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ABSTRACT In an effort to understand the sources of uncertainty and the physical consistency of climate models from the North American Regional Climate Change Assessment Program (NARCCAP), an ensemble of general circulation models (GCMs) and regional climate models (RCMs) was used to explore climatological water balances for the Churchill River basin in Labrador, Canada. This study quantifies mean atmospheric and terrestrial water balance residuals, as well as their annual cycles. Mean annual atmospheric water balances had consistently higher residuals than the terrestrial water balances due, in part, to the influences of sampling of instantaneous variables and the interpolation of atmospheric data to published pressure levels. Atmospheric and terrestrial water balance residuals for each ensemble member were found to be consistent between base and future periods, implying that they are systemic and not climate dependent. With regard to the annual cycle, no pattern was found across time periods or ensemble members to indicate whether the monthly terrestrial or atmospheric root mean square residual was highest. Because of the interdependence of hydrological cycle components, the complexity of climate models and the variety of methods and processes used by different ensemble members, it was impossible to isolate all causes of the water balance residuals. That being said, the residuals created by interpolating a model’s native vertical resolution onto NARCCAP’s published pressure levels and the subsequent vertical interpolation were quantified and several other sources were explored. In general, residuals were found to be predominantly functions of the RCM choice (as opposed to the GCM choice) and their respective modelling processes, parameterization schemes, and post-processing.

RÉSUMÉ Afin de mieux comprendre les sources d’incertitude et la cohérence physique dans les modèles climatiques du North American Regional Climate Change Assessment Program (NARCCAP), nous avons utilisé un ensemble de modèles de circulation générale et de modèles climatiques régionaux pour explorer les bilans hydrologiques climatologiques pour le bassin du fleuve Churchill, au Labrador, au Canada. Cette étude quantifie les résidus moyens des bilans hydrologiques terrestres et atmosphériques de même que leurs cycles annuels. Les bilans hydrologiques atmosphériques annuels moyens ont constamment eu des résidus plus élevés que les bilans hydrologiques terrestres, notamment à cause des effets de l’échantillonnage de variables instantanées et de l’interpolation de données atmosphériques en fonction des niveaux de pression publiés. Les résidus des bilans hydrologiques atmosphériques et terrestres pour chaque membre de l’ensemble se sont révélés cohérents entre les périodes de base et future, ce qui implique qu’ils sont systématiques et non liés au climat. En ce qui concerne le cycle annuel, nous n’avons pas trouvé de configuration entre les périodes ou les membres de l’ensemble qui indiquerait si le résidu quadratique moyen terrestre ou atmosphérique est plus élevé. Étant donné l’interdépendance des éléments du cycle hydrologique, la complexité des modèles climatiques et la variété des méthodes et des processus utilisés par les différents membres de l’ensemble, il a été impossible d’isoler toutes les causes des résidus des bilans hydrologiques. Cela dit, nous avons quantifié les résidus créés par l’interpolation de la résolution verticale native d’un modèle en fonction des niveaux de pression publiés par le NARCCAP et par l’interpolation verticale subséquente et nous avons exploré plusieurs autres sources. De manière générale, il ressort que les résidus sont surtout fonction du choix des modèles climatiques régionaux (par opposition au choix des modèles de circulation générale) ainsi que de leurs processus de modélisation, de leurs schémas de paramétrisation et de leur post-traitement.
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1 Introduction

There is a growing realization in scientific and engineering communities that a changing global climate requires the use of high-resolution climate models to aid in the design and planning of large-scale water resource projects (Dimri, 2012). Simple use of historical climate records is inadequate when planning for mean hydrological states and extreme events because both are influenced by climate change (Trenberth, Dai, Rasmussen, & Parsons, 2003). In order to determine the effectiveness of a climate model’s ability to simulate the hydrological cycle, and therefore its usefulness to water resource managers, its atmospheric and terrestrial water balances must be examined (Berbery & Rasmussen, 1999). It is recognized that simulation of the water cycle and the wide variety of physical processes involved is a key factor in a model’s ability to effectively simulate current and future climates (Chahine, 1992; Hack, Kiehl, & Hurrell, 1998). Hu, Oglesby, and Marshall (2005) stated that the “examination of moisture simulation as it relates to climate likely holds the key to our understanding and eventually resolving issues surrounding model uncertainty.”

