the default conditions in both reanalyzes much more than in the atmospheric balance. Many of these imbalances are control volume dependant and the usefulness of the reanalysis for each box control volume will be looked into in great detail in Chapter **5.**

Figure 4-23: Correlation Plots for Rondonia **-** Reanalysis Comparison Yearly

4.4. Precipitation Datasets

The majority of the alternative data used in this study is in the form of various precipitation datasets. Twelve different precipitation datasets are used with the Reanalysis-2 water balance in this section, in addition to the given Reanalysis-2 precipitation. Both the atmospheric and surface water balances are computed. Each water balance is evaluated for the time period over which the precipitation dataset coincides with the Reanalysis-2, therefore this period varies **by** precipitation dataset.

We will first look at all of these datasets at the same time for the seven box control volumes. Unfortunately, it is difficult to derive meaningful conclusions about these datasets while looking at them all at once, therefore several important datasets will be pulled out and broken up into groups. **Of** special interest are datasets which cover the same historical period as the Reanalysis-²**(79-01).** These datasets include the **GPCP,** the **GHCN-CAMS** gridded dataset, and the best estimates from the OPI and CMAP datasets, which all can replace every value of the Reanalysis-2 precipitation. Also of particular interest in this study are the TRMM datasets, which are only available since January of **1998.** Because the Reanalysis-2 is only available through 2001, the Reanalysis-1, which runs through 2002, is used for this precipitation analysis.
4.4.1. All Precipitation Datasets

Figures 4-24 through 4-32 contrast precipitation datasets over all of the atmospheric and surface water balances on monthly and yearly time scales. Figures 4-24 through 4-26 deal with the residuals created **by** the water balances in terms of absolute error and bias. Figures 4-27 through 4-29 show the slope, correlation coefficient, and NRMSE for the atmospheric balance. Figures 4-30 through 4-32 show the same statistics for the surface water balance. As stated previously because of the large amounts of different precipitation data it is hard to make specific statements from this analysis. More particular observations can be made when a closer look is given to particular subsets of the data, and when some of these datasets are applied to a global type analysis in Section 4.3. For a few control volumes there are no results for certain precipitation datasets because they have errors or do not cover the region (see Section 2.12). They pertain mostly to tropical precipitation datasets which cannot be applied to control volumes which extend past 40 degrees north latitude.

Looking at the atmospheric absolute error in Figure 4-24 the differing precipitation datasets seem to yield very similar results over the monthly and yearly time scales for all precipitation datasets used in the Larger Rondonia, NW Brazil, Rondonia, and **SEUS** control volumes. Over East Brazil the reanalysis clearly yields the best balance, however, better balances are also seen with remotely sensed technologies. Again the situations for the Larger **US** and the **SWUS** control volumes for the atmospheric balance are not good. Because of the large errors in the **SWUS** atmospheric balance, regardless of precipitation dataset, the data can be disregarded. There are larger differences in surface absolute error shown in Figure 4-25 over precipitation datasets, specifically for the monthly case where the Larger Rondonia, NW Brazil, and **SEUS** control volumes show significant improvement with the OPI and CMAP precipitation datasets.

Figure 4-24: Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Absolute Error Monthly and Yearly

Figure *4-25:* Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface Absolute Error Monthly aynd Yearly

Figure 4-26: Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric and Surface Bias Error Monthly

Monthly bias is shown for the atmospheric and surface balances in Figure 4-26.Yearly values are similar but not shown. The figure highlights the difference in total precipitation magnitude as applied to the different control volumes. The precipitation datasets can be evaluated for whether they are too low or too high relative to other components of the water balance. Biases are generally consistent with absolute errors in the atmospheric balance, but differ in the surface balance. The complete closure of the water balance does not seem to rely on precipitation datasets nearly as much as it depends on the control volume being considered.

Figures 4-27 through 4-29 show relevant regression and correlation statistics for the atmospheric monthly and yearly balances. As far as the monthly case goes the results are very consistent in terms of closure of the water balance to observations made for the residual statistics, with the exception of the NW Brazil control volume. For the atmospheric balance this control volume will be examined more closely later. For the yearly atmospheric balances, large discrepancies start to arise in terms of slope on the bottom of Figure 4-27. For all control volumes there are either very good correlations for a particular precipitation data set, or very bad correlations. The general problems with the Larger **US** and **SWUS** seem to be a problem with the monthly cycle across different precipitation datasets. These control volumes behave similarly to the other control volumes on a yearly basis. There is little consistency between control volumes on the yearly time scale based on precipitation dataset other than that the Reanalysis-2 consistently balances well in all cases, as it should.

Figure 4-27: Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Regression Slope Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-28: Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Correlation Coeff Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-29: Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric NRMSE Monthly and Yearly

Figures 4-30 through 4-32 show the relevant regression and correlation statistics for the surface balance contrasting precipitation sources. There are differences between the alternate There are differences between the alternate precipitation datasets for most of the control volumes. Generally there is reasonable consistency in the seasonal cycle as the precipitation datasets allow for (P-E) to balance the surface runoff and change in storage. Slopes are consistently zero or negative for all precipitation datasets applied to the NW Brazil control volume indicating poor balances. Differences in slope are more evident on the yearly time scale, particularly in the case of the **SEUS** control volume.

The monthly surface correlation coefficients are good for most precipitation datasets over most control volumes. An interesting situation again arises over the **SEUS** where the reanalysis precipitation provides a strong surface correlation, while all other alternatives do not. Correlations tend to be not as great for the surface balance for the OPI and CMAP datasets. These precipitation datasets tend to consistently follow each other in most of these analyses as they are of similar origin. Consistency however is rarely seen for the gauge based precipitation datasets (Columns **3** through **5)** and remotely sensed precipitation datasets (Columns **6** through **9).** The **GPI** and **SSM/I** precipitation datasets have consistently high NRMSE for both the monthly and yearly time scales. Overestimation was a factor in the derivation of both of these datasets.

Figure 4-30: Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface Regression Slope Monthly and Yearly

Figure **4-31:** Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface Correlation Coefficient Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-32: Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface NRMSE Monthly and Surface

As in previous sections we now select some sample precipitation regressions to elucidate the bar graphs above. Here we will select three precipitation datasets which represent the different types of precipitation data available. First shown is the reanalysis precipitation, which is the default precipitation set in this work and commonly provides the best balance. Next, shown is the **GPI,** a fairly long **(1986-2001)** tropical satellite based precipitation dataset, to represent satellite based data. Finally, the **GHCN-CAMS** dataset is used to represent the gauged datasets.

First shown is the NW Brazil control volume as an example for the atmospheric monthly and yearly water balances in Figures 4-33 and 4-34. For the monthly time scale the satellite precipitation is generally underestimated as can be seen **by** the positive slope of the regression line for this control volume. For the yearly case in Figure 4-34, the reanalysis balance looks good, while the addition of the **GPI** precipitation degrades the balance, especially in the 1990's. The gauge correlation is better than the **GPI** correlation, but shows a weak signal compared to the runoff flux term, which results in a larger positive slope. It is apparent from these figures that on the monthly time scale many of the precipitation datasets agree with the reanalysis balance. Nevertheless, the water balances exhibit differences between datasets.

Figure 4-33: Correlation Plots for NW Brazil **-** Precipitation Comparison Monthly Atmospheric

Figure 4-34: Correlation Plots for NW Brazil **-** Precipitation Comparison Yearly Atmospheric

Figures *4-35* and 4-36 show example correlation plots for the **SEUS** control volume. This control volume was selected for closer inspection as there are sharp contrasts between water balance properties between the precipitation datasets as they apply to the surface water balance. In Figure *4-35,* the reanalysis surface monthly water balance shows a very strong correlation and is very well balanced. However, when reanalysis precipitation is replaced **by** gauge and satellite data some points correlate well while others correlate poorly. The runoff and change in storage data remains the same as can be seen **by** the green line represented in the bottom panels, however, the P-E quantity changes dramatically with precipitation dataset. One explanation is that that the model derived reanalysis precipitation for this region was made to fit the surface water balance of the reanalysis.

For the yearly time scale in Figure 4-36, the goodness of balance steadily decreases from left to right, with some signal pick up in the Reanalysis-2, but no signal pickup the when using gauge precipitation. This is interesting because the **SEUS** is a heavily gauged precipitation area, and therefore it would seem the reanalysis disregards the rain gauge data completely.

Figure *4-35:* Correlation Plots for **SEUS -** Precipitation Comparison Monthly Surface

Figure 4-36: Correlation Plots for **SEUS -** Precipitation Comparison Yearly Surface

4.4.2. Longer Precipitation Datasets

We now look at precipitation datasets which can completely replace the Reanalysis-2 precipitation **(1979-2001)** in the water balance and thus determine if an alternative source of precipitation is better at closing the water balance using the reanalysis for all other fields. Datasets used are the **GPCP,** CMAP, OPI, and **GHCN-CAMS** products. For the first time here we will consider the basin sized control volumes. Because of the nature of these balances, the defaults will be considered slightly different. Surface runoff is considered default in basin sized control volumes. Thus for the surface balance of the basin sized control volumes, both precipitation and runoff may differ from the reanalysis.

Figures 4-37 through 4-40 display the effect of change in precipitation source on the absolute error and bias calculations for the monthly/yearly and atmospheric/surface conditions. In the atmospheric balance no matter what the precipitation is, the Mississippi and Arkansas water balances have higher errors, as was the case with the **SWUS** and Larger United States water balances before. The reanalysis consistently provides a better balance for all control volumes. Very few anomalies arise in the atmospheric balances, as all the alternate precipitation datasets do slightly worse in atmospheric absolute error and bias, and absolute errors decrease on the yearly basis. For the surface balance (Figures 4-39 and 4-40) the alternative precipitation datasets result in a better balance than the reanalysis for certain control volumes. In Rondonia, the OPI+ dataset works well, while over the Amazon the gauge network seems to work well.

Figure 4-37: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Absolute Error Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-38: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Bias Error Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-39: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Absolute Error Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-40: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Bias Error Monthly and Yearly

Figures 4-41 through 4-43 explore the atmospheric balance correlation. In Figure 4-41, in almost all cases, the reanalysis has the closest slope to one. Some of the yearly problems are cleared up in the basin control volumes, specifically over the Mississippi and Arkansas basins. Figure 4-42 paints a similar picture of the atmospheric correlation, where on the yearly time scale sharply higher correlations are found using default reanalysis precipitation. Figure 4-43 shows the NRMSE for the atmospheric water balance. The reanalysis performs the best here, while the OPI+ dataset consistently has the worst NRMSE. This is consistent with what is known about the OPI+ dataset as it is not recommended for studies of this nature.

Figures 4-44 through 4-46 show the land surface balance correlation statistics for the larger precipitation datasets. In the surface correlation the reanalysis is not clearly the best precipitation dataset in terms of either slope or correlation coefficient. In fact for the Arkansas and Mississippi control volumes it is the worst. What we have done here is use a dataset which is not part of the reanalysis to close the surface balance (runoff). Over the United States alternative precipitation datasets likely match better with these runoff datasets. On the monthly time scale, looking at the **SEUS,** very poor correlations are found for all precipitation datasets but the reanalysis. This is a box control volume and not a basin control volume and the runoff is coming from an entirely different source. For the NRMSE in Figure 4-46, errors are found to be largest generally for the OPI+ dataset again and lowest for the reanalysis.

Figure 4-41: L. Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Regression Slope Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-42: L. Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric Correlation Coeff Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-43: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric NRMSE Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-44: Large Precipitation Comparison - Surface Regression Slope Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-45: L. Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface Correlation Coefficient Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-46: Large Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface NRMSE Monthly and Yearly

Example correlation plots for the above figures are provided in Figures 4-47 through 4-49. First we will look at the Northwest Brazil control volume for the atmospheric balance and yearly time scale. The three alternative precipitation data sets show very similar annual trends with P-E underestimating moisture flux. The reanalysis does far better than any other precipitation dataset.

Figures 4-48 and 4-49 explore the surface water balance on the yearly basis. These balances are of particular interest because alternative precipitation seemed to improve the water balances for the Arkansas and Mississippi control volumes. The amplitudes of the two sides of the surface balance don't match up very well, but the signals do. For the Mississippi Basin the same observations can be made. The Reanalysis correlation is strong, but the scatter plots seem to be better for the alternative precipitation datasets. The balances in general are not great in these two cases.

Figure 4-47: Correlation Plots for NW Brazil **-** Large Precip Comparison Yearly Atmospheric

Figure 4-48: Correlation Plots for Arkansas Basin **-** Large Precip Comparison Yearly Surface

Figure 4-49: Correlation Plots for Mississippi Basin **-** Large Precip Comparison Yearly Surface

4.4.3. TRMM Precipitation Datasets

The TRMM precipitation datasets represent the latest of current precipitation sensing technologies. Three monthly precipitation products are provided which can be conveniently used in this study, the gauge based TRMM **GPCC** dataset, the **SSM/I** based TRMM 3A46 dataset, and the actual TRMM precipitation product the TRMM 3B43 dataset. Since TRMM focuses on tropical precipitation between 40 degrees north and 40 degrees south latitude, only some of the control volumes of this work can be used with the dataset. These control volumes are: Larger Rondonia, East Brazil, Northwest Brazil, Rondonia, Amazon Basin, and Port Velho Basin.

In Figure *4-50* the atmospheric residuals are analyzed for the TRMM products in terms of absolute error and bias. In general, the TRMM 3A46 dataset results in the lowest absolute error and bias in the different water balances. Figure *4-51* shows the residual statistics when using TRMM products to obtain the surface water balance. Here the errors are slightly higher for the TRMM 3A46 dataset. This is unfortunate because it is hard to determine whether the atmospheric or surface balance is a more reliable evaluation of the precipitation products. **By** the classifications developed earlier for the box control volume we would tend to believe the atmospheric balance is more reliable while for the basin sized volume we would tend to think the surface balances were more reliable.

Figure *4-50:* TRMM Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmospheric **AE** and Bias Monthly and Yearly

Figure *4-51:* TRMM Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface **AE** and Bias Monthly and Yearly

Figures 4-52 and 4-53 show the relevant correlation statistics for the atmospheric and surface balances respectively. It should be noted here that these regressions are based on only 43 to **⁶⁰** points on the monthly basis, and only **3** to **5** points on the yearly basis. For the monthly time scale the TRMM 3A46 in some cases has a slope closer to one, a correlation coefficient closer to one, and a lower NRMSE, but not as consistently as in the residual analysis.

Figure 4-52: TRMM Precipitation Comparison **-** Atmos. Regression Stats Monthly and Yearly

Figure 4-53: TRMM Precipitation Comparison **-** Surface Regression Stats Monthly and Yearly

Figures 4-54 and 4-55 give example correlation plots for the TRMM precipitation analysis. **Of** specific interest in this study is the application of these products to the Rondonia control volume. The monthly time step is looked at in detail as the yearly time scale would only contain a maximum of five points. In Figure 4-54 the atmospheric case is shown and though it seems poor correlations exist, looking at the bottom figures, the monthly and seasonal signals seem to be reproduced well **by** all three TRMM datasets, with the TRMM **GPCC** maybe having a slight edge. For the surface case the TRMM precipitation datasets form a tight correlation for the years they are available. The 3A46 dataset performs the best here, but it is clear that for these balances all of the TRMM datasets could be applied well and the TRMM datasets are valuable for the evaluation of the water balance in Rondonia over the last five years.

Figure 4-54: Correlation Plots for Rondonia **-** TRMM Precipitation Comparison Monthly Atmos.

Figure 4-55: Correlation Plots for Rondonia **-** TRMM Precipitation Comparison Monthly Surf

4.5. **Time Scale**

The time scale of the water balance has been taken into account in the study of each water balance situation presented. On a monthly basis a water balance typically follows a seasonal cycle, and thus even if error exists in some fields, a balance can still be established because the water balance variables are for example all high in the summer and low in the winter. There is, however, more potential for variability on a monthly time scale because the time averaging of the water balance is less than that of the yearly cycle. **A** yearly water balance alternatively contains no regular seasonal cycle, but likely is composed of less variable and better averaged data. These properties can be seen using our analysis tools and all default conditions.

Figure 4-56 shows the residual statistic analysis for the default conditions for each of the box control volumes, and contrasts the statistics **by** time scale of the water balance. For the monthly water balance, the absolute error is consistently slightly higher. However, for the surface balance there is no discernable pattern between the two time scales. There is barely any difference between the bias on the monthly and yearly time scales, and small differences in bias are likely due to rounding errors.

Figure 4-56: Time Scale Comparison **-** Atmospheric and Surface Absolute Error and Bias Error

Figure 4-57: Time Scale Comparison **-** Atmospheric, Surface, and Total Regressed Slope and R2

Figure 4-58: Time Scale Comparison **-** Atmos, Surface, and Total Corr. Coeff. and NRMSE

Figures *4-57* and *4-58* show the relevant correlation statistics for all three of the possible regressions, atmospheric, surface and total, so they can be contrasted **by** time. For the atmospheric regression the slopes are consistently closer to one on a monthly basis, while the R^2 and correlation coefficients are mostly a draw. The NRMSE is lower for the yearly balance on a consistent basis. However, the correlation between the two sides of the balance is not greatly improved on the monthly basis as shown by the R^2 and correlation statistics.

Three control volumes of interest are presented for the time scale analysis, as we explore all three types of correlations, atmospheric, surface, and total. In both of the first two examples, Figures *4-59* and 4-60, we see how differences can arise between the monthly and yearly time scales. For the atmospheric case in East Brazil, both the monthly and yearly time scales provide a well correlated atmospheric balance. On the monthly scale the peaks match up very well because of the seasonal cycle. However, when the yearly average is taken, the moisture flux values are clearly higher than the precipitation **-** evaporation term at all points. The same observation is made for the **SWUS** in Figure 4-60 to an even more extreme state (and replacing moisture flux with runoff). This proves that just because a monthly water balance is good, it doesn't mean when this data is averaged annually the balance will still be good, because the monthly water balance is **highly** dependent on a seasonal pattern.

In Figure 4-61 the total water balance correlation is observed for Rondonia. The signals are correlated well from month to month and year to year, however the balance is still flawed. There is a large bias that can be clearly seen **by** the residual analysis.

Figure *4-59:* Correlation Plots for East Brazil **-** Time Scale Comparison Atmospheric

Figure 4-60: Correlation Plots for **SWUS -** Time Scale Comparison Surface

Figure 4-61: Correlation Plots for Rondonia **-** Time Scale Comparison Total Balance

4.6. Storage Considerations

Early data processing indicated poor surface water balances in most areas studied, which necessitated the search for an alternative method for closing the surface water balance. This, as discussed in Section **3.3.2.3** involves the removal of the storage term (dS/dt) in the surface balance, and compensating for this deletion **by** lagging the runoff time series **by** a period of months when applying it to the water balance. In this analysis only the surface water balance need be considered on the monthly time scale. First the box control volumes will be analyzed in this manner, followed **by** the basin control volumes. For the basin control volumes the reanalysis runoff will be used in addition to the surface runoff data, as the application of the lag time runoff methods may be useful to both sources of runoff.

In Figure 4-62 the residual statistics for the box control volumes are shown for all of the storage methodologies. In theory the absolute error should be lowest in the case where change in storage is included. Then, in the series of monthly lags, a minimum error should become prevalent for one of the months indicating the best correlation of precipitation and runoff signals without storage. In all but one case (Larger **US)** the change in surface storage scenario has the lowest absolute error, as it should have. No best lag can be identified. The bias should be about the same for all conditions including when change in storage is included, because the sum of all of the change in storage terms should be zero over the duration of the balance. This behavior is observed.

Figure 4-62: Storage Method Comparison **-** Absolute Error and Bias, Box Control Volumes

In Figures 4-63 through 4-66 the surface correlation is observed between our different surface flux term and both the precipitation – evaporation term and the moisture flux term. Here the total correlation is useful as in the case of the total water balance we are trying to match the storage methodology to the selected moisture flux methodology. Figure 4-63 shows the first attempt at regression with $P - E$. What is seen here are good correlations when the storage is included, but no regressions are found with near correct properties for any control volumes except the **SEUS** when looking at the lad time trials. The **SEUS** control volume displays a lag time of zero months, which is likely the case since it is a small control volume and fairly active in a hydrological sense. Regression and correlation statistics are consistently off for all other lag situations in Figure 4-63 and 4-64.

In Figures 4-65 and 4-66 we test the total correlation. Results are nearly the same. In both cases the correlation and R^2 in NW Brazil appear to get worse as lag time increases, however the slopes on these regressions are negative. The primary purpose of these figures is to show the impossibility of matching the moisture flux cycle to the runoff cycle without surface storage for the box control volume. This just simply can't be done given the coarseness of the data and the small size of these control volumes.

Figure 4-63: Storage Method Comparison **-** Surface Regression Stats, Box Control Volumes

Figure 4-64: Storage Method Comparison **-** Surface Correlation Stats, Box Control Volumes

Figure *4-65:* Storage Method Comparison **-** Total Regression Stats, Box Control Volumes

Figure 4-66: Storage Method Comparison **-** Total Correlation Stats, Box Control Volumes

Storage Methodology Study Absolute Error

Figure 4-67: Storage Method Comparison **-** Absolute Error and Bias, Basin Control Volumes

In Figure 4-67 we apply the different storage conditions to the basin control volumes. **All** different storage and runoff combinations are analyzed for the default conditions. surface runoff we begin to see effective lag analysis in terms of absolute error. For the Amazon control volume we see a minimum absolute error at three months, and for the other three basin control volumes a lag time of one month is observed. We do not see these tendencies when using the reanalysis runoff, which is derived **by** the linear (default) method. In all cases but the Mississippi Basin control volume, the surface runoff improves the balance over the reanalysis runoff. The bias is an ineffective analysis tool for long term averages. What can be observed, however, is the bias of the long term balance. The Porto Velho surface balance is very good when surface runoff is used, while the Mississippi River basin is balanced very well when the reanalysis runoff is used over the long haul.

In Figures 4-68 through 4-71 we again look for a correlation between the various fluxes. Slopes are found to be the best for the lag conditions at one month for the Amazon, Arkansas, and Mississippi control volumes which is realistic. However, when the reanalysis runoff is applied to the basin sized control volume no correlation at all exists between the runoff and precipitation signals. Looking at the correlation statistics is more revealing because what we are looking for in the lag situation is not necessarily a balance, but a correlation between the two sides of the balance. In the bottom section of Figure 4-68, for the surface runoff, the R^2 of the regression is almost always highest for the inclusion of storage, and the lag times match those that we found in the absolute error analysis. The only balance to make any use of the reanalysis runoff is the Mississippi Basin control volume which for storage conditions shows a promising regression and correlation. We will explore this correlation further.

Figure 4-68: Storage Method Comparison **-** Surface Regression Stats, Basin Control Volumes

Figure 4-69: Storage Method Comparison **-** Surface Correlation Stats, Basin Control Volumes

Because of the success at using the surface balance to find lag times, we attempted to find the same patterns **by** performing the total water balance regression and correlation in Figures 4-70 and 4-71. Nevertheless, there are difficulties finding the moisture flux of a basin sized control volume, and the regression yields wild results, especially in the case of using the reanalysis runoff. Looking at the correlation coefficients in Figure 4-71, we see the same peaks for the lag times that were derived earlier for surface runoff. Being able to find these lag times for a basin is very important to a water balance study because it allows for precipitation and surface runoff to be compared directly without change in storage and thus allows for the completion of a rough water balance without knowledge of soil moisture in a basin.

Figure 4-70: Storage Method Comparison **-** Total Regression Stats, Basin Control Volumes

Figure 4-71: Storage Method Comparison **-** Total Correlation Stats, Basin Control Volumes

Returning to the box control volume, we present the example correlation plots for the **SEUS** control volume. On the leftmost side of Figure 4-72 a strong correlation and balance is observed for default conditions with change in storage. However, as storage change is removed and lag time is increased the balance and correlation breaks down rapidly. It can be concluded then rather definitively for this control volume, that there is no lag time on a monthly scale between the runoff and the precipitation cycles of the water balance. In Figure 4-73 an even less encouraging example of the storage analysis is provided with the Larger **US** control volume. With change in storage this water balance does well, however as soon as change in storage is removed the correlation of the two sided balance disappears.

In Figures 4-74 through **4-77** the basin sized control volumes of the Mississippi and Porto Velho basins are analyzed with example correlation plots. The first two figures use surface runoff data, while the second two use the reanalysis runoff. In Figure 4-74 and 4-75 the leftmost balances, the ones which include the surface storage, are the best. However, for the one month lag case in each figure $(3rd$ from the left), the runoff is well correlated with the precipitation – evaporation term, which can be better seen in the lower panel snapshot of the data for a few selected years. The signal pickups are subtle in the Mississippi Basin, but not in the case of the Porto Velho Basin, where the pronounced seasonal cycle is picked up on a one month lag. It is interesting that in both of these cases the lag time between the runoff and the precipitation signals are one month, while the size of the basins is quite different.

In Figures 4-76 and **4-77** reanalysis runoff is applied to the same control volumes. The purpose of Figure 4-76 is to show the usefulness of the reanalysis runoff in closing the water balance for the Mississippi Basin control volume, which is balanced well when storage is included. Because of the size of the Mississippi Basin control volume, it could be possible that a consistent lag time can not be found for the control volume because there are such a wide variety of basin response times and hydrological features contained in the basin.

In Figure **4-77** the reanalysis runoff term does not complete the balance well for any of the scenarios presented. The runoff methodology seems to route the runoff in the wrong direction, meaning there is a problem applying the runoff methodology to the basin control volume. These results indicate the reanalysis storage is much more accurate than the runoff term for the basin control volumes. This makes sense because the basins are large control volumes, and the storage change is spatially averaged to fit the precipitation minus evaporation cycle.

Figure 4-72: Correlation Plots for **SEUS -** Storage Method Comparison Surface

Figure 4-73: Correlation Plots for Larger **US -** Storage Method Comparison Surface

Figure 4-74: Correlation Plots for Miss. Basin **-** Storage Method Comparison Surface Runoff

Figure 4-75: Correlation Plots for P. Velho Basin **-** Storage Method Comparison Surface Runoff

Figure 4-76: Correlation Plots for Miss. Basin - Storage Method Comparison Reanalysis Runoff

Figure **4-77:** Correlation Plots for P. Velho Basin **-** Storage Method Comparison Re. Runoff

In summary, the lag time balance method is effective only for basin sized control volumes with surface runoff, where meaningful results can be obtained. This can be seen especially for the Port Velho Basin in Figure *4-75.* In most other cases, the inclusion of the surface storage term in the water balance is paramount.

4.7. Control Volume Type

Although much of this information has been presented before, it is necessary to look here at all **11** control volumes at default conditions so as to directly look at the properties of these balances when compared to one another. **By** this analysis we can get a sense of how different control volumes of size and shape balance.

Figure **4-78** shows the residual statistics for all **11** of the control volumes for both the atmospheric and surface balances, default conditions. As has been observed before, the Larger **US** and **SWUS** control volumes for the atmospheric balance display larger absolute errors and biases. The closure of the box control volume atmospheric water balance relies not only on size, but also on the location of the control volume, with errors common over particularly arid or mountainous land. The Large Rondonia control volume has a better balance than the other four smaller tropical, control volumes. **A** more complete classification of different sized box control volumes for atmospheric water balances will be considered in the global water balance in Section 4.3. For the basin control volumes and the atmospheric balance the same general trends exist with size and location of control volume. The Amazon Basin and Mississippi Basin balances are better than their smaller sub basins. The tropical Amazon and Porto Velho basins are better balances than the Mississippi and Arkansas basins.

