



**HESSD**

12, 7405–7436, 2015

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)



[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



# Multiscale evaluation of the standardized precipitation index as a groundwater drought indicator

R. Kumar<sup>1</sup>, J. L. Musuza<sup>1,2</sup>, A. F. Van Loon<sup>3,4</sup>, A. J. Teuling<sup>3</sup>, R. Barthel<sup>5</sup>,  
J. Ten Broek<sup>3</sup>, J. Mai<sup>1</sup>, L. Samaniego<sup>1</sup>, and S. Attinger<sup>1,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UFZ-Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Leipzig, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Now at the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

<sup>3</sup>Hydrology and Quantitative Water Management Group, Wageningen University, Wageningen, the Netherlands

<sup>4</sup>Now at the School of Geography, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

<sup>5</sup>Department of Earth Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

<sup>6</sup>Institute of Geosciences, University of Jena, Jena, Germany

Received: 2 July 2015 – Accepted: 16 July 2015 – Published: 5 August 2015

Correspondence to: R. Kumar (rohini.kumar@ufz.de)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

## Abstract

The lack of comprehensive groundwater observations at regional and global scales has promoted the use of alternative proxies and indices to quantify and predict groundwater droughts. Among them, the Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) is commonly used to characterize droughts in different compartments of the hydro-meteorological system. In this study, we explore the suitability of the SPI to characterize local and regional scale groundwater droughts using observations at more than 2000 groundwater wells in geologically different areas in Germany and the Netherlands. A multiscale evaluation of the SPI is performed using the station data and their corresponding 0.5° gridded estimates to analyze the local and regional behavior of groundwater droughts, respectively. The standardized anomalies in the groundwater heads (SGI) were correlated against SPIs obtained using different accumulation periods. The accumulation periods to achieve maximum correlation exhibited high spatial variability (ranges 3 to 36 months) at both scales, leading to the conclusion that an a priori selection of the accumulation period (for computing the SPI) would result in inadequate characterization of groundwater droughts. The application of the uniform accumulation periods over the entire domain significantly reduced the correlation between SPI and SGI ( $\approx 21\text{--}66\%$ ) indicating the limited applicability of SPI as a proxy for groundwater droughts even at long accumulation times. Furthermore, the low scores of the hit rate (0.3–0.6) and high false alarm ratio (0.4–0.7) at the majority of the wells and grid cells demonstrated the low reliability of groundwater drought predictions using the SPI. The findings of this study highlight the pitfalls of using the SPI as a groundwater drought indicator at both local and regional scales, and stress the need for more groundwater observations and accounting for regional hydrogeological characteristics in groundwater drought monitoring.

## HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

### Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



# 1 Introduction

Drought as a natural hazard is often associated with high socio-economic losses and damage to ecosystems (Wilhite, 2000). Many of these drought effects are not directly caused by rainfall deficits, but are related to below-average storage conditions in surface water, reservoirs, and groundwater that are the consequences of the propagation of a meteorological drought into the hydrological system (Tallaksen and Van Lanen, 2004; Mishra and Singh, 2010; Sheffield and Wood, 2011; Seneviratne et al., 2012). Due to a lack of large-scale groundwater and surface water observations, most scientists and water resources managers interested in drought predictions have to rely on proxy data to quantify storage conditions.

One widely-used approach is to use drought indices based solely on precipitation (e.g. Standardized Precipitation Index; SPI), because precipitation records generally have good spatial coverage and long observation periods required for drought analysis. It is then assumed that by computing the SPI over longer time scales (e.g., 3, 6, 12 or more months), it mimics the filtering effect of catchment storage conditions and hence captures the smooth precipitation deficits typical for hydrological (groundwater) droughts (Seneviratne et al., 2012; Joetzjer et al., 2013; Li and Rodell, 2015). Although the SPI is recognized as an effective meteorological drought index (Hayes et al., 2010) due to its relative ease of computation and comparability across climates, some studies have questioned its application for groundwater drought monitoring because the translation of precipitation deficits into hydrologic (groundwater) droughts is non-linear (Bloomfield and Marchant, 2013; Teuling et al., 2013; Van Loon et al., 2014).

Another approach to quantify drought is based on the use of large-scale gridded data products, e.g., from hydrologic models or satellites (e.g., Sheffield et al., 2004; Andreadis et al., 2005; Vidal et al., 2010; Samaniego et al., 2013; van Huijgevoort et al., 2013; Prudhomme et al., 2014; Mo and Lettenmaier, 2013; Nijssen et al., 2014; Hao et al., 2014; Li and Rodell, 2015; Damberg and AghaKouchak, 2014; Wanders et al., 2015; AghaKouchak et al., 2015). An extensive multi-model study (Prudhomme

## HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

### Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



et al., 2014) for example, projected increases in hydrological drought severity in many areas around the world. This approach also has limitations in its application at local to regional scale hydrological drought monitoring because of scale mismatches and some issues in the correct representation of storage in models (Gudmundsson et al., 2012; Van Loon et al., 2012; Tallaksen and Stahl, 2014). The importance of spatial variation in groundwater drought conditions resulting from complexity in subsurface conditions is increasingly recognized (Peters et al., 2006; Bloomfield and Marchant, 2013; Stoelzle et al., 2014).

While there are many studies that have focused on analyzing the propagation of meteorological droughts through the hydrologic systems for improved process understanding of the evolution of groundwater droughts (e.g., Eltahir and Yeh, 1999; Peters et al., 2003, 2006, 2005; Tallaksen et al., 2006, 2009; Weider and Boutt, 2010; Van Loon et al., 2014), there is still lack of observational-based studies to verify whether hydrological drought proxies, like precipitation-based indices (SPI) and gridded data products, are suitable for groundwater drought monitoring at regional to local scales relevant for water management. Recently, Bloomfield and Marchant (2013) introduced the Standardized Groundwater level Index (SGI), similar to the SPI, and found a site specific relationship between the two indices. Their study was, however, limited to the analysis of local scale behavior of groundwater droughts at 14 sites across the UK.