Both general circulation models (GCMs) and high-resolution regional climate models (RCMs) play important roles in developing an accurate water balance (Berbery & Rasmussen, 1999). Moisture is involved in a diverse range of temporal and spatial scales: from minutes to decades and from the micro-physical level up to global circulation. It has been found that water climatologies are different from model to model for a number of reasons (Wang & Paegle, 1996), some of which will be explored in this work. Additionally, differences in climate sensitivity (defined as the equilibrium global mean temperature increase caused by doubling atmospheric CO₂ concentrations) among climate models can be explained in part by differences in projected moisture levels, for which the simulation and parameterization of surface and boundary layer processes are largely responsible (Hu et al., 2005). It is apparent that moisture and its motion are major climatological factors for any basin (Liu & Stewart, 2003).

a Motivation

There are several reasons for undertaking a water balance study. This section discusses a selection of motivations for, and examples of, existing studies.

One motivation is to examine model uncertainty, improve climate model processes and parameterization, and validate the physical consistency of climate models. In this vein, Music and Caya (2007) performed a comprehensive validation of water budget components of a basin with respect to the annual mean and annual cycle. Roads, Chen, Kanamitsu, and Juang (1998) evaluated climate models by examining the vertical distribution of water budget residuals as well as the fit of primary variables to observations. These types of studies typically focus on one or two specific climate models.

Another common motivation is to understand the hydrologic processes of a region and how they evolve over time. Strong et al. (2002), as part of the Global Energy and Water Exchanges (GEWEX) project, performed a water budget analysis on the Mackenzie River basin. The primary objective of GEWEX was to quantify all aspects of the hydrological cycle of the Mackenzie River basin for purposes of investigating the impacts of climate change on the water budget. Jin and Zangvil (2010) found that moisture convergence and precipitable water tendency balance precipitation and evaporation over the eastern Mediterranean and are strongly correlated in time.

A third motivation for water balance studies is to obtain approximations for difficult-to-observe variables. Serreze et al. (2002) use National Centers for Environmental Prediction/National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCEP/NCAR) global reanalysis data to calculate precipitation minus evapotranspiration (P−E) from the moisture flux convergence for several large Arctic basins. Seneviratne, Viterbo, Lüthi, and Schär (2004) and Hirschi, Seneviratne, and Schär (2006) showed that one can effectively estimate basin-scale terrestrial water storage using atmospheric and terrestrial water balance equations, plus streamflow measurements.

Accordingly, the purpose of this paper is twofold: (i) to investigate the physical consistency of a selection of RCMs forced by various GCMs over the Churchill River basin in Labrador, Canada, and (ii) to identify reasons why the atmospheric and terrestrial water budgets do not balance.

b Study Region

The Churchill River, located in Labrador, Canada, is 856 km long and drains roughly 92,500 km². The basin is the site of the existing Churchill Falls hydroelectric facility and the proposed Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Project. Figure 1 presents a map of the basin and includes major water features and population centres. A map showing the topography and common grid resolution (0.25 degrees) to which all the models in this study were re-gridded can be found in Roberts and Snelgrove (2015).

The basin is typically snow covered for more than half the year because snowfall is the most common precipitation type from October to May. According to Environment Canada’s in-situ meteorological stations, mean annual precipitation ranges from 850 to 950 mm, with a relatively even split between rain and snow. The mean annual temperature ranges from −5° to 0°C, with record winter extremes below −40°C and record summer extremes surpassing 30°C (Environment Canada, 2014).