There are no normalized errors in the surface balance greater than one for any control volume. There is more variability associated with the moisture flux calculation as much more water is passing through the atmosphere than the surface in a given month. The trends that existed between groups of control volumes for the atmospheric balance can't be made for the surface balance. The errors are lower for the basin sized control volumes in terms of the absolute error, with comparable errors for the **SEUS** control volume.

Figures 4-79 and 4-80 show the regression and correlation statistics for all 11 control volumes under default conditions. For this comparison we will consider four statistics for all three of the correlation types, atmospheric, surface, and total. The total regression is appropriate for use here because we are using default conditions, but it is likely not very useful. This information has already been views in Section *4.5* for the box control volumes, but here the basin control volumes are added. In terms of slope of the atmospheric balances, the Larger Rondonia, Northwest Brazil, and Mississippi Basin control volumes show the best adherence to one for both monthly and yearly time scales. Good slopes are hard to come **by** on the yearly time scale for the surface balances, but a handful are good on the monthly basis, with the best in the **SEUS.** The total correlation only yields "decent" slopes for the **SEUS** and Amazon control volumes

The R^{^2} and correlation coefficient statistics tell very similar stories about the tightness of correlation between the different sides of the water balance, in Figures 4-79 and over to Figure 4-

80. For the atmospheric balance the best correlations are found for the Larger Rondonia and Amazon control volumes while the *SWUS* and Larger **US** control volumes are the worst. Monthly correlation for most water balances is stronger than yearly correlation for the surface water balance with strong correlations in the **SEUS** and the Porto Velho control volumes. **A** lot of the poor total correlations occur in the basins over the United States and over the smaller control volumes. The basins over the United States (Mississippi and Arkansas) have weak correlations for all three balances (atmospheric, surface, and total). The box control volumes have varying correlations over different geographic areas. The use of the surface runoff data seems to have a pronounced effect on the correlation of the basins being good or bad, and the **USGS** Runoff data seems to be substandard when plugged into these regressions. In general as we go from atmospheric to surface to total correlations, the coefficients go down.

Continuing on to the NRMSE for the different control volumes on the bottom of Figure 4-80 we see the same atmospheric weaknesses, all in control volumes over the United States (box and basin with the exception of the **SEUS).** The magnitude of precipitation is smaller over these control volumes decreasing the normalization factor which likely drives the NRMSE up, and these effects are more prominent in the atmospheric balance. For the surface balance we have good conditions for all of the basin control volumes and the **SEUS.** The total NRMSE is one in nearly all cases, but is smallest for Larger Rondonia, Rondonia, and **SEUS,** with the Amazon Basin.

Figure **4-78:** Control Volume Comparison **-** Atmos. an **d** Surface Absolute Error and Bias Error

Figure 4-79: Control Volume Comparison **-** Atmos, Surface, and Total Regressed Slope and R2

Figure 4-80: Control Volume Comparison **-** Atmos, Surface, and Total Corr. Coeff. and NRMSE

Four control volumes are selected for a more detailed look, each different in nature. The Rondonia and Larger Rondonia control volumes are selected as the small and large box control volumes, and the Amazon and Porto Velho control volumes are selected as the small and large basin control volumes. **All** of these control volumes overlap to some extent and represent the same general hydrological conditions. Figure 4-81 displays the residual statistics for only these four selected and different control volumes. The larger areas are better balanced on the atmospheric level, but only the Larger Rondonia control volume is well balanced. The surface balances are improved on the monthly scale for the basin control volumes, and biases are reduced.

In Figure 4-82 and 4-83 the regression and correlation statistics for all three types of correlation are considered. For the atmospheric balance the slope is much better aligned to one for the box control volumes. The Amazon basin slope is fairly high, which illustrates the difficulties of applying the moisture flux methodology to a basin control volume. The surface slopes are poor in all cases but the Porto Velho basin, and therefore because alignment does exist in the atmospheric balance it won't exist in the total balance. However, for the Amazon Basin control volume the alignment does occur for the total two sided balance because of the high slope of the atmospheric balance correlates to the low slope of the surface balance.

The atmospheric R^{^2} and correlation coefficients are again similar in terms of trends, and for the atmospheric balance shows little difference among types of control volumes, all being fairly good, with the Porto Velho lagging a little behind. The only good correlations in the surface balance are in Porto Velho basin. While the total Amazon slope looked good the correlation is clearly not that strong. For the NRMSE on the bottom of Figure 4-83, the atmospheric balance gets worse from left to right as expected.

In Figure 4-84 the atmospheric correlation plots for the four control volumes of interest are shown on the yearly time scale. The Larger Rondonia control volume has a very tight atmospheric correlation, while the Rondonia control volume has a good signal correlation, but a clear bias. In Figure 4-85 the surface balance is considered. In this case the Larger Rondonia control volume is very biased, while the Rondonia control volume is well balanced. However, neither balance is very well correlated. The surface correlations look better especially in the Porto Velho control volume, as the numbers are realistic with positive side surface flux and precipitation **-** evaporation. The total correlations are given in Figure 4-86. The Rondonia control volume clearly results in the best balance out of the four balances presented.

Figure **4-81:** Tropical Volume Comparison **-** Atmos. and Surface Absolute Error and Bias Error

Figure 4-82: Tropical Volume Comparison **-** Atmos, Surface, and Total Regressed Slope and R2

Figure 4-83: Tropical Volume Comparison **-** Atmos, Surf, and Total Corr. Coeff. and NRMSE

Figure 4-84: Tropical Correlation Plots - Atmospheric Regression

Figure 4-85: Tropical Correlation Plots **-** Surface Regression

Figure 4-86: Tropical Correlation Plots **-** Total Regression

5. Data Analysis by Study Region

For each control volume there are four basic water balances that we wish to close for each study region: the monthly atmospheric water balance, the yearly atmospheric water balance, the monthly surface water balance, and the yearly surface water balance. Each of these water balances can be evaluated using the Reanalysis-1 and the Reanalysis-2 *(55* years and **23** years) respectively. The primary purpose of this section will be to present the water balance over each region for both reanalyzes. These water balances are presented with default conditions which include: moisture flux method 2, non-zero change in storage, and the linear runoff methodology routing methodology.

For each control volume there are a large number of permutations of use of characteristics which can be used to perform the water balances. Tables *5.1-5.7* show the characteristics which can be changed in each water balance over each control volume. Five evaluation criteria were used to evaluate the water balances: absolute error, bias error, regression slope, correlation coefficient, and RMSE. **All** of the normalized statistics were not used because there is no comparison of different control volumes in this evaluation. The R^{^2} values were not used as most of the water balances yield very poor R^2 results and the adherence of the balance to a linear relationship is evaluated in the correlation coefficient. Intercept is disregarded as it is accounted for in the bias residual statistic.

All possible water scenarios for each control volume and balance are placed in a spreadsheet and with the five evaluation criteria. The different scenarios are sorted and ranked **by** performance in each criterion. In the case of ranking bias and slope the departure from zero and one are ranked based on a modification to the original properties. Once each of the criterions is ranked, the rankings are summed for each scenario, and the best balances are then sorted and ranked from the lowest sum of ranks to the highest sum of ranks. The spreadsheets which were used to carry out this evaluation are given in Appendix **A** for reference purpose as the water balance statistics for every balance conducted over all eleven control volumes are presented. Once the evaluation was completed the data for each control volume and water balance was analyzed carefully to pick the best possible water balance, which in some cases was not the balance ranked the highest **by** the evaluation criterion. These selections will be discussed and displayed further, along with the default reanalysis balances on an area-by-area basis. Also included in each section will be the annual time series of precipitation for all control volumes on a yearly basis.

Variables 1 3 2 1 2 13 156 Table **5-1:** Water Balance Combinations for Eastern Brazil, Northwest Brazil, Larger Rondonia, Rondonia

Table **5-2:** Water Balance Combinations for **SEUS**

Control	Moisture								
Volume	Flux	Runoff Method	Storage	Runoff Data	Reanalysis	Time	Precipitation	Time	
Monthly									
Atmospheric	Method 1	1	N/A	N/A	$\mathbf{1}$	1/1948-12/2002		N/A	
							Reanalysis		
	Method 2				$\overline{2}$	1/1979-12/2001	GPCP	1/1979-12/2001	
							GPCC	1/1986-12/1996	
							GPCC TRMM	1/1998-12/2002	
							GHCN/CAMS	1/1948-11/2002	
							SSM/I	7/1987-11/1987	
								1/1988-6/1990	
								1/1992-12/2002	
							OP ₁₂	1/1979-8/2002	
							OP ₁₃	1/1979-8/2002	
							CMAP	1/1979-6/2002	
							CMAP ₂	1/1979-6/2002	Total
Sum									
Variables	$\overline{\mathbf{2}}$	\mathbf{z}					10		40
Control	Moisture								
Volume	Flux	Runoff Method	Storage	Runoff Data	Reanalysis	Time	Precipitation	Time	
Yearly									
	Method 1	1	N/A	N/A	1	1948-2002		N/A	
							Reanalysis		
	Method 2	2			$\overline{2}$	1979-2001	GPCP	1979-2001	
							GPCC	1986-1996	
Atmospheric Sum							GPCC TRMM	1998-2002	
							GHCN/CAMS	1948-2002	
							SSM/I	1988-1989	
								1992-2002	
								1979-2001	
							OP ₁₂		
							OP ₁₃	1979-2001	
							CMAP	1979-2001	
							CMAP ₂	1979-2001	Total
Variables	$\mathbf{2}$	$\mathbf{2}$					10		40
Control	Moisture								
Volume	Flux	Runoff Method	Storage	Runoff Data	Reanalysis	Time	Precipitation	Time	
Monthly									
					1				
Surface	Method 1	Linear	Yes	Reanalysis		1/1948-12/2002	Reanalysis	N/A	
		Point	No		$\overline{2}$	1/1979-12/2001	GPCP	1/1979-12/2001	
		Area	1 mon				GPCC	1/1986-12/1996	
			2 mon				GPCC TRMM	1/1998-12/2002	
			3 mon				GHCN/CAMS	1/1948-11/2002	
			4 mon				SSM/I	7/1987-11/1987	
								1/1988-6/1990	
								1/1992-12/2002	
							OP ₁₂	1/1979-8/2002	
							OP ₁₃	1/1979-8/2002	
							CMAP	1/1979-6/2002	
							CMAP ₂	1/1979-6/2002	Total
Sum									
Variables	1	з	6	1	\mathbf{z}		10		360
Control	Moisture								
Volume	Flux	Runoff Method	Storage	Runoff Data	Reanalysis	Time	Precipitation	Time	
Yearly									
Surface	Method 1	Linear	Yes		1	1948-2002		N/A	
				Reanalysis			Reanalysis		
		Point	No		$\overline{2}$	1979-2001	GPCP	1979-2001	
		Area					GPCC	1986-1996	
							GPCC TRMM	1998-2002	
							GHCN/CAMS	1948-2002	
							SSM/I	1988-1989	
								1992-2002	
							OP _{I2}	1979-2001	
							OP ₁₃	1979-2001	
							CMAP	1979-2001	
							CMAP ₂	1979-2001	Total
Sum Variables	1	3	2	1	2		10		120

Table **5-3:** Water Balance Combinations for **SWUS**

Table 5-4: Water Balance Combinations for Larger **US**

Table **5-5:** Water Balance Combinations for Amazon and Port Velho Basins

Control Volume	Moisture Flux	Storage	Runoff Data	Runoff Time	Reanalysis	Time	Precipitation	Time	
Monthly									
Atmospheric	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1/1948-12/2002	Reanalysis	N/A	
					$\overline{2}$	1/1979-12/2001	GPCP	1/1979-12/2001	
							GPCC	1/1986-12/1996	
							GPCC TRMM GHCN-CAMS	1/1998-12/2002	
							GPI	1/1948-11/2002 1/1986-12/2002	
							TRMM 3B43	1/1998-12/2002	
							SSM/I	7/1987-11/1987	
								1/1988-6/1990	
								1/1992-12/2002	
							OP ₁₂	1/1979-8/2002	
							OP ₁₃	1/1979-8/2002	
							CMAP	1/1979-6/2002	
							CMAP2	1/1979-6/2002	Total
Sum Variables	ī	1	1		$\overline{2}$		12		24
	Moisture								
Control Volume	Flux	Storage	Runoff Data	Time	Reanalysis	Time	Precipitation	Time	
Yearly Atmospheric	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.	1948-2002	Reanalysis	N/A	
		N/A			$\overline{2}$	1979-2001	GPCP	1979-2001	
							GPCC	1986-1996	
							GPCC TRMM	1998-2002	
							GHCN-CAMS	1948-2002	
							GPI	1986-2002	
							TRMM 3B43	1998-2002	
							SSM/I	1988-1989	
							OP ₁₂	1992-2002	
							OP ₁₃	1979-2001 1979-2001	
							CMAP	1979-2001	
							CMAP ₂	1979-2001	Total
Sum Variables	1	1.	1		$\overline{2}$		12		24
	Moisture								
Control Volume	Flux	Storage	Runoff Data	Runoff Time	Reanalysis	Time	Precipitation	Time	
Monthly Surface	N/A	Yes	Surface	1/1970-12/1996	1	1/1948-12/2002	Reanalysis	N/A	
		No 1 mon	Reanalysis	N/A	$\overline{2}$	1/1979-12/2001	GPCP GPCC	1/1979-12/2001	
		2 mon					GPCC TRMM	1/1986-12/1996 1/1998-12/2002	
		3 mon					GHCN-CAMS	1/1948-11/2002	
		4 mon					GPI	1/1986-12/2002	
							TRMM 3B43	1/1998-12/2002	
							SSM/I	7/1987-11/1987	
								1/1988-6/1990	
								1/1992-12/2002	
							OP ₁₂	1/1979-8/2002	
							OP ₁₃	1/1979-8/2002	
							CMAP	1/1979-6/2002	
Sum Variables							CMAP2	1/1979-6/2002	Total
(SurfR)	1	6	1		2		10		120
Sum Variables									
(ReR)	1	6	1		$\mathbf{2}$		12		144
Sum Variables									264
	Moisture								
Control Volume Yearly Surface	Flux Method 1	Storage Yes	Runoff Data Surface	Runoff Time 1970-1996	Reanalysis	Time 1948-2002	Precipitation	Time	
		No	Reanalysis	N/A	1 2	1979-2001	Reanalysis GPCP	N/A 1979-2001	
							GPCC	1986-1996	
							GPCC TRMM	1998-2002	
							GHCN-CAMS	1948-2002	
							GPI	1986-2002	
							TRMM 3B43	1998-2002	
							SSM/I	1988-1989	
								1992-2002	
							OP ₁₂	1979-2001	
							OP ₁₃	1979-2001	
							CMAP	1979 2001	
Sum Variables							CMAP ₂	1979-2001	Total
(SurfR)	1	$\overline{2}$	1		2		10		40
Sum Variables									
(ReR)	1	$\mathbf{2}$	1		$\mathbf{2}$		12		48
Sum Variables									88

Table **5-6:** Water Balance Combinations for Arkansas Basins

Table **5-7:** Water Balance Combinations for Mississippi Basins

5.1. East Brazil

The East Brazil control volume was selected for this study as one of three small control volumes over the tropical portion of the South American continent. This control volume represents the more populated and developed portions of Brazil, and thus likely is a better observed region. Figure *5-1* shows the yearly Reanalysis-1 water balances for Eastern Brazil. In the atmospheric balance precipitation exceeds evaporation for much of the second half of the balance. This should result in a slightly positive moisture flux, unfortunately a very negative moisture flux is found. The moisture flux does increase slightly from *1950-1955* and in the later half of the balance which is consistent with the P-E difference. The result in general is a very biased residual at the beginning and the end of the balance of similar magnitude to the other water balance variables. In the surface balance residual is consistently negative. Similarities in signals between the P-E and storage change exist, but the methodology fails to pick up much of the runoff. **A** balance is achieved in the first half on the time period, but not in the second half. The magnitudes of the errors are high for these water balances.

To see if the second half of these balances can be improved we refer to Figure **5-2** which shows the Reanalysis-2 yearly balances. For the atmospheric balance there are few differences from the Reanalysis-1. For the surface balance runoff has a little more amplitude here from year to year however this does not lead to much improvement. While the entire time series is unbalanced in the Reanalysis-1 a balance is achieved in the middle portion of the Reanalyis-2 surface balance. Both the absolute error and bias increase from the Reanalysis-1 to Reanalysis-2 for both the atmospheric and surface water balances. Virtually no correlation exists between elements of the atmospheric and surface water balances from either dataset.

Figure *5-3* displays alternative precipitation datasets on an annual basis for the Eastern Brazil control volume, which yields some interesting results. **Up** until **1979** the Reanalysis-1 seems to be consistent with the alternative sources of precipitation, however, in **1979** the Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 jump and are significantly higher for the rest of the time period. This behavior was observed in the atmospheric balance and compensated for in the moisture flux, but in the surface balance it isn't compensated for until the Reanalysis-2. The alternative precipitation datasets are very consistent with each other especially in the large dataset category. The larger datasets are probably the correct ones; however these datasets will not necessarily be able to close this balance.

Figure 5-2: Eastern Brazil Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure 5-3: Eastern Brazil Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

Turning to the monthly balance, we observe the Reanalysis-i in Figure *5-4.* For the atmospheric monthly balance we see a strong correlation between the two elements of the water balance. Moisture flux is clearly overestimated as was seen on the yearly time scale which results in a slope above one. But on a monthly basis there is a tight correlation, and the seasonal cycle can be seen well in the example plot. The correlation coefficient for this balance is .8927, while the slope of the regression is 1.83. For the surface balance we also see a good correlation between the two sides of the balance, however the runoff isn't well aligned with the precipitation which can be seen in the bottom right panel. Despite the fact that change in surface storage is included in the balance, there appears to be a lag time in the runoff. Unfortunately, lag time is only considered without storage in this study, because change in storage should account for any lag time. In the Reanalysis-1 for this control volume a one or two month lag time may be very useful. The correlation coefficient here is *.4511* with a slope of *.6511.*

Turning to the Reanalysis-2 in Figure 5-5, we see a very similar atmospheric water balance. The slope of the regression is reduced to *1.57.* The lag time problem is completely removed in the example plot of the Reanalysis-2 surface balance, however the balance here is deceptive as can be seen by the scatter plot. On the yearly basis for this control volume we observed a very good balance over the early 1990's. The monthly balance is very good here too, and the seasonal cycle is very well alligned. However, for other portions of the time series, there appears to be significant errors, so by our ranking system given in Appendix A, the Reanalysis-2 only provides for slight improvements in the surface water balance from the Reanalysis-i. The correlation coefficient for the Reanalysis-2, .4349, is almost exactly the same as in the Reanalysis-i.

Figure 5-4: Eastern Brazil Reanalysis-I Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-5:** Eastern Brazil Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Trying to improve on the Eastern Brazil water balance we refer to the ranking system devised
and presented in Appendix A. Table 5-1 indicated that for this control volume, for the Table 5-1 indicated that for this control volume, for the atmospheric yearly water balance, we can vary flux methodology (2), reanalysis (2), and precipitation dataset **(13).** For the yearly surface balance we can vary runoff methodology (2), reanalysis (2), storage method (2), and precipitation dataset **(13).**

For the East Brazil atmospheric yearly balance the default Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 balances are among the top **3** of all the balances evaluated. The Reanalysis-1 provides the best balance which is very encouraging in the context of use for climate studies. However, absolute errors and biases are high. Inputting the **GPCP** precipitation dataset into the later portion of the Renalysis-1 results in a comparable balance to that of the reanalysis (shown in Figure *5-6).* The properties of this balance are very similar to the default reanalysis balances. **Of** special note here is the TRMM 3B43 dataset which under certain conditions ranks **5th,** but the temporal resolution is only **5** years which isn't significant on the yearly basis.

In the yearly surface balance the reanalysis balances are not as good. We replace the precipitation with **GPI** precipitation, change the runoff method to area, and eliminate the storage term. This balance is ranked second. However the best balance contains **GPCC** TRMM, and contains only four years of data. When the change in storage is removed and the precipitation replaced the balance improves a lot especially in its second half. The correlation coefficient is **.6303** and the bias is only 2 kg/m^2-month, indicating almost all water is accounted for over the duration of the balance.

Figure **5-6:** Eastern Brazil Selected Yearly Water Balances

For the monthly time scales the improved balances are shown in Figure *5-7.* There are as many possibilities here as there were for the yearly time scale *(52)* for the atmospheric balance. Again for the atmospheric balance, not much improvement could be achieved from the reanalysis balance. The highest ranking balance is the TRMM 3A46 precipitation applied to the Reanalysis-1 with moisture flux Method 2. In general the Reanalysis-1 balances with various precipitation datasets tend to be better balanced than the Reanalysis-2 for the East Brazil control volume. There is little improvement though, and **by** this dataset moisture flux is too high for all data points.

For the monthly surface balance there are a great number of possible water balances which can be applied and improvement can be found. Alternatives are found in runoff method **(3),** reanalysis (2), storage method **(6),** and precipitation **(13).** Based on the evaluation criteria the **GPI** precipitation is again a good fit for the water balance with area runoff, and remaining default conditions. The balance ranks well among all evaluation criteria and the correlation factor is improved to nearly **.8,** almost double what it was before. Possible explanations include the elimination of data points early in the time series, and just a greater effectiveness of the **GPI,** combined with a better runoff model for this region. **GPI** precipitation is similar to the reanalysis, but slightly lower for this control volume as shown in Figure *5-3.*

Figure *5-7:* Eastern Brazil Selected Monthly Water Balances

5.2. Larger Rondonia

The Larger Rondonia control volume was selected for this work to compare to the smaller *7.5* degree box control volumes in the Amazon rain forest region, to see if there were substantial advantages to using a control volume with six moisture flux points on a side, and four times the area. The size of this water balance should allow for the anomalous flux and other fields to have a smaller affect on the balance, and should in general improve the balance because more data is being averaged. We have shown how this control volume clearly improves the ability to obtain a water balance in this region in the previous chapter, and we will now study it more closely.

Figure *5-8* shows the yearly water balance for the Reanalysis-1. The atmospheric water balance is very good and the results are very interesting. There is a marked increase in the magnitude of the precipitation and a corresponding increase in the magnitude of moisture flux over the second half of the water balance. The balance term dips slightly here with this increase. **A** similar situation was observed in the Eastern Brazil balance, and also **by** Chen (2001), as discussed in Chapter **1,** whose control volume was near the same size and in the same area as this one. The atmospheric water balance closes well, with small absolute and bias error on the magnitude of **¹⁰** kg/m^2-month and a correlation of .9740. There is solid evidence of a change in the water balance over the Amazon Rain Forest here. We will continue to look for this pattern in other water balances in this geographic region. In the Reanalysis-1 surface balance the change in storage signal is weak and steady and the runoff is nearly flat. There is a **-.2362** correlation in this balance with an absolute error and bias of about *75* kg/m^2-month.

In the Reanalysis-2 shown in Figure *5-9* the yearly atmospheric balance again is closed very well, though there are some differences in the data especially at the end of the time series. There are very small differences in evaluation criteria between reanalyzes, with the surface balance continuing to be a failure. The runoff is routed in the wrong direction and ends up negative, and the storage change follows a very regular pattern every few years. The correlation coefficient is at least above zero as positive changes in storage correspond to precipitation increases.

A look at the annual precipitation (Figure *5-10)* for this control volume is very relevant, as there is a marked increase in precipitation in the second half **of** the Reanalysis-I water balance and we wish to see if alternative precipitation datasets agree. The same trend is observed as in Eastern Brazil, the precipitation increases in the Reanalysis-1 over the second half of the *55* year period, but the alternative precipitation values are consistent with the reanalysis precipitation prior to this time. The Reanalysis-2 seems to improve the precipitation to make it more consistent with alternative sources.

Figure **5-8:** Larger Rondonia Reanalysis-I Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-9:** Larger Rondonia Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-10:** Larger Rondonia Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

Figure **5-11:** Larger Rondonia Reanalysis-I Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-11** shows the monthly balances for Larger Rondonia for the Reanalysis-1. The results look similar to those obtained in the Eastern Brazil control volume. Although these regions have similar hydrological properties it should be noted that they don't overlap (though they do share a partial boundary). The slope of the regression of the atmospheric balance is much improved **(1.0332),** almost exactly aligned with one. For the surface balance a very regular change in change in storage cycle seems to dominate the balance and it looks as if the runoff is missing or negative when it should be positive, as was sensed in the yearly results. The seasonal cycle and correlation looks poor for the surface balance. The surface balance has a correlation slope *of.59* and a correlation coefficient of .3743.

The Reanalysis-2 is considered under the same circumstances in Figure *5-12.* The atmospheric balance looks just as good as the Reanalysis-i based on the evaluation criteria. The surface balance looks to be improved in terms of seasonal cycle. However the bias and absolute errors increase in this case because the negative runoff forces the runoff and change in storage term in the wrong direction. For this control volume the linear runoff method clearly fails to capture even the correct direction of the runoff as the change in storage is responsible for any type of correlation present (coefficient *.5473).* It is encouraging that these cycles do line up fairly well even with a complete failure in runoff. Perhaps a more sophisticated runoff routing system and better data could result in both a good surface balance for this control volume.

Figure *5-12:* Larger Rondonia Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

The amount of scenarios for the Larger Rondonia control volume balances are the same as those for the Eastern Brazil control volume in Table **5-1-1,** providing a large amount of possibilities for improvement. As was the case with the previous control volume, it is difficult to improve on any of the atmospheric balances because of the good **job** the Reanalysis does fitting its own precipitation to the moisture flux. On the yearly basis the balance is slightly improved **by** changing the moisture flux methodology to **1,** or changing the precipitation dataset to TRMM 3A46. However, in this case we will use an alternative precipitation dataset, the **GPI.** This precipitation dataset is high like that provided **by** the reanalysis thus it helps make the atmospheric balance better, as shown in Figure *5-13.* To improve the yearly surface balance, the evaluation criteria are used and the best balance is arrived at **by** changing to the point runoff method, applied to the Reanalysis-1, and using **GPCC** presentation. This provides an absolute error and bias of 34.63 kg/m \textdegree 2-month, or in other words approximately the difference between the precipitation and evaporation. The application seems to simply lower the precipitation and nullify the negative pull of the runoff. Several scenarios with the **GPCC** precipitation work well for this control volume, likely because this precipitation provides for the lowest bias. It is of special note though that gauges may underestimate precipitation in this control volume (a general note about gauges). What we really need here is better surface flux data (especially runoff).

In Figure 5-14 improvements are made to the monthly water balances. There aren't any improvements for the atmospheric balance. For the Larger Rondonia control volume, the atmospheric water balance can be deemed a success, at least from the reanalysis standpoint. For the monthly surface balance we again turn to the best water balance as evaluated **by** the criteria in Appendix **A.** This is achieved with point runoff, applied to Reanalysis-2, and using the OP12 precipitation dataset. **A** correlation coefficient of .4989 is achieved as the seasonal precipitation cycle is lowered and the runoff/change in storage cycle is heightened. The balance is still fairly poor with a regression slope of .3 and a bias of 34.8 kg/m²2-month, similar to that of the yearly case. **A** better method of obtaining runoff flux out of this control volume is necessary in order to compute the surface water balance, and such inconsistencies would make it impossible to conduct a total water balance for this control volume.

