

Interactive comment on “A Simple Temperature-Based Method to Estimate Heterogeneous Frozen Ground within a Distributed Watershed Model” by Michael L. Follum et al.

Michael L. Follum et al.

michael.l.follum@usace.army.mil

Received and published: 22 October 2017

We would like to thank Referee #1 for their comments and suggestions. We appreciate all their insights about the paper and hope our responses address their suggestions and facilitate further discussion.

Main Issue #1, The frozen ground index method proposed requires numerous forcing data, therefore why use it instead of an energy balance approach?: The main goal of this study is to develop a frozen ground method that can be used within a

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



variety of watershed models, and we believe that the new modCFG1 model has two significant advantages within this context. First, many watershed models do not explicitly simulate soil moisture, which would be required to implement an energy balance method. The modCFG1 method can also use soil moisture to simulate the depth of frozen ground (as presented in this study), but soil moisture is not required to simulate the presence/absence of frozen ground. Thus, the modCFG1 method can still be used to identify frozen soil for runoff production purposes even when soil moisture is not simulated. Second, the modCFG1 method still requires fewer types of forcing data and fewer parameters than energy balance models. For example, the attached figure compares the forcing data requirements for two energy balance models (COUP and SHAW) along with the data requirements for the pre-existing CFG1 model and the new modCFG1 model. The energy balance models both require radiation data that are not readily available for many watersheds. In contrast, modCFG1 model requires cloud cover data, which are routinely measured at most airports (data archived in the U.S. at the National Centers for Environmental Information, <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/>) as well as many meteorological stations. Although it is difficult to determine the total number of parameters that are required by energy balance models, the modCFG1 likely requires specification of many fewer parameters, which reduces the potential for equifinality. In the revised paper, we plan to include a clearer statement of the paper's goals in the Introduction section, a short discussion of data requirements in the Model Application section, and a discussion of the model's use in data-sparse environments in the Conclusions.

Main Issue #2, Results are OK, but not exciting.: We agree that simulating temporal variability of frost depth remains a difficult problem for this model and others. However, the results in this paper are still a valuable contribution for three reasons. First, although temperature index models are commonly used in practice, very few studies have tested such models against observed frost depths. This study provides a rare evaluation of the existing CFG1 model. Second, the proposed modCFG1 model performs much better than the CFG1 model in capturing the spatial variability of frozen ground within the

watershed (Figures 5 and 6). Figure 6 shows that the modCFG1 model better captures the different frost depths at the various sites in the watershed. Accurate representation of the spatial pattern of frozen ground is expected to be important in capturing its role in flood production. Regarding temporal variability, the modCFG1 better reproduces the high (e.g., WY 2007) and low (e.g. WY2008) frost depths and better captures the presence of frozen ground (Table 6). Third, the results suggest that litter depth is an important control on frost depth (last paragraph on page 21).

Specific Comment #1, Interesting to see comparison of radiation-derived proxy temperature (T_{rad}) to air temperature (T_{a}).: The values of T_{rad} tend to be higher than T_{a} when a cell has more direct sunlight (due to the cell's aspect and slope). Cloud and canopy cover also affect the T_{rad} pattern. In contrast, T_{a} in the CFG1 model is estimated only using elevation. The impact of T_{rad} on snowpack was examined in Follum et al. (2015). We agree with the reviewer that a comparison between T_{rad} and T_{a} is important for the present study, and we will add this comparison to the results (likely in section 4.1) in the revised manuscript. Also, the effects of canopy that were highlighted in Webster et al. (2017) will be included in the discussion of the results.

Specific Edit Page 2, Line 17 “When the frost index exceeds a threshold, the soil is considered frozen and impermeable to infiltration.”: We agree that frozen soils are not completely impermeable to infiltration, especially in forested environments (Lindstrom et al. 2002; Bayard et al., 2005; Nyberg et al., 2001; Shanley and Chalmers, 1999). However, this statement is referring to how some hydrologic models use degree-day frozen ground methods (such as CFG1) to restrict infiltration. In the revised manuscript, a clarification will be added (with citations) that indicates that this approach sometimes deviates from reality.

Specific Edit Page 20, Line 7 “...because any frozen ground has the potential to impede infiltration and produce flooding.”: This statement will be modified to: “...because even shallow frost with high moisture content (concrete frost) has the potential to impede infiltration and produce flooding.”

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Specific Edit Page 8, Line 30 Description of frost tubes.: The CRREL-Gandahl frost tubes (Ricard et al., 1976) were used at SREW. The reviewer is correctâĂŹthe frost tubes were filled with a methylene blue solution where freezing depth is identified by a change in colour within the tube (blue indicates thawed, clear indicates frozen). More details on the method of frost depth measurement will be provided on Page 8, with a reference to Vermette and Kanack (2012) who include images and descriptions of frost tubes that are similar to those used at SREW.

Specific Edit Pages 18 and 19, Figures 5 and 6: We agree with the reviewer that the change in elevation (and thus temperature) has small effect on snow and frozen ground within SREW. We appreciate the recommendation to cite the recent work by Stähli (2017), and we will include it in the results and discussion section.