Because of the large amount of snow accumulation in winter, spring melt is a predominant feature in the annual hydrograph of the Churchill River. However, the spring melt signal is subdued by the existence of the Churchill Falls hydroelectric facility and its associated reservoirs and control structures. Roughly three-quarters of the runoff from the Churchill River originates upstream of Churchill Falls.
Two types of soil are predominant in the basin: well-drained and acidic podzolic soil and organic soil with poor drainage. In addition to the extensive wetlands, coniferous black spruce forest is ubiquitous, though in some areas a variety of hardwood species can be found. The dominant features in the northwestern portion of the basin are the reservoirs for Churchill Falls. Downstream of Churchill Falls, the eastern half of the basin is at elevations below 400 m and has a well-defined drainage pattern with steep tributary slopes and relatively few wetlands. Glacial activity resulted in rugged topography throughout the basin, with high points in the western headlands reaching 1550 m, down to near sea level in the east (Nalcor Energy, 2009).

Early work on water balances was limited to basins larger than $2 \times 10^6$ km$^2$, due primarily to low radiosonde observation density and sampling frequency (Min & Schubert, 1997; Rasmussen, 1968). More recently, a commonly touted critical size for water balance computations using atmospheric reanalysis is on the order of $10^3$ km$^2$. That being said, Hirschi et al. (2006) performed water balances on three basins similar in size to the Churchill River basin ($84,144$, $85,223$, and $94,836$ km$^2$) with acceptable imbalances. All studies mentioning critical basin size have used observations, analyses, and reanalysis datasets with roughly 1 degree resolution and larger. Higher resolution climate models, such as those used in this study (50 km horizontal grid spacing, resulting in the basin being represented by 37 grid points, and 3-hour sampling frequency) should be able to provide reliable water balances for domains the size of the Churchill River basin (Jin & Zangvil, 2010). The 0.25 degree grid to which all model output was re-gridded does not provide additional information in this respect, though it does allow for more consistent representation of the irregular basin boundaries.

**Literature Review**

There is a great deal of interdependence within modelling processes, as well as components of the water cycle, making the isolation of a single source of imbalance difficult. Every factor and process involved in water cycle simulation is potentially important and should not be discounted without just cause. The following review highlights potential causes of water balance residuals from published literature. These potential causes are organized into categories below.
1 VERTICAL COORDINATE SYSTEM AND SPATIAL RESOLUTION

The conversion from a model’s native vertical coordinate system to published pressure levels has been known to introduce mass imbalances up to a relative magnitude of 100% depending on the region and variable of interest (Berbery & Rasmusson, 1999; Serreze et al., 2002; Trenberth, 1991). These imbalances are mostly systemic and decrease in magnitude as vertical resolution increases. Similarly, some vertical coordinate systems are more susceptible to the introduction of errors during vertical integration than others (e.g., pressure levels versus sigma levels (Liu & Stewart, 2003)).

Complex topography leads to difficulties in simulating water vapour transport at lower levels, though a sigma level approach has been shown to resolve the atmospheric boundary layer better and reduce this aspect of bias (Chen, Norris, & Roads, 1996; Liu & Stewart, 2003). This is not a predominant factor in the current study because the topography of the basin is relatively uncomplicated compared with mountainous regions in other studies. Errors in surface pressure fields and topography, in addition to the vertical resolution and post-processing, also play a role in the balancing of the water budget (Min & Schubert, 1997).

Roads et al. (1998) found that initializing an 18-level climate model with a 28-level analysis simulation produced larger budget imbalances than when vertical levels aligned (despite the application of a variety of digital filters), showing that discrepancies between GCM and RCM vertical levels are contributing factors.

Liu and Stewart (2003) postulated that a small domain size and low spatial resolution (e.g., 15 grid points at 2.5 degree resolution) would not effectively capture local convection events, drastically affecting local water content.