Figure **5-13:** Larger Rondonia Selected Yearly Water Balances

Figure *5-14:* Larger Rondonia Selected Monthly Water Balances

5.3. Larger United States

In this section we continue to look at a large control volume, however we switch geographic regions to the United States. This region was selected as an alternative large control volume over a supposedly better observed area than the Larger Rondonia control volume. It is also a change from the tropical Larger Rondonia area to the varying climate features of the drier Western United States.

Figure *5-15* shows the yearly water balances obtained from the Reanalysis-1. The problems are almost too numerous to describe. The evaporation is higher than the precipitation over land, which is a **highly** unlikely phenomenon for a land mass of this size. Such a phenomenon corresponds to a slightly negative moisture flux, however the moisture flux is found to be of about the same magnitude as the precipitation and evaporation quantities. The runoff provided **by** the Reanlaysis-1 is again near zero without much **of** a signal and the change in surface storage fluctuates wildly dictating the behavior of the balance term. The correlation coefficients for both balances are near zero. In Figure *5-16,* the Reanalysis-2 yearly balances are presented. The properties of the water balance are just about the same, and **by** the evaluation criteria the balance actually gets worse. For the surface balance the correlation coefficient improves, but the absolute error increases. Bias is relatively low for the surface balance, because storage change over the long run is zero, and runoff is non-existent, therefore the bias is just the precipitation evaporation term.

Figure 5-15: Larger US Reanalysis-1 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure 5-16: Larger US Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

In Figure *5-17* the annual precipitation time series are shown for the Larger United States control volume. The precipitation is largely consistent and appears to be a little higher in the second half of the entire time interval. This is encouraging because it appears by the water balances that the precipitation is too low, as it should be at least as large as the evaporation.

In Figure 5-18 the monthly water balances are considered for the Reanalysis-1. The seasonal cycle is not picked up at all, and instead there is a negative correlation between the side flux and the bottom flux of the atmospheric balance. The slope of the regression is - 1.2973 and the correlation coefficient is -.4539. For the surface balance the seasonal cycle is picked up, but likely as a result of the change in storage cycle. We observed in the yearly case that the runoff term is nearly non-existent for the Reanalysis-l. There is a strong correlation of this cycle with a correlation coefficient of .7673; however the slope of the linear regression of this relationship is about 3. Both the moisture flux and runoff seasonal cycle are much stronger then the $P - E$ seasonal cycle. In Figure 5-19 we see much of the same for the atmospheric balance in the Reanalysis-2. The balances are equally bad as can be discerned by the complete lack of correlation of the seasonal cycles. The surface balance however is greatly improved. Although there is a large bias, the signals are much better aligned. These observations are consistent with the results of the evaluation for this control volume in Appendix A which classifies the default monthly surface Reanalyis-2 balance as one of the best, with a correlation coefficient of .76 16 and an absolute error of 21.90 kg/m^2-month compared to 51.27 kg/m^2-month for the Reanalysis-1.

Figure **5-17:** Larger **US** Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

Figure **5-18:** Larger **US** Reanalysis-I Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-19:** Larger **US** Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Throughout this study we have observed problems with the atmospheric water balance of the Larger United States control volume. We see an unrealistically high seasonal cycle and unrealistically high annual values for the moisture flux. The most likely explanation for this is the mountainous terrain contained in this control volume. The moisture flux calculations depend on pressure level data, starting from sea level pressure, however these levels don't even exist in mountainous regions and this may lead to difficulties in the moisture flux calculation.

As a result of the location of the Larger United States control volume, several precipitation datasets are not used. Table *5-4* shows the variables which are considered for each control volume, which is similar to the previous two control volumes, however missing the **3** tropical precipitation datasets **(GPI,** TRMM 3B43, TRMM 3A46), and also missing the **SSM/I** precipitation which contained an anomalous error for this control volume. Precipitation is the only characteristic affected **by** the geography of the control volume.

Continuing, as we try to make corrections for the atmospheric yearly balance, we find the default reanalysis balances rank among the worst based on evaluation criterion. The top ranking balances have weak correlations and regressions. Selecting a balance with a good regression slope would mean doubling the various error statistics. Therefore we select the top ranked balance which includes a change to Method 1 and Reanalysis-1, applying the **GPCP** precipitation. Interestingly, for the Larger **US** control volume changing to Method 1 is very affective, as a regression slope of .5093 is obtained with an absolute error and bias of 21 kg/m^2 month, less than half of that for the default balance.

For the yearly surface balance it is difficult to improve the balance, as all scenarios have very similar errors and very poor correlations and regression results. The most **highly** rated balances aren't correlated well at all, so in an attempt to find balance that is more correlated to the one to one line, we take the most **highly** rated water balance with a good slope. **A** slope of *.9855* is found for the default conditions and applying the CMAP2 precipitation. The regression can be improved without offsetting the residual errors, but as can be seen **by** the bottom of Figure **5-20** the balance isn't improved too much.

Figure *5-20:* Larger **US** Selected Yearly Water Balances

Trying to improve the monthly atmospheric water balance is nearly impossible. For every scenario a negative correlation coefficient and slope are found. However, the less negative regression statistics do tend to correlate with the smaller residual errors and therefore it is possible to arrive at the same conditions that helped the yearly atmospheric water balance, applying Method 1 to the Reanalysis-1 with the **GPCP** precipitation. It is encouraging that the **GPCP** precipitation improves these balances, as it is a more reliable precipitation than the reanalysis. Looking at this balance in Figure *5-21,* at least the opposite seasonal cycles of the two terms are aligned, and the bias is reduced to **21.03** kg/m^2-month, same as in the case of the yearly balance.

In the monthly surface balance, improvement is gained with default conditions being applied to the Reanlaysis-2. **A** comparable balance with acceptable correlation statistics is also found **by** changing to the point runoff method and keeping everything else as the default conditions for the Reanlaysis-2. **All** water balance statistics are almost exactly the same, as runoff is only slightly changed.

Figure **5-21:** Larger **US** Selected Monthly Water Balances

The Larger United States water balance proves very hard to close for both the atmospheric and surface water balances. This is surprising considering the success in a remote area for the same size control volume. Problems in the closure of this balance were clearly affected **by** the inability of the moisture flux and runoff methodologies to compute realistic side fluxes for both water balances.

5.4. Northwest Brazil

The Northwest Brazil control volume was selected for this work because it is a very remote area of the Amazon rain forest which has neither good measurement nor land change. Figure **5-22** displays the Reanalysis-1 yearly water balances for this region. Again we see a jump in the precipitation, though slight, about halfway through the time series, and a much more dramatic raise in moisture flux, which increases the negative bias of the residual over the last twenty years of the balance. The bias for the atmospheric balance is **-45.97** kg/m^2-month, however the correlation coefficient is a very high **.8262,** as the moisture flux signal matches up with the precipitation signal on a year **by** year basis. The results of the surface balance are less encouraging. While the change in storage cycle appears to correlate slightly with the precipitation signal, the runoff does not and is negative and constant throughout almost the entire time series indicating the methodology does a poor **job** routing the precipitation. The result is a large negative bias and a poor correlation coefficient.

In Figure *5-23* we again see a very strong correlation between precipitation and moisture flux peaks for the Reanalysis-2 yearly atmospheric balance. The evaporation term in this balance is nearly constant for the duration of the time series, and the moisture flux is clearly overestimated in most cases. The correlation coefficient for this balance is .8424 and the slope of regression is improved to **1.37** from **1.51** in the Reanaysis-1 yearly atmospheric balance. The surface balance appears to get worse. In the Reanalysis-1 the runoff was near zero for all but the last five years of the time series. In the Reanalysis-2 runoff has magnitude, but is negative. It is likely the runoff is routed in the wrong direction here, as there is an increase in bias in the Reanalysis-2.

Figure 5-22: Northwest Brazil Reanalysis-1 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-23:** Northwest Brazil Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

The annual precipitation time series for the Northwest Brazil control volume are given in Figure *5-24.* As with the other two control volumes in this region analyzed already, the Reanalysis-1 precipitation time series jumps during the second half of the time period, while more contemporary precipitation efforts are consistent with the early part of the Reanalysis-1. For this control volume however there is a sharp contrast between the Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 precipitation datasets. The Reanalysis-2 is closer to the observational precipitation data. The magnitude of precipitation for this control volume is fairly high, and there is a large amount of water flowing through this region every month. The **GPI** and **SSM/I** datasets are again higher than the other precipitation datasets; however their maximum signals do not coincide well with those from the Reanalysis-1.

Switching to the monthly time scale the Reanalysis- 1 default balances are presented in Figure *5- 25.* In the atmospheric balance a good correlation is obtained, however the moisture flux signal is overestimated with a regression slope of 1.22 and a correlation coefficient of **.8253.** For all of the example points given in the bottom portion of the figure the moisture flux is higher, however signals are picked up on a point **by** point basis. The monthly surface balance is not very good. The runoff is routed in the wrong direction (negatively) and the seasonal cycle does not appear to be aligned.

Switching to the Reanalysis-2 in Figure *5-26,* the atmospheric monthly balance is about the same, the slope of the regression is slightly increased to **1.29,** but so is the correlation coefficient of.8431. The bias is reduced from -56.63kg/m^2-month to *-45.93* kg/m^2-month, which can be
seen **by** the example points. Although the evaluation criteria indicate the Reanalysis-I is a better balance, the Reanalysis-2 is clearly comparable if not better for this control volume and the atmospheric monthly balance. The monthly surface balance for the Reanalysis-2 is interesting for this control volume. The side flux term for the surface balance appears to be greatly improved, as there is signal pick up for the example points shown in the bottom plot. However, the intensity of the water cycle in Northwest Brazil is very large and so is the scale on these graphs, thus the bias between the points is large. Examining the correlation plot, the correlation is poor, leading to a negative correlation coefficient and regression slope.

Figure 5-24: Northwest Brazil Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

We now try to improve these water balances, especially the surface balance, **by** altering water balance characteristics. For the possible changes, Table *5-1* can again be used as this is one of the small tropical control volumes where all possibilities exist. The Northwest Brazil control volume is a very typical control volume in this work, as the atmospheric balance is easy to close to some to degree, while the surface balance is more difficult. In Figure *5-27* we try to improve the yearly water balances and we find **by** the criteria in Appendix **A** that for the yearly atmospheric balance, small improvements can be made. The best ranking method involves a slight shift of coordinates to the moisture flux Method 1 applied to the Reanalysis-1. This shift in coordinates lowers the moisture flux so it is almost perfectly aligned with the precipitation evaporation and the bias is reduced to -4.33 kg/m^2 -month in a water balance with quantities very high in magnitude. This is a very good balance, and for the atmospheric case this exercise can be deemed a success.

For the yearly surface balance on the bottom half of Figure **5-27,** the default reanalysis balances rank poorly, but so do all cases. In the top ranked scenario the runoff methodology is changed to the point runoff method and change in storage is eliminated, applying the balance to Reanalysis-2 using OP12 precipitation. Through these changes positive yet small slopes and correlation coefficients are obtained, and we see small correlation between the runoff and precipitation time series in the graph, as the annual evaporation is nearly constant. The balance still has a very negative bias.

Figure **5-25:** Northwest Brazil Reanalysis-I Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure 5-26: Northwest Brazil Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-27:** Northwest Brazil Selected Yearly Water Balances

In Figure **5-28** the monthly atmospheric water balance is improved in the same manner that the yearly water balance was improved, **by** applying the first moisture flux methodology to the Reanalysis-1. The bias is removed and is equivalent to that of the yearly balance. The slope of the regression is .9214. We select this set of conditions though it is ranked second **by** the evaluation criteria, because it is twice as long as the very similar balance achieved under the same conditions for the Reanalysis-2, which is ranked number **1.** For the surface water balance there is a lot of room for improvement and correspondingly many different water balances which can be tried, however, there are still no good results. For this control volume the point runoff methodology is applied to Reanalysis-1 with change in storage, as this is the top ranked water balance based on the evaluation criteria. The point methodology allows for a much better seasonal correlation through the side flux of the surface balance is still grossly underestimated (Bias of **-77.65** kg/m^2-month, regression slope of about .2 **1).**

Figure **5-28:** Northwest Brazil Selected Monthly Water Balances

For the Northwest Brazil control volume many of the same observations were made as for the other tropical control volumes in this region so far. **A** second half of the Reanalysis-1 rise in precipitation is again observed, but accounted for **by** the reanalysis moisture flux in the atmospheric balance. The surface balance is much harder to close than the atmospheric balance.

5.5. Rondonia

The Rondonia control volume was the first and original control volume selected for this work. It is an area of unique importance in the Amazon rain forest and is currently undergoing land change.

In Figure *5-29* the Reanalysis-1 yearly water balances are displayed. What is seen here is a clear jump in the precipitation between **1970** and *1975,* and a corresponding jump in moisture flux. Following these shifts the balance is actually improved, thus in this case, the poor water balance and uncharacteristic negative moisture flux over the region could be explained away **by** unreliable data in the early half of the Reanalysis-1. However, we have consistently seen this trend over every region in the Amazon rain forest. It is unlikely that all of these observations are a coincidence. There is a distinct change in the water balance over these regions in the past **fifty** years. Such a discrepancy makes it even more important to continue collecting data for such studies to see if trends continue. Decent statistics are obtained for this balance with a bias of 18.67 kg/m²-month and correlation coefficient of .7202. The question lies in the validity of the balance. For the yearly Reanalysis-1 surface balance, there is little adherence to the P-E cycle **by** either the runoff or storage change. Curiously in the last five years of the Reanalysis-1 the water balance is greatly improved, however this does not salvage a balance with a **.3092** correlation coefficient and no slope. The error is low due to the closeness of the P-E quantity to zeros.

In Figure **5-30** the Reanalysis-2 yearly water balances are displayed. The Reanalysis-2 increases the bias for the atmospheric balance. The precipitation and evaporation cycle is improved as there is less of a difference from the first half of the Reanalysis-1. However, the moisture flux is very negative, resulting in a high positive residual and a bias of 93.50 kg/m²-month. The correlation coefficient of the balance is still a high **.8210.** This is indicated **by** the residual line being fairly flat. For the surface balance the change in storage and runoff terms do not correlate properly with the rest of the balance, and instead alternate around zero. **A** positive regression slope of .3348 and weak R^{^2} of .0759 represent a faint linear relationship between the different sides of the water balance. Upon residual analysis, the water balance could be balanced about as well **by** eliminating the side flux of the surface balance entirely, as this flux provides no improvement to the balance. Closing the yearly surface balance with the reanalysis continues to be nearly impossible with the given data in remote areas, even with the Reanalysis-2, as the gridded runoff is not represented correctly **by** the methods used.

Figure *5-29:* Rondonia Reanalysis-1 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure *5-30:* Rondonia Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

In Figure 5-31 the yearly precipitation time series are shown, and differences are seen in the Rondonia control volume compared to the other control volumes analyzed so far. The Rondonia control volume compared to the other control volumes analyzed so far. alternative precipitation datasets are not aligned with the precipitation from the first half of the analysis for this control volume, but rather with the second half of the Reanalysis-1 where the precipitation is higher. This is unusual because for other control volumes in South America alternative precipitation datasets do not agree with the second half of the Reanalysis-1.

Figure *5-31:* Rondonia Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

In Figure *5-32* the monthly atmospheric and surface water balances are plotted for the Reanalysis-1. For the atmospheric balance we don't see as tight a correlation. It should be noted however, that over this control volume there is no strong seasonal cycle in the moisture flux time series as was the case with all control volumes to this point. As a result the signals presented are more like those of the yearly time scale, and so is the correlation. The correlation coefficient of this balance is only .3343. For the surface balance the seasonal cycle is uncovered with the removal of the moisture flux. There is a clear correlation of seasonal cycle shown **by** a correlation coefficient of *.4566.* This shows the effect of the seasonal cycle in improving the balance on the monthly time scale.

Figure *5-32:* Rondonia Reanalysis-1 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

In Figure *5-33* we switch to the Reanalysis-2 on the monthly time scale. We see the negative bias in the moisture flux as observed on the yearly time scale. Although the bias is greatly increased, the correlation coefficient is also increased from the Reanalysis-1. The seasonal cycle is improved for the moisture flux, although it is way too low. The entire regression seems to be biased **by** an intercept as the slope **of** the regression is **.7111** with a regression intercept of -89.44 kg/m^-month which is very close to the bias, meaning this balance could be corrected **by** ^a nudging term at each time step. The surface balance in this case looks very good, which is surprising given the condition of the yearly surface water balance in the Reanalysis-2. **By** the evaluation criteria this balance is slightly worse than that obtained **by** the Reanalysis-1 primarily due to the side flux of the surface balance not having a strong enough seasonal cycle. This is likely caused **by** an unsuccessful runoff calculation which may be improved **by** a change in methodology. **A** correlation coefficient of this balance is a fairly high *.5428.*

Figure *5-33:* Rondonia Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

For the atmospheric yearly balance the best results **by** the evaluation criteria are clearly given **by** the default method used **by** the Reanalysis-1. The Reanalysis-2 balance is also one of the top balances in this scenario, but of great interest here is the success of the water balance applying the TRMM 3B43 dataset to both the atmospheric and surface balance on the yearly time scale. In the atmospheric balance this application is to the Reanalysis-1 with Method 2 moisture flux. The balances obtained are shown in the top portion of Figure *5-34.* For the surface balance the TRMM 3B43 precipitation is applied to the Reanalysis-1 with the area runoff methodology. The figures indicate biases, but otherwise generally good water balances on the yearly basis with the TRMM precipitation product. The correlation coefficient for the yearly atmospheric balance is only *.3551* while a strong correlation is observed in the surface balance with comparable errors and biases.

Figure *5-34:* Rondonia Selected Yearly Water Balances

Next we attempt to improve the monthly water balances. For the atmospheric balance we again see the top ranked balances belong to the reanalysis under various conditions. Trying to keep with the application of TRMM products to this water balance the **GPCC** TRMM precipitation dataset is applied to the Reanlaysis-l for the atmospheric monthly balance shown in Figure *5-35.* The balance is not improved in this case, but a comparable balance is achieved with a weak correlation of **.1161.** It is curious here that **by** the evaluation criteria the reanalysis balances for the monthly atmospheric case are far better than those obtained with alternative precipitation applied. The validity of the reanalysis precipitation has been questioned throughout this work, and it is hard to classify this precipitation as reliable despite the fact it completes the water balance.

For the monthly surface balance significant improvements can be made on the monthly time scale **by** using the evaluation criteria and once again a **TRMM** dataset completes the balance the best, and again it is the **GPCC** TRMM dataset. The point runoff methodology is used along with the Reanalysis-1. The balance is very visually apparent **by** both the scatter plot, and the plot of the compared data points in the time series. The runoff signal is captured **by** this configuration. It is possible to show the entire monthly time series for both balances in the bottom portion of these plots as there are only *59* points in each time series. The slope of the surface correlation is almost exactly **1** with a high regression R^2 **1:1** value of **.6320,** a quantity that is usually meaningless.

Rondonia **Q -** dW/dt vs P **- ^E**Atmos Mon Flux Met 2, R1, TRMM **GPCC** Precip,R **+** dS/dt vs. P **-E** Surf Month Point Runoff, **R1,** Storage, TRMM **GPCC** Precip

Figure *5-35:* Rondonia Selected Monthly Water Balances

It is exciting to see the TRMM products be so helpful in refining the water balance for the Rondonia control volume. We do not know what to make of the water balance for this control volume based on the Reanalysis prior to **1970,** as a climatic change is indicated **by** the best atmospheric water balance, the Reanalysis- **1.** It was also found that **by** trying many variations of the surface water balance, the balance could be greatly improved.

5.6. Southeast United States

The Southeast United States control volume was selected as a box control volume of the smaller *7.5* degree size, which could be used as a control in that it is in a geographic region where a lot of hydrometeorological data is known and recorded. It is also located in between 40 degree **^N** and 40 degrees **S** latitude and therefore is included in the TRMM and **GPI** precipitation datasets. Unlike the other control volumes over the Untied States, this control volume contains no unusual features, and should thus prove good as a comparison to the smaller control volumes in South America.

Figure *5-36* displays the yearly water balances for the **SEUS** for the Reanlysis-1. For the atmospheric balance, the precipitation generally decreases in the 1960's, and a corresponding decrease is found in the moisture flux. However, the moisture flux is in general too low resulting in a positive bias of **31.90** kg/m^2-month. The correlation of the slope is exactly one with an intercept of the regression equaling the bias and a correlation coefficient of *.7956.* This balance is very good with the exception of the bias. For the surface balance we again find a poor runoff time series for the Reanalysis-1. **A** correlation coefficient of .2298 is found for the Reanalysis-1 surface balance.

Switching to the Reanalysis-2 in Figure *5-37* the bias is reduced for the yearly atmospheric control volume to 22.02 kg/m^2-month, but there is still significant error in the balance compared to the magnitude of the other water balance components, and the correlation coefficient is reduced to **.4736.** Still the reduction in bias and general errors is encouraging. For the Reanalysis-2 surface balance the runoff is improved, but the balance gets worse. The correlation coefficient here is high at *.5836,* but the bias of 17.40 kg/m^2-month is on par with the difference between precipitation and evaporation, meaning the surface side flux doesn't help to improve the balance. The absolute error of 29.43 kg/m^2-month is significantly higher than the bias.

Figure *5-36:* Southeast **US** Reanalysis-1 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure *5-37:* Southeast **US** Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

In Figure *5-38* the different annual precipitation time series for the **SEUS** control volume are plotted. The shift in precipitation observed in the tropical control volumes is not observed here as it wasn't observed in the Larger **US** control volume. Variation in the reanalysis precipitation is again observed, as there is a slight dip in the middle of the time series. Interestingly the gauge precipitation dataset does not show this dip, and this dip is consistent with the moisture flux dip in the Reanalysis-1. In this case the gauge precipitation is likely accurate because the Untied States has been densely gauged over the past *50* years, and most of these gauges are included in this dataset. So the precipitation trend in the reanalysis which is not backed **by** observational (gauges) data matches with the moisture flux of the reanalysis. The Reanlaysis-2 correlates well here to the Reanalysis-I precipitation, but all other datasets consist of a much lower precipitation values especially recently. The **GPI** precipitation is again observed to be high. The TRMM precipitation datasets are aligned with all the other datasets. It should be noted that the TRMM 3A46 dataset contains errors for this control volume and is not considered.

Figure *5-38:* Southeast **US** Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

Figure *5-39* shows the monthly water balances for the Reanalysis-1 in the Southeast United States control volume. In the monthly balance a generally good correlation is found between the two sides of both the atmospheric and surface the water balances. The seasonal cycles are not as strong for this control volume as they were in the control volumes of this size in South America. **A** correlation coefficient of *.5553* is found for the atmospheric balance, with an equivalent bias to the yearly balance. The surface balance and the atmospheric balance seem to have similar regressions for the Reanalysis-1, as one balance is not clearly better than the other. This is encouraging because for most control volumes only one of the two balances can be computed well. **A** lower correlation coefficient of **.2360** is found for the surface balance but signals are represented well. The correlation plot in this case does not indicate such a tight correlation.

The result for Reanalysis-2 in Figure 5-40 shows that the atmospheric balance is slightly more spread, with a smaller bias and a correlation coefficient of .4011. This water balance is spread, with a smaller bias and a correlation coefficient of .4011. inconsistent, as seen in bottom panel, where for some months there is no balance, while other months the balance is near perfect. For the surface balance, there is great improvement from Reanalysis-1 to Reanalysis-2. **A** good correlation is found between the two sides of the surface water balance, indicating the default linear runoff methodology works well for this control volume. This balance has a correlation coefficient here of **.8228,** and though there is a slight bias, the balance is well calculated and among the best **by** the evaluation criteria.

Figure *5-39:* Southeast **US** Reanalysis-i Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure *5-40:* Southeast **US** Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Table *5-2* shows the characteristics that can be changed in the different water balances of the **SEUS** control volume. The only difference between this control volume, and the control volumes represented in Table *5-1,* is the elimination of the TRMM 3A46 precipitation dataset. For each of the yearly water balances there is significant room for improvement from the reanalysis. For the atmospheric balance, the bias can be completely eliminated **by** the use of a gauged precipitation dataset, the **GPCC,** to the Reanalysis-1 in Figure *5-41.* This balance is taken over the **GPCC** TRMM dataset which is ranked highest **by** the criteria, because it contains more than the four years available in the **GPCC** TRMM product. **A** correlation coefficient of .4331 is found here, but the balance is unbiased *(-1.65* kg/m^2-month) and the residual is fairly inactive. The surface balance can be improved **by** a change in methodology, rather than precipitation. Here storage is eliminated and the area runoff method is applied to the Reanalysis-2. This results in a very good yearly surface balance, which is rare in this study. The runoff correlates well with the P-E difference yielding a flat residual and a correlation coefficient of **.8215.** The bias is **8.68** kg/m^2-month with an absolute error of **9.51** kg/m^-month, indicating a fairly constant error for all points, thus good signal pick up. The storage change for the yearly balance is bad in this control volume, which is unusual as the storage usually is the only quantity holding the surface water balance together.

Figure 5-41: Southeast **US** Selected Yearly Water Balances

In Figure 5-42 improvements are made on the monthly time scale to the **SEUS** control volume. For the atmospheric balance the default reanalysis balances are among the best based on the evaluation criteria. Also among the best balances **by** the evaluation criteria are those resulting with TRMM 3B43 precipitation, among which the best of these uses the Reanalysis-2 and moisture flux Method 2. The big difference in this balance is that the bias is eliminated (down to $4.00 \text{ kg/m}^{\wedge}2\text{-month}$, while other water balance properties remain about the same with a correlation coefficient of **.5098.** The best suited water balance is passed over in this case as we are trying to use the TRMM 3B43 product as much as possible on the monthly time scale. The TRMM 3B43 precipitation dataset is consistent with the alternative precipitation datasets, and this may indicate a problem with the reanalysis.

In the case of the surface water balance we saw that the Reanalysis-2 provided a very good surface balance under default conditions. For this control volume, the balance can actually be improved **by** the evaluation criteria, applying the **GHCN-CAMS** gauge based dataset to the Reanalysis-1 and using the area runoff methodology, a 54 year and eleven month surface water balance is created which is almost as correlated and as accurate as the balance obtained previously for the Reanlaysis-2. The fact that such a good monthly surface water balance can be obtained using an alternative precipitation dataset means that the side flux of the surface balance does not correlate as well with the Reanalysis-1 precipitation. This monthly surface balance is a large improvement on the Reanlaysis-I balance with a correlation **of** .7064 and a bias of only 4.40 kg/m^2-month.

Figure *5-42:* Southeast **US** Selected Monthly Water Balances

For the **SEUS** control volume the balancing of the monthly surface balance is a success. The atmospheric balance is less successful here and similar problems with the reanalysis data are found here that are found in all tropical control volumes thus far. There aren't many ways to

deal with these problems as there are a limited amount of possibilities for variations of the atmospheric water balance.

