



Supplement of

Cold climates, complex hydrology: can a land surface model accurately simulate deep percolation?

Alireza Amani et al.

Correspondence to: Alireza Amani (alireza.amani@usherbrooke.ca)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

1 Additional Simulation Results

This section presents a comparison of soil moisture and percolation simulations with and without the soil freezing module activated in the SVS land surface model. To highlight the potential influence of the soil freezing module, the analysis focuses on the months where soil freezing is likely to occur (November to April). Figures S1 and S2 show the daily averaged soil moisture and percolation volumes, respectively, for three periods: November 2019 to April 2020, November 2020 to April 2021, and November 2021 to April 2022.

5



Figure S1. Daily averaged soil moisture $(m^3 m^{-3})$ simulated with and without the soil freezing module in the SVS model. (a) November 2019 to April 2020. (b) November 2020 to April 2021. (c) November 2021 to April 2022 (no observations available for this period). The lines represent the ensemble means of the SVS model with soil freezing (gold brown), without soil freezing ("no frz", grey), and observations from lysimeters L1 (black) and L2 (purple). The shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals of the corresponding SVS ensembles.



Figure S2. Daily averaged percolation (mm d^{-1}) simulated with and without the soil freezing module in the SVS model. (a) November 2019 to April 2020. (b) November 2020 to April 2021. (c) November 2021 to April 2022. The lines represent the ensemble means of the SVS model with soil freezing (gold brown), without soil freezing ("no frz", grey), and observations from lysimeters L1 (black) and L2 (purple). The shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals of the corresponding SVS ensembles.

2 Comparison of PTF-Estimated and Laboratory-Measured Soil Properties

This section presents a comparison of soil hydraulic properties estimated from laboratory measurements and estimated using pedotransfer functions (PTFs). Table S1 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the observed and PTF-predicted soil properties
for topsoil and cover material.

			0	bservation			Model		
Soil Type	Parameter	Z	Min	Max	Median	Ens-Min	Ens-Max	PTF Estimate	PTF Reference
Topsoil	Sand (%)	9	37.0	92.0	75.0				1
	Clay (%)	9	0.0	0.0	0.0				ı
	\mathbf{K}_{sat} (m·s ⁻¹)	58	$1.0 imes 10^{-6}$	$2.1 imes 10^{-4}$	$1.4 imes 10^{-5}$	$5.1 imes10^{-7}$	$5.0 imes 10^{-6}$	$1.29 imes10^{-5}$	Clapp and Hornberger (1978)
	ψ_{ae} (m)	4	0.24	0.51	0.39	0.05	0.45	0.08	Clapp and Hornberger (1978)
	p (-)	4	0.4	2.4	1.0	1.0	2.0	3.50	Clapp and Hornberger (1978)
	$\theta_{sat} \ (\mathrm{m}^3 \cdot \mathrm{m}^{-3})$					0.39	0.44	0.39	Boone et al. (1999)
	$\theta_{fc} (\mathrm{m}^3 \cdot \mathrm{m}^{-3})$					0.08	0.17	0.09	Boone et al. (1999)
	$\theta_{unf} (\mathrm{m}^3 \cdot \mathrm{m}^{-3})$					0.06	0.10	0.03	Niu and Yang (2006)
Cover M.	Sand (%)	5	55.0	78.0	68.0				1
	Clay (%)	S	6.0	12.0	7.0				1
	$\mathbf{K}_{sat} \ (\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{s}^{-1})$	64	$2.0 imes 10^{-6}$	$1.3 imes10^{-4}$	$1.8 imes 10^{-5}$	$1.0 imes 10^{-6}$	$5.0 imes10^{-6}$	$1.01 imes 10^{-5}$	
	ψ_{ae} (m)	2	0.32	0.40	0.35	0.6	0.8	0.10	
	(-) q	٢	1.3	2.1	1.9	1.0	3.5	4.53	
	$\theta_{sat} \ (\mathrm{m}^3 \cdot \mathrm{m}^{-3})$					0.35	0.37	0.40	
	$\theta_{fc} (\mathrm{m}^3 \cdot \mathrm{m}^{-3})$					0.20	0.28	0.18	
	$\theta_{unf} (\mathrm{m}^3 \cdot \mathrm{m}^{-3})$					0.03	0.05	0.06	
Table S1. Des	criptive statistics of	labor	atory-estimated	l and PTF-pred	icted physical a	ind hydraulic se	oil properties fc	or topsoil and cov	ver material. Observed parameters
include percer	ntages of sand and c	slay, si	aturated hydrau	dic conductivit	y (K_{sat}), air er	try pressure (η	b_{ae}), and the b_{e}	coefficient. 'N' r	epresents the number of samples.
'Ens-Min' and	1 'Ens-Max' indicat	te para	ameter ranges fo	or ensemble co.	nstruction. 'PT	F Estimate' rej	presents the me	an estimate fron	1 the pedotransfer function (PTF),

Table S1. Descriptive statistics of laboratory-estimated and PTF-predicted physical and hydraulic soil properties for topsoil and cover material. Observed parameter
include percentages of sand and clay, saturated hydraulic conductivity (K_{sat}), air entry pressure (ψ_{ac}), and the b coefficient. 'N' represents the number of sample:
'Ens-Min' and 'Ens-Max' indicate parameter ranges for ensemble construction. 'PTF Estimate' represents the mean estimate from the pedotransfer function (PTF
and 'PTF Reference' indicates the source of the PTF.

References

15

Boone, A., Calvet, J.-C., and Noilhan, J.: Inclusion of a Third Soil Layer in a Land Surface Scheme Using the Force-Restore Method., Journal of Applied Meteorology, 38, 1611–1630, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1999)038<1611:IOATSL>2.0.CO;2, 1999.

Clapp, R. B. and Hornberger, G. M.: Empirical Equations for Some Soil Hydraulic Properties, Water Resources Research, 14, 601–604, https://doi.org/10.1029/WR014i004p00601, 1978.

Niu, G.-Y. and Yang, Z.-L.: Effects of Frozen Soil on Snowmelt Runoff and Soil Water Storage at a Continental Scale, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 7, 937–952, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM538.1, 2006.