In this data-based exploratory study, we test the suitability of the SPI to characterize groundwater droughts using observations at more than 2000 groundwater wells located in Germany and the Netherlands. We used this large set of groundwater wells to comprehensively analyze the local to regional behavior of groundwater droughts and investigate the scale mismatch between local and regional scale estimates. A focus on groundwater was preferred to other hydrological variables because of the immense multi-sectoral importance of the resource (Famiglietti, 2014). Given the wide-spread availability and usage of precipitation-based drought indices, we hypothesize that if adequate accumulation periods and lead times are applied to the precipitation signal, the observation-based SPI can predict groundwater droughts. In this maiden attempt

we carry out a quantitative evaluation of the performance of the widely-used SPI for groundwater drought monitoring on a local to regional scale using a large collection of groundwater well records, focusing on the statistical skill and not on the causing factors. The results of this study will provide insight to the water-sector practitioners and managers on the precautions demanded if they are to use local precipitation data or large-scale gridded estimates to characterize groundwater droughts.

## 2 Method

### 2.1 Study area and data

The study was performed using monthly groundwater observations from two hydro-geologically different regions located in southern Germany and central Netherlands (Dutch province of Gelderland) with 1991 and 49 groundwater wells, respectively (Fig. 1). The Dutch region is characterized by the maritime climate and the wells are located on a relatively low terrain, but with large spatial differences in unsaturated zone and groundwater conditions. The German wells are located in a region with hilly to mountainous terrain, with continental climate and a wide range of unconsolidated and consolidated geological formations. The monthly groundwater data for the German wells were collected from the Bavarian Environment Agency (LfU Bayern) and the State Institute for Environment, Measurements and Nature Conservation Baden-Württemberg (LUBW). The data for the Dutch wells were acquired from the Dutch institute TNO ([www.dinoloket.nl/](http://www.dinoloket.nl/)). The selected wells' records did not exhibit significant signs of anthropogenic influences and could therefore allow the understanding of the natural response of the groundwater to the precipitation signal. The majority of the selected wells (around 90%) are located in shallow aquifers with an average depth to the water table within 20m below the ground surface (see Fig. 3a for the well distribution). The length of records varied from well to well with a minimum of 10 years (Fig. 1) starting from the year 1951 for the German wells and 1988 for the Dutch wells.

# HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



# HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

It should be noted that the 10-year criterion does not meet the recommended minimum 30 years (McKee et al., 1993; Guttman, 1999) for estimating drought indices (i.e., SPI or SGI). However, a longer cutoff of 30 years would lower the number of qualifying wells significantly. For example, all the Dutch wells would have been excluded under this criterion (Fig. 1). The limited availability of in situ groundwater data records as well as the variable record lengths are inevitable problems in performing groundwater drought studies over a large domain (see e.g., Peters et al., 2006; Weider and Boutt, 2010; Li and Rodell, 2015). We nevertheless have tested the reliability of our results to this data availability issue (as discussed later in Sect. 3.1).

The daily precipitation time series at every well were extracted from their gridded estimates computed based on the available rain-gage network (Samaniego et al., 2013; ten Broek et al., 2014). The underlying point measurement data from about 5600 rain gauges for Germany and 51 rain gauges for the Netherland were acquired from the German Meteorological Service (DWD) and the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI), respectively. Interested readers may refer to Samaniego et al. (2013) and ten Broek et al. (2014) for more details on processing with the precipitation data sets for the German and the Dutch regions, respectively. The monthly total precipitation was then computed from their respective daily estimates to match the temporal resolution of groundwater records. Additionally, prior to the SPI calculations, the precipitation time series was filtered based on the temporal availability of groundwater records to ensure the comparability between the two time series.

## 2.2 Drought indices

The Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) was developed by McKee et al. (1993) to characterize the wetness and dryness conditions of a region based on the departure of the monthly precipitation estimate from their (average) normal value. The SPI can be estimated for different time scales by accumulating the monthly precipitation over different periods, typically at 3, 6, 12, 24, or 36 months (see McKee et al., 1993 for a detailed treatment). In most applications of the SPI, an analytic distribution function

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



(e.g., the gamma) is fitted to the long-term precipitation record for a given accumulation period, and then the corresponding cumulative probability distribution is computed. Finally, the cumulative probability distribution is transformed to the standard normal distribution to estimate the SPI (Lloyd-Hughes and Saunders, 2002; Mishra and Singh, 2010; Dai, 2011; Seneviratne et al., 2012). Any month with an SPI value below (above) zero is assumed to reflect dry (wet) conditions. Fitting theoretical distribution functions to data is potentially problematic because it is difficult to determine the structural form of the distribution function in advance. For example, Guttman (1999) found for the SPI that the gamma distribution was the best universal model, whereas Lana et al. (2001) found that data from Catalonia in Spain could best be modeled with the Poisson-gamma distribution. Additional problems may arise if the data exhibits multi-modality.

To avoid these problems and minimize the uncertainty associated with the selection and estimation of parametric distribution functions, we used a non-parametric kernel density estimator to compute the cumulative probability distributions of the precipitation and groundwater data. The kernel density  $\hat{f}(x)$  is given as

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{k=1}^n K\left(\frac{x - x_k}{h}\right) \quad (1)$$

where  $h$  represents the bandwidth,  $K(x)$  the kernel smoothing function,  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  the set of variable of interest (i.e., precipitation or groundwater level), and  $n$  the sample size. We used the Gaussian kernel in this study because of its unlimited support and estimated the bandwidth  $h$  by an optimization against a cross-validation error estimate (see Samaniego et al., 2013 for details). The distribution functions and the corresponding bandwidths were estimated for each well and calendar month separately. The resulting quantiles, bounded on  $[0, 1]$ , are denoted hereafter as SPI and SGI for precipitation and groundwater, respectively. The quantile-based index has been used in several recent drought studies (Sheffield et al., 2004; Andreadis et al., 2005; Vidal et al., 2010; Samaniego et al., 2013), and can be easily transformed to the unbounded range of the standard normal distribution (Vidal et al., 2010). The

SPI and SGI values below (above) 0.5 denote dry (wet) conditions. Compared to the absolute values of groundwater heads (precipitation estimates), the transformed SGI (SPI) values facilitate better the comparison across space and season (Sheffield et al., 2004).