5.7. Southwest United States

The Southwest United States control volume is the last box sized control volume analyzed in this work. It is selected as an alternative *7.5* degree control volume with different hydrological characteristics from the other smaller box control volumes looked at so far. The Southwest United Sates is an arid mountainous region. However it is in the United States where accurate measurements should exist over the reanalysis time period.

Figure *5-43* shows the yearly balances for the **SWUS** control volume using the Reanalysis-1. In both balances we see major problems. In the atmospheric balance there are annual precipitation and evaporation of around 20 to 30 kg/m²-month. However, the moisture flux calculation is on the order of -100 kg/m^2 -month for each point. It is hard to tell here but there is a faint linear correlation between the P-E difference and the side flux term (mostly moisture flux on the yearly time scale), with a correlation coefficient of **.1026** and a regression slope of *.5483.* There is clearly no balance achieved here though, as results are similar to those obtained in the Larger **US** control volume. The surface balance is no better. The failure of the Reanalysis-1 to pick up any runoff variation on an annual basis still exists, although this result is not wholly unrealistic given the area under consideration being largely a desert. The annual storage changes clearly govern the behavior of the residual term. **A** low bias is found in this balance only because the change in storage over the length of the water balance is zero.

Moving to the Reanalysis-2 in Figure *5-44* the same properties are found for the atmospheric balance. Although **by** the P-E data the moisture flux should be slightly negative over this region, it shouldn't be as negative as it is and the moisture flux observed is unrealistic. Any land mass would not be such a source of moisture to the atmosphere. **A** decent regression slope of **1.11** and correlation coefficient of **.2171** are found for this control volume showing there is some correlation between the two sides of this balance, more so than there was in the Reanalysis-1, however the bias is increased by an additional 30 kg/m²-month.

Figure 5-43: Southwest **US** Reanalysis-I Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure 5-44: Southwest **US** Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

In Figure *5-45* the different sources of precipitation for the **SWUS** control volume are plotted as their yearly time series. The magnitude of the precipitation in the **SWUS** is much lower than in any other control volume looked at so far. In the top panel the larger precipitation datasets agree well on an annual basis, though variability exists which is fairly high compared to the low annual values. There again appears to be a slight shift in the Reanalysis-1 precipitation and an increase in precipitation from beginning to end. This trend can also be seen slightly in the gauge precipitation. In the annual atmospheric balance in Figure 4-129, precipitation starts out slightly below evaporation which stays constant for the time series, then gradually rises above the evaporation. Unlike in other control volumes though, there is no corresponding moisture flux trend (in other words the moisture flux matching its own reanalysis precipitation), and any trend observed would be of little meaning anyway, considering the error found in the atmospheric balance. No major differences appear in the second half of the precipitation record. It should be noted here that several precipitation datasets in the bottom portion of this graph are unavailable for this control volume. The **GPI,** TRMM 3B43, TRMM 3A46 do not apply here as the control volume contains points north of 40 degrees **N** latitude.

Figure *5-45:* Southwest **US** Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

Now considering the default reanalysis monthly water balances, the Reanalysis-1 balances are plotted in Figure 5-46. The atmospheric balance presented on the left bears no resemblance to balance as there is no correlation between the bottom flux and the atmospheric flux. The balance, as there is no correlation between the bottom flux and the atmospheric flux. moisture flux cycle is wildly negative. An absolute error of 122 kg/m^2 -month is observed, which is a significant imbalance given the magnitude of the precipitation and evaporation terms. Meaningless regression statistics and a negative correlation coefficient are also found. The surface balance shown on the right indicates more encouraging results. The seasonal cycle is picked up resulting in a correlation between the bottom and surface fluxes. The amplitude of the surface side flux is very high in this case, likely caused **by** the fluctuation in surface storage which was observed in the yearly balance. Such a large cycle is unrealistic in an arid region such as this one. Encouraging balance statistics are found here, a bias of just *4.75* kg/m^2-month and a correlation coefficient of **.7649** with a regression slope of **2.96.**

Figure *5-46:* Southwest **US** Reanalysis-1 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

In Figure 5-47 the same balances are conducted with the Reanalysis-2 data under default conditions. Little change is observed in the atmospheric balance as the correlation presented and example plot below look nearly exactly the same as the Reanalysis-1. The absolute error in this case is increased to 141 kg/m^2-month, and again unrealistic regression and correlation statistics are obtained. The interest here is the sharp improvement of the monthly surface balance between the Reanalysis-1 and the Reanalysis-2. The surface flux seasonal cycle goes from having too great amplitude to an almost correlated amplitude with the bottom flux seasonal cycle. This bias is unfortunately increased to 13.23 kg/m ²-month, which is significant for the SWUS control volume, however we find a regression slope of **1.17** and a correlation coefficient of .7420.

Figure *5-47:* Southwest **US** Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Improvements to this water balance derive from a unique amount of iterative changes in balance characteristics, as presented in Table *5-3.* Three of the thirteen precipitation datasets are eliminated from consideration. No other characteristics are affected. Improving the atmospheric balance is likely an exercise in futility. Looking at the results of the evaluation, the top rated balances use the **GPCC** TRMM precipitation which is considered too short a time series (4 years), for a meaningful yearly balance. The next best ranked balance is unfortunately the Reanalysis-1. For comparison purposes we present the $4th$ highest ranked balance, applying **SSM/I** precipitation to the Reanalysis-1 balance, using moisture flux Method **1. A** slight correlation can be visualized in the top panel (Figure *5-48)* between the moisture flux and the P-**^E**quantity as they increase slightly over the time series, but in summary the yearly atmospheric balance for this control volume can not be calculated accurately.

For the surface balance, the yearly reanalysis balances can be improved **by** using the evaluation criteria. Here we change to the area runoff method applied to the Reanalysis-1, with storage included, and the **GPCC** precipitation utilized. This scenario is selected as it is the highest ranked set of conditions which have reasonable results for each of the evaluation criteria. **A** bias of 3.34 kg/m $^{\wedge}$ 2-month is obtained, an improvement over previous default conditions, and a near closure in the long term. The correlation coefficient is a weak **.1913,** and the inconsistencies in this water balance can be seen in the bottom portion of Figure *5-48* as the residual is still controlled **by** the change in storage, but to a lesser extent.

Figure *5-48:* Southwest **US** Selected Yearly Water Balances

In Figure *5-49* improvements are presented for the monthly water balances for the **SWUS** control volume. For the atmospheric balance the reanalysis balances are ranked as some of the poorest **by** the evaluation criteria, and improvements can be made **by** changing to moisture flux Method 1, and using the recent gauged precipitation data set, the **GPCC** TRMM as applied to the Reanalysis-1. The bias of the water balance remains very high, however a regression slope of *.9855* is found with a correlation of .3289. Using moisture flux methodology 2 a strong seasonal cycle was found which was out of phase and amplitude with the P-E seasonal cycle. The sample points shown on the bottom left of this plot do not have this cycle which helps make this balance better. However, with a bias of **82** kg/m^2-month being greater than either the precipitation or evaporation terms **by** a factor of two, we are unable to effectively close the atmospheric balance.

For the surface balance a good balance was found on the monthly time scale for the Reanalysis-2 default conditions, which ranks among the best balances **by** the evaluation criteria in Appendix **A.** This balance can be improved **by** changing from the linear method to area method of runoff, resulting in the top ranked monthly surface balance by the evaluation. The bias is improved to 9.61 kg/m^{γ}-month with a lower absolute error and comparable regression statistics. The 9.61 kg/m²-month with a lower absolute error and comparable regression statistics. amplitude of the surface flux is reduced **by** the inclusion of routing data **by** this method, and a tight correlation results.

Figure *5-49:* Southwest **US** Selected Monthly Water Balances

For the **SWUS** control volume, the only great success is computing the monthly surface balance. **All** other balances contain significant errors especially in the atmospheric balances, likely caused **by** the geographic features of the region. It is difficult to complete water balances in this region because of the relatively small magnitude of the side flux terms (moisture flux and runoff).

5.8. Amazon River Basin

The Amazon River Basin control volume is the first of four basin control volumes to be presented. This control volume is the largest considered in this study and includes several of the box control volumes which have already been discussed (Rondonia, Larger Rondonia, and Northwest Brazil). It contains very jagged edges which could present difficulties in calculating moisture flux. In the surface balance case, surface runoff data from the RIVDIS dataset is used as the default, while when improving the balance, the reanalysis runoff is used. The surface runoff limits the temporal length for the surface water balance, but not the atmospheric balance.

The default yearly balances for the Reanalysis-1 are shown in Figure *5-50.* For the atmospheric balance we see signs of success. While evaporation stays constant for the most part, precipitation peaks in the early *1950's* and in the second half of the balance. The peaks in the moisture flux match this behavior, but the amplitudes do not agree. The second half of the period, especially between *1975* and *1995,* is relatively well balanced though year to year signals aren't picked up well. The bias of this balance is 46.43 kg/m^2-month, and a good correlation coefficient of *.6485* is found with a regression slope of **2.05** indicating the amplitude of moisture

flux is about double what it should be. For the surface balance we see a noticeable change from typical default balance results. Because of limitations in the surface runoff data, runoff is only available from **1970-1996,** thus **27** years are represented here. The surface runoff here is much higher than was ever seen in box control volumes and the change in surface storage is no longer controlling of the balance which also was typical of the surface balance in box control volumes. As far as balance, the runoff is curiously high compared to the P-E cycle resulting in a bias of *54.96* kg/m^2-month, with an identical absolute error. There is virtually no regression slope for this balance.

Considering the Reanalysis-2 in Figure *5-51* the yearly atmospheric balance looks about the same as it did in the Reanalysis-1. **By** the evaluation criteria, the water balance is slightly better in the Reanalysis-2 with a bias of 42.47 kg/m^2-month and a greater correlation coefficient of *.8590.* The residual seems to be **highly** variable though, and the better balance is likely the result of eliminating the first half of the data. The surface balance is truncated at the beginning, **by** the start of the Reanalysis-2 (starts in **1979)** and the end of the surface runoff data (ends in **1996).** In this case the change in storage is a larger factor in the balance as the bias is reduced to 42.32 kg/m^2-month and a correlation coefficient of **.3186** is found, both improvements on the Reanalysis-1. The change in storage fluctuations on a year to year basis seem to be necessary in order to show a relationship between runoff and the P-E difference.

Figure **5-50:** Amazon Basin Reanalysis-1 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-51:** Amazon Basin Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

^Acloser look at the annual precipitation time series for various precipitation datasets over the Amazon Basin control volume are shown in Figure **5-52.** We again see a trend repeated in all of the Amazon region control volumes. In the second half of the Reanalysis-1 time series there is an increase in annual precipitation, which is confirmed **by** the Reanalysis-2. Nevertheless, in the long gauge dataset and the smaller datasets no precipitation change is found. considerable variability among the satellite and gauge precipitation datasets which is notable. One would think such variability would be reduced in such a large control volume.

In Figure **5-53** the monthly water balances are shown for the Reanalysis-1. In both the atmospheric and surface balances, the seasonal cycle is picked up well between the P-E cycle and the side fluxes in each balance. However, other problems exist. In the atmospheric balance, a regression slope of **3.99** is found between the two sides of the balance with a correlation coefficient of **.8113.** This indicates the amplitude of the moisture flux seasonal cycle is way too strong. The absolute error is three times the bias indicating large errors at specific times which get averaged out over the duration of the balance. For the surface balance we see a good **1:1** correlation between the two sides of the balances, but a bias as in the yearly time scale. The absolute error and bias are nearly equal for this balance.

Figure **5-52:** Amazon Basin Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

Figure **5-53:** Amazon Basin Reanalysis-i Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

The Reanalysis-2 balances are shown in Figure *5-54,* where many of the same observations can be made as in the Reanalysis-1 balances. In the atmospheric balance the regression slope and the correlation coefficient are improved **(3.28** and **.8907** respectively) as both reanalysis balances are ranked the same **by** the evaluation criteria. The surface balance is slightly improved in the Reanalysis-2 as the storage cycle is improved to match the surface runoff obtained with the bias being reduced by 10 $\text{kg/m}^{\wedge}2$ -month, but still being a significant 44.0 $\text{kg/m}^{\wedge}2$ -month, with an absolute error of 50.8 kg/m^2 -month. The seasonal cycle is captured well by all of the reanalysis balances. However this cycle is particularly strong over the Amazon River Basin and therefore should be apparent in any monthly dataset of such variables.

Figure *5-54:* Amazon Basin Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

The Amazon and Porto Velho control volumes contain the maximum amount of scenarios for basins, with possibilities outlined in Table *5-5.* For both the yearly and monthly atmospheric water balances the number of scenarios is the same as only two characteristics can be changed, the reanalysis (2) and the precipitation dataset (13). This results in 26 possibilities. For the surface balances a variety of possibilities still exist. For the monthly balance instead of three types of runoff methodologies, we in effect have two runoff methodologies, the surface runoff, or the reanalysis runoff which was derived using the linear runoff method. Because of the geometry involved with these control volumes it was deemed too computationally intensive to try every runoff methodology for each basin. There are still changes in reanalysis (2), and storage method (6), as in the case with the box control volumes. For the precipitation, we have different possibilities for each of the runoff methodologies. Using the reanalysis runoff all precipitation datasets are valid because the balance can be calculated through 2002. However, in

the case of surface runoff the TRMM precipitation datasets are useless since runoff data is only available through **1996,** thus only **10** precipitation possibilities exist in this case. The result then is **276** different scenarios for the monthly balance. For the yearly balance **92** possibilities are available once lags are not considered.

Improvements to the yearly water balances are presented in Figure *5-55.* For the atmospheric balance the criteria indicate the most improvement to the balance can be made **by** applying the CMAP precipitation dataset to the Reanalysis-1. **By** this application the bias is reduced to **17.0** kg/m[^]2-month though the correlation coefficient stays low at **.2676**. Looking at the various scenarios for this balance good correlations tend to correspond to scenarios with high biases. The residual signal here has less amplitude than the moisture flux indicating some correlation which is impressive considering the difficulty hypothesized in calculating moisture flux through such a control volume. The surface balance is improved **by** eliminating change in storage and applying **GPI** precipitation to the Reanalysis-2 with surface runoff. The results of this water balance are very appealing. The higher GPI precipitation matches the surface runoff, which was deemed too large in the reanalysis. Change in storage over such a large basin should be zero over a number of years, and with a bias here of less the 1 kg/m^2-month we have successfully completed a water balance over the Amazon River Basin using this set of conditions. **A** good regression slope and correlation coefficient are also found.

For the monthly cases two new water balances are presented in Figure *5-56.* For the atmospheric balance the CMAP precipitation dataset is applied to the Reanalysis-1. This balance was selected as the evaluation criteria fail to capture some of the differences in bias and slope, which were the weaknesses of the original balance. The regression slope is reduced in this balance to 1.95 and the bias reduced to 18.6 kg/m^{^2}-month. All possibilities yield a slope greater than one, as the moisture flux seasonal cycle is set, and no P-E seasonal cycle can be fit to match it. It is very likely the moisture flux seasonal cycle is wrong in this balance and can't be determined **by** these means available in this work. The surface balance is again improved, as in the yearly balance, **by** the application of a satellite based precipitation dataset. In this case the **SSM/I** yields higher monthly precipitation numbers that match the surface runoff. A bias of 24.36 kg/m^{^2}month and a correlation coefficient of *.7516* are obtained which improve the balance. Several points in the scatter plot of this balance are outliers. These points correspond to the holes in the **SSM/I** data and these points are removed when the data analysis is conducted.

Figure **5-55:** Amazon Basin Selected Yearly Water Balances

Figure **5-56:** Amazon Basin Selected Monthly Water Balances

For the Amazon Basin it is difficult to close the atmospheric water balance on a consistent basis so the residuals do no change depending on the year or especially the month. It is unclear whether the relationships that do exist are based on the strong seasonal cycle of the data, or the actual correlation of the data. Biased surface balances are found in the reanalysis; however these balances can be improved especially in the yearly time scale with alternative precipitation sources. Such a surface balance utilizes only evaporation and change in storage from the reanalysis.

5.9. Porto Velho River Basin

The Porto Velho basin control volume is a sub basin of the Amazon Basin control volume comprised of the upper reaches of the Madeira River. **A** gauging station of this river is located in Porto Velho, Brazil in the northern portion of Rondonia. Therefore much of the Porto Velho control volume covers the same area as the Rondonia control volume. The Porto Velho control volume is only about a 4th of the size of the Amazon basin and extends into the Andes Mountains. The length of record constraints apply to the runoff data as in the Amazon River Basin, as the RIVDIS is again used.

The default Reanalysis-1 yearly balances are shown in Figure *5-57.* In the atmospheric balance some of the same properties are found as in the Amazon basin. The moisture flux signal correlates well with the precipitation signal; however the amplitude of the moisture flux is much too strong on a year to year basis. This relationship breaks down in the second half of the balance. As in the rest of South America, precipitation seems to increase with time for this control volume. The signal in the two sides of this balance is picked up well as the correlation coefficient of this balance is *.7538,* however the regression slope is a high **3.73,** with a RMSE of 118.2 kg/m^{2-month . For the surface balance, the runoff is again high compared to differences} in precipitation and evaporation, resulting in a significant residual. The surface balance seems a more accurate way to assess the water balance as errors are less significant. The surface runoff data should match the P-E cycle well in the long run; however this is not seen in either the Amazon or Porto Velho basins. A bias of 32.18 kg/m²2-month is observed in the Reanalysis-1 surface balance with a correlation coefficient of .3174.

Moving to the Reanalysis-2 in Figure *5-58* the moisture flux time series improves, but is still wildly amplified compared to the P-E difference. The regression slope is reduced to 2.20 with a weaker correlation coefficient of .5314 and an increased RMSE of 139.4 kg/m²-month. Again, it is difficult to calculate the moisture flux for a basin sized control volume as the resolution of the boundary is finer than the resolution of the data used for the calculation. The Reanalysis-2 surface balance is a clear improvement from the Reanalysis-1. The bias is reduced to *-5.71* kg/m^2 -month which is low compared to magnitude of values of different quantities in the water balance of this control volume. The correlation is weak here at .2941, and the residual appears to be controlled **by** the change in storage. Perhaps this balance can be improved **by** removing this storage.

Figure 5-57: P. Velho Basin Reanalysis-1 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-58:** P. Velho Basin Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

The annual precipitation time series for the Porto Velho Basin are shown in Figure *5-59.* As stated before we see the slight increase in the Reanalysis-1 precipitation. observed in the **GHCN-CAMS** dataset, however in this case the gauge dataset is likely of not great quality given the remoteness of this control volume. datasets continue to follow in line with the early Reanalysis. Large discrepancies are found with increased precipitation in the satellite precipitation datasets and in the Reanalysis-2. As in the case of the Amazon basin, these higher precipitation readings correspond well to the surface runoff data provided, which should be fairly accurate. There is discrepancy among satellite estimates. The **GPI** seems to fit the surface balance well, but the more modem TRMM 3B43 does not.

Figure **5-59:** P. Velho Basin Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

In Figure *5-60* the default monthly balances for the Reanalysis-I are presented. In the example plot of the atmospheric balance a strong negative bias and exaggerated amplitude are seen. The regression slope of this balance is found to be **3.37** though a correlation coefficient of **.6099** is found as there is good point to point correlation in this water balance. **A** very large RMSE is found, *205.5* kg/m^2-month, for this balance. For the surface balance a similar problem arises with the side flux having a higher amplitude that the P-E cycle. Because of the strength of the seasonal cycle the correlation coefficient is found to be **.7634,** but with a regression slope of only **.38** and a bias of **31.21** kg/m^2-month.

In the Reanalysis-2 balances, shown in Figure *5-61* changes are observed in both balances. In the atmospheric balance point to point correlation is again seen with a regression slope of 2.41

(improved), but an RMSE of 270.9 kg/m^2 -month with similar residual statistics. The moisture flux in the two reanalysis looks very similar, as the P-E cycle is changed in Reanalysis-2. Improvement is found in the monthly surface balance of the Reanalysis-2, it ranked **highly** out of the many subjected to the evaluation criteria. Reanalysis-1 are eliminated due to the amplification of the precipitation signal in Reanalysis-2, which indicates a large increase in rain during the peak rainy season in the basin. In addition the change in storage appears to help the balance on a point to point basis. Because there is improvement on both sides of the balance in this case it is hard to believe that the Reanalysis-2 precipitation is wrong, though it is very inconsistent with the larger precipitation datasets tested. A bias of -5.91 kg/m²-month and a correlation coefficient of **.8736** are observed. The absolute error found is 40.94 kg/m $^{\wedge}$ 2-month, which is comparable to that found in the Reanalysis-1.

Figure *5-60:* P. Velho Basin Reanalysis-I Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure *5-61:* P. Velho Basin Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

The characteristics of the water balance that can be changed to improve the Porto Velho Basin control volume balance can be found in Table *5-5* and are the same as those used in the Amazon Basin control volume. In Figure *5-62* two new yearly balances are shown. In the yearly atmospheric balance, the default reanalysis balances ranked in the middle of the pack of the possible balances and the best balance was found **by** applying the **SSM/I** precipitation to the Reanalysis-2. This is unusual and a look at the plot can explain why. The SSM/I precipitation is low over this control volume and the moisture flux is biased negatively, therefore a better balance is found with the application of this precipitation, as the bias is shrunk to **66.18** kg/m^2 month. The correlation coefficient is found to be a low *.1095* though the balance correlates to a **1:1** slope. As anticipated the surface balance can be improved **by** changing the precipitation dataset to the high **GPI** precipitation and removing the storage term, using the Reanalysis-2 for just evaporation, as P and R are now both being found **by** alternative means. **A** bias **of** -11.43 kg/m^2-month is found with a correlation coefficient of **.7386** and an RMSE of just **12.73** kg/m^2 -month. The error is low given the magnitude of the terms involved and there is good correlation in signal observed.

Turning to the monthly balance in Figure **5-63** the default reanalysis balances again rank in the middle of the pack. The top ranked balance is found **by** applying the **GPCP** precipitation to the Reanalysis-1. The **GPCP** has a much stronger seasonal cycle than the reanalysis precipitation datasets resulting in a regression slope of only **1.86** with a correlation coefficient still fairly high at *.5107.* Unfortunately the RMSE and absolute error are still over 200 kg/m^2-month with no significant improvement in bias. For the surface balance small improvements are seen especially in terms of absolute error (now 31.44 kg/m^2-month) and regression slope **(.81)** when the **SSM/I** precipitation is applied to the Reanalysis-1. The seasonal cycles match very well and more importantly the results look realistic. Again outliers exist on this correlation plot due to errors which were not considered in the statistical analysis.

The Porto Velho control volume balanced in a manner similar to the of the Amazon control volume. **A** much too strong amplitude was found on both time scales in the moisture flux calculations which generally offset the results. It will be tested in the next two sections whether the strong seasonal cycle is the only reason for water balance correlation in a basin as seasonal cycles are not as prevalent in the other two basin control volumes. The surface balances found over this control volume were impressive, however, the precipitation datasets used to obtain these balances are under scrutiny as the **GPI,** Reanalysis-2, and **SSM/I** precipitation datasets all indicate above average precipitation.

Figure **5-62:** P. Velho Basin Selected Yearly Water Balances

Figure *5-63:* P. Velho Basin Selected Monthly Water Balances

5.10. Mississippi River Basin

The Mississippi River basin control volume was selected for this work as it is a large basin control volume in the general area and of comparable size to the Larger **US** control volume. It is located in the United States and Canada therefore more accurate data should be available for the balance in this control volume. It does not share the tropical properties of the balances in South America which have balanced better than control volumes in this region thus far. As with the previous two basins and in general throughout this work for the basin control volumes, surface runoff is used as the default although reanalysis data is added as an alternative to try and improve the balance. In this case and for the Mississippi River basin **USGS** runoff is used from 1948 to **1996.**

In Figure *5-64* the yearly water balances are presented for the Reanalysis-1. The results of neither balance are encouraging. In both balances the annual evaporation typically exceeds the precipitation. This is unusual over a land mass over a long period of time. Furthermore, in the atmospheric balance, while the moisture flux for the scenario described should be near zero, the moisture flux is consistently larger than either the precipitation or evaporation. The result is a bias of -143 kg/m^2-month. Ironically, a regression slope of **1.03** and correlation coefficient of *.3605* are found with a regression intercept approximately equal to the bias. This indicates there is a signal relation in this balance between the moisture flux and the P-E difference. The surface balance yields realistic numbers for all components of the water balance, but the anomaly of precipitation being less than evaporation on an annual basis throws the balance off. The bias of this balance is **22.91** kg/m^2-month with a correlation coefficient of *.3159.* The residual term in the balance appears to have as much variability as the terms, meaning a good balance is not achieved.

For the Reanalysis-2 similar results are found as shown in Figure **5-65.** The precipitation and evaporation are nearly equal throughout the record. The moisture flux again doesn't correspond to the precipitation and evaporation series, and the balance would be much better off if this quantity was zero and just the change in precipitable water was considered. The bias is increased and the correlation coefficient decreases. For the surface balance the runoff alone seems to correlate well with the P-E cycle. The addition of the change in storage term from the Reanalysis-2 dictates the behavior of the entire balance, as the residual is almost completely dependent on the change in storage.

A look at the annual precipitation time series is interesting for the Mississippi Basin. Although we did not see a precipitation shift as has been the case for numerous reanalysis precipitation datasets, the precipitation for this control volume seemed lower than would be expected. Looking at Figure **5-66** most of the precipitation datasets available are consistent with the Reanalysis-I and Reanalysis-2 precipitation datasets. In all cases **3** precipitation datasets: GPI, TRMM 3B43, and the TRMM 3A46 are not useful since they are for tropical regions. The TRMM **GPCC** product can be used for the atmospheric balance as it is not spatially restricted; however the duration of the record is out of the range of the surface balance.

Figure 5-64: Miss. Basin Reanalysis-1 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-65:** Miss. Basin Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-66:** Miss. Basin Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

Turning to the default monthly balance, the Reanalysis-1 balances are shown in Figure *5-67.* As was predicted the Mississippi Basin control volume is different from the basin control volumes in the South American rain forest and thus there is no longer a strong seasonal cycle in the precipitation and evaporation cycle. As shown in the example plot, a weaker seasonal cycle still exists. There is a slight correlation between signals of the two terms of the atmospheric and surface balances which can not be seen in the upper correlation plots, but can be seen in the lower example plots. The peaks in each time series line up and a correlation coefficient of .1004 is found, but with an RMSE of 163 kg/m²-month for the atmospheric balance. In the surface balance a very large and regular divergence flux exists, which is odd. It appears that the surface storage is not flattening the seasonal cycle of the runoff as it probably should, as the runoff data is known to be fairly accurate and have a strong seasonal cycle, stronger than that of the P-E seasonal cycle. It will be interesting to see if storage considerations or other datasets can help this balance. **A** correlation coefficient of *.5621* is found, however with an RMSE of *53.63* kg/m²-month which is on the order of magnitude of the actual quantities being balanced.

