

Interactive comment on “The role of glacier dynamics and threshold definition in the characterisation of future streamflow droughts in glacierised catchments” by Marit Van Tiel et al.

L. M. Tallaksen

lena.tallaksen@geo.uio.no

Received and published: 2 June 2017

The paper addresses an important topic related to the influence of glaciers on the flow regime in a future (warmer) climate, and drought in particular. My remarks relate primarily to the terminology used for defining drought and do not address the full paper as such.

Two different threshold approaches are employed; a threshold based on the historical period and a transient threshold approach, whereby the threshold adapts every year in the future to the changing regimes. In both cases, drought occurs when the discharge falls below the threshold. A daily variable threshold is used (80th percentile), defined

C1

based on a 30-day moving average time series. There is no seasonal distinction made and droughts can occur any time of the year as long as the flow is below the daily varying threshold.

The study, which is based on two catchments, projects “extreme increases in drought severity in the future” for the scenario HVT-D, i.e. a historical threshold combined with a dynamical glacier area. More specifically, the simulations show a lower peak flow and a shift towards an earlier melt peak, implying higher than normal flow early in the summer season and lower than normal flow towards the end of the melt period (ref. Figure 7). Accordingly, the projected increase in drought severity (from the time of the peak and onwards) is mainly caused by a change in the timing of the melt peak, or as stated in the paper, “by the regime shift due to a reduction in glacier area”. (It is recommended to use the same scale on the y-axis for the different plots in Figure 7 to ease the comparison.)

Both catchments have typically glacier flow regimes with low flows in winter and high flows in summer. Projected changes in flow seasonality in catchments with glaciers are strongly linked to changes in the snow regime with more precipitation falling as rain (rather than snow) and less snow accumulating (with the exception of some high altitude regions). Milder winters are projected to lead to earlier spring flood, a tendency that can already be observed for Norway (Wilson et al., 2010). Similar, warmer spring and summers are projected to lead to earlier and more glacier melt (as long as the glacier volume does not reduce too much). However, a shift in the timing or a reduction in the flow during the snow or glacier melt season is not associated with an increase in drought in these cold climate regions; neither by the snow/glacier research communities nor by water management. Rather, if focus is on drought, there is a concern that a longer snow free season combined with an increase in evapotranspiration may lead to increased drought in the following low flow period (e.g. Wilson et al., 2010). Glacierised catchments located in wet climates such as western part of Norway are further expected to be less prone to droughts in the future as compared to catchments

C2

located in drier climates.

The terms 'flood' and 'drought', as well as 'high flow' and 'low flow' periods are well defined concepts in hydrology, and I would strongly argue against using the term 'drought' for a period with relatively low flow during the high flow season or equivalent, 'flood' for a period with relatively high flow during the low flow season, merely based on their percentage deviations from the seasonal flow regime (and not their impacts). Rather, I suggest referring to these deviations as streamflow anomalies (or deficiencies for drought) as originally proposed by Stahl (2001) when introducing the daily varying threshold approach, and later elaborated in Hisdal et al. (2004). As highlighted in these studies, the variable threshold approach is adapted to detect streamflow deviations during both high and low flow seasons, and periods with relatively low flow during the high flow season are commonly not considered droughts. Still, lower than normal flows during high flow seasons may be important for later drought development.

References

Hisdal, H., Tallaksen, L.M. Clausen, B. Peters, E. & Gustard, A. (2004) Hydrological Drought Characteristics. In: L.M. Tallaksen & H.A.J. van Lanen (Eds), Hydrological Drought Processes and Estimation Methods for Streamflow and Groundwater. Developments in Water Sciences 48. Elsevier B.V., the Netherlands, 139-198.

Stahl, K. (2001). Hydrological drought: A study across Europe (Doctoral dissertation, Institut für Hydrologie der Universität). Available online through: freidok.uni-freiburg.de

Wilson, D., Hisdal, H and Lawrence, D. (2010) Has streamflow changed in the Nordic countries? – Recent trends and comparison to hydrological projections. *J. Hydrol.*, 394, 334-346.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-119>, 2017.