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The hydrological cycle in JULES

It is important to get canopy capacity right because it determines how moisture is exchanged between surface and atmosphere within a time step, and hence the degree of land-surface - atmosphere coupling.

Default canopy capacity in JULES is 0.5 + 0.05*LAI. BUT:

1. In temperate regions, the seasonal variation in canopy capacity may not be well-represented
2. The canopy capacity may be too high.
3. It is at odds with other LSMs (eg SiB and NCAR-LSM), which define canopy capacity as A * LAI
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Methodology

Driving/validation data:

• Benchmarking fluxnet sites
• Hourly/half hourly meteorological driving data
• Vegetation/soils based on observations
• Short data periods (up to 13 years)

Fig. 1 | Location of the FLUXNET sites used in this study labeled as follows: FP = Fort Peck; BV = Bondville; MM = Morgan Monroe; HF = Harvard Forest; S67 = Santarem km 67, Brazil; S77 = Santarem km 77, Brazil; KA = Kaamenen; HY = Hyytiälä; TH = Tharandt; and ES = El Saler.

JULES set up:

• Phenology ON
• Canopy model 4
• Full spin up
Effect of canopy capacity function on the simulation of Latent Heat

JULES forced with fluxnet data. Canopy capacity function of the form:

(i) $A + 0.05 \times \text{LAI}$
(ii) $A \times \text{LAI}$

The constant ‘$A$’ varies from 0.1-0.9

For each run RMSE of latent heat (3-hourly) is plotted against mean canopy capacity.
Fig. 2. Monthly-mean observed evaporation ($E_{OB}$, solid thick line) and modeled evaporation ($E_{MOD}$, solid thick broken line) air temperature (thin solid line), and rainfall (bar chart) for the following FLUXNET sites: (a) Kaamanen, (b) Hytylä, (c) Morgan Monroe, (d) Harvard Forest, (e) Tharandt, (f) Bondville, (g) El Saler, (h) Fort Peck, (i) Santarem km 67, and (j) Santarem km 77.
Broad-leaf tree sites

Most error arises from the systematically high latent heat in JULES – not from canopy capacity.
The higher the canopy capacity, the higher the error.
It is evident, however that the errors are lower for canopy capacity of the form $A \times \text{LAI}$
FIG. 2. Monthly-mean observed evaporation ($E_{OB}$, solid thick line) and modeled evaporation ($E_{MOD}$, solid thick broken line) air temperature (thin solid line), and rainfall (bar chart) for the following FLUXNET sites: (a) Kaamanen, (b) Hyytiälä, (c) Morgan Monroe, (d) Harvard Forest, (e) Tharandt, (f) Bondville, (g) El Saler, (h) Fort Peck, (i) Santarem km 67, and (j) Santarem km 77.
Not surprisingly, the form of the canopy capacity function does not matter for needle-leaf trees (LAI does not vary seasonally in JULES)
Fig. 2. Monthly-mean observed evaporation ($E_{OB}$, solid thick line) and modeled evaporation ($E_{MOD}$, solid thick broken line) air temperature (thin solid line), and rainfall (bar chart) for the following FLUXNET sites: (a) Kaamanen, (b) Hyytiälä, (c) Morgan Monroe, (d) Harvard Forest, (e) Tharandt, (f) Bondville, (g) El Saler, (h) Fort Peck, (i) Santarem km 67, and (j) Santarem km 77.
C3 Grass sites

C3 grass results are difficult to interpret. There is considerable variability between sites and regions.

This may be related to JULES’ simulation of the seasonal cycle in temperate regions.
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Hyytiala: Needle leaf trees
Conclusions

• It is important to get canopy capacity right, because of its importance for land-atmosphere coupling.

• However, in the cases of needle-leaf and broadleaf trees, canopy capacity is not the primary cause of error in latent heat. Generally, reducing the canopy capacity will reduce errors mainly by compensating for excessively high evapo-transpiration.

• It is evident that canopy capacity of the form A*LAI is more appropriate in temperate BT/NT regions because it introduces a more realistic seasonal cycle in canopy capacity, which improves the seasonal cycle in latent heat.

• In the case of grasses, the situation is more complex. Canopy capacity has an effect on error over and above its impact on reducing evapo-transpiration.
Recommendations

• For broadleaf and needle leaf trees, canopy capacity should be defined as $A \times \text{LAI}$, where $A$ is between 0.1 and 0.2. This can be done in the .jin file.

• Further work should be carried out to determine the best parameterization for grasses. For now, it would be best to stick to $0.5 + 0.05 \times \text{LAI}$.

• Sorting out the canopy capacity will not solve JULES’ problem of high evapo-transpiration. Further work on the hydrological cycle in JULES (eg during SWELTER) is required.