Switching to the Reanalysis-2 in Figure *5-68,* the same general characteristics are observed as in the Reanalysis-1. There is slight correlation of peaks of the atmospheric balance which can only be seen on the bottom left and not in scatter plot. The RMSE is enlarged to 168 kg/m²-month and the correlation coefficient rises to .2349. In the surface balance there is improvement. The correlation coefficient remains about the same at .4948, but the RMSE is reduced to 27.46 kg/m^2 -month, still significant, but half of that found in the Reanalysis-1. What is odd is in the Reanalysis-2 the reanalysis change in surface storage makes the balance worse on the yearly time scale but on the monthly time scale it makes the balance better. It may be important to note that two datasets are being combined to arrive at the surface divergence flux in these balances, the surface runoff and the reanalysis change in storage term.

Figure *5-67:* Miss. Basin Reanalysis-1 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure *5-68:* Miss. Basin Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Possible improvement scenarios are outlined in Table *5-6.* For the atmospheric balance, three precipitation datasets are eliminated, as part of this control volume extends past their bounds. The possibilities for each time scale are reduced to 20. The surface balance possibilities are again broken into two sections. Using surface runoff nine precipitation datasets are combined with six storage methods and two reanalysis. With the reanalysis runoff ten precipitation datasets can be used. The same conditions apply for the yearly time scale reducing the storage consideration from six to two.

Improvements in the yearly balances are shown in Figure *5-69.* For the atmospheric balance, the Reanalysis-1 balance was **highly** ranked **by** the evaluation criteria, and the balance can be slightly improved **by GPCP** or **SSM/I** precipitation data. The **GPCP** precipitation application is presented here. The improvements are so minor they are almost not noteworthy as the residual statistics are reduced each by a mere 3 kg/m^2 -month and the correlation is only slightly improved. The balance is still not very good. For the surface balance significant improvements can be made **by** utilizing the Reanalysis-2 runoff instead of the **USGS** surface runoff for this control volume. This is very interesting because is shows the reanalysis change in surface storage balances with the reanalysis runoff, and not the more accurate surface runoff. The conditions of including storage and using the **SSM/I** precipitation are chosen because all five of the evaluation criteria need to be accounted for. Higher ranked balances contain regression slopes that differ substantially from one. The bias is reduced to near zero in this balance proving the reanalysis surface data balances over the long term for this control volume, with no outside data being introduced.

Attempts to improve the monthly balance are shown in Figure *5-70.* In the atmospheric balance the reanalysis contains some of the top ranked balances based on the evaluation criteria and there are no great improvements that can be made. The one balance ranked better than both of the reanalyzes involves applying the **SSM/I** precipitation to the Reanalysis-1. The bias and absolute error are again reduced just slightly though the correlation coefficient is greatly improved. The monthly surface balance is greatly improved **by** applying the **GHCN-CAMS** precipitation to the Reanalysis-2, and changing to reanalysis runoff. As shown on the right of Figure *4-156* excellent agreement is obtained between the two sides of the water balance with a bias of just **3.22** kg/mA2-month and a correlation coefficient of *.7305.*

For the Mississippi River Basin control volume, seasonal cycle correlation is observed between terms of the atmospheric water balance. However the balance is far too biased to be considered successful. For the surface balances a much better balance is obtained when the reanalysis derived runoff is applied to the water balance, as no bias is detected. It is disappointing though that for a control volume such as the Mississippi River basin, the use of actual observed data (gauges and surface runoff), can not be effectively combined to produce a water balance. Instead the best balance is derived **by** the reanalysis model.

Figure *5-69:* Miss. Basin Selected Yearly Water Balances

Figure *5-70:* Miss. Basin Selected Monthly Water Balances

5.11. Arkansas River Basin

The Arkansas River Basin control volume was chosen as the smaller basin considered in North America. It is a sub basin of the Mississippi and has the advantage that it is entirely enclosed beneath 40 degree **N** latitude, thus it is entirely visible **by** the TRMM precipitation radar and the TRMM 3B43 and **GPI** datasets can be used. The size of this balance compared to the grid size of the datasets being applied to it makes it unlikely a balance will be obtained, however the exercise is still carried out to see the results, as for all control volumes considered so far encouraging results have been obtained for some portion of the water balance over each region.

The yearly water balances for the Arkansas Basin control volume found **by** the default conditions for the Reanalysis-1 are presented in Figure **5-71.** The results of the atmospheric balance are very similar to those obtained in the Mississippi River balance. Annual evaporation is observed to be higher than annual precipitation for every year of the **fifty** five year time series. The moisture flux is large and positive not corresponding to the P-E. A bias of -144.6 kg/m²-month is found, with no correlation between the two sides of the balance as the correlation coefficient is **.0238.** The results of the surface balance are also very similar to the Mississippi River basin. The indication of the P-E cycle is that the runoff of the basin should be negative, which on a yearly basis in unrealistic because the control volume in theory is a basin, and a river such as the Arkansas isn't going to go dry over a period of a year. Switching focus to the balance the discrepancy in sign of the runoff makes it impossible to obtain a balance, and the residual term is not flat indicating correlation. The RMSE of this balance is 22.86 kg/m[^]2-month, larger than the magnitude of the precipitation term, with a weak correlation coefficient of **.2161.**

In the Reanalysis-2 (Figure **5-72)** we see similar adjustments to the Mississippi River Basin in the Arkansas River Basin. The difference between P-E is reduced to the point that it is almost eliminated. However, for the atmospheric balance the moisture flux remains about the same indicating continuity between the Reanalysis-1 and the Reanalysis-2. The moisture flux here is even higher, resulting in a bias of -193.42 kg/m^2 -month and even less correlation. There is little hope to improve this balance as the moisture flux term is simply unrealistic. In the surface balance case the P-E quantity seems to match better in terms of magnitude to the runoff, but the surface storage term appears to throw the balance off on a point to point basis and the RMSE is increased to 32.92 kg/m²-month. There is no correlation between the side fluxes of this control volume with the P-E quantity at each point as the reanalysis pretty much fails to compute a yearly water balance.

The annual precipitation time series for the Arkansas Basin control volume are presented in Figure 4-159. Again a slight increase is observed in the precipitation of the Reanalysis-1, which is matched **by** the larger precipitation datasets. This trend is not observed in the gauge precipitation dataset. The only precipitation datasets which can not be used at some point in this balance is the TRMM 3A46 because it contains errors.

Figure **5-72:** Arkansas Basin Reanalysis-2 Yearly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-73:** Arkansas Basin Different Sources of Yearly Precipitation

Turning to the monthly case the default Reanalysis-i balances are presented in Figure 5-74. On the monthly time scale the atmospheric balance appears to be a little different than on the yearly time scale. The bias remains the same and there is virtually no correlation between the two quantities plotted on the top left. The surface balance is a different, as on the monthly time scale the balance looks much better as the seasonal cycle is picked up in both sides of the balance and correlation is observed, though also a bias in favor of the surface side flux is observed. **A** very strong correlation of **.6663** is found, showing on a monthly basis the data consistently finds peaks and troughs in the data for both sides of the balance.

The Reanalysis-2 atmospheric balance shown in Figure **5-75** is even worse then the Reanalysis-I balance. The atmospheric water balance over the Arkansas River basin is a failure. For the surface balance the correlation does decrease for the Reanalysis-2 to .4043 which is unusual, but the bias is also improved as was observed in the yearly time scale. **A** decent water balance can be obtained for the surface balance on a monthly basis, but this balance is shown to be less complete when aggregated to the yearly time scale, and the only property which can be extracted from these balance are strong monthly signal correlations between the two sides of the balance.

Figure 5-74: Arkansas Basin Reanalysis-I Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

Figure **5-75:** Arkansas Basin Reanalysis-2 Monthly Atmospheric and Surface Balances

The Arkansas Basin control volume is unique in the amount of water balance characteristics which can be altered to try and improve the balance. Although it is not a South American water balance, it can be classified as a tropical water balance in terms of the precipitation datasets. There are therefore 24 possible balances for the atmospheric balances outlined in Table *5-7.* For the surface balance we can again change reanalysis (2), storage considerations **(6,** monthly/2, yearly), and runoff data source (2), in addition to precipitation dataset. None of the TRMM datasets can be used for the surface runoff case, and all but TRMM 3A46 can be used for the reanalysis runoff case.

The best yearly water balances for the Arkansas River Basin based on the evaluation criteria are presented in Figure *5-76.* In the atmospheric balance the focus of the improvement is only on reducing the bias, which therefore results in the inclusion of the **GPI** precipitation. This precipitation is much larger in magnitude than any of the other precipitation datasets. The accuracy of this dataset is unknown, but it reduces the atmospheric bias -86.28 kg/m²-month with a correlation coefficient of .4143 and a regression slope of 1.20. Thus, the balance is improved in terms of correlation greatly, but not balanced. For the surface balance the application of CMAP2 precipitation and the removal of storage improved the bias and the correlation of the balance. The correlation coefficient is improved to *.5746.* Such improvements are difficult to see on a yearly plot.

For the monthly time scale both balances are improved **by** the application of **GPCP** precipitation data. In the atmospheric balance this application is more important than reducing the bias as a higher correlation is obtained. In general this improvement is unsuccessful at actually obtaining a water balance. For the surface balance, surface runoff is applied to the Reanalysis-2 with the **GPCP** precipitation a good correlation and scatter plot is obtained in Figure *5-77* on the top right. A correlation coefficient of .5746 is obtained, with a bias of just 5.83 kg/m²-month. There is some spread in the scatter plot, but a generally good balance from month to month. The change in precipitation dataset helps the balance.

For the Arkansas Basin control volume the limits appear to be reached in terms of water balance calculations. The atmospheric balances show traces of correlation, but terrible biases that make the balance unsuccessful. The results of the surface balance are better, but the correlations on the monthly time scale are still not as good as those observed in other balances.

Figure **5-76:** Arkansas Basin Selected Yearly Water Balances

Figure **5-77:** Arkansas Basin Selected Monthly Water Balances

6. Global Data Analysis

In this section the entire globe between the latitudes of **60 N** and **60 S** will be broken into equally sized regional boxes of **30, 15,** and *7.5* degrees on a side and for each box the atmospheric water balance will be evaluated. Areas north and south of these latitudes are excluded due to a number of reasons. These reasons include the difficulty in computing water balances due to longitudinal geometries at high latitudes and the incompleteness of most precipitation datasets at these high latitudes. Such a comprehensive analysis is possible only for the atmospheric water balance and not the surface water balance. In order to compute a surface water balance change in storage and runoff must be calculated, however over oceans these calculations are not possible in the context of this work. Thus, in the global case we are simply looking at one atmospheric mass balance equation:

$$
\frac{dW}{dt} = -P + E + Q \tag{6-1}
$$

Since only the atmospheric water balance is considered, only a couple of comparisons are possible.

$$
P - E - Q + \frac{dW}{dt} = residual
$$
 Eq. (6-2)

$$
P - E = Q - \frac{dW}{dt}
$$
 Eq. (6-3)

When doing the global analysis the statistics that have been created before can be plotted on a contour map and can be spatially analyzed. On a coarser resolution it is difficult to recognize this "map" as the world, however at finer resolutions continental features become much more prevalent, and the data is more useful in a geographical sense. It is likely though that finer resolution water balances will be less accurate, as errors are smoothed with increased spatial averaging. The hope of such an analysis is that there would be no large differences between the closure of the water balance between land and sea or between any set of regions. Unfortunately, this is rarely the case.

The global data analysis will be composed of 4 sections. In Section **6.1** the general water balance characteristics for the reanalysis, considering all water balance analysis tools which have been utilized and applied in this work, will be shown. In Section **6.2** alternative precipitation datasets which are available on a global scale will be used in the global atmospheric water balances. In Section **6.3** the global water balances will be analyzed on a seasonal and decadal basis, and finally, in Section 6.4 land and sea points will be contrasted against each other on a global basis.

6.1. Water Balance Property Data Analysis

The first look at global data in this work focuses completely on the reanalysis. Maps are made of all water balance properties for the Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 for the monthly and yearly time scales. The purpose of this section is to show errors in computation of the global atmospheric water balance spatially.

6.1.1. Global Atmospheric Absolute Error

Although water balances are being compared from different geographic regions, which before were analyzed **by** normalized residual statistics, it is useful to use non-normalized residual statistics because the actual magnitude of the imbalances are of interest. The first such analysis involves mapping the absolute error of the atmospheric water balance at three resolutions. Looking at the **30** degree case in Figure **6-1,** improvements are found in absolute error when the time scale is changed from monthly to yearly. There is little improvement however in the Reanalysis-2 from the Reanalysis-1. Problem areas include Eastern Asia and Southern Africa for all cases. Increasing the resolution to **15** degrees in Figure **6-2** the general observations made for the **30** degree case are maintained. Note that the change in the colorbar in this figure has doubled, thus error increases in all regions **by** a factor of two. At the finer resolution there errors are more tightly constrained to land points. Reducing the resolution again to **7.5** degrees in Figure **6-3** we again double the colorbar to get approximately the same picture, though better resolved. Higher absolute errors are seen in points mostly over various land bodies specifically over Central Asia.

Figure **6-1: 30** degree Absolute Error Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-3:** *7.5* degree Absolute Error Reanalysis Balances

6.1.2. Global Normalized Atmospheric Absolute Error

Normalizing the absolute error allows a better comparison of regions. The global atmospheric water balance is composed of many unique regions, some with a very active water cycle (i.e. rain forests) and some with very inactive water cycles (i.e. deserts). Errors in more inactive water cycles such as those over the desert are highlighted **by** this analysis. Figure 6-4 shows the **30** degree normalized absolute error. Again general improvements are seen with change in time scale, but there is little difference between reanalysis. Other problem areas are seen now at the **30** degree level over North and South America in more mountainous regions which in the case of North America are likely drier. The resolution is increased to **15** degree in Figure *6-5.* Clear bands of absolute error greater than one, can be seen through Africa into Asia, and in the mountainous regions of North and South America. These errors are likely small in magnitude, but when normalized **by** the precipitation grow large. These errors are intensified and better resolved in Figure **6-6.** Clear imbalances are seen over a large portion of Asia and the Western United States. Over the ocean, the balances seem to agree more in the tropical regions, which makes sense in that the normalization quantity is likely larger over the tropics.

Figure 6-4: **30** degree Normalized Absolute Error Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-6:** *7.5* degree Normalized Absolute Error Reanalysis Balances

6.1.3. Global Atmospheric Bias Error

Of particular importance in the global study is the bias. This is in essence the departure from balance for the entire time series of each control volume, and as before the monthly and yearly biases are the same. From this analysis we can find the areas of the world where there is a surplus (red) and where there is a deficit (blue) in the atmospheric water balance. In Figure **6-7** the **30** degree resolution is presented and relatively small biases are observed for all portions of the globe. Problem areas in both reanalyzes include Eastern Asia and Southern Africa, and in general equatorial regions look less biased. There are few noticeable differences between reanalyzes.

Increasing the resolution to **15** degrees in Figure **6-8,** problem areas are again observed over Asia, and Africa, with additional significant errors over South America. Interestingly, there is no pattern to these errors, they are both positive and negative and scattered about the land masses randomly. These errors tend to be intensified in the Reanalysis-2 and both reanalyzes show breakdowns in the north most and south-most control volumes. Errors in general are much higher on the fifteen degree resolution as the bounds of the colorbar are more than doubled. Moving to the **7.5** degree resolution in Figure **6-9,** the colorbar bounds remain the same. In general larger positive and negative biases are observed over land more than over water. There is a general surplus in the southern most control volumes but other geographic patterns are not observed. Only certain portions of the land masses are unbalanced. Northern land masses appear better balanced.

Figure **6-8: 15** degree Bias Error Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-9: 7.5** degree Bias Error Reanalysis Balances

6.1.4. Global Normalized Atmospheric Bias Error

In this section the biases are normalized. In Figure **6-10** the normalized bias is presented at the **30** degree resolution. Here more dramatic imbalances are highlighted. Large normalized deficits occur in the same places as were observed in the last section; however the surpluses which were observed are no longer as bad, as the precipitation magnitude is high over these areas. Additional deficits are found over the mountainous regions of North America and South America.

In Figure **6-11** the resolution is reduced to **15** degrees and additional problem areas are discovered. The western portions of South America and North America, as well as parts of all other land masses contain normalized biases on the order of magnitude of the precipitation of that region. Again, there is no pattern to the sign of these biases; they are both positive and negative. The only real observation which can be made is that these biases all occur over land. There is also a larger difference in the normalized case between good and bad areas when looking at the normalized error and this observation is intensified in Figure **6-12** for the **7.5** degree resolution. Again, significant normalized biases greater than **1** occur mostly over land which show no pattern as surplus and deficit control volumes are scattered randomly over land. In North and South America, these biases tend to occur over the western parts of the continent on and off the land masses. The land stretching from Northern Africa into Central Asia also shows significant highs and lows for this property, but no pattern. These biases over the Eastern Hemisphere correspond to very arid regions, and are intensified **by** normalization.

Figure **6-10: 30** degree Normalized Bias Error Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-11: 15** degree Normalized Bias Error Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-12: 7.5** degree Normalized Bias Error Reanalysis Balances

6.1.5. Global Atmospheric Regression Slope

In the next three sections results of the regression calculation for the atmospheric two sided water balance are presented. Of the most importance in the regression study is the evaluation of the slope. **A** slope above one results in a larger signal in moisture flux (given that change in precipitable water has little variation) than in the P-E quantity, and a slope below one means the

reverse. In Figure **6-13** the regression slopes for the **30** degree resolution are shown. Several control volumes control volumes yield slopes which differ significantly from one. These points are more common over land than water and don't show much of a pattern as far as being either high or low. The **15** degree resolution of the regression slope is shown in Figure 6-14. There are many light blue and yellow points in both the **30** and **15** degree resolution indicating slope slightly below and slightly above one especially over the oceans. These results indicate fairly good regression slopes.

In Figure *6-15* a much more detailed picture of the different regression slopes is shown at the *7.5* degree resolution. The same scale is used at all resolutions in order to display the decay of the slope from the coarse resolution to fine resolution. For the **30** degree resolution only a few tiles show the maximum and minimum slope of the color bar provided. With the **7.5** degree resolution many more points are dark blue and dark red, indicating slopes at or over the color bar bounds.

Subtle differences can be detected between the monthly and yearly time scales and between the Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 across all resolutions, as the yearly balances tend to have slopes with a further departure from one especially over land in the **15** and *7.5* degree resolutions. Fewer points are present for these regressions, and there is no seasonal cycle. Such differences can be specifically seen over the South American continent for both reanalysis (where strong seasonal cycles have been observed previously) across the different time scales.

Figure **6-13: 30** degree Regression Slope Reanalysis Balances

Figure *6-15: 7.5* degree Regression Slope Reanalysis Balances

6.1.6. Global Atmospheric Regression Intercept

The regression intercept is essentially **a** measure of bias in the regression, and since there is a better measure of bias in the residual statistics it is often bypassed. It is interesting though to look at this statistic for initial reanalysis conditions on a global map to observe trends and compare to with the other regression statistics. In Figure **6-16** the regression intercept is mapped for the **30** degree resolution. The desirable intercept of zero is represented **by** green blocks, while blue and red indicate strong negative and positive intercepts respectively. At this resolution there aren't many points which show regression intercepts over **10** kg/m^2-month. There is little difference between regression intercept across time scale or reanalysis. The distribution of errors appears totally random.

In Figure **6-17** the **15** degree regression intercepts are shown. The scale of the colorbar is doubled in order to obtain a similar picture as before, and again there are few obvious patterns in terms of regression intercepts. This is alarming over areas like the tropical ocean where water balances of this nature are suppose to be very successful. The same can be said for Figure **6-18** where the bounds of the colorbar are again doubled. Errors at the *7.5* degree resolution are more concentrated over land masses and to the north and south, but clear conclusions can not be drawn. Other water balance evaluation criteria are able to detect errors in the water balance more clearly, a further reason to disregard regression intercept in the global analysis.

Figure **6-16: 30** degree Regression Intercept Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-18:** *7.5* degree Regression Intercept Reanalysis Balances

6.1.7. Global Atmospheric Regression R^2

In this section, the R^2 values corresponding to the atmospheric regression calculated for each point in the global water balance map are presented. Therefore, results in these plots are dependent on the regression slope and intercept which were obtained for each control volume in the previous two sections. Very high R^2 values are found almost exclusively in the tropical regions for the **30** degree resolution. This relationship is strongest in the monthly Reanalysis-2

case and weakest in the yearly Reanalysis-1 case. There is a major contrast between the middle two rows in each plot and the top and bottom row of Figure **6-19.** The properties of these tropical regressions are varied, but they all correspond to good correlation even over the yearly time scale, an interesting observation which is unique to the **30** degree resolution.

When the resolution is increased to **15** and **7.5** degrees the strongest relationships are again seen clearly in the monthly Reanalysis-2, and the weakest in the yearly Reanalysis-1, shown in Figures **6-20** and **6-21.** However, as resolution is increased, the strong R^2 values are more limited to the oceans than the land in the tropical regions. In the coarse **30** degree resolution all of the control volumes in the tropical regions have at least some ocean in them. At finer resolutions when points can be better classified as land or ocean, the land points don't perform as well.

Figure **6-20: 15** degree Regression R^2 Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-21: 7.5** degree Regression R^2 Reanalysis Balances

6.1.8. Global Atmospheric Regression R^2 1:1

In Figure **6-22** the R^2 **1:1** values are shown for the **30** degree resolution control volumes. For the monthly time scale many tropical control volumes adhere well to the **1:1,** with the Reanalysis-2 having more of these solid red areas. Few such points are found for the yearly time scale even at the 30 degree resolution. The strong seasonal cycle governs the R^2 1:1 term in tropical regions as it did for the regression line R^2 term. In Figure 6-23, showing the 15 degree resolution, fewer good areas exist on the monthly time scale and those that do exist are primarily over the tropical oceans. The locations of these good R^2 1:1 results extend north and south in the oceans in the Reanalysis-2. Some ocean points yield good results for the yearly times scale and more so in the Reanalysis-2, but the global map is dominated **by** blue and therefore significantly negative R^2 1:1 values. In Figure 6-24 the same observations can be made for the **7.5** degree resolution as for the **15** degree resolution. Over the oceans and over large tropical areas (30 degrees), the R^2 1:1 measure is an effective tool in evaluating the water balance.

Figure **6-22: 30** degree Regression R^2 **1:** 1Reanalysis Balances

Figure 6-24: **7.5** degree Regression R^2 **1:1** Reanalysis Balances

6.1.9. Global Atmospheric Correlation Coefficient

The correlation coefficient and R^2 metrics are very similar as they both measure the adherence of the two sided water balance to a linear relationship. Therefore the results of maps of the **³⁰** degree correlation coefficient in Figure **6-25** are no surprise. Again the tropical regions show very good correlations while other points showing less correlation. For most balances the correlation coefficient is greater than **.5** for all control volumes at the **30** degree resolution and monthly time scale, with the exception of two control volumes which are completely over land. Increasing the resolution to **15** degrees in Figure **6-26** all tropical regions still show a good correlation in the monthly Reanalysis-2 balance regardless of land or water. At the **7.5** degree scale in Figure **6-27** the correlations begin to break down in the tropical regions over land. Particularly weak correlations are found over northern landmasses at **15** and **7.5** degree resolution.

Figure **6-25: 30** degree Correlation Coefficient Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-27: 7.5** degree Correlation Coefficient Reanalysis Balances

6.1.10. Global Atmospheric Root Mean Square Error

The root mean square error is an excellent tool for the analysis of the atmospheric balance. The RMSE is always positive thus the magnitudes of the error are easy to recognize on a global map. In Figures **6-28** through **6-30** the root mean square error is mapped for the global atmospheric water balance at **30, 15,** and **7.5** degrees respectively. At the **30** degree resolution many regions yield RMSEs of less than **10** kg/m^2-month especially on the yearly time scale. This is a very low error. Problem areas arise where residual statistics indicated problems earlier, in Eastern Asia and Southern Africa. Errors are approximately doubled when resolution is increased from **30** degrees to **15** degrees as indicated **by** the change in colorbar. On the **7.5** degree resolution and monthly time scale, significant errors are found over almost all land masses. These large errors are indiscriminate to geographic features as they cover both mountainous and flat lands. Such errors are nowhere near as high or concentrated to land on the yearly time scale. On the yearly time scale many water balances over land have the same error as water balances over ocean. In the case of RMSE the best balances are found in the yearly Reanalysis-2 and the worst in the monthly Reanalysis-I because of variability which exists in the monthly time scale.

Figure **6-28: 30** degree RMSE Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-29: 15** degree RMSE Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-30: 7.5** RMSE Reanalysis Balances

6.1.11. Global Atmospheric Normalized Root Mean Square Error

The final analysis tool which can be applied to the global atmospheric water balance is the normalized version of the RMSE. This is displayed at various resolutions over Figures **6-31** through **6-33.** For the **30** degree resolution higher normalized error exists generally over land, without much of a pattern, but at the **15** and **7.5** degree resolutions these errors become increasingly concentrated and localized. Specifically at the **7.5** degree resolution there is a large contrast between normalized errors greater than 2 (dark red) and normalized errors less than **1** (blue). These areas are not limited to land mass, although they persist over the African and Asian continents, they also exist in wake of continents specifically in the Southern Hemisphere. It is hard to ascertain the reason for the ocean errors in these locations as ocean water balances have behaved very regularly for most other properties. These areas of the ocean must be drier and clearly more error prone. The normalized absolute error and bias were a prior indicator.

Figure **6-31: 30** degree NRMSE Reanalysis Balances

Figure **6-33: 7.5** degree NRMSE Reanalysis Balances

6.2. Precipitation Set Data Analysis

In the previous section the different properties of the global atmospheric water balance were looked at and evaluated **by** looking at spatial maps. The results on each spatial map can also be averaged over the control volumes in either the global **(60 N** to **60 S)** or tropical **(30 N** to **30 S)** regions to evaluate the general characteristics of all balances. This is a necessary simplification of analysis when different precipitation datasets are applied to each water balance.

An additional six precipitation datasets can be applied to each control volume in the global atmospheric water balance: the default reanalysis precipitation, the **GPCP** precipitation, the **SSM/I** precipitation, the OPI/Longwave-Radiation and OPI/Model precipitation datasets, and the CMAP precipitation dataset. The CMAP2 precipitation dataset contains errors globally and therefore is dropped from consideration. Additionally, the **GPI** and TRMM 3B43 precipitation datasets can be applied to the tropical region control volumes between **30** degrees **N** and **³⁰** degree **S.**

Thus analyzing different characteristics as applied to the global atmospheric water balance eight basic balances are created varying reanalysis (2), time scale (2), and creating separate analyzes for global and tropical regions. The tropical region analysis allows for the inclusion of two additional precipitation datasets as mentioned before and is also of interest as since during the spatial analysis it was observed that the tropical water balances had much different characteristics, especially for the **30** degree resolution.

In Figure 6-34 the averaged absolute errors are displayed averaging over all control volumes for the different water balance characteristics. Resolution is decreased from the top row to the bottom row. In general, across each balance the reanalysis precipitation provides the lowest absolute error, particularly in the tropical regions. The precipitation errors for the global cases are generally the same for all datasets as the **GPCP** and **SSM/I** applications provide generally higher errors. The same can be said for only tropical control volumes on the right with even higher absolute error in the water balance found when the tropical specific 3B43 and **GPI** precipitation are applied. These effects are dampened as resolution decreases, but are generally universal.