### 2.3 Experimental setup and evaluation criteria

In this study, we explore the ability of SPI to characterize the local and regional scale behavior of groundwater droughts. Therefore, we carried out our analysis at two disparate scales denoted hereafter as the point and the grid scales. The point scale analysis was performed on well-by-well basis using their available SPI and SGI time series. We based this analysis on the assumption that the zone of influence for changes in groundwater levels is limited to the area directly surrounding the well as most of the wells are located within shallow aquifers (see, Fig. 3 for the distribution of average depth to the water table across the investigated wells). We note that the approach chosen here is consistent with that commonly used in previous groundwater studies (e.g., Bloomfield and Marchant, 2013; Li and Rodell, 2015). On the other hand, the grid scale analysis was carried out using the monthly estimates of drought indices gridded at a 0.5° spatial resolution – the scale which is commonly used in regional and global scale drought studies (e.g., Sheffield et al., 2004; Andreadis et al., 2005; Gudmundsson et al., 2012; Seneviratne et al., 2012; Van Loon et al., 2012; Tallaksen and Stahl, 2014; Wanders et al., 2015). The gridded fields of drought indices were estimated using a procedure similar to the ones employed in creating multi-model drought indices (see, e.g., Mo and Lettenmaier, 2013; Nijssen et al., 2014). Following this procedure, the individual estimates of well-specific drought index were combined into a single grid representative estimate by averaging the drought index from those wells which lie within the selected grid cell. The resulting monthly estimates at each grid were then converted into a percentile based drought index following the (non-parametric kernel) density estimator approach illustrated in Sect. 2.2 for the well-specific data sets. The number of qualifying wells with at least 10 years of records per grid cell varied across

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

⏴

⏵

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





the study domain between (1 and 261) for Germany and (1 and 14) for the Netherlands with a median value of around 21 and 5 wells, respectively.

To provide a qualitative skill of the SPI to characterize the SGI, we first examine the spatio-temporal relationship between the two indices based on the cross-correlation analysis. Here we consider the entire spectrum [0, 1] of the SPI and the SGI, without distinguishing between dry or wet regimes. The analysis was performed separately for both point and grid scale data sets, with different accumulations and lags of SPI ranging from 1 to 48 months. In this analysis, we used the Spearman rank correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) as a non-parametric measure to quantify the strength of a monotonic relationship between the SPI and SGI. Since the propagation of precipitation signals to the groundwater is highly nonlinear, the rank correlation was preferred over the traditional Pearson (linear) correlation coefficient in this analysis. The goal here was to identify what accumulations and lags of SPI are required to align the signals of precipitation with the groundwater heads; and how they vary in space for both point and the gridded data sets.

In the subsequent analysis, we focus on assessing the ability of SPI to detect groundwater droughts based on SGI. A drought is defined when the indices (i.e., SPI or SGI) fall below a certain threshold ( $\tau$ ), taken here as 0.2 following previous studies (Sheffield et al., 2004; Andreadis et al., 2005; Vidal et al., 2010; Samaniego et al., 2013). According to the drought classification scheme used by the U.S. Drought Monitor (USDM; <http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu>), more severe and extreme drought conditions appear when the indices fall below the  $\tau$  value of 0.1 and 0.05, respectively. The reliability of groundwater drought predictions made by the SPI for different drought classes can be assessed using probabilistic scores based on the probability of detection or hit rate ( $H$ ) and the false alarm ratio ( $F$ ). Following the ( $2 \times 2$ ) contingency table, the hit rate ( $H$ ) is given by

$$H = \frac{a}{a + c} \quad (2)$$

## HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

### Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



and the false alarm ratio ( $F$ ) represented as

$$F = \frac{b}{a + b} \quad (3)$$

where  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  are the hits, false alarms and misses, respectively (Wilks, 2011). In our case, the hit rate  $H$  is the fraction of all groundwater drought events correctly predicted by the SPI (i.e., the ratio of the number of times the SPI predicts a groundwater drought when the SGI indicates the occurrence of one, to the total number of times the SGI indicates drought conditions). The false alarm ratio  $F$  represents the fraction of forecasted drought events that were false alarms (i.e., the ratio of the number of times the SPI predicts a groundwater drought when the SGI does not indicate one, to the total number of times the SPI predicts droughts). The best scores for  $H$  and  $F$  are 1 and 0, respectively; and the worst values being 0 and 1, respectively.

### 3 Results and discussion

#### 3.1 Cross-correlation analysis between SPI and SGI

The results of the cross-correlation analysis between SGI and SPI at different accumulations and lags reveal a large degree of spatial variability in the accumulation period  $A$  to achieve maximum correlation  $r_m$  at both point and grid scales (Fig. 2). The  $A$  value corresponding to the  $r_m$  is referred hereafter as an “optimal” accumulation period. The estimates of  $A$  across the majority of wells and grid cells (> 90 %) in both study regions varied broadly between 3 and 36 months with an overall median value of around 6 to 12 months. The relatively large variation of  $A$  values across the investigated wells signifies the importance of the underlying climate, soil, vegetation, and aquifer properties in modulating the precipitation signals for groundwater flows.

Our preliminary analysis indicated that the wells located in comparatively very thick unsaturated zones or deeper groundwater tables exhibited on average higher

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



accumulation periods, and vice-versa (Fig. 3a). For example, the higher accumulation values (> 24 months) in the middle of the (Gelderland) Dutch region are due to the presence of a relatively thicker unsaturated zone going up to 30m deep (Fig. 2). Consistent with the theoretical expectation, a similar relationship between the accumulation periods and the depth to the water table was reported recently by Li and Rodell (2015) when analyzing groundwater droughts at wells located in the Mississippi river basin and near-by regions. In general, deeper groundwater tables (or thicker unsaturated zone) cause more attenuation of the high frequency precipitation signals, and require longer accumulations of precipitation to properly align with the smoothed variability of groundwater signals (Barthel, 2011). On the other hand, the shallower groundwater table responds more quickly to high frequency precipitation events and the variability of the groundwater anomalies is better explained by the shorter timescale of the SPI. There are, however, exceptions to this general behavior and the temporal dynamics of groundwater indices (SGI) at some wells in shallower aquifers exhibited better correlation with a longer time scale SPI, going up to 48 months (Fig. 3a). This highlights the need to take into account other hydrogeological and well-specific information like aquifer release and storage characteristics, perforation type, borehole location, among others (Bloomfield and Marchant, 2013; Stoelzle et al., 2014). The lack of complete information on these characteristics at every well hinders further investigation of this issue. We note that the focus of this study is not on identifying potential factors or relationships explaining the spatial variability of accumulation periods. Nevertheless, we emphasize here that the results of this (limited) exploratory analysis (Fig. 3a) show the opportunity for establishing a first-order regional relationship between the accumulation period and the average depth to water table, for which global estimates are now becoming available (Fan et al., 2013).

