

Response to review comments on the paper “Comparison of published palaeoclimate records suitable for reconstructing annual to sub-decadal hydroclimatic variability in eastern Australia: implications for water resource management and planning” by Flack et al. (Manuscript number: hess-2020-314)

Reply to comments from Reviewer #2 (Lisa Davis):

2-1. *This paper examines decadal and sub-decadal hydroclimatological changes in eastern Australia by performing a meta-analysis or synthesis of pre-existing multi-proxy paleorecords from within or in proximity to the region. The results of the paleorecord analyses are applied within the context of a water resources management framework. This paper does several things that make it a novel and timely contribution of broad interest to many communities (including the paleoenvironmental, hydrologic, hydroclimatologic, and water resources communities) and a good fit for HESS, with its integrative perspective as a journal.*

Although the number of regional and continental scale syntheses of paleoenvironmental data have increased over the last decade, too few exist for many locations in the world to make these data accessible and viable for use by hydrologists and water resource professionals. This paper helps ameliorate this issue for a large region of the Australian continent. A second contribution of this work is that it presents a methodology for others to follow to increase the number of regional to continental scale interpretations of paleoenvironmental data for the purposes of water resource management. There is a great need for longer records of hydroclimatological data, particularly when it comes to extremes and droughts because 20th century precipitation and flow records, typically used as the basis for forecasting the occurrence of future extremes, is too short to have a statistically relevant number of extreme event observations to make their predictions of extremes reliable. This problem has been documented worldwide and it could be argued all of humanity is at the precipice of a hydrological crisis given how many major infrastructure designs are based on a 20th century record that no longer applies. Many researchers are producing site specific, paleoenvironmental data, spanning millennia and thus a wide range of hydroclimatological regimes. But they are not analyzing and disseminating the results in a framework that would facilitate the adoption of this information by the hydrologic modeling and water resources community. Thus, the importance of this paper is that it demonstrates a method for interpreting and applying paleoenvironmental data to address water resources and hydrologic assessments of extreme events for others to follow.

This paper being published so soon after the revision of flood frequency guidelines (US Geological Survey Bulletin 17C, released in final form in 2017) makes the paper a very timely publication. These guidelines, designed to inform federal water regulators in the U.S. but used the world over, recommend combining paleodata with instrumented precipitation and streamflow records to improve the reliability of extreme flood prediction.

Author Response: Thanks for these positive comments. You summarise the intent of our paper well – to demonstrate how insights from palaeoclimate data can be used to improve hydroclimatic risk assessments and water resources management.

Response to review comments on the paper “Comparison of published palaeoclimate records suitable for reconstructing annual to sub-decadal hydroclimatic variability in eastern Australia: implications for water resource management and planning” by Flack et al. (Manuscript number: hess-2020-314)

2-2. *Introduction - The emphasis of the introduction should be flipped to make the Australia specific information, currently in the first paragraph, be secondary to the information in the bulleted points about the global issue of short, 20th century records being used as the basis of precip and hydro forecasts. As part of making the broader relevance of the paper more apparent, I suggest expanding the bulleted information between 45-55. I think the point made later about the recommendations of the USGS’s newly revised flood frequency guidelines (Bulletin 17C) should be introduced in here as well.*

Author Response: Agree. Thanks for this suggestion. The Introduction has been revised as suggested.

2-3. *Table 1: I would state which multiproxy methods were used so that it is easier for the reader to quickly verify that an annual resolution of data applies. For the Gallant and Gergis (2011), for example, I would change to “Tree Rings & Coral.”*

Author Response: Revised as suggested.

2-4. *Table 1: Regarding the remote records, McGowan et al. 2009 is not included in the references. It needs to be added.*

Author Response: Apologies, the details for McGowan et al. (2009) have now been added to the references.

2-5. *I found a paper by the same lead author (McGowan) about streamflow reconstructions in the MD River Basin: Geophysical Research Letters (GRL) <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL037049>. If the GRL paper is the same used as a data source for the analyses, I’m not sure I agree that it fits the needs of the analysis. The GRL paper reconstructs streamflow for the Murray River in Australia based on a statistical correlation between the instrumented streamflow record and a reconstruction of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation from paleo records in Canada and China. But no paleorecord was used to validate the association between streamflow in the PDO from anywhere near Australia. I know there are limited datasets to work with, but this seems too indirectly tied to Australia to be meaningful. The other PDO reconstruction data source used (Buckley et al. 2019) uses paleorecords from across the Pacific and seems more reasonable to include. I know the Pacific is large and perhaps by having both PDO reconstructions the goal was to cover all of the Pacific? This is relevant because of the discussion in Lines 158-171, pgs. 7-8 concerning the accuracy of localized vs. remote reconstructions. The PDO reconstruction for the McGowan paper was built on paleorecords that were the most geographically remote of all the data sources. If this is the same paper.*

Author Response: We acknowledge the point made by the reviewer and agree that the McGowan et al. (2009) palaeoclimate information is based on the most geographically remote of all the data sources. However, the important point, and the reason the McGowan et al. (2009) record was included, is that it is based on a published reconstruction of the PDO that is considered satisfactory and the PDO is known to have a significant influence on hydroclimatic variability in eastern Australia. Hence the McGowan et al. (2009) record meets the selection criteria used in this study. We agree that you need to be careful when using remote proxies to infer location-specific hydroclimatic information (hence the discussion and caveats given in Lines 158-171).

Response to review comments on the paper “Comparison of published palaeoclimate records suitable for reconstructing annual to sub-decadal hydroclimatic variability in eastern Australia: implications for water resource management and planning” by Flack et al. (Manuscript number: hess-2020-314)

2-6. *What instrumented data were used in the analyses? Was it precipitation or streamflow or both and how are the instrumentation data distributed over the study area?*

Author Response: Precipitation data from the instrumental period (~1900 to present) was obtained from the Australian Water Availability Project (AWAP) (Jones et al., 2009) and used in Section 4.3. AWAP data is an Australia wide gridded (~5km x 5km resolution) rainfall dataset available as monthly rainfall averages and anomalies. AWAP data is produced by extrapolating from gauged daily or monthly rainfall data (Tozer et al., 2012; King et al., 2013).

2-7. *Line 159, pg. 7: commas needed around “however.”*

Author Response: Revised as suggested.