In Figure **6-35** the normalized absolute error is displayed in the same way. Trends are generally the same with an even larger increase in **SSM/I** and **GPI** precipitation error. These precipitation datasets are both satellite based and their variability seems to increase the normalized absolute error. For the **7.5** degree resolution absolute errors for all precipitation datasets are on average of the same order of magnitude as the precipitation itself. It is known that over the oceans these errors are fairly low; therefore over land the errors must be even higher. This contrast between land and ocean points will also be analyzed in a later section.

Figure 6-34: Global and Tropical Analysis of Different Precipitation Datasets **-** Absolute Error

Figure **6-35:** Global/Tropical Analysis of Different Precip. Datasets **-** Norm. Absolute Error

Of special interest in the global atmospheric balance is the averaged global bias of all water balances. **If** the reanalysis is truly a global product there should be little if any bias in the long term water balance, when all spatial areas are taken into account. When other precipitation datasets are introduced, biases are more likely as the water budget of the reanalysis was made to match its own precipitation data and not alternatives. The biases for different global atmospheric characteristics are given in Figure **6-36.**

As suspected, the biases are lowest for the reanalysis precipitation for each situation, and across time scale bias remains constant. Bias residuals behave similarly to absolute error residuals as far as precipitation dataset, in terms of departure from zero. **All** biases are negative for every situation. Interestingly, bias is not only constant across time scale, but it also nearly constant across resolution. This proves that the integrity of the different datasets used in each case is maintained throughout the water balance process. The biases for the reanalysis are very low for all situations in the Reanalysis-1 and the Reanalysis-2 indicating that the water balance in the reanalysis is preserved in between both the **60** degree and **30** degree latitudes. **All** of the moisture flux terms which contain sizeable errors at some resolutions cancel out in the spatial averaging and the water balance nearly balance and simplifies to $P=E$.

This is an important observation in that the total moisture flux globally is approximately zero when complete spatial averaging is performed (as it should be), and any discrepancies are likely due to differences in moisture flux through the top and bottom boundaries **(60** or **30** degrees latitude). Alternative precipitation datasets indicate much more precipitation globally within the bands being analyzed. It would seem then that a proper balance would include increased precipitation and evaporation. The reanalysis evaporation should be higher in order to match more accurate alternative precipitation datasets.

The normalization of the bias in Figure **6-37** yields consistent results at the **30** degree and **¹⁵** degree resolutions. However, as resolution increases, biases become less negative and even approach zero. This does not mean a balance is achieved. There are many tropical regions which are dry and mountainous and these normalized errors can be very high because of very low average precipitation being used as a normalization tool. This effect will increase with increased resolution because the precipitation data can be more specific at higher resolutions and therefore have greater extremes.

Figure **6-36:** Global and Tropical Analysis of Different Precipitation Datasets **-** Bias Error

The regression intercept is bypassed here as it yields no new insight. The same is true for the R^2 and R^2 **1:1** analyzes as they yield nothing that can not be evaluated **by** the correlation coefficient. The slope and correlation coefficient for these spatially averaged analyzes are displayed in Figure **6-38** and **6-39.** Looking at the global results for slope in Figure **6-38** the reanalysis precipitation yields the slope closest to one clearly at every resolution. For all yearly cases the average slope is less than one indicating weaker signals in the moisture flux time series than the P-E time series. The distinction between precipitation datasets is clearer in the yearly time scale, and on the *7.5* and **15** degree resolutions. Slope results tend to depart more from one with increase in resolution. For the tropical cases the regression slope is generally closer to one. The tropical precipitation datasets yield comparable results to the other precipitation datasets over this area.

Turning to correlation coefficient, the reanalysis precipitation clearly provides for the best correlation of the two sides of the water balance for every situation and resolution presented.
Correlation generally decreases with increased resolution which is expected. The other Correlation generally decreases with increased resolution which is expected. precipitation datasets vary in terms of effectiveness. However there is a general increase in average correlation coefficient for the tropical control volumes. **A** stronger seasonal cycle is more likely in tropical regions leading to higher correlation.

Figure **6-39:** Global and Tropical Analysis of Different Precip. Datasets **-** Correlation Coeff

In Figures 6-40 and 6-41 the RMSE and Normalized RMSE are presented as the other water balance properties in this section. For every scenario evaluated **by** the RMSE the reanalysis precipitation again provides the best results. It has become clear that the reanalysis precipitation is best suited to close its own water balance, globally. In general, results of the RMSE property are similar to the residual evaluation of the different balances especially on the monthly basis. Error nearly doubles over each resolution for both the RMSE and NRMSE. Error increases, but so did correlation when only the tropical control volumes are considered. These findings are counterintuitive and must indicate there is much more water in the tropical water balances over which error can range. NRMSEs are especially high for the **SSM/I** precipitation dataset. The normalizing ability of this dataset over dry regions has a large affect on this property.

Figure 6-40: Global and Tropical Analysis of Different Precipitation Datasets **-** RMSE

Figure 6-41: Global and Tropical Analysis of Different Precipitation Datasets **-** NRMSE

6.2.1. Spatial Precipitation Data Analysis

Each precipitation dataset can be applied to a global water balance map at each resolution to generate a unique spatial map. In other words every bar of each graph in the previous Section **6.2** represents the averaged value of the spatial mapping for that property. However, this results in an amount of maps too numerous to analyze in detail. Therefore, a number of these maps have been created varying precipitation over the Reanalysis-2 monthly and yearly time scales for the global and tropical areas and placed in Appendix B. For the Reanalysis-2 monthly and yearly time scale four precipitation datasets are applied to all of the control volumes on the global scale and plotted for each water balance property and resolution. Theses precipitation datasets are the Reanalysis, **GPCP, SSM/I,** and CMAP precipitation datasets. The **GPCP** and CMAP precipitation datasets are likely the best alternative precipitation datasets, while the **SSM/I** is a unique satellite based dataset. Additionally, the same plots are made for all precipitation datasets for the tropical region.

A few of these plots are selected for discussion. The yearly Reanalysis-2 is selected at the **7.5** degree resolution as these balances are most important to the main purpose of evaluating regional water balances at higher resolutions. Important water balance features of the global and tropical water balances are presented.

In Figures 6-42, 6-43, and 6-44 absolute error, bias, and RMSE for different precipitation datasets are presented. The figures look generally similar in terms of absolute error, with some problem areas over land which persist regardless of precipitation dataset. The tropical ocean absolute error is affected **by** all three of the alternative precipitation datasets, and appears to be the major difference in the figures. The reanalysis ocean water balances were observed to be very strong in Section **6.1,** but are weakened **by** more reliable precipitation datasets **(GPCP** and CMAP) here. This indicates the reanalysis model is balancing itself. These trends are also seen in Figure 6-44 in terms of RMSE. The bias maps in Figure 6-43 indicate the signs of these imbalances. For the alternative precipitation datasets biases are both high and low over land and vary without a pattern. The ocean biases which correspond to higher absolute errors are primarily negative indicating a surplus in precipitation over the ocean. This is consistent with the overall results in the previous section, and is very interesting as with the reanalysis water balances all ocean balances showed great agreement, but supplying alternative precipitation that may be better than the reanalysis provides problems over the ocean.

Figure 6-42: **7.5** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure 6-43: **7.5** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure 6-44: *7.5* degree RMSE Different Precipitation Global Yearly

In Figures *6-45* and 6-46 the two sided water balance is represented for different precipitation datasets. In terms of slope, there is a general departure of slope from one for all alternative precipitation datasets shown, and the effect is about the same for all three alternatives. The same can be said about the correlation coefficient. The relationship between the P-E and primarily the moisture flux term **Q** (as change in yearly precipitable water is nearly zero) is not represented as well when alternative precipitation datasets are applied.

Figure 6-46: *7.5* degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Global Yearly

It would stand to reason that with so many alternatives, differences would be discernable between precipitation datasets when looking only at tropical control volumes. However, looking at the absolute error results in Figure 6-47, few differences are apparent besides the obvious deviation of all of the alternative precipitation datasets from that provided **by** the reanalysis. The absolute error of the water balances over tropical regions is very good for the reanalysis in most areas. The tropical precipitation datasets (3B43 and **GPI)** provide little additional insight to the water balance. If anything, increases in absolute error are seen over the ocean especially in the Indian and Pacific Oceans. These errors can be observed as negative biases over the Indian Ocean in Figure 6-48. The absolute errors and biases are strongest for the TRMM 3B43 dataset, perhaps due to the fact only five years of data is available for the TRMM 3B43 precipitation, and a point or two of bad data may throw the balance off. Similar spatial observations are supported **by** the RMSE in Figure 6-49.

Turning to the analysis of the two sided balance the regression slopes and correlation coefficients are presented for the tropical control volumes in Figures *6-50* and *6-51.* Focusing on the added precipitation datasets in terms of slope, very poor regression slopes persist for specifically the TRMM 3B43 precipitation dataset. Again, these poor regressions are likely due to the fact only five points are being regressed, and a strong regression cannot be found with so few points. **A** similar finding is found in terms of correlation coefficient. This problem requires a look at these same figures except for the monthly time scale in Appendix B. **A** quick look to these figures indicates similar problems with the TRMM 3B43 on a monthly scale, where the times series consists of **60** months. The precipitation dataset is simply too short to compare with other precipitation datasets in this type of analysis.

Figure 6-47: *7.5* degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure 6-48: **7.5** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure 6-49: **7.5** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure **6-50: 7.5** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure **6-51: 7.5** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Global Yearly

With the addition of alternative precipitation datasets, the reanalysis mapped water balance properties look generally better, with alternative precipitation datasets having strikingly similar properties. Key differences between the reanalysis and alternatives are found over the ocean and the errors in more reliable precipitation datasets on a global scale indicates errors in both precipitation and evaporation in the reanalysis, as on the global scale these water balance properties should equal each other. The bias analysis indicates P=E for the reanalysis, but the reanalysis evaporation is not consistent with alternative precipitation datasets.

6.3. Time Period Data Analysis

The water balance can be broken into different time periods. In the case of the Reanalysis-1, this breakdown is more useful for a multi year analysis as there are **fifty** five years of data. The water balance here can be considered on a decadal basis and a separate evaluation can be performed every ten years for both the monthly and yearly time scales. This is particularly useful because there is a likelihood that over the last **fifty** years the quality of information has improved in the reanalysis and this hypothesis can be tested in terms of the atmospheric water balance.

For the Reanalysis-2, such a long time period analysis isn't as meaningful. **A** different analysis can be performed on the monthly time scale. The data here can be separated **by** month, and thus the properties of this water balance can be observed for twelve different months. It was also deemed useful to perform this same analysis **by** substituting the Reanalysis-2 precipitation with the TRMM 3B43 precipitation and considering only the corresponding tropical points. The Reanalysis-1 is used with the TRMM 3B43 precipitation in order to increase the length of the balance **by** one year.

For both of these analyses spatial differences in water balance properties are extremely limited, specifically in the evaluation of the two sided balance. Therefore these differences will not be looked into in detail, only presented for a few properties to show there are few differences. Most of the analyzes in this section deal with the overall averaging of water balance properties across all of the control volumes in the different time periods and resolutions. The seasonal analysis is performed first followed **by** the decadal analysis.

6.3.1. Seasonal Variations in the Reanalysis-2

In this section several water balance properties are analyzed as global averages over the different months and different resolutions of the Reanalysis-2 monthly balance. The absolute errors for these balances are displayed in Figure **6-52.** Across the three different resolutions there is an increase in absolute error over the summer months peaking in July. The pattern is very regular for the seasonal cycle with minimums in the winter months and maximums in the summer months. When normalization is performed, the difference between errors in resolutions is greatly increased. Minimum errors occur here in the spring and the fall with much larger maximum errors in the summer. When only points from one month are considered especially in the **7.5** degree case, regions arise particularly in the extreme winter and summer months over which monthly precipitation is very small. Any errors in the water balance over these regions caused **by** evaporation and moisture flux are therefore greatly amplified **by** normalization with low precipitation. For instance over desert regions it may never rain in the winter over a **7.5** degree grid space.

In terms of regular bias in Figure **6-53** a general increase in bias is observed over the summer months. What is remarkable here is the magnitude of the bias is on the order of 1 kg/m²-month over all seasons. For all months the Reanalysis-2 provides a very good water balance with hardly any overall residual. In other word P=E for every month averaged over the twenty three years of the balance. **A** nearly perfect balance is achieved on the global basis. When bias is normalized however, trends are seen similar to that of normalized absolute error. There is clear interference as resolution decreases **by** outlier points resulting in a 12 month profile similar to the normalized absolute error at each resolution.

In Figures *6-54* and *6-55* the monthly regression and correlation statistics for this water balance analysis are given. The average regression slope for each month is very close to one and there are few differences between months. The regression slope is often most useful on the monthly time scale when all months are being analyzed. However, when only one month is analyzed, the signals on each side of the balance are unique to the month being analyzed. Interestingly this property does not degrade with resolution. What likely happens as resolution increases is that overestimates and underestimates cancel each other out. Equally impressive for the regression analysis is the regression intercept property which is on the order of magnitude and behaves like
the bias, being nearly zero over all twelve months. The regression R^2 and correlation the bias, being nearly zero over all twelve months. coefficients for this experiment are split between figures *6-54* and *6-55* with differences between months being very small. **A** slight decrease is seen for the summer months which corresponds to the higher residual errors found for these months, but the differences are small. The results of the RMSE and NRMSE statistics for this balance are very similar to the absolute error results for both the normalized and non-normalized cases.

Figure *6-52:* Global Analysis of Different Months **-** Absolute Error

Figure 6-54: Global Analysis of Different Months **-** Regression Statistics

Figure **6-55:** Global Analysis of Different Months **-** Correlation Statistics

In Figures **6-56** through **6-59** the average water balance properties of all control volumes in the tropics are presented applying the TRMM 3B43 precipitation dataset to the last five years of the In terms of absolute error and RMSE, which throughout the global analysis yield very similar results, errors are again very even throughout the months, increasing uniformly with resolution. Such consistency is surprising considering only five points (years) of data are available for each month analyzed. Problems again arise with normalization, but on a very random basis. Satellite precipitation can be particularly vulnerable as a normalization tool especially when only five points are being considered.

Unlike absolute error there is a clear bias trend with the application of TRMM 3B43 precipitation when points are sorted **by** month. Ideal conditions exist in the summer, and in general there is a surplus of precipitation being applied to each control volume. This surplus is lowered in the summertime with the TRMM 3B43 precipitation. These trends are destroyed **by** normalization. In terms of the regression analysis the regression slope, intercept, and R^2 values are **highly** variable throughout the 12 months. This is caused **by** the low number of points being used in each regression. The clearest two sided comparison analysis is provided **by** the correlation coefficient which is consistently lower over all resolutions during the summer months. These results are opposite of the bias results the only other property where there were strong monthly trends are seen. It is therefore hard to make any conclusion over what months the TRMM 3B43 dataset can be applied best to atmospheric water balances. It is unlikely the total tropical atmosphere control volume is a net source or sink of water for the rest of the globe, therefore P=E is best satisfied in the summer when bias is low.

Figure **6-56:** Tropical Analysis of Different Months w/ TRMM 3B43 **-** Absolute Error

Figure **6-57:** Tropical Analysis of Different Months w/ TRMM 3B43 **-** Bias Error

Figure 6-58: Tropical Analysis of Different Months w/ TRMM 3B43 - Regression Statistics

Figure 6-59: Tropical Analysis of Different Months w/ TRMM 3B43 - Regression Statistics

For the monthly analysis, getting back to the original Reanalysis-2 global conditions, spatial maps can be made of water balance properties for specific months. Differences in these maps on a monthly basis are minimal for most of the water balance properties studied. Therefore only the two non-normalized residual statistics are shown for the different resolutions. The absolute error is shown in Figures **6-60** through **6-62** and the bias is shown in Figure **6-63** through **6-65.** Four months are selected to represent each season: January, April, July, and October. As displayed **by** these figures at each resolution there is little distinction between these properties for single months. Errors circulate throughout Asia on the **30** and **15** degree basis, and the balances are particularly bad over the southwest United States during the summertime for absolute error. Similar problems are also over Asia during the summertime on the **7.5** degree resolution. In terms of bias the same general observations apply as there is just little spatial change in the residuals generated **by** the water balances considering different months.

Figure **6-61: 15** Degree Absolute Errors Different Seasons Reanalysis-2, 4 Different Months

Figure **6-62: 7.5** Degree Absolute Errors Different Seasons Reanalysis-2 Monthly, 4 Different Months

Figure **6-63: 30** Degree Bias Errors Different Seasons Reanalysis-2 Monthly, 4 Different Months Global **15** degree Atmospheric Bias Error Monthly R2 **-** January Global **15** degree Atmospheric Bias Error Monthly R2 **-**April

Figure 6-64: **15** Degree Bias Errors Different Seasons Reanalysis-2 Monthly, 4 Different Months

Figure **6-65: 7.5** Degree Bias Errors Different Seasons Reanalysis-2 Monthly, 4 Different Months

Figure **6-66: 7.5** Degree Bias Errors Different Seasons Reanalysis-2 w/ TRMM 3B43 Precipitation, Tropical

Changes in spatial properties are also not observed with the application of the TRMM 3B43 product to the tropical portions of this balance. An example spatial plot contrasting bias on the **7.5** degree resolution is presented in Figure **6-66.** Bias was the property which showed the most spatial differentiation with change in month for these conditions. Subtle differences are observed between figures, but in general balances are very similar from month to month and season to season.

When the monthly Reanalysis-2 water balance is sorted **by** month, nearly identical water balance properties are found over each month, and spatially these properties do not change much either. Problems develop in the normalization of properties for certain months, and small conclusion can be drawn, as the balances are slightly worse on average during the summertime. Conducting the same study except considering only tropical points and using the TRMM 3B43 precipitation, bias is observed to be lowest in the summer months overall.

6.3.2 Decadal Variations in the Reanalysis-1

The length **of** the Reanalysis-I allows for the dataset to be broken down **by** decade, and the water balance for each decade analyzed globally for the atmospheric case. The most useful way to view the results of this analysis is **by** the averaging of water balance properties over all control volumes considered. Both the yearly and monthly time scales can **be** analyzed in this manner at each resolution.

Four plots are made of the global spatial averages of water balances properties considering different resolutions and time scales averaging over all control volumes in Figures **6-67** through **6-70.** Looking at the absolute error results in Figure **6-67,** there is hardly any difference between the errors observed over different decades, while previously observed trends for time scale and resolution are preserved. Considering the normalized absolute error, on the finer resolutions the 1980's decade performs poorly. This is counterintuitive to the theory that the water balance gets better as time nears the present. In terms of bias, differences are apparent in the top of Figure **6- 68.** These biases are very small, as have been consistently found when averaging the global atmospheric water balance. **All** biases are below **5** kg/m^2-month, small in comparison to typical values of water balance variables. The 1960's is consistently the most biased decade, though **by** a very small amount. The normalized biases behave like the normalized absolute errors.

Figure **6-67:** Global Analysis of Different Decades **-** Absolute Error

Figure **6-68:** Global Analysis of Different Decades **-** Bias Error

Figure **6-69:** Global Analysis of Different Decades **-** Regression Statistics

Figure **6-70:** Global Analysis of Different Decades **-** Correlation Statistics

Figure **6-71:** *7.5* Degree Absolute Errors Different Decades Reanalysis-I Monthly

Similar observations apply for the regression slope and intercept. The average regression slope for each of the time scales and resolutions resides around one, and the intercept is **highly** governed by the bias. What is interesting in this analysis are the R^2 and correlation coefficients found. Both of these properties steadily degrade over the decades for each time scale and resolution. One would expect these quantities to increase as better available data helped to complete the water balance, but the opposite is true. It is hard to speculate the reasons for this, but the trend is likely not a coincidence.

Several of these decadal comparisons were mapped spatially for different water balance properties, with no noticeable differences between decades. In Figure **6-71** an example of these plots is presented to illustrate the lack of change **by** decade in the reanalysis water balance. Only slight changes in absolute error over land are detected from decade to decade. It is an important observation that the reanalysis water balance is consistent across decades.

6.4. Land Points vs. Sea Points

A common theme of the global water balance data shown so far is a contrast between the errors found over land and the errors found over water. Because of the large differences between the atmospheric water balance systems over land and ocean, it stands to reason that water balance properties may be different. For instance some precipitation datasets may be better over water than over land or vice versa.

The smallest available grid over which the atmospheric water balance can be reasonably calculated is **7.5** degrees. This is a fairly large area, and it is difficult to distinguish land points from sea points on a grid of *7.5* degrees. For the pressure level fields of the reanalysis data, a **2.5** degree land grid is provided, and this grid is used to generate Figure **6-72.** The percentage of land for each point on a *7.5* degree grid of the globe is found from the finer resolution *2.5* degree dataset. Many points of the *7.5* degree resolution contain both land and sea, because of the coarseness of the resolution. Expanding such an analysis to a **15** or **30** degree resolution would be useless because only a very poor and probably inaccurate land grid could be generated. Grids are classified as land if they have more than *50%of* their area covered land. Figure **6-73** is created this way, for **60 N** to **60 S,** and Figure 6-74 is created for the tropical precipitation cases.

In this analysis, global maps are not necessary because all land and sea points are being combined and we are looking for distinction simply between these two types of points. Variables that can be considered while looking at this distinction are reanalysis, time scale, and precipitation dataset. **A** separate analysis of only tropical points is also conducted.

Figure **6-72 -** Percentage of Land for a *7.5* Degree Resolution

Figure 6-74: *7.5* Degree Land Grids for Tropical Datasets

In Figures **6-75** through **6-78** the water balance properties of land and sea control volumes are averaged and contrasted against each other for a variety of conditions. As expected in Figure **6- 75** the absolute error for all land conditions is much higher than that for sea conditions. The difference is approximately a factor of two. At this resolution large atmospheric errors exist for both land and sea points. Based on the bias results the weakness of the **SSM/I** precipitation dataset is clearly an overestimation of precipitation over the ocean. **A** strong difference between this dataset's applicability to the land and sea balances is observed in the bias specifically. When the residual statistics are normalized in Figure **6-76,** results are consistent for absolute error and most of the bias results are as well. The normalized bias for land is much higher and positive. This is probably caused **by** poor reanalysis normalization over sparsely precipitated land cells, likely in the desert. Such dry points are less likely over the ocean. More meaningful results when averaging over all global points are picked up **by** the actual residual statistics without normalization.

Figure **6-75:** Global Analysis of the Land/Sea Contrast **-** Residual Statistics

Figure **6-76:** Global Analysis of the Land/Sea Contrast **-** Normalized Residual Statistics

In Figure **6-77** and **6-78** regression and correlation statistics are presented with the land and sea points being separated. Much better and consistent regression slopes are found for all balances with sea points, as regression slopes are very close to one on average for the ocean in all situations. Over land the reanalysis precipitation provides a good average slope, as the reanalysis precipitation matches its own water balances on average. However, there is complete precipitation matches its own water balances on average. disagreement in the slope property when alternative precipitation datasets are applied over land. As usual intercept results imitate balance results and RMSE results imitate absolute error results. In terms of R^2 and correlation coefficient values are consistently and significantly lower over land than over sea. Particularly poor correlation is found over land points for the yearly time scale and alternative precipitation datasets.

Separating the land and sea points, differences are seen in the yearly slope and correlation using the reanalysis precipitation, however using other precipitation datasets over land with the yearly time scale provides very low correlations, and deems these precipitation datasets nearly useless to the water balance over land.

Figure **6-77:** Global Analysis of the Land/Sea Contrast **-** Regression Statistics

Figure **6-78:** Global Analysis of the Land/Sea Contrast **-** Correlation Statistics

Figure **6-80:** Tropical Analysis of the Land/Sea Contrast **-** Normalized Residual Statistics

Figure **6-82:** Tropical Analysis of the Land/Sea Contrast **-** Correlation Statistics

The same analysis applied to only the tropical points between **30** degrees north and **30** degrees south is displayed in Figure **6-79** through **6-82.** The ratio of land to sea errors is about the same in terms of absolute error and RMSE, however the magnitude of errors are slightly higher in the tropical cases for all conditions. In terms of bias there is a large contrast between the **GPI** precipitation over land and sea, as over land biases are near zero and even positive. The normalization process again interferes with the normalized residual statistics and RMSE. Average regression slopes are again consistent with one for all conditions except for the use of alternate precipitation over land on the yearly basis. This property is not corrected in the tropical case.

The comparison of land and sea balances under different conditions in general validates what was seen in spatial plots earlier. The ocean balances are balanced much better than the land balances. About two times as well on average in terms of absolute error and regression correlation. Useful observations can be made pertaining to precipitation datasets over land and sea points especially in terms of overall bias, as certain precipitation datasets cater better to land or sea points or, in the case of the reanalysis, both.

7. Ground Heat Flux Research

Ground heat flux (GHF) over the land surface can be calculated using the half-order derivative method proposed **by** Wang and Bras **(1999):**

$$
G(t) = \frac{I}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^t \frac{dT_g(s)}{\sqrt{t - s}}
$$
 (Eq. 7-1)

where G (t) is the ground heat flux at time t, T_g is the ground temperature, and s is the integration time of the temperature time series used to find the ground heat flux. s varies between **0** and t. **I** is the thermal inertia of the soil material:

$$
I = \sqrt{K\rho C} \tag{Eq. 7-2}
$$

where K is the bulk thermal conductivity $(Wm^{-1}K^{-1})$, ρ is the bulk density ($kg m^{-3}$), and C is the specific heat capacity $(\mathbf{J} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{g}^{-1} \mathbf{K}^{-1})$. $t=0$ represents the time when G=0, which is typically at 6 am local time. The interested reader is referred to Wang and Bras **(1999)** for a detailed description of the half order derivative method.

In this study the Reanalysis-1 and Ranalysis-2 skin temperature (ground temperature) data at **6** hourly, daily, and monthly time resolutions will be used to compute the global 6-hourly, daily, an **d** monthly ground heat flux for the year **1988. A** certain amount of data from the previous year **1987** is needed to calculate the ground heat flux at the beginning of **1988.**

In Section 7.1, a first estimate of G will be derived with a constant $I = 1 \times 10^3$ J m⁻² s^{-1/2} K⁻¹ using the Reanalysis-1 dataset. In Section **7.2** the spatially varying **I** parameter will be estimated from field observations. Section **7.3** contains an original methodology for determining the global map of **I,** based on the findings of Section **7.2.** In Section 7.4, a global ground heat flux product will be presented.

7.1. Initial Findings

The only global data set on ground heat flux comes from the **NCEP** Reanalysis product. We'll use the skin temperature to recalculate ground heat flux using **Eq. (7-1).** Ground heat flux in the **NCEP** Reanalysis dataset, like many other fields, is derived **by** a global model on a 6-hourly basis, and then aggregated into daily and monthly resolutions. In this section a universal thermal inertia of 1 x 10^3 J m⁻² s^{-1/2} K⁻¹ is applied to all land points to derive a ground heat flux timeseries at three time scales. There are 5914 land pixels with a size of about 1.90° x 1.88° (lat x long).