The lag times ( $L$ ) leading to maximum correlation ( $r_m$ ) between the SPI and SGI show a limited spatial variability across the majority of wells and grid cells with values generally close to zero (Fig. 2b). This implies that the temporal anomalies of the groundwater heads (SGI) at those locations are aligned to those of the (accumulated)

## HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

### Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



precipitation (SPI). Results of our analysis did indicate a substantial variation in the maximum correlation ( $r_m$ ) across the investigated wells, pointing out the lack of a uniform strong relationship between SPI and SGI (Fig. 2c). The  $r_m$  values ranged between 0.40 and 0.87 for the majority of German wells, and between 0.47 and 0.87 for the Dutch wells with the overall median  $r_m$  value of around 0.68 and 0.70, respectively. A relatively weaker correlation between SPI and SGI was found for wells located in a shallower aquifer, where the average depth to the water table is less than 5 m (Fig. 3b). The  $r_m$  value estimated across these shallower wells was on average around 0.64, whereas for wells located in a relatively deeper aquifer (with water table depth > 5 m) the average  $r_m$  was 0.72. This trend of the correlation ( $r_m$ ) with the average water table depth is, however, not so strongly pronounced as in a case of the accumulation period (Fig. 3a and b).

We also tested the reliability of the above results against the data availability issue. The  $A$  and  $r_m$  obtained across all wells were grouped into three categories according to their available record lengths (i.e., in 10–20, > 20–30, and > 30 years). Both the spread and the average behavior of the optimal accumulation period ( $A$ ) and the maximum correlation ( $r_m$ ) were comparable across the group of wells with different record lengths (Fig. 3c and d). This shows that the above presented results are reliable and are not contingent on the selection of wells with either short or long record lengths. We also emphasize here that our results are not biased to the selected statistical criteria (i.e., rank correlation). Similar results (not shown here) were obtained using other criteria such as the Pearson correlation coefficient and the mean absolute error; both exhibited substantially large (small) variations in the accumulation (lag) periods across the analyzed wells and grid cells.

### 3.2 SPI with spatially uniform accumulation periods

The spatial variation in the optimum accumulation periods shown in Fig. 2 demonstrates that there exists no single representative value that is applicable over the entire domain. A noticeable reduction in the correlation values ( $r$ ) between SGI

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



and SPI was observed when a uniform accumulation period was applied to all wells or grid cells (Fig. 4). For instance, the correlation estimated across the investigated wells on average reduced from the  $r_m$  value of 0.67 to 0.23, 0.46, 0.53, 0.50, 0.44, and 0.27 for the 1, 3, 6, 12, 24, and 48 months of uniform accumulations, respectively.

Around 10 to 65 % of the wells exhibited a notably low correlation with  $r$  values less than 0.3. The gridded data sets exhibited slightly better correspondence between SPI and SGI than the point ones, with the maximum correlation being dropped from 0.73 to 0.26, 0.54, 0.62, 0.64, 0.56, and 0.35 for the 1, 3, 6, 12, 24, and 48 months of uniform accumulations, respectively. In this case, nearly 5–60 % of the grid cells exhibited notably low correlation values below 0.3. Among the different uniform accumulation periods, the strongest correlation between SGI and SPI was observed for 6–12 months of accumulations, while the weakest link was found for the one month precipitation accumulation (Fig. 4). These results suggest that the changes in the monthly groundwater levels can not be explained by the month-to-month precipitation variability, rather the smoothed response of groundwater requires the contribution from seasonal to annual precipitation. These results are consistent with findings of other recent studies performed in different regions (e.g., Bloomfield and Marchant, 2013; Li and Rodell, 2015), and the findings here assert to the general notion of the groundwater system acting as a low pass filter, responding to moderate climate forcings (e.g., Eltahir and Yeh, 1999; Weider and Boutt, 2010).

The discrepancy between SGI and SPI was further quantified using the mean absolute error ( $E$ ) criterion to provide a quantitative estimate of the error  $E$  in the units of the SPI or SGI (i.e., between 0 and 1). The resulting  $E$  value for both point and gridded data sets on average ranged between 0.17 and 0.26 for different accumulation periods of the SPI (Fig. 4). These are quite substantial errors considering that the threshold used to classify between a drought and a no-drought event is usually taken as 0.2 for the quantile based drought indices (Sheffield et al., 2004; Andreadis et al., 2005; Vidal et al., 2010; Samaniego et al., 2013). In this case, even the minimum mean absolute error ( $E$ ) estimates corresponding to the spatially varying optimal

accumulation periods were fairly large with an average estimate of around 0.15–0.16 for the point and the gridded data sets. These high degrees of discrepancies between the SGI and the SPI clearly indicate the inability of the precipitation based drought index to adequately characterize groundwater drought events.

Results of our analysis also show a relatively larger spread in both statistical criteria (i.e.,  $r$  and  $E$ ) estimated for the point data sets as compared to the gridded ones (Fig. 4). This once again emphasizes the importance of local scale heterogeneities in propagating the precipitation signals to groundwater. Clearly, the exhibited high variability of precipitation and groundwater anomalies at a point scale are smoothed out at a grid scale due to the spatial averaging that resulted in a better correspondence between the gridded indices at a regional scale (Fig. 4). Despite the better agreement, the error between the gridded SGI and SPI at any of the uniform or the optimal accumulation periods remained substantially high with an average value of at least 0.15 – the error level that is comparable to a threshold value ( $\tau = 0.2$ ) used to classify droughts.

