# Groundwater impacts on soil moisture simulation

# Guo-Yue Niu, Zong-Liang Yang,

Department of Geological Sciences, Jackson School of Geosciences, The University of Texas at Austin

# and Ken Mitchell

CCSM Workshop June 18th, 2008

# Problems due to free drainage

#### Total soil water storage: ds/dt = P - E - R

- 1. Upper-boundary condition (P E R<sub>sur</sub>)
- 2. Lower-boundary condition ( R<sub>sub</sub>)

#### **Redistribution among layers:**

- 1. Soil hydraulic properties ( $K_{sat}$ ,  $\psi_{sat}$ )
- 2. Vertical distribution of roots

#### Problems due to free drainage (GLDAS/Noah)



Top 0.4m

Top 1.0m

Top 2.0m

# A simple groundwater model (SIMGM) (Niu et al., 2007)



#### Problems when applied to CLM: too wet soil, possibly due to

- Too small recharge rate from soil to aquifer (too small  $K_a$ );
- Too strong upward flow (too large soil suction,  $\psi_{bot}$ );
- Too small groundwater discharge inducing overflow of groundwater to soil

# Modifications to SIMGM

#### Enlarge hydraulic conductivity K<sub>a</sub>

 $C_{mic} * \psi_{bot}$ 

 $K_{bot} (1 - \exp(-f(z_{wt} - z_{bot})) / (f(z_{wt} - z_{bot})) \rightarrow K_{bot}$ 

Enlarge  $R_{sbmax}$  by  $e^2 = 7.39$  (for Noah) groundwater discharge rate:  $R_{sb} = R_{sbmax} * exp(-f * z_{wt})$   $\Rightarrow R_{sb} = R_{sbmax} * exp(-f * (z_{wt} - z_{bot}))$ surface runoff rate:  $R_{sf} = P * F_{max} exp(-0.5 * f * z_{wt})$   $\Rightarrow R_{sf} = P * F_{max} exp(-0.5 * f * (z_{wt} - z_{bot}))$ Limit upward flow:



C<sub>mic</sub> → fraction of micropore content 0.0 – 1.0 (0.0 ~ free drainage)

# Capillary Fringe and Soil Pore-Size Distribution

#### See http://www.earthdrx.org/poresizegwflow.html



#### Capillary Tubes

Capillary rise is related to the diameter of the tube: the smaller the tube diameter the greater the rise of the water column

Capillarity is due to adhesion of water to a surface and cohesion of the adhered water to and among other water molecules



#### Macropore effects:

- 1. Larger recharge rate (through macropores)
- 2. Smaller upward flow (through micropores)

## Tests against Sleepers River streamflow data



# Soil moisture simulations in Illinois



# Noah LSM with CLM schemes

Stomatal resistance: Ball-Berry Soil moisture stress factor : metric potential Micropore degree: Cmic = 0.0 (free drainage)

#### Soil moisture numerical scheme:

CLM vs. Noah



# Noah LSM with CLM schemes

CLM soil moisture numerical scheme Soil moisture stress factor: CLM Stomatal resistance: Ball-Berry also changed s1 = 0.5\*(SMC(k)+SMC(min(nsoil,k+1)))/smcmax to s1 = SMC(k)/smcmax

Micropore degree:  $C_{mic} = 0.0$  vs.  $C_{mic} = 0.4$ 



9

# Noah LSM with CLM Schemes

CLM soil moisture numerical scheme Stomatal resistance: Ball-Berry Micropore degree: Cmic = 0.0 (Free drainage)

#### Soil moisture stress factor: btran





# Noah LSM with CLM schemes

CLM soil moisture scheme Soil moisture stress factor: BATS Stomatal resistance: Ball-Berry Micropore degree:  $C_{mie} = 0.0$  vs.  $C_{mie} = 0.6$ 



### Noah LSM with CLM schemes:

CLM soil moisture scheme Soil moisture stress factor: BATS Stomatal resistance: Ball-Berry Micropore degree: Cmic = 0.6 2L averaged SM vs. 1L SM to compute hydraulic conductivity



12

Groundwater is really important for modeling soil moisture, both for mean-state and variability.

We propose to modify SIMGM to account for macropore effects:

1. Enlarge recharge rate from soil to aquifer and

2. Limit the upward flow from aquifer to soil; and

**3. Enlarge groundwater discharge rate (to avoid overflow to soil)** 

C<sub>mic</sub> is an important calibration parameter and largely depends on surface schemes, e.g., formulations of soil moisture stress factor, although it should depend on deep soil structure.

Larger  $C_{mic}$  for larger E at the surface; Smaller  $C_{mic}$  for smaller E at the surface