Four measures are then utilized to compare the "estimated" ground heat flux and the "observed" ground heat flux (from the reanalysis output), namely root mean square error (RMSE), normalized root mean square error (NRMSE), regression slope and regression intercept. The root mean square error is a measure of the differences between two time series in a non biased fashion. The purpose of the initial estimates is to identify the locations where there are

substantial differences between the estimated and observed ground heat flux. Differences may exist between the two reanalysis datasets with certain geographical and temporal features. The comparison will help in producing the improved global maps of ground heat flux

Figure **7-1:** RMSE between the Estimated and Reanalysis-1 **GHF -** Non-Averaged Data

Figure **7-1** illustrates the RMSE between the Reanalysis-i observed and the estimated ground heat flux at the three time resolutions using the skin temperature input. On the 6-hourly time scale, moderate differences are found throughout the globe, on the order of 20 Wm⁻². Large differences are found over desert regions around the world including Northern Africa, Central Asia, Australia, the Southwest United States, and the Andes mountains. On the daily and monthly time scales, these differences are reduced with significant errors over Central Asia, but predominantly over high latitude regions.

Figure **7-2:** RMSE between the Estimated and Reanalysis-I **GHF -** Aggregated Data

Like the reanalysis ground heat flux, 6-hourly estimated ground heat flux can be aggregated to daily and monthly time scales, resulting in three additional ground heat flux products which can
be compared with the Reanalysis-1 products at the corresponding time scales. These be compared with the Reanalysis-1 products at the corresponding time scales. comparisons are shown in Figure **7-2.** Large differences persist for the same regions as in Figure **7-1** showing non-aggregated data. **Of** particular interest are the high latitude regions and Central Asia. The differences are the largest when the 6-hourly estimated ground heat flux is aggregated all the way to monthly data and then compared with the reanalysis monthly ground heat flux. In northern areas the aggregation leads to major difference between the two.

Figure **7-3:** Normalized RMSE between the Estimated and Reanalysis-I **GHF -** Non-Aggregated Data

Because of the variability in the magnitude of ground heat flux, normalized RMSE is used to quantify the relative error of the estimated ground heat flux to the observed ground heat flux. Normalization is performed for each dataset **by** dividing the RMSE **by** the average of the absolute value of Reanalysis-i ground heat flux. Since the annual mean ground heat flux is close to zero it is necessary to normalize **by** the average of the absolute value of ground heat flux. Figure **7-3** shows that relatively large normalized differences are observed over Greenland and Antarctica. Significant errors also appear in dry desert regions as well as in the arctic regions to a lesser extent. The arctic errors do not appear to be very large on the monthly time scale, while the differences over the desert are greater. When comparing the aggregated estimated ground heat flux with the reanalysis shown in Figure 7-4, there are increased differences over Northern Africa and Australia when aggregating from the 6-hourly to the monthly time scale.

Figure 7-4: Normalized RMSE between the Estimated and Reanalysis-i1 **GHF -** Aggregated Data

Regression slope and intercept are two useful parameters in comparing the estimated ground heat flux with the Reanalysis-1 ground heat flux. They can be obtained from the scatter plot of the reanalysis ground heat flux as the y-axis vs. the estimated ground heat flux as the x-axis. Close correlation is found in all cases, but the regression slopes vary. When the estimated ground heat flux does not follow the **1:1** line we assume the reanalysis data is more accurate than the estimated ground heat flux using a constant **I,** since the thermal inertia parameter is expected to vary spatially. In the following analysis, the thermal inertia in **Eq. (7-1)** would be adjusted to force the regression slope to be unity.

Figure **7-5:** Regression Slope of Reanalysis-1 **GHF** vs. Estimated **GHF -** Non-Aggregated Data

Figure **7-5** shows the global maps of regression slopes of non-aggregated estimated ground heat flux vs. the corresponding reanalysis data at the three time resolutions. In general the regression slopes of the 6-hourly and daily data are quite low. Note that the regression slopes vary with the time resolutions of the data, while the thermal inertia should be time-independent theoretically. For example the monthly map shows greater regression slopes globally relative to the 6-hourly and daily map with significant geographical variations. The global maps of regression slopes for aggregated data are shown in Figure **7-6.**

Figure **7-6:** Regression Slope of Reanalysis-1 **GHF** vs. Estimated **GHF -** Aggregated Data

Figure **7-7:** Regression Intercept of Reanalysis-1 **GHF** vs. Estimated **GHF -** Non-Aggregated Data

⁶hourly avg to Daily **GHF** Regression Intercept Reanalysis-1/Method Derived **-** Universal K 5

⁶hourly avg to Monthly **GHF** Regression Intercept Reanalysis-1/Method Derived **-** Universal K **5**

Daily avg to Monthly **GHF** Regression Intercept Reanalysis- 1/Method Derived **-** Universal K

Figure **7-8:** Regression Intercept of Reanalysis-1 **GHF** vs. Estimated **GHF -** Aggregated Data

Figures **7-7** and **7-8** show that the regression intercepts on the order of *5* Wm-2 are relatively small. Greater intercepts are observed in the Northern regions and in Central Asia, which will be regions of focus as we attempt to improve the estimated ground heat flux.

Problems associated with the thermal inertia parameter become more prevalent at certain locations. Theoretically, the thermal inertia could be estimated **by** regressing the estimated against measured ground heat flux for that region. Four points were selected over the globe to illustrate the differences between the estimated ground heat flux and the Reanalysis-1 ground heat flux using the uniform thermal inertia. These points are located in South America, Central Canada, Sahara Desert, and Tibet. At two locations (Central Canada and Sahara Desert), field experimental data are available and will be used in the following section to estimate an effective thermal inertia for the two biggest problem regions (deserts and high latitudes).

Over the South America point, estimated ground heat flux agrees well with the Reanalysis-1 ground heat flux on all time scales. The agreement is best for the 6-hourly time scale, as shown in Figure **7-9.** There is a very little variation in the daily cycle. The regularity of this cycle can be seen in the correlation plot in the top left of Figure *7-15.* The cycle is so regular that clusters of points are seen for different times during the daily cycle. Such features do not exist at the other two time scales. Daily and monthly time-series of the estimated and the observed ground heat flux are plotted in Figures **7-11** and **7-13.** It is evident that the uniform thermal inertial leads to good estimates of ground heat flux compared with that from the reanalysis over the South America point.

Over the Sahara Desert, the estimated ground heat flux does not agree with the Reanalysis-1 ground heat flux. The bottom left panel of Figure **7-15** clearly shows the problem of the estimated ground heat flux over the Sahara Desert on the 6-hourly time scale. Later, observations from the **HAPEX-SAHEL** field experiment **(3** degrees **N** latitude and 14 degrees **E** longitude) will be utilized to obtain an estimate of the thermal inertia parameter. Figure **7-9** indicates that there is a large difference between amplitude of the diurnal cycle in the estimated 6-hourly ground heat flux and the Reanalysis-1 ground heat flux. We found that the assumed value of the uniform thermal inertia is too large, causing an over estimate of the ground heat flux relative to the reanalysis data assumed to be reasonably accurate.

Time series of the ground heat fluxes at a location in Central Canada are shown in Figure **7-10, 7-12,** 7-14 with the corresponding scatter plot in Figure **7-16.** This location is near the BOREAS field experiment site *(53* degrees **N** latitude and **106** degrees W longitude). On top of Figure **7- 10** the 6-hourly data is presented over the period of mid March to mid June. Unlike the other points, ground heat flux at this location does not have a regular diurnal cycle. For the first half of this period (wintertime), estimated ground heat flux fluctuates wildly while the reanalysis flux is close to zero. For the middle portion of the year the reanalysis and estimated flux agree very well. It indicates that the diffusion coefficient varies seasonally. The same feature can be seen in the daily data over the entire year on the top portion of Figure **7-12.** In Figure **7-16,** the data points in the scatter plot are also grouped where the points at the beginning and the end of the **6** hourly and daily time series stay in one group with the data points in the middle of the time series in another. The monthly data does not show this pattern. Larger records are needed to ascertain if this behavior persists in the monthly data.

An additional location in Central Asia (Tibetan Plain, **34'N 86*E)** is also studied. This location has already shown up on many of the early plots as a source of major difference between the estimated and reanalysis ground heat flux. Judging **by** the scatter plots in Figure **7-16,** this location is similar to the South America with a strong seasonal cycle on the 6-hourly time scale using most of the year. The assumed uniform thermal inertia works well for most of the year across all time scales. Biases exist for this point as shown in Figure **7-12** at the daily time scale in the middle portion of the year. Such errors can not be fixed **by** altering the thermal inertia.

Figure 7-9: Comparison of Estimated and Reanalysis-i Ground Heat Flux over South America and the Sahara Desert for the 6-hr time scale

Figure 7-10: Comparison of Estimated and Reanalysis-1 Ground Heat Flux over the BOREAS site (Central Canada) and Central Asia for the 6-hr time scale

Figure **7-11:** Comparison of Estimated and Reanalysis-1 Ground Heat Flux over South America and the Sahara Desert for the Daily time scale

Figure **7-12:** Comparison of Estimated and Reanalysis-1 Ground Heat Flux over the BOREAS site (Central Canada) and Central Asia for the Daily time scale

Figure **7-13:** Comparison of Estimated and Reanalysis-I Ground Heat Flux over South America and the Sahara Desert for the Monthly time scale

Figure 7-14: Comparison of Estimated and Reanalysis-I Ground Heat Flux over the BOREAS site (Central Canada) and Central Asia for the Daily time scale

Figure *7-15:* Comparison of Estimated and Reanalysis-I Ground Heat Flux over South America and the Sahara Desert **-** Correlation Plots for **All** Time Scales

Figure **7-16:** Comparison of Estimated and Reanalysis-1 Ground Heat Flux over the BOREAS site (Eastern Canada) and Central Asia **-** Correlation Plots for **All** Time Scales

7.2. Estimates of Thermal Inertia Parameter

For two of the most problematic regions, observed ground heat flux and skin temperature are available and will be used to obtain a realistic estimate of the thermal inertia parameter. The BOREAS field experiment is located in Central Canada. The **HAPEX-SAHEL** field experiment is located in the Sahara Desert.

7.2.1. BOREAS

It was first hypothesized that the larger differences between the reanalysis and the estimated ground heat flux are due to the frozen ground. Under this assumption the skin temperature could be used to indicate an alternative thermal inertia depending if the skin temperature were below freezing for a given time. The BOREAS **field** data used here consists of observations every thirty minutes from April **1** to December **30, 1996** when soil heat flux and was sampled at **3** cm depth. **A** soil temperature profile is also available, and can be used to extrapolate the soil surface skin temperature.

A reference ground heat flux was first calculated using **Eq. (7-1)** where the BOREAS derived **6** hourly skin temperature was used with the original default thermal inertia. Then, ten different thermal inertias are applied to frozen and non-frozen points separately to re-calculate the corresponding ground heat flux.

Figure **7-17:** Regression Slope vs. Thermal Inertia Used to Obtain Slope For Two Different Types of Land

Figure **7-18:** Estimated and Observed **GHF** vs. Time for 2 Sets of Scenarios for the Value of Thermal Inertia

Figure **7-19:** Top **-** Observed Data at the BOREAS site, Bottom **-** Scatter plots for 2 Sets of Scenarios for the Value of the Thermal Inertia

In Figure **7-17** the regression slopes are plotted for the comparison of the observed and the estimated ground heat flux with different thermal inertias applied to frozen and non-frozen points. The regression slope is closest to one for thermal inertia of 1×10^3 J m⁻² s^{-1/2} K⁻¹ for the non-frozen points (default) and 2.2×10^3 J m⁻² s^{-1/2} K⁻¹ for the frozen points. In Figure 7-18 the observed ground heat flux is compared to the estimated using the default thermal inertia and the newly estimated thermal inertia.

However, matching the reanalysis ground heat flux with that calculated using the BOREAS temperature record requires a very low thermal inertia under "frozen" conditions. This is not due to the frozen ground, and snow cover must be the cause.

Snow cover is an output parameter in the reanalysis data for each land point at every time scale, and can be used in place of temperature to separate points with different thermal inertias. For a full analysis of the impact of snow cover, the thermal inertia the Reanalysis-2 is introduced in addition to the Reanalysis-1 and BOREAS data. Relevant data and results using the default thermal inertia are presented in Figure **7-20** through **7-22.**

Differences are evident between the surface temperature given **by** the Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 and the BOREAS field data. The middle panels of Figures **7-20, 7-21,** and **7-22** illustrate the time series of skin temperature. The uniqueness of the BOREAS skin temperature record indicates that the skin temperature from both reanalysis datasets is not the same as the measured skin temperature at the BOREAS site. In fact, skin temperature from the BOREAS dataset is the surface soil temperature beneath the snow cover, and the reanalysis skin temperature is the surface snow temperature.

Figure **7-20:** 6-hourly Time Series Data from the Reanalysis-I for the BOREAS Site

Figure **7-21:** 6-hourly Time Series Data from the Reanalysis-2 for the **BOREAS** Site

Figure **7-22:** 6-hourly Time Series Data from the BOREAS experiment with the Reanalysis-2 snowfall for the BOREAS Site

Figure **7-23:** Correlation plots of Observed vs. Estimated Ground Heat Flux for the Reanalysis-1, Reanalysis-2, and BOREAS Experiment over the BOREAS site, distinguishing between snow points and non-snow points

In Figure **7-23** all three sources of data for this point are compared with the scatter plots of reanalysis vs. estimated ground heat flux with the default thermal inertia. The first row of graphs shows all data points. The second row shows the snow covered points only. The third row shows the snow free points only. As BOREAS data product does not have snow cover measurement, the Reanalysis-2 snow cover is used. In the case of both reanalyzes, there is a clear distinction between the scatter plots of snow points and non snow points. For snow points, the scatter plot reveals a linear regression with a very low slope, while non-snow points fit the **1:1** line well. In the scatter plot of BOREAS data, the snow points reveal a linear relationship with a slope of greater than **1.** The reanalysis results correspond to substituting a thermal inertia much lower than the default thermal inertia into Equation **7-1** for all snow points in order to produce a regression between estimated and reanalysis ground heat flux which better fits the **1:1** line.

In the Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 datasets, sub-freezing temperature points are usual covered **by** snow or vice-versa. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that most points with subfreezing temperature are covered with snow. In order to prove that snow is responsible for dampening the ground heat flux signal in the reanalysis due to a low thermal inertia, we examine two points where sub-freezing skin temperature persists without snow cover. In **1988,** two locations in Central Asia and the Northern Reaches of Canada (much farther north than the BOREAS site) were experiencing sub-freezing temperatures and snow free.

In the top panel of Figure 7-24 the sub-freezing skin temperature is plotted for the duration of the data presented for the Tibetan Plain location. The middle panel of the figure shows the time series of the Reanalysis-1 ground heat flux and the estimated ground heat flux. It is clear from the scatter plot that the uniform thermal inertia is acceptable for this land type in terms of its magnitude although there is apparent bias. Nevertheless, the results are consistent with the reanalysis with a near **1:1** regression with temperatures below zero. Hence, it's the snow that causes the differences in the reanalysis and estimated ground heat flux. Further proof is provided for a point in the Northern Canadian Islands in Figure *7-25.* The differences between the reanalysis and the estimated ground heat flux in northern land points are clearly corresponding to a much lower thermal inertia when snow is present.

Figure 7-24: Plots for Central Asia in Late 1988 where skin temperature is below 0 degrees C and there is no snow cover, daily time step

Figure 7-25: Plots for Canadian Islands in Late 1988 where skin temperature is below 0 degrees C and there is no snow cover, daily time step

7.2.2. HAPEX - SAHEL

Measurements of ground heat flux in a desert region are available from the HAPEX-SAHEL field experiment. Two datasets from this study are utilized, the ECSS_HERB_FLUX_DATA and ECSS HERB SOIL 1 DAT prepared by Bruno Monteny are available http://www.ird.fr/hapex/. The first dataset contains various surface heat fluxes including the ground heat flux, while the second one contains the surface temperature. The longest continuous record covers the period of 9/21/92 to 10/18/02. The time step of this data is 20 minutes. The observed surface temperature and ground heat flux are shown in Figure 7-26.

The true thermal inertia can be estimated graphically by plotting regression slope vs. thermal inertia. In order to estimate the thermal inertia, different values of thermal inertia are applied to calculate the ground heat flux. The best estimate of thermal inertia will be that corresponding to unity slope of the regression between the estimated and observed ground heat flux. The bottom panel of Figure 7-26 plots the regression slope versus the thermal inertia. The slope of one corresponds to the thermal inertia of about 540 J m⁻² s^{-1/2} K⁻¹. In Figure 7-27 and 7-28 the estimated ground heat flux is compared to the observed ground heat flux for the default thermal inertia and the regression derived thermal inertia. Eq. (7-1) with the newly estimated thermal inertia can almost exactly duplicate the ground heat flux.

Figure **7-26:** Top-HAPEX-SAHEL observed data, Bottom- Regression slope between the observed and method derived ground heat fluxes versus thermal inertia used

Figure **7-27:** Time Series Plots of Observed Ground Heat Flux vs. Method Ground Heat Flux

Figure 7-28: Scatter Plots of Observed Ground Heat Flux vs Method Ground Heat Flux

7.3. Estimation of Thermal Inertia by Land Type

The thermal inertia is a function of land type which varies spatially. It would be unrealistic to estimate the thermal inertia at each of the 5914 land points over the entire globe by a regression approach as shown above. Such derived thermal inertia parameter would rely on the reanalysis ground heat flux data. Our objective is to create a unique ground heat flux dataset independent of existing model products. Each pixel of the reanalysis has an area of about *250* km x *250* km within which soil properties are rarely homogeneous. Thermal properties are known for individual soil materials, but an area-mean thermal inertia is difficult to calculate from the individual components. In addition, observations are only available at limited locations covering a small fraction of the earth's surface.

An alternative method is therefore suggested for the derivation of these thermal inertias. This method involves the use of a gridded land type dataset. The University of Maryland (UMD) Global Land Cover Classifications data set is a gridded dataset of broad land type classification available at three resolutions: 1-degree, .5-degree, and *.25* degree. For this study, the 1-degree dataset is used to assign each reanalysis point with one of twelve basic land classifications. The 1 degree point nearest to the center of each reanalysis grid point is used. The results of this regridding are presented in Figure 7-29. The legend is given in Table 7-1, with the number 0 (blue) indicating water.

Figure **7-29:** Land Type Classification

For all points pertaining to each land type across the globe, all estimated and reanalysis ground heat flux data are combined and plotted on one graph, and from this graph a regression slope is found. This slope is then used to find the thermal inertia for all the points of a given land type. **By** this methodology the reanalysis ground heat flux is used as a loose guideline to regress the thermal inertia for a large number of points, but is not used on a point **by** point basis. This approach keeps the ground heat flux methodology simple. The land classification is simple enough to be used globally.

Additionally, a separate classification is assigned to snow cover. It was shown in Section **7.2** that thermal inertia is **highly** sensitive to snow cover. Thus any point in each time series for each land point which contains snow is placed in a separate category. Thus, a representative thermal inertia for all snow points is obtained. This thermal inertia is applied to all data points where snow is present.

Now we use this methodology to derive the thermal inertia with the help of the Reanalysis-I and Reanalysis-2 data at three resolutions. The results for each land type are given in Tables **7-1** through **7-6.** Each table lists the regression slope and intercept for each land type. The regression intercept is included to check for biases. The correlation coefficient is provided in order to check the quality of correlation for a given land type. **A** good correlation assures the grouping of many different points into one land type, corresponds to one thermal inertia.

As observed in Section **7.1,** the regression slopes vary with the time resolution of the input data for each land type. For example, the regression slope using monthly data is smaller than using daily data. The magnitude of this decrease is presented **by** an Increase Factor defined as the increase from daily to monthly in the monthly table, and increase from 6-hourly to daily in the daily table. There are improvements in the Increase Factor in the Reanlysis-2, but still for the Reanlysis-2 this factor is significantly greater than **1** across each time scale. In order to utilize this analysis to link the thermal inertias to these different land types, one set of thermal inertia coefficient must be chosen for each reanalysis.

Linear Regression of Ground Heat Flux Data By Land Type 1988 Monthly Time Scale - Reanalysis-1							
#	Land Type	Slope	Intercept	Correlation	Regressed I	Inc. Factor	
Ω	Snow/water	0.4485	0.8134	0.4444	449	4.32	
	Evergreen Needleleaf Forests	1.5742	0.0514	0.8156	1574	1.73	
$\overline{2}$	Evergreen Broadleaf Forests	0.9316	-0.1625	0.3943	932	1.33	
3	Deciduous Needleleaf Forests	2.2850	2.0035	0.8662	2285	2.14	
4	Deciduous Broadleaf Forests	1.0697	-0.1565	0.7946	1070	1.34	
5	Mixed Forest	1.4914	-0.4092	0.8362	1491	1.58	
6	Woodlands	1.4160	-0.7832	0.8246	1416	1.59	
7	Wooded Gasslands/Shrublands	1.2942	-0.6630	0.7905	1294	1.57	
8	Closed Bushlands or Shrublands	1.3898	-0.9314	0.8328	1390	1.63	
9	Open Shrublands	0.9639	-1.0933	0.6921	964	1.27	
10	Grasslands	0.9918	-0.4550	0.7171	992	1.34	
11	Croplands	1.0551	-0.0825	0.8294	1055	1.46	
12	Barren	0.4905	-0.2419	0.6028	491	0.85	

Table **7-1:** Thermal Inertia Calculations Monthly Time Scale Reanalysis-I

Linear Regression of Ground Heat Flux Data By Land Type 1988 Daily Time Scale - Reanalysis-1							
#	Land Type	Slope	Intercept	Correlation	Regression K	Inc. Factor	Rounded Reg. K
0	Snow/water	0.1042	1.6341	0.3766	104	3.03	100
	Evergreen Needleleaf Forests	0.9055	-4.2701	0.8495	906	1.30	910
$\overline{2}$	Evergreen Broadleaf Forests	0.7028	-0.6177	0.6937	703	0.97	700
з	Deciduous Needleleaf Forests	1.0695	-9.6510	0.8613	1070	1.23	1070
4	Deciduous Broadleaf Forests	0.7955	0.4571	0.8164	796	1.27	800
5	Mixed Forest	0.9450	-3.2597	0.8516	945	1.31	950
6	Woodlands	0.8934	-2.2716	0.8131	893	1.63	890
	Wooded Gasslands/Shrublands	0.8217	-1.7578	0.7953	822	1.89	820
8	Closed Bushlands or Shrublands	0.8521	-2.2885	0.7929	852	2.46	850
9	Open Shrublands	0.7575	-2.3280	0.7473	758	2.18	760
10 [°]	Grasslands	0.7417	-1.9820	0.7829	742	1.53	740
11	Croplands	0.7217	-0.8180	0.8329	722	1.48	720
12	Barren	0.5755	-0.5276	0.7559	576	2.68	580
	Table 7.0. Thomas Inortia Coloulationa Daily Time Soole Deanglypic 1						

Table **7-2:** Thermal Inertia Calculations Daily Time Scale Reanalysis-I

Here, the daily time scale is used as a basis for finding the thermal inertia. The regressed thermal inertia in **J** m⁻² s^{-1/2} K⁻¹ is rounded in Tables 7.2 and 7.5 to the nearest 10 **J** m⁻² s^{-1/2} K⁻¹. It is found that the daily time scale does not have the problem of inconsistency that exists in the **6** hourly and monthly time scale data. On problem with of 6-hourly data is that the diurnal cycle is represented **by** only four points, leading to a grouping of data points (see Figure *7-15,* the South American point on a **6** hourly time scale). The monthly data only has twelve points to represent the seasonal cycle and ground heat flux changes little on a monthly basis. This behavior is reflected in the correlation coefficients which, on the daily time scale, are highest for most land types, indicating a fairly strong linear relationship.

Linear Regression of Ground Heat Flux Data By Land Type 1988 6-hourly Time Scale - Reanalysis-1								
#	Land Type	Slope	Intercept	Correlation	Regressed K			
0	Snow	0.0333	1.6773	0.2273	33			
	Evergreen Needleleaf Forests	0.6954	-5.2290	0.7988	695			
$\overline{2}$	Evergreen Broadleaf Forests	0.7231	-0.6797	0.7598	723			
3	Deciduous Needleleaf Forests	0.8668	-12.1303	0.8326	867			
4	Deciduous Broadleaf Forests	0.6281	0.6021	0.7820	628			
5	Mixed Forest	0.7212	-4.0725	0.7997	721			
6	Woodlands	0.5476	-2.8203	0.7173	548			
7	Wooded Gasslands/Shrublands	0.4344	-2.1582	0.6694	434			
8	Closed Bushlands or Shrublands	0.3459	-3.1758	0.6335	346			
9	Open Shrublands	0.3475	-2.9603	0.6314	348			
10	Grasslands	0.4848	-2.4880	0.7078	485			
11	Croplands	0.4870	-0.8715	0.7179	487			
12	Barren	0.2151	-0.4904	0.5853	215			

Table **7-3:** Thermal Inertia Calculations 6-hourly Time Scale Reanalysis-1

Linear Regression of Ground Heat Flux Data By Land Type 1988 Monthly Time Scale - Reanalysis-2							
#	Land Type	Slope	Intercept	Correlation	Regressed K	Inc. Factor	
0	snow	0.3225	0.1036	0.4929	323	7.51	
	Evergreen Needleleaf Forests	1.0450	-1.2629	0.7615	1045	1.40	
$\overline{2}$	Evergreen Broadleaf Forests	0.7420	-0.8708	0.3956	742	0.95	
3	Deciduous Needleleaf Forests	1.4538	-1.6900	0.8683	1454	1.50	
4	Deciduous Broadleaf Forests	1.1115	0.1068	0.8999	1112	1.72	
5	Mixed Forest	1.1130	-0.5935	0.8637	1113	1.45	
6	Woodlands	1.1911	-0.9912	0.8154	1191	1.49	
7	Wooded Gasslands/Shrublands	1.2201	-0.8437	0.7948	1220	1.56	
8	Closed Bushlands or Shrublands	1.4961	-1.4572	0.8331	1496	1.83	
9	Open Shrublands	1.1159	-1.4005	0.7759	1116	1.51	
10	Grasslands	0.9377	-0.7924	0.7464	938	1.36	
11	Croplands	0.9593	0.1430	0.8779	959	1.38	
12	Barren	0.7074	-0.3437	0.8300	707	1.10	

Table 7-4: Thermal Inertia Calculations Monthly Time Scale Reanalysis-2

There is a problem in the Reanalysis-2 where the thermal inertia for snow seems unrealistically low. This thermal inertia is therefore replaced **by** that from the Reanalysis-1 in the final product. The thermal inertia derived using daily data agrees well with that from **HAPEX-SAHEL** observational data. A thermal inertia of 540 J m⁻² s^{-1/2} K⁻¹ using the field data is well reproduced in the Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 over the barren land type. The thermal inertia found for snow points (at least in the Reanalysis-1) are also seems consistent with those observed in section **7.2.1,** which indicated a nearly flat regression with a default value of thermal inertia.