### 3.3 Temporal evolution of SPI and SGI

Figure 5 shows the exemplary time series of the SGI and SPI at 6 and 12 months of the accumulation periods for all wells and grid cells and their respective spatial averages for an overlapping period of 1995–2006. The SGI estimates for both point and gridded data sets exhibited higher spatial variability that cannot be adequately represented by their respective SPIs regardless of the accumulation periods used. This points out the enhanced role of soil, vegetation, and hydro-geological properties in propagating the precipitation signal through the subsurface. These observations are consistent with the findings of Weider and Boutt (2010) who also found that groundwater levels in New England have higher (spatial) variability in their responses than other hydro-meteorological variables including precipitation and streamflows.

The SPI and the SGI for large-scale drought events like that of 1996 and 2003 show a remarkable regional difference between German and Dutch wells (Fig. 5).

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

I◀

▶I

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



A drought is defined when the indices (e.g., SPI) fall below a threshold ( $\tau$ ) value of 0.2. For instance, the regionally averaged SPI estimates indicate the most severe and extended (prolonged) droughts during the 1996 event for Dutch wells, which was not so strongly pronounced at the German wells (Fig. 5). The opposite behavior was, however, noticed for the 2003 drought event, where the SPI pointed towards more severe drought situations at the German wells than at the Dutch wells. The regional differences were also apparent in the anomalies of groundwater heads (SGI) with German wells showing on average a relatively smoother groundwater response compared to the highly fluctuating and variable groundwater anomalies at the Dutch wells (Fig. 5). In comparison to the SPI, the regionally averaged SGI exhibited far less severe drought conditions, although there were some wells at which the drought severity based on SGI and SPI were comparable (Fig. 5). Notably, the 1996 and the 2003 drought events that appeared in the averaged SPI at the Dutch and the German wells, respectively, were not strongly pronounced in their respective SGI estimates to characterize these events as severe large-scale groundwater droughts. This underpins the inability of the SPI to satisfactorily characterize droughts in the groundwater compartment even when applied at longer time scales.

### 3.4 Skill of the SPI to predict groundwater droughts

The skill of the SPI to predict groundwater droughts is assessed using the probabilistic scores based on the hit rate ( $H$ ) and the false alarm ratio ( $F$ ) (see Sect. 2.3 for a description of their estimation). The results shown in Fig. 6 for  $H$  indicate that for a drought threshold  $\tau$  of 0.2, the SPI was only able to correctly predict three out of five ( $H \geq 0.6$ ) SGI-based groundwater droughts at less than 12% of the German and 16% of the Dutch wells for any of the two uniform accumulation periods (6 and 12 months) of SPI. Even in the case of the SPI corresponding to the spatially varying optimal accumulation period (Fig. 6a), only 21 and 18% of the German and the Dutch wells exhibited an  $H$  score greater than 0.6, respectively. The low reliability of the groundwater drought predictions using the SPI was also confirmed from the  $F$  scores,

shown in Fig. 7, for which at least three in every five events ( $F > 0.6$ ) were wrongly predicted at around 50 % of the wells for both uniform accumulation periods (6 and 12 months) of SPI. In this case, around 30 % of the wells in both regions exhibited a high false alarm ratio ( $F > 0.6$ ) for groundwater drought predictions using the SPI with the optimal accumulation periods (Fig. 7a).

Although the skill of the SPI for the gridded data sets was better than that of the well-specific ones, both the  $H$  and the  $F$  scores for the gridded data were far from their best scores (Figs. 6 and 7). Overall, the  $H$  score on average ranged between 0.52 and 0.58 for the optimal and uniform accumulation periods of SPI, and the corresponding  $F$  score varied between 0.44 and 0.50. These results clearly highlight the limited skill of the gridded SPI to capture regional scale groundwater droughts with either optimal or uniform accumulation periods of SPI.

Results of the further analysis for predicting more severe and extreme groundwater drought conditions also revealed a significantly poor skill of the SPI at both point and grid scales (Fig. 8). For example, the 6 and 12 months of uniform accumulation period based SPI predictions for the severe groundwater drought conditions ( $\tau = 0.1$ ) exhibited an average hit rate  $H$  of around 0.26 (i.e., only one in every four events is correctly predicted) for the point data sets, and around 0.33 (i.e., only one in every three events is correctly predicted) for the gridded data sets. The corresponding average  $F$  score was quite high around 0.79 (i.e., nearly four in every five events predicted are false alarms) and 0.67 (i.e., two in every three events predicted are false alarms), respectively. Even with the spatially varying optimal accumulation period, the overall skill of the SPI was poor, with an average  $H$  score of 0.30 and 0.39 for the point and the gridded data sets, respectively. The corresponding  $F$  score was 0.72 and 0.60, respectively.

The performance of the SPI further deteriorated drastically for the predictions of the extreme groundwater drought conditions ( $\tau = 0.05$ ), regardless of the accumulation periods and spatial resolution of the data sets (Fig. 8). These results highlighted the limited reliability of the SPI for predicting groundwater droughts at different severity levels. Among other things, these levels are used for watching (or tracking) the onset,

## HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

### Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





development, and termination of drought events – essential elements to any effective drought monitoring system (e.g., USDM). The skillful predictions of these drought conditions are of critical importance because planners and water managers need to know for example the onset of droughts to take appropriate drought mitigative actions to reduce damages (Hayes et al., 2010).