Specific Edit Pages 25-29 Cited literature almost exclusively from North America.: We agreeâĂŹresearch outside of North America will be added including numerical modelling approaches such as COUP (Jansson 2001; Jansson and Karlburg, 2010) and DWHC (Chen et al., 2007) and field investigations (Stähli 2017; Lindstrom et al. 2002; Bayard et al., 2005; Bayard and Stähli, 2005; Nyberg et al., 2001).

Specific Edit Pages 25-29 Inclusion of Campbell et al., (2010).: The research by Campbell et al. (2010) is related to our work and will be included in the Introduction and the Results and Discussion sections.

REFERENCES:

Chen, R.S., Kang, E.S., Ji, X.B., Yang, Y., Zhang, Z.H., Qing, W.W., Bai, S.Y., Wang, L.D., Kong, Q.Z., Lei, Y.H., Pei, Z.X.: Preliminary study of the hydrological processes in the alpine meadow and permafrost regions at the headwaters of Heihe River, *Journal of Glaciology and Geocryology*, 29(3), 387-396, 2007.

Bayard, D., Stähli, M.: Effects of frozen soil on the groundwater recharge in Alpine areas, *Climate and hydrology in mountain areas*. Wiley, Chichester, 73-83, 2005.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Bayard, D., Stähli, M., Pariaux, A., Flühler, H.: The influence of seasonally frozen soil on the snowmelt runoff at two Alpine sites in southern Switzerland, *Journal of Hydrology* 309(1), 66-84, 2005.

Flerchinger, G., Saxton, K.E.: Simultaneous heat and water model of a freezing snow-residue-soil system I, Theory and development, *Transactions of the ASAE*, 32(2), 565-0571, 1989.

Follum, M.L., Downer, C.W., Niemann, J.D., Roylance, S.M., Vuyovich, C.M.: A radiation-derived temperature-index snow routine for the GSSHA hydrologic model, *Journal of Hydrology*, 529, Part 3, 723-736, 2015.

Jansson, P.E.: Coupled heat and mass transfer model for soil-plant-atmosphere systems. 2001.

Jansson, P.E., Karlberg, L.: Coupled heat and mass transfer model for soil-plant-atmosphere systems, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, p. 454, 2010.

Lindstrom, G., Bishop, K., Lofvenius, M.O.: Soil frost and runoff at Svartberget, northern Sweden—Measurements and model analysis, *Hydrological Processes*, 16, 3379–3392, 2002.

Molnau, M., Bissell, V.C.: A continuous frozen ground index for flood forecasting, *Proceedings 51st Annual Meeting Western Snow Conference*, Canadian Water Resources Association, Cambridge, Ontario, 109-119, 1983.

Nyberg, L., Stähli, M., Mellander, P.E., Bishop, K.: Soil frost effects on soil water and runoff dynamics along a boreal forest transect: 1. Field investigations, *Hydrological Processes*, 15, 909 – 926, 2001.

Ricard, J.A., Tobiasson, W., Greatorex, A.: The field assembled frost gage, United States Army Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, 1976.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Scherler, M., Hauck, C., Hoelzle, M., Stähli, M., Völksch, I.: Meltwater infiltration into the frozen active layer at an alpine permafrost site, *Permafrost and Periglacial Processes* 21(4), 325-334, 2010.

Shanley, J.B., Chalmers, A.: The effect of frozen soil on snowmelt runoff at Sleepers River, Vermont, *Hydrological Processes*, 13, 1843-1857, 1999.

Stähli, M.: Hydrological significance of soil frost for pre-alpine areas, *Journal of Hydrology*, 546, 90-102, 2017.

Vermette, S., Kanack, J.: Modeling frost line soil penetration using freezing degree-day rates, day length, and sun angle, 69th Eastern Snow Conference, Frost Valley YMCA, Claryville, New York, USA, 2012.

Webster, C., Rutter, N., Jonas, T.: Improving representation of canopy temperatures for modeling subcanopy incoming longwave radiation to the snow surface, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 122(17), 9154-9172, 2017.

Interactive comment on *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-345>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



	Energy Balance COUP Model (Scherler et al., 2011)	Energy Balance SHAW Model (Flerchinger and Saxton, 1989)	Temperature-Index CFG1 Model ¹ (Molnau and Bissel, 1983)	Modified Temperature-Index modCFG1 Model Proposed
Precipitation	✓	✓	✓	✓
Air Temperature	✓	✓	✓	✓
Relative Humidity	✓	✓		✓
Wind Speed	✓	✓		
Global or Net Radiation	✓	✓		
Incoming Long-Wave Radiation	✓			✓
Cloud Cover				

¹ Assumes CFG1 is combined with a Temperature-Index Snow model (which requires precipitation)

² Using the RTI snow model which requires precipitation and relative humidity (both RTI and modCFG1 require cloud cover)

Fig. 1. Required forcing data for the COUP, SHAW, CFG1, and modCFG1 frozen ground models.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

