

JULES-ZOOM coupling and assessing the surface runoff characteristics of JULES for the Kennet catchment

HyDEF Project Meeting 27 June 2012

















- □ JULES ZOOM coupling
- □ Surface runoff
- Drainage volume
- □ Soil moisture
- **Representing heterogeneity**



Data

JULES input type	Source data description	Source
1 km catchment grid	 50 m resolution raster file catchment outlet 	http://edina.ac.uk/digimap/ ttp://www.environmentagency.gov.uk/hiflows/station.aspx?39016
Vegetation cover	 1) 50 m IGBP 2007 land cover map 2) land use reclassification scheme (from 17 IGPB classes to 9 JULES classes) (Smith et al, 2006) 	http://webmap.ornl.gov/wcsdown/dataset.jsp?ds_id=10004
Soil parameters	1 km NSRI soil maps (van Genuchten parameterisation) based on Simota & Mayr (1996)	http://www.landis.org.uk/data/
Meteorological inputs	Daily, 1 km CHESS data	Personal communications with CEH
Observations	1) Daily flow data 2) Neutron probe soil moisture (Warren Farm)	http://www.ceh.ac.uk/data/nrfa/data/search.html Personal communications with CEH



JULES



4 layers of depths:

- 0.1 m
- 0.25 m
- 0.65 m
- 2 m

Free drainage lower boundary

1km² grid







JULES: elements of mass balance in the Kennet



Imperial College

London

- 1) Almost no surface runoff
- 2) Drainage/Precip =0.47
- 3) AE/Precip ≈ 0.3
- 4) Drainage is 22% higher than observed flow



Flows – no groundwater routing



Imperial College London

Flows – ZOOMQ3D groundwater routing



Recharge – comparison of BGS model and JULES

Imperial College London



Imperial College London

Soil moisture: Warren Farm



Soil moisture (soil volume fraction), -

Imperial College London

Soil moisture: Warren Farm





Kennet Geology



WHITE CHALK SUBGROUP



Grid to grid variability in permeability





Sub-grid variability in permeability

NSRI K_{sat} at Warren Farm, mm/s



JULES: sensitivity to K_{sat}



<u>Compare to</u>: K_{sat} in the Kennet is 0.007 – 0.04 mm/s (top layer)

October, 2002 – December, 2008 Other soil parameters = "fine soil" parameters



Summary and conclusions

New developments:

- 1) JULES was set up using a 1km NSRI soil database,
- 2) 1 km CHESS data was used as meteorological input, and
- 3) ZOOMQ3D was used for groundwater routing.
- 4) PDM or Topmodel options in JULES not used

Issues with results:

- 1) No surface runoff,
- 2) High drainage rate,
- 3) AE under-estimation,
- 4) Drier than observed soils.



Possible next steps