## 4 Conclusions

In this study we assessed the ability of the precipitation based drought index (SPI) to characterize groundwater droughts at more than 2000 wells located in two regions in Germany and the Netherlands. These two groundwater networks consisting of a large number of wells and available records allowed us to quantitatively evaluate the skill of the SPI for groundwater drought monitoring at a local and regional scale using the well-specific and the 0.5° gridded data sets, respectively. On the basis on this data-based exploratory analysis, we found that the precipitation needs to be accumulated over several (3–24) months to (temporally) align the SPI with the SGI time series at both local and regional scales, reflecting the significantly smoothed response of groundwater to precipitation signals. Despite this alignment and with a relatively fair degree of correlation, the SPI lacked the skill to predict groundwater droughts based on SGI. The necessary accumulation periods varied considerably in space however and were not known beforehand. We found that the thickness of the unsaturated zone (expressed here as the average depth to the water table) partly but not entirely controlled the spatial variation of the accumulation period. The groundwater levels at the wells located in relatively deeper aquifers exhibited on average stronger correlation with longer time scale SPI, and vice-versa. There was, however, a considerable noise in this relationship and further studies are required to investigate the possible role of other land-surface and hydro-geological properties including aquifer storage and transmission characteristics.

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



# HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The application of the uniform accumulation periods over the entire domain significantly reduces the correlation between SPI and SGI indicating the limited applicability of SPI as a proxy for groundwater droughts even at long accumulation times. The differences between the SGI and SPI at both point and gridded data sets were substantially high and generally comparable to the often used threshold value ( $\tau = 0.2$ ) to classify droughts. Based on the results of this multiscale analyses, the assumption of an average smoothing of precipitation to mimic groundwater response during droughts is highly unrealistic.

Depending on the region, the severity of SPI-based drought events differed greatly from those based on the SGI. In some cases the SPI-based extreme droughts (e.g., 1996 or 2003) only showed up in some groundwater wells but not in the spatially-averaged SGI, indicating the enhanced role of the subsurface medium in modulating the precipitation signal. Future studies may look into disentangling the roles of the individual subsurface medium attributes and climatic factors. The predictions of groundwater droughts at different severity levels are crucial for water utilities and regulators for planning (e.g., management of abstraction rates and tariffs, etc) and decision making (e.g., restricting water usage and rationing). The results of the probabilistic scores based on the hit rate and the false alarm ratio clearly indicated the inability of the SPI to capture these aspects of drought conditions, and would therefore be inadequate for monitoring and planning purposes.

In contrast to recent studies (e.g., Bloomfield and Marchant, 2013; Li and Rodell, 2015) that have mainly focused on analyzing the correlation between precipitation-based index and groundwater drought index over their entire ranges [0, 1], representing both dry and wet conditions, here we specifically aimed at analyzing the ability of the SPI to predict groundwater drought conditions at different severity levels. These analyses have allowed us to gain more insights into the limitations of a precipitation-based drought index to properly identify the groundwater droughts. Based on the results obtained in this study, the hypothesis that the observation-based SPI can

adequately predict groundwater droughts could not be supported for the analyzed point and gridded data sets.

The evidence presented in this study regarding the inability of the SPI to characterize groundwater drought events at both local and regional scales calls for a different observation-based indicator like the SGI. If for data availability reasons, the precipitation-based drought indicator is used for groundwater drought studies, the aforementioned limitations should be borne in mind. Finally we stress the need for putting more efforts in the collection and collation of groundwater data, so that groundwater observations become available on global scale to characterize groundwater drought and the availability of subsurface water resources during drought, at spatial scales small enough to be relevant for water resources management.

*Acknowledgements.* We are grateful to the Bavarian Environment Agency (LfU Bayern) and the State Institute for Environment, Measurements and Nature Conservation Baden-Württemberg (LUBW) who provided the southern Germany groundwater data sets for use in GLOWA-Danube ([www.glowa-danube.de](http://www.glowa-danube.de)), a project funded by the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF); and the German Weather Service (DWD) for providing the precipitation data for Germany. We also wish to thank the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI) in De Bilt, the Netherlands ([www.knmi.nl/index\\_en.html](http://www.knmi.nl/index_en.html)) for providing the precipitation data and the Dutch institute TNO ([www.dinoloket.nl/](http://www.dinoloket.nl/)) for the Dutch groundwater level data. The Dutch authors were partly funded by the EU-FP7 project DROUGHT-R&SPI (contract no. 282769). This paper supports the work of the UNESCO-IHP VIII FRIEND programme and the Helmholtz Climate Initiative REKLIM project.

The article processing charges for this open-access publication were covered by a Research Centre of the Helmholtz Association.

## HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

### Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

⏴

⏵

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## References

- AghaKouchak, A., Farahmand, A., Melton, F., Teixeira, J., Anderson, M., Wardlow, B., and Hain, C.: Remote sensing of drought: progress, challenges and opportunities, *Rev. Geophys.*, 53, 452–480, doi:10.1002/2014RG000456, 2015. 7407
- 5 Andreadis, K. M., Clark, E. A., Wood, A. W., Hamlet, A. F., and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Twentieth-century drought in the conterminous United States, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 6, 985–1001, 2005. 7407, 7411, 7412, 7413, 7417
- Barthel, R.: An indicator approach to assessing and predicting the quantitative state of groundwater bodies on the regional scale with a special focus on the impacts of climate change, *Hydrogeol. J.*, 19, 525–546, 2011. 7415
- 10 Bloomfield, J. P. and Marchant, B. P.: Analysis of groundwater drought building on the standardised precipitation index approach, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 17, 4769–4787, doi:10.5194/hess-17-4769-2013, 2013. 7407, 7408, 7412, 7415, 7417, 7422
- Dai, A.: Drought under global warming: a review, *WIREs Climate Change*, 2, 45–65, 2011. 7411
- 15 Damberg, L. and AghaKouchak, A.: Global trends and patterns of drought from space, *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, 117, 441–448, 2014. 7407
- Eltahir, E. A. B. and Yeh, P. J.-F.: On the asymmetric response of aquifer water level to floods and droughts in Illinois, *Water Resour. Res.*, 35, 1199–1217, 1999. 7408, 7417
- Famiglietti, J. S.: The global groundwater crisis, *Nature Climate Change*, 4, 945–948, 2014. 7408
- 20 Fan, Y., Li, H., and Miguez-Macho, G.: Global patterns of groundwater table depth, *Science*, 339, 940–943, 2013. 7415
- Gudmundsson, L., Tallaksen, L. M., Stahl, K., Clark, D. B., Dumont, E., Hagemann, S., Bertrand, N., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Hanasaki, N., Voss, F., and Koirala, S.: Comparing large-scale hydrological model simulations to observed runoff percentiles in Europe, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 13, 604–620, 2012. 7408, 7412
- 25 Guttman, N. B.: Accepting the standardized precipitation index: a calculation algorithm, *J. Am. Water Resour. As.*, 35, 311–322, 1999. 7410, 7411
- Hao, Z., AghaKouchak, A., Nakhjiri, N., and Farahmand, A.: Global integrated drought monitoring and prediction system, *Scientific Data*, 1, 140001, doi:10.1038/sdata.2014.1, 2014. 7407
- 30