Linear Regression of Ground Heat Flux Data By Land Type 1988 Daily Time Scale - Reanalysis-2							
#	Land Type	Slope	Intercept	Correlation	Regression I	Inc. Factor	Rounded Reg. I
0	Snow	0.0425	0.5042	0.2768	43	2.69	40
	Evergreen Needleleaf Forests	0.7473	-3.0729	0.8490	747	1.26	750
$\mathbf{2}$	Evergreen Broadleaf Forests	0.7801	-0.8525	0.7731	780	1.30	780
3	Deciduous Needleleaf Forests	0.9825	-8.4173	0.8652	983	1.31	980
4	Deciduous Broadleaf Forests	0.6481	-0.2584	0.8362	648	1.14	650
5	Mixed Forest	0.7689	-2.7090	0.8505	769	1.27	770
6	Woodlands	0.7993	-2.1442	0.8190	799	1.44	800
7	Wooded Gasslands/Shrublands	0.7802	-1.7803	0.8200	780	1.54	780
8	Closed Bushlands or Shrublands	0.8167	-2.8519	0.8163	817	1.75	820
9	Open Shrublands	0.7392	-2.5549	0.8139	739	1.63	740
10	Grasslands	0.6883	-2.0808	0.8204	688	1.36	690
11	Croplands	0.6959	-0.7033	0.8678	696	1.35	700
12	Barren	0.6399	-0.7676	0.8550	640	1,67	640

Table **7-5:** Thermal Inertia Calculations Daily Time Scale Reanalysis-2

Table **7-6:** Thermal Inertia Calculations 6-hourly Time Scale Reanalysis-2

7.4. Presentation of the Ground Heat Flux Product

In this section the ground heat flux data products are presented. Example plots are shown *for* each season for the 6-hourly and daily time scales for both reanalyzes. **All** 12 months of monthly data are shown here. For each point in time, a plot of the ground heat flux product is accompanied **by** a plot of the ground heat flux at the same time from the reanalysis dataset, followed **by** the difference between these two. The difference is not meant as the accuracy of the product, but to indicate where the two data products differ. Lastly, each of the three time scales is aggregated to monthly data and presented for each month. **A** few general comments are provided.

The examples of the 6-hourly time data product are given in Figures **7-30** through **7-37.** Ground heat fluxes are plotted every six hours starting from the indicated GMT. The diurnal cycles are shown in all **8** figures. As the day progresses, the negative (blue) ground heat flux propagates across the plot, corresponding to the sunrise and the increase in temperature, while the yellow/orange color represents sunset and a decrease in temperature. The main difference between the new product and the reanalysis in all cases is the amplitude of the maximum and minimum values. This could be predicted, as the thermal inertia from the daily time scale regression calculation is applied to the **6** hour method calculation, and these thermal inertias are larger for almost all land types than the thermal inertias found **by** regression the 6-hourly data. In terms of season, there are largest maximums and minimums occur during the summer (the location of these points shift during the time of day). Comparing the results of the Reanalysis-1 and the Reanalysis-2 for the 6-hourly time scale, there are smaller differences between the estimated and the reanalysis as shown the difference plots in Figures 7-34 and **7-37.** As was seen earlier there were smaller Increase Factors in the regressed thermal inertia in the Reanalysis-2, and in general the Reanalysis-2 data are slightly better.

Examples of the daily data product are given in Figure **7-38** through 7-41. The first two days of the months of January, April, July, and October are shown for each reanalysis. The differences between the reanalysis and the new data are smaller here as the thermal inertia used for all products were derived from the daily reanalysis data. Overall, there is very good agreement between the reanalysis and the new estimates. The new data of daily ground heat flux is more negative in the northern regions than either reanalysis. Snow should not be a concern in July over these points and what causes the difference is unclear.

The monthly data are presented in Figures 7-42 to **7-47.** In general the reanalysis ground heat flux has higher magnitude of minimums and maximums than the new estimates. The opposite was found for the 6-hourly datasets. This discrepancy is due to the use of the daily data to derive the thermal inertia. We believe that the new estimates of ground heat flux are more accurate than the reanalysis data. Differences between the estimated and reanalysis ground heat flux are reduced in the Reanalysis-2. Over all three time resolutions, the new data are better correlated to the Reanalysis-2 data. The seasonal cycle can clearly be seen in the new estimates. The signal is smoother in the new estimates of ground heat flux than in the reanalysis ground heat flux. In the final set of figures, all of the newly derived data are represented. The 6-hourly and daily products are aggregated to monthly data. Three plots are shown in sequence in Figures **7-48** to **7-53** for all months. **All** datasets are fairly consistent with one another, suggesting **Eq. (7-1)** is a promising tool in the estimation of ground heat flux using the skin temperature input.

Considerable differences are evident between the 6-hourly reanalysis and the new estimates of ground heat fluxes as shown in Figures **7-30** through **7-37.** The difference is defined in all product figures as the estimated ground heat flux minus the reanalysis ground heat flux. Therefore a positive difference indicates estimated ground heat flux is exceeds reanalysis ground heat flux, and a negative difference indicates reanalysis ground heat flux exceeds estimated ground heat flux. There is a negative difference over Central Asia and a positive difference over North America at **00:00** GMT. At **06:00** GMT there is a positive difference over Africa and a negative difference over North and South America. At 12:00 GMT there is a positive difference over Africa and a negative difference over North and South America, and at **18:00** GMT there

are no major differences between the two ground heat flux datasets. In general the estimated ground heat flux has greater diurnal variations. The positive and negative differences in ground heat flux propagate across the heat flux map as the day progresses and generally correspond to positive and negative peaks in the estimated ground heat flux.

The differences between the daily estimated and reanalysis ground heat flux are unique to the season being studied, but generally the same across reanalysis in Figures **7-38** through 7-41. In January there is a slight negative difference over the northern regions, and in July there is a slight positive difference over the northern regions. The reanalysis ground heat flux in northern regions is too high relative to the low estimates. In all four seasons there is a positive difference over Central Asia. This area was observed in Figure 7-24 where it is shown that the reanalysis ground heat flux is lower than the estimates at all times. Over a long period averaged ground heat flux should close, while the reanalysis ground heat flux does not have that feature for this region. Thus it appears that the reanalysis ground heat flux is underestimated.

There are noticeable positive differences between the monthly reanalysis and the new estimates of ground heat flux throughout the year over Central Asia. Again the reanalysis ground heat flux appears to be too small particularly during summer for this area. Differences between the estimated and reanalysis ground heat flux have similar features in the two reanalyzes in Figure **7-** 42 through **7-47.** During the summer months there is a significant positive difference between the reanalysis and estimated ground heat fluxes in both the northern and southern regions of the globe. The reanalysis ground heat flux appears to be unrealistically small over the summer in these areas.

The purpose of this investigation is to offer an alternative dataset of ground heat flux. This new product is developed with the help of the reanalysis modeled ground heat flux, land cover data, and the reliable skin temperature input from the reanalysis data. The key parameter is the thermal inertia of the land. The thermal inertia is time invariant **by** theory. However, using a regression to obtain this parameter over different time scales of the reanalysis, we find different values of the parameter. These problems are less severe in the Reanalysis-2. This research suggests that the discrepancies are probably due to flaws in the reanalysis model used to produce the 6-hourly and monthly ground heat flux.

Figure **7-30: GHF** Products Plots for 6-hourly time scale using the Reanalysis-I **-** January **1, 1988** (winter)

Figure **7-31: GHF** Products Plots for 6-hourly time scale using the Reanalysis-i **-** April **1, 1988** (spring)

Figure **7-32: GHF** Products Plots for 6-hourly time scale using the Reanalysis-I **-** July **1, 1988** (summer)

Figure **7-33: GHF** Products Plots for 6-hourly time scale using the Reanalysis-1 **-** October **1, 1988** (fall)

Figure 7-34: **GHF** Products Plots for 6-hourly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** January **1, 1988** (winter)

90W 0 90E

100

-100

90W 0 90E

Figure **7-35: GHF** Products Plots for 6-hourly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 - April **1, 1988** (spring)

Figure **7-36: GHF** Products Plots for 6-hourly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** July **1, 1988** (summer)

Figure **7-3 7: GHF** Products Plots for 6-hourly time scale using the Reanalysis- **1 -** October **1, 1988** (fall)

Figure **7-38: GHF** Products Plots for Daily time scale using the Reanalysis-1 **-** January/April **1988** (winter/spring)

Figure **7-39: GHF** Products Plots for Daily time scale using the Reanalysis-1 **-** July/October **1988** (summer/fall)

Figure 7-40: **GHF** Products Plots for Daily time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** January/April **1988** (winter/spring)

Figure 7-41: **GHF** Products Plots for Daily time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** July/October **1988** (summer/fall)

Figure 7-42: **GHF** Products Plots for Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-I **-** January, February, March, April 1988

Figure 7-43: **GHF** Products Plots for Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-1 **-** May, June, July, August **1988**

Figure 7-44: **GHF** Products Plots for Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-1 **-** September, October, November, December **1988**

Figure 7-45: **GHF** Products Plots for Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** January, February, March, April 1988

Figure 7-46: **GHF** Products Plots for Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** May, June, July, August **1988**

Figure **7-47: GHF** Products Plots for Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** September, October, November, December **1988**

Figure **7-48: GHF** Products Plots Aggregated to the Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-1 **-** January, February, March, and April **1988**

Figure 7-49: **GHF** Products Plots Aggregated to the Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-I **-** May, June, July, and August **1988**

Figure **7-50: GHF** Products Plots Aggregated to the Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-1 **-** September, October, November, and December **1988**

Figure **7-51: GHF** Products Plots Aggregated to the Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** January, February, March, and April 1988

Figure **7-52: GHF** Products Plots Aggregated to the Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** May, June, July, and August **1988**

Figure **7-53: GHF** Products Plots Aggregated to the Monthly time scale using the Reanalysis-2 **-** September, October, November, and December **1988**

8. Conclusion

This work leads to a great deal of meaningful conclusions relative to the computation of water balances. The following is a brief summary of the major findings of this work.

8.1 Regional Water Balances

A number of evaluation methods are used in this work, and are outlined in Chapter **3.** After the extensive use of these methodologies we get a general sense of which are most useful. The absolute error and bias are found to be very effective measures of the water balance residual. Also very useful is the regression slope on the monthly time scale where the adherence of different water balance variables to the seasonal cycle is evaluated.

The sensitivity of the water balance to different calculation methods, as well as domain scale and position is evaluated. The two moisture flux methodologies considered yield similar results for most control volumes. The three runoff methodologies evaluated also yield results which in general do not favor a specific method. The linear method is thought to have the best theoretical basis, but the point method produces slightly better results. The Reanalysis-2 gives slightly better results than the Reanalysis-I for both atmospheric and surface balances.

A large amount of alternative precipitation datasets are used to compute both the atmospheric and surface water balances. The reanalysis precipitation completes both the atmospheric and surface balances consistently better than any other precipitation dataset. **A** specific look at TRMM precipitation datasets indicated these datasets are valuable in refining the water balance over the last five years **(1998-2002).** The use of the change in surface storage term derived from the reanalysis is the most effective method to account for change in surface storage. Nevertheless effective lag times can be found for all basin control volumes that eliminate the dependence on change in storage.

Control volumes which include a great deal of mountainous land (Mississippi, Arkansas, **SWUS,** and Larger **US)** yield poor atmospheric and surface balances. In the more successful South American balances the atmospheric balance is strengthened greatly **by** enlarging the control volume size, and the box control volumes compute a better atmospheric balance than the basin sized control volumes. The surface balance does not change much with basin size or shape.

The most important conclusion drawn from the evaluation of individual water balances is the general precipitation trend in all South American control volumes. The Reanalysis-1 precipitation in the NW Brazil, Larger Rondonia, East Brazil, Rondonia, Amazon, and Porto Velho control volumes increases in the second half of the yearly time series. This increase corresponds well with the moisture flux derived **by** the Reanalysis-1. However, the *55-year* gauge-based precipitation dataset shows no precipitation increase for any of these control volumes. Other precipitation datasets over these regions are also inconsistent in their compliance to the reanalysis. Therefore, although some encouraging atmospheric water balances are computed for these control volumes it is difficult to decide whether these balances are the result of good data, or rather the reanalysis model forcing the data to balance.

8.2 Global Atmospheric Water Balance

In Chapter **6** the atmospheric water balance is computed over the entire globe between **60'N** and **60'S.** The balance is calculated over boxes of **30, 15,** and **7.5** degrees on a side. As the resolution of the control volumes increases from **30** to **15** and **15** to **7.5** degrees on a side, the average residual of all control volumes across the globe increases **by** about a factor of two. Residuals are observed to visibly decrease from the monthly to yearly time scale. At the **30** degree resolution almost all control volumes perform well, and at all resolutions control volumes over the ocean perform. Biases over land at the **15** and **7.5** degree resolution are randomly largely positive and largely negative.

By varying precipitation in the global atmospheric water balance, it becomes apparent that the reanalysis precipitation is the most effective precipitation dataset at closing atmospheric water balances, as expected. Conducting separate balances for each month of the Reanalysis-2, a slightly better monthly balance is obtained in the winter months when all control volumes are taken into consideration in the Reanalysis-2.

By performing this analysis with the last five years of the Reanalysis-1, and replacing the precipitation with the TRMM 3B43 product for all control volumes inside of **30'N** and **30'S** latitude, results in biases that are closer to zero in the summertime. Breaking the Reanalysis-1 down and performing five decade long water balances, no large difference were found between the water balance properties calculated for the different decades.

When land and sea points are separated for various conditions, absolute errors are roughly twice as high over land. It is also observed that **SSM/I** precipitation is much more effective at closing the atmospheric water balance over land than over water.

8.3 Ground Heat Flux Research

A ground heat flux product is generated using the Wang and Bras **(1999)** method of estimation. The Reanalysis-1 and Reanalysis-2 skin temperatures at the 6-hourly, daily, and monthly time scales are used for this derivation for the year **1988.** The key parameter in the derivation of ground heat flux is determined to be the thermal inertia of each land point. An original methodology is devised for obtaining the thermal inertia of all land points in the reanalysis, **by** dividing land points into twelve broad land cover classifications, including snow cover. Daily data is used to regress a thermal inertia for each of these twelve land classifications using all reanalysis ground heat flux data and estimated ground heat flux data for a given land type. These thermal inertias are then used to create a ground heat flux product at the 6-hourly, daily, and monthly time scales.

Samples of the finished product are provided in Chapter **7.** There is a general increase in magnitude and sharpening of the diurnal cycle in the estimated 6-hourly ground heat flux when compared to the reanalysis ground heat flux. Significant areas of improvement include Central Asia and extreme northern and southern regions. The results of the new estimates are comparable to the reanalysis ground heat flux.

8.4 Concluding Remarks

This work includes an extensive evaluation of the Reanalysis-1, Reanalysis-2, and all other relevant and available datasets **by** application to various regional water balances. **Of** specific concern is the lack of ability to close regional water balances over land, specifically over a box of **7.5** degrees to a side. The integrity of the reanalysis data is simply not strong enough to complete such a balance reliably on either the atmospheric or surface levels.

The moisture flux and runoff variables are particularly uncertain. There is some success in calculating the moisture flux **by** known methodologies over regions of interest, but this is largely at the **15** and **30** degree resolutions. The runoff methodologies developed in this study were limited **by** the resolution of the data, and not terribly successful. Basin size control volumes were created as an alternative to box control volumes. Problems arose in the atmospheric balance of these control volumes, since in order to have a reasonably resolved basin a one-degree grid was necessary to form the boundaries of the control volume. However, the only data available to calculate moisture flux was gridded at a **2.5** degree resolution.

A major conclusion of this work is that global hydrometeorological datasets such as the reanalysis should take into account the water balance at finer resolutions when deriving its product. Current technologies are not adequate to close regional scale water balances over a number of years over North or South America at the **7.5** degree resolution. The theoretical framework for such a calculation is simple and well founded. It is the quality of available data that is lacking.

References

Baumgartner, **A., E.** Reichel: **1975:** *The World Water Balance.* R. Oldenbourg, **179 pp.**

- Betts, A.K., Viterbo, P., Wood, **E., 1998:** "Surface Energy and Water Balance for the Arkansas-Red River Basin from the ECMWF Reanalysis," Journal of Climate, **11, 2881-2897.**
- BOREAS (Boreal Ecosystem-Atmosphere Study) **-** Energy, water, heat, co2, and trace gas exchanges, http://www-eosdis.ornl.gov/BOREAS/boreas_home_page.html.
- Chapelon, **N.,** Douville, H., Kosuth, P., Oki, T, 2002 "Off-line Simulation of the Amazon Water Balance: **A** Sensitivity Study with Implications for the GSWP," Climate Dynamics, **19,** *141-154.*
- Chen, T., **J.** Yoon, K. **J.** St. Croix, and **E.S.** Takle, 2001: "Suppressing Impacts of the Amazonian Deforestation **by** the Global Circulation Change," Bulletin of Meteorological Society, **82, 2209-2216.**
- Chen, M., P. Xie, **J.E.** Janowiak, P.A. Arkin, 2002: "Global Land Precipitation: **A 50** Year Monthly Analysis Based on Gauge Observation," Journal of Hydrometeorology, **3,** 249- **265.**
- Ferrero, R.R., F. Weng, **N.C.** Groody, **A.** Basist, **1996:** "An Eight-Year **(1987-1994)** Time Series of Rainfall, Clouds, Water Vapor, Snow Cover, and Sea Ice Derived from **SSM/I** Measurements, **77, 891-905.**
- Gutowski, **W.J.,** Y. Chen, Z. Otles, **1997:** "Atmospheric Water Vapor Transport in **NCEP-NCAR** Reanalysis: Comparison with River Discharge in the Central United States," Bulletin of Meteorological Society, **78, 1957-1969.**

HAPEX **SAHEL** Information System Home Page, http://www.ird.fr/hapex/.

- Henderson-Sellers, **A.,** H. Zhang, and W. Howe, **1996:** "Human and Physical Aspects of Tropical Deforestation," Climate Change: Developing Southern Hemisphere Perspectives, **259-292.**
- Higgins, R.W., Mo K.C., **1996:** "The Moisture Budget of the Central United States in Spring as Evaluated in the **NCEP/NCAR** and the **NASA/DAO** Reanalysis," Monthly Weather Review, 124, **939-963.**
- Huffman, **G.J.** et al, **1997:** "The Global Precipitation Climatology Project **(GPCP)** Combined Precipitation Dataset," Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, **78, 5-20.**
- Janowiak, **J.E.,** Gruber, **A.,** Kondragunta, C.R., Livezey, R.E., Huffman, **G.J., 1998: "A** Comparison of the **NCEP-NCAR** Reanalysis Precipitation and the **GPCP** Rain Gauge-

Satellite Combined Dataset with Observational Error Considerations," Journal of Climate, **11, 2960-2979**

- Janowaik, **J.E.,** P. Xie, **1999: "CAMS-OPI: A** Global Satellite-Rain Gauge Merged Product for Real-Time Precipitation Monitoring Applications, 12, **3335-3342.**
- Kalnay, **E.** et al, **1996:** "The **NCEP/NCAR** 40-Year Reanalysis Project," Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, **77,** 437-471.
- Kanamitsu, M., W. Ebisuzaki, **J.** Woolen, **J.** Wooden, **J.** Porter, M. Fiorino, 2002: "Overview of **NCEP/DOE** Reanalysis-2."
- Lenters, **J.D.,** Coe, M.T., Foley, **J.A.,** 2000: "Surface Water Balance of the Continental United States, **1963-1995:** Regional Evaluation of a Terrestrial Biosphere Model and the **NCEP/NCAR** Reanalysis, *105,* **22393-22425**
- LBA-HydroNET V2.0, http://www.lba-hydronet.sr.unh.edu/database.html.
- Mo, K.C., Higgins, R.W., **1996:** "Large-Scale Atmospheric Moisture Transport as Evaluated in the **NCEP/NCAR** and the **NASA/DAO** Reanalysis," Journal of Climate, *9,* **1531-1545.**
- Nicholson, **S.E.,** Kim, **J.,** Ba, M.B., Lare, A.R., **1997:** "The Mean Surface Water Balance over Africa and Its Interannual Variability," Journal of Climate, **10, 2981-3002.**
- Oki, T., Sud Y.C., **1998:** "Design of Total Runoff Integrating Pathways (TRIP)," [Available online at http://EarthInteractions.org/]
- Rasmussen, E.M., **1967:** "Atmospheric Water Vapor Transport and the Water Balance of North America: Part **I.** Characteristics of the Water Vapor Flux Field," Monthly Weather Review, *95,* 403-426.
- Rasmussen, E.M., **1968:** "Atmospheric Water Vapor Transport and the Water Balance of North America: Part **II.** Large Scale Water Balance Investigations," Monthly Weather Review, **96, 720-734.**
- Rasmussen, E.M., **1971: "A** Study of the Hydrology of Eastern North America Using Atmospheric Vapor Flux Data," Monthly Weather Review, **99, 119-135.**
- Roads, **J.,** Kanamitsu, M., 2002: **"CSE** Water and Energy Budgets in the **NCEP-DOE** Reanalysis II," Journal of Hydrometeorology, **3, 227-248.**
- Rudolf, B., 2001: "Satellite-Based Global Precipitation Estimates and Validation Results," [Author URL http://www.dwd.de/research/gpc].
- Skole, **D., C.** Tucker, **1993:** "Tropical Deforestation and Habitat Fragmentation in the Amazon: Satellite Data from **1978** to **1988,"** Science, **260, 1905-1910.**
- "TRMM Science Operations Plan," **1996.** [Available on-line at http://trmm.gsfc.nasa.gov/publications_dir/sciencedoc.html]
- **USGS (U.S.** Geological Survey) Home Page, http://www.usgs.gov
- Wang, **J.,** R.L. Bras, **1999:** "Ground Heat Flux Estimation from surface soil temperature," Journal of Hydrology, **216,** 214-226.
- Wang, **J.,** R.L. Bras: **"A** New Method for Estimation of Sensible Heat Flux from Air Temperature," Water Resources Research, 34, **2281-2288.**
- Willlmott, **C.J., C.N.** Rowe, Y. Mintz, *1985:* "Climatology of the terrestrial seasonal water cycle," Journal of Climatology, *5,* **589-606.**
- Xie, P., P.A. Arkin, **1995:** "An Intercomparison of Gauge Observations and Satellite Estimates of Monthly Precipitation," Journal of Applied Meteorlogy," **34,** 1143-1160.
- Xie, P., P.A. Arkin, **1997:** "Global Precipitation: **A** 17-Year Monthly Based on Gauge Observations, Satellite Estimates, and Numerical Model Outputs," Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, **11, 2539-2558.**

Appendix A

 $\sim 10^7$

 \sim

 $\sim 10^{11}$

 $\sim 10^{-10}$

 \sim

 \bar{z}

 \sim

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{A})$.

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$.

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 σ

 $\bar{\kappa}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 ω

 $\ddot{}$

Appendix B

Figure B-1: 30 degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Monthly
Global 15 degree Norm. Atmospheric Absolute Error Monthly R2
Global 15 degree Norm. Atmospheric Absolute Error Monthly GPCP

Figure B-2: **15** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-3: **7.5** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-4: **30** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-6: **7.5** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-9: **7.5** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-12: **7.5** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure **B-15: 7.5** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure **B-18: 7.5** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Global Monthly

0.5

Figure B-21: **7.5** degree Regression R^2 Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-22: **30** degree Regression R^2 **1:1** Different Precipitation Global Monthly

0.50 -0.5

 0.5

0.5

Figure B-24: 7.5 degree Regression R^2 1:1 Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-25: 30 degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Global 15 degree Atmospheric Correlation Coeff Monthly R2

Global 15 degree Atmospheric Correlation Coeff Monthly GPCP

Figure B-26: 15 degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Global Monthly
Global 7.5 degree Atmospheric Correlation Coeff Monthly R2
Global 7.5 degree Atmospheric Correlation Coeff Monthly GPCP

Figure **B-27: 7.5** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-28: 30 degree RMSE Different Precipitation Global Monthly
Global 15 degree Atmospheric RMSE Monthly GPCP

Figure B-30: **7.5** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-33: **7.5** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Global Monthly

Figure B-34: **30** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly Global **15** degree Norm, Atmospheric Absolute Error Yearly R2 Global **15** degree Norm Atmosphenc Absolute Error Yearly **GPCP**

Figure **B-35: 15** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure **B-36: 7.5** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure **B-37: 30** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-39: **7.5** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-40: **30** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly Global **15** degree Norm Atmospheric Bias Error Yearly **GPCP**

Figure B-41: **15** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-42: **7.5** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-43: 30 degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-45: **7.5** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-48: **7.5** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-49: 30 degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Global 15 degree Atmospheric Regression Intercept Yearly R2

Global 15 degree Atmospheric Regression Intercept Yearly GPCP Global **30** degree Atmospheric Regression Intercept Yearly R2 Global **15** degree Atmospheric Regression Intercept Yearly **GPCP**

Figure B-51: **7.5** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-52: **30** degree Regression R^2 Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-54: **7.5** degree Regression R^2 Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure **B-57: 7.5** degree Regression R^2 **1:1** Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-60: **7.5** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-61: 30 degree RMSE Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Global 15 degree Atmospheric RMSE Yearly R2

Global 15 degree Atmospheric RMSE Yearly GPCP

Figure **B-63: 7.5** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure B-64: **30** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Global Yearly Global **15** degree Atmospheric Normalized **RMSE** Yearly R2 Global **15** degree Atmospheric Normalized RMSE Yearly **GPCP**

Figure **B-66: 7.5** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Global Yearly

Figure **B-67: 30** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-68: 15** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-69: 7.5** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-70: 30** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-71: 15** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-72: 7.5** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-73: 30** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-73: 30** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-76: 30** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-78: 7.5** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-80: **15** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-82: **30** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-83: 15** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-84: **7.5** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-86: 15** degree Regression R^2 Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-88: 30 degree Regression R^2 1:1 Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-89: 15** degree Regression R^2 **1:1** Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-90: **7.5** degree Regression R^2 **1:1** Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-91: **30** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-92: **15** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-93: **7.5** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure B-94: **30** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-96: 7.5** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-98: 15** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Monthly

Figure **B-100: 30** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-101: **15** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-102: **7.5** degree Normalized Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-104: **15** degree Absolute Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure **B-106: 30** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-108: **7.5** degree Normalized Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B- **110: 15** degree Bias Error Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-1 *12:* **30** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B- 114: **7.5** degree Regression Slope Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B- **116: 15** degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B- **117:** *7.5* degree Regression Intercept Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-118: 30 degree Regression R^{^2} Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-120: **7.5** degree Regression R^2 Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B- 122: **15** degree Regression R^2 **1:1** Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-123: **7.5** degree Regression R^2 **1:1** Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-124: **30** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-125: **15** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure **B-126: 7.5** degree Correlation Coefficient Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure **B-128: 15** degree RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure B-130: **30** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Figure **B-132: 7.5** degree Normalized RMSE Different Precipitation Tropical Yearly

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank **NASA** for sponsoring this work under grant *NAG59640,* Application of TRMM Products in Hydrologic Studies and the Amazon Region. The opinions expressed here do not represent NASA's positions or policies.

I would also like to thank my advisor, Rafael Bras, as well as the members of my research group: Jingfeng Wang, Frederic Chagnon, Jean Fitzmaurice, and Fotis Fotopoulos, without which this work would not be possible.

And lastly, **I** would like to thank to my parents and brother for there never ending support and love.