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Hayes, M., Svoboda, M., Wall, N., and Widhalm, M.: The Lincoln Declaration on drought indices: universal meteorological drought index recommended, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 92, 485–488, 2010. 7407, 7421

Joetzier, E., Douville, H., Delire, C., Ciais, P., Decharme, B., and Tyteca, S.: Hydrologic benchmarking of meteorological drought indices at interannual to climate change timescales: a case study over the Amazon and Mississippi river basins, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 17, 4885–4895, doi:10.5194/hess-17-4885-2013, 2013. 7407

Lana, X., Serra, C., and Burgueño, A.: Patterns of monthly rainfall shortage and excess in terms of the standardized precipitation index for Catalonia (Spain), *Int. J. Climatol.*, 21, 1669–1691, 2001. 7411

Li, B. and Rodell, M.: Evaluation of a model-based groundwater drought indicator in the conterminous U.S., *J. Hydrol.*, 526, 78–88, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.09.027, 2015. 7407, 7410, 7412, 7415, 7417, 7422

Lloyd-Hughes, B. and Saunders, M. A.: A drought climatology for Europe, *Int. J. Climatol.*, 22, 1571–1592, 2002. 7411

McKee, T. B., Doesken, N. J., and Kleist, J.: The relationship of drought frequency and duration to time scales, in: *Proceedings of the 8th Conference on Applied Climatology*, vol. 17, American Meteorological Society, Boston, MA, USA, 179–183, 1993. 7410

Mishra, A. K. and Singh, V. P.: A review of drought concepts, *J. Hydrol.*, 391, 202–216, 2010. 7407, 7411

Mo, K. C. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Objective drought classification using multiple land surface models, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 15, 990–1010, 2013. 7407, 7412

Nijssen, B., Shukla, S., Lin, C., Gao, H., Zhou, T., Ishottama, Sheffield, J., Wood, E. F., and Lettenmaier, D. P.: A Prototype Global Drought Information System Based on Multiple Land Surface Models, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 15, 1661–1676, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-13-090.1, 2014. 7407, 7412

Peters, E., Torfs, P. J. J. F., van Lanen, H. A. J., and Bier, G.: Propagation of drought through groundwater – a new approach using linear reservoir theory, *Hydrol. Process.*, 17, 3023–3040, 2003. 7408

Peters, E., van Lanen, H. A. J., Torfs, P. J. J. F., and Bier, G.: Drought in groundwater-drought distribution and performance indicators, *J. Hydrol.*, 306, 302–317, 2005. 7408

Peters, E., Bier, G., van Lanen, H. A. J., and Torfs, P. J. J. F.: Propagation and spatial distribution of drought in a groundwater catchment, *J. Hydrol.*, 321, 257–275, 2006. 7408, 7410

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Prudhomme, C., Giuntoli, I., Robinson, E. L., Clark, D. B., Arnell, N. W., Dankers, R., Fekete, B. M., Franssen, W., Gerten, D., Gosling, S. N., Hagemann, S., Hannah, D. M., Kim, H., Masaki, Y., Satoh, Y., Stacke, T., Wada, Y., and Wisser, D.: Hydrological droughts in the 21st century, hotspots and uncertainties from a global multimodel ensemble experiment, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 111, 3262–3267, 2014. 7407

Samaniego, L., Kumar, R., and Zink, M.: Implications of parameter uncertainty on soil moisture drought analysis in Germany, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 14, 47–68, 2013. 7407, 7410, 7411, 7413, 7417

Seneviratne, S. I., Nicholls, N., Easterling, D., Goodess, C., Kanae, S., Kossin, J., Luo, Y., Marengo, J., McInnes, K., Rahimi, M., Reichstein, M., Sorteberg, A., Vera, C., and Zhang, X.: Changes in climate extremes and their impacts on the natural physical environment, in: *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation*, A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Field, C. B., Barros, V., Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Dokken, D. J., Ebi, K. L., Mastrandrea, M. D., Mach, K. J., Plattner, G.-K., Allen, S. K., Tignor, M., and Midgley, P. M., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, NY, USA, 167–172, 2012. 7407, 7411, 7412

Sheffield, J. and Wood, E. F.: *Drought: past problems and future scenarios*, Earthscan Publications Ltd, 2011. 7407

Sheffield, J., Goteti, G., Wen, F., and Wood, E. F.: A simulated soil moisture based drought analysis for the United States, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D24108, doi:10.1029/2004JD005182, 2004. 7407, 7411, 7412, 7413, 7417

Stoelzle, M., Stahl, K., Morhard, A., and Weiler, M.: Streamflow sensitivity to drought scenarios in catchments with different geology, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 6174–6183, 2014. 7408, 7415

Tallaksen, L. M. and Stahl, K.: Spatial and temporal patterns of large-scale droughts in Europe: model dispersion and performance, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 429–434, 2014. 7408, 7412

Tallaksen, L. M. and van Lanen, H. A. J. (Eds.): *Hydrological Drought – Processes and Estimation Methods for Streamflow and Groundwater*, Developments in Water Sciences 48, Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 2004. 7407

Tallaksen, L. M., Hisdal, H., and van Lanen, H. A. J.: Propagation of drought in a groundwater fed catchment, the Pang in the UK, in: *Climate Variability and Change: Hydrological Impacts*, edited by: Demuth, S., Gustard, A., Planos, E., Scatena, F., and Servat, E., vol. 308, International Association of Hydrological Sciences (IAHS), 5th FRIEND World Conference

# HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Havana, Cuba, 27 November–1 December 2006, IAHS Publication, Wallingford, UK, 128–133, 2006. 7408

Tallaksen, L. M., Hisdal, H., and Lanen, H. A. V.: Space-time modelling of catchment scale drought characteristics, *J. Hydrol.*, 375, 363–372, 2009. 7408

ten Broek, J., Teuling, A. J., and Van Loon, A. F.: Comparison of drought indices for the province of Gelderland, the Netherlands, Tech. Rep. 16, DROUGHT-R and SPI, Wageningen, the Netherlands, 2014. 7410

Teuling, A. J., Loon, A. F. V., Seneviratne, S. I., Lehner, I., Aubinet, M., Heinesch, B., Bernhofer, C., Grünwald, T., Prasse, H., and Spank, U.: Evapotranspiration amplifies European summer drought, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 2071–2075, doi:10.1002/grl.50495 2013. 7407

van Huijgevoort, M. H. J., Hazenberg, P., van Lanen, H. A. J., Teuling, A. J., Clark, D. B., Folwell, S., Gosling, S. N., Hanasaki, N., Heinke, J., Koirala, S., Stacke, T., Voss, F., Sheffield, J., and Uijlenhoet, R.: Global multimodel analysis of drought in runoff for the second half of the twentieth century, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 14, 1535–1552, 2013. 7407

Van Loon, A. F., Van Huijgevoort, M. H. J., and Van Lanen, H. A. J.: Evaluation of drought propagation in an ensemble mean of large-scale hydrological models, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 16, 4057–4078, doi:10.5194/hess-16-4057-2012, 2012. 7408, 7412

Van Loon, A. F., Tjeldeman, E., Wanders, N., Van Lanen, H., Teuling, A. J., and Uijlenhoet, R.: How climate seasonality modifies drought duration and deficit, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 119, 4640–4656, 2014. 7407, 7408

Vidal, J.-P., Martin, E., Franchistéguy, L., Habets, F., Soubeyroux, J.-M., Blanchard, M., and Baillon, M.: Multilevel and multiscale drought reanalysis over France with the Safran-Isba-Modcou hydrometeorological suite, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 14, 459–478, doi:10.5194/hess-14-459-2010, 2010. 7407, 7411, 7413, 7417

Wanders, N., Wada, Y., and Van Lanen, H. A. J.: Global hydrological droughts in the 21st century under a changing hydrological regime, *Earth Syst. Dynam.*, 6, 1–15, doi:10.5194/esd-6-1-2015, 2015. 7407, 7412

Weider, K. and Boutt, D. F.: Heterogeneous water table response to climate revealed by 60 years of ground water data, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37, L24405, doi:10.1029/2010GL045561, 2010. 7408, 7410, 7417, 7418

Wilhite, D. A.: Drought as a Natural Hazard: Concepts and Definitions, in: Drought: A Global Assessment. Hazards and Disasters: A Series of Definitive Major Works, Chapter 1, edited by: Keller, A. Z., Routledge Publishers, London, UK, 2000. 7407

5 Wilks, D. S.: Statistical Methods in the Atmospheric Sciences, 3rd Edn., Academic Press, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 2011. 7414

# HESSD

12, 7405–7436, 2015

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version


Interactive Discussion






## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.




**Figure 1.** The locations of (a) German and (b) Dutch wells overlaid on the respective terrains. The marker colors show the number of months  $N_m$  with available records during the periods 1950–2013 and 1988–2013 for German and Dutch wells, respectively.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)




**Figure 2.** The (a) optimal accumulation  $A$  (month) and (b) lag periods  $L$  (month) required to obtain the (c) maximum correlation  $r_m$  (-) between the SGI and SPI at point and gridded ( $0.5^\circ$ ) scales for German (top) and Dutch (bottom) data sets.



**Figure 3.** Box-and-whisker plots of the optimal accumulation period ( $A$ ) and the maximum correlation ( $r_m$ ) estimated for a group of wells with varying depth to water table (top: **a** and **b**) and record lengths (bottom: **c** and **d**). The percentage of wells falling within each group is indicated at the top of every plot.

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI


R. Kumar et al.



**Figure 4.** The correlation  $r$  (top) and the mean absolute error  $E$  (bottom) estimated between the SGI and SPI of the 1, 3, 6, 12, 24, and 48 months of uniform accumulations for the point and the gridded data sets. Their respective maximum ( $r_m$ ) and the minimum ( $E_m$ ) estimates corresponding to the optimal accumulation periods of SPI are also shown in the leftmost of the panels. Results are summarized here as average  $\pm$  one standard deviation.

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI


R. Kumar et al.



**Figure 5.** The monthly time series of the 6 and 12 month point (light blue) and gridded (light pink) SPI and the respective spatial averages (dark blue and dark red) for **(a)** German and **(b)** Dutch data sets. The bottom plots are the corresponding SGI time series and their spatial averages. The black dashed line depicts the drought threshold  $\tau$  of 0.2.

## Groundwater drought prediction using SPI

R. Kumar et al.



**Figure 6.** The hit rate ( $H$ ) to detect SGI based groundwater droughts using the SPI with the (a) optimal accumulation period and (b, c) 6 and 12 months of uniform accumulation periods at the point and gridded scales for German (top) and Dutch (bottom) data sets. A threshold value  $\tau$  of 0.2 is used to identify drought events.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

I ◀

▶ I

◀

▶

Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version


Interactive Discussion





**Figure 7.** The false alarm ratio ( $F$ ) to detect SGI based groundwater droughts using the SPI with the (a) optimal accumulation period and (b, c) 6 and 12 months of uniform accumulation periods at the point and gridded scales for German (top) and Dutch (bottom) data sets. A threshold value  $\tau$  of 0.2 is used to identify drought events.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[I ◀](#)
[▶ I](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)

**Figure 8.** The hit rate ( $H$ ) and the false alarm ratio ( $F$ ) averaged over all investigated **(a)** wells and **(b)** grid cells to detect SGI based groundwater droughts using the SPI with the optimal accumulation and 6 and 12 months of uniform accumulation periods for varying levels of threshold value  $\tau$  (0.2, 0.1, and 0.05) used to identify drought events.