2 TEMPORAL RESOLUTION AND SAMPLING FREQUENCY

Inadequate sampling of instantaneous variables (e.g., wind) cannot be compensated for by using long sampling periods, and it has been found that moisture convergence is the variable most strongly affected by sampling frequency (Chen et al., 1996). Imbalances as large as the moisture convergence itself over mid-latitude storm tracks were found when using 12-hourly, or even sometimes 6-hourly, sampling. Roads et al. (1998) discussed this sampling issue while investigating non-linear fluxes.

As a subset of moisture convergence, the inability to resolve low-level jets also leads to errors, though in North America this issue is concentrated primarily in the Great Plains regions (Chen et al., 1996). Resolution of the diurnal cycle is important to regions with low-level jets (Berbery & Rasmusson, 1999), which are not major sources of influence over the Churchill River basin. They recommend eight timesteps per day (3-hour intervals) to effectively capture the diurnal cycle, especially for smaller basins.

3 MODEL PROCESSES AND PARAMETERIZATION

Parameterizations of smaller scale turbulent processes, such as condensation, boundary layer moisture flux, boundary layer temperature flux, and net radiation flux (shortwave and longwave) at the surface all contribute to the water budget. Jin and Zangvil (2010) argue that the residuals in atmospheric water balances can be attributed mainly to the theoretical treatment of the water budget equations. They found that assimilating empirical data decreased residuals, though this approach is only viable when using reanalysis models, such as NCEP or the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) 40-year Reanalysis (ERA-40).

Ruane (2010) found that regions where seasonal precipitation draws primarily from atmospheric moisture convergence are sensitive to dynamical processes (e.g., large-scale waves, circulations, or conditions favourable to mesoscale activity), whereas regions with a high recycling ratio are more sensitive to processes affecting atmospheric stability (e.g., land-surface interaction, boundary layer physics, and convective processes).

Global fields of precipitation, temperature, and motion strongly depend on land-surface evapotranspiration (Shukla & Mintz, 1982), which is generally parameterized as the sum of soil evaporation, vegetation evaporation, and vegetation transpiration (Wang & Dickinson, 2012). Different land-surface models give a wide range of ratios of transpiration to total evapotranspiration. Parameterized latent heat (as evapotranspiration) typically uses about 60% of net surface radiation, though it can vary between models from below 50% to almost 90% (Trenberth, Fasullo, & Kiehl, 2009; Wang & Dickinson, 2012), contributing to inter-model discrepancies.

Terrestrial water storage is a key part of the water balance and hydrological cycle because it determines the partitioning of the water and energy fluxes at the land surface (Mueller, Hirschi, & Seneviratne, 2011). Although the importance of the effect of soil moisture on terrestrial water balances is intuitive, it is also important for atmospheric water balances in regions with high precipitation recycling. As with the evapotranspiration ratio above, estimates of soil moisture on a regional scale differ greatly from model to model (Hirschi et al., 2006; Reichle, Koster, Dong, & Berg, 2004; Schär, Lüthi, Beyerle, & Heise, 1999).

Climate Models

The North American Regional Climate Change Assessment Program (NARCCAP; http://www.narccap.ucar.edu/about/index.html) is an international collaboration whose primary purpose is to create high-resolution climate simulations of North America in order to examine uncertainties within the member RCMs and the driving GCMs (Mears et al., 2009). The NARCCAP ensemble members simulate a base period (1971–2000) and a future period (2041–2070) under the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) A2 emission scenarios (IPCC, 2000) using various map projections at...
50 km resolution. To give an idea of the variety of modelling and parameterization strategies employed by different modeling groups, a brief synopsis of the RCMs and GCMs used in this study are presented in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

### 2 Methodology

To determine the movement of moisture into and out of a basin, the atmospheric and terrestrial water balances were calculated for mean monthly climatologies. The equations for each water balance are presented below (Eqs (1) and (2); see Rasmusson (1968) and Peixoto and Oort (1992) for more details). The units of each component in Eqs (1) and (2) were converted to cubic metres per second for consistency across each water balance. For the Churchill River basin $10^70.6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ is approximately $1.00 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$.

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial t} - \nabla H \vec{Q} = P - E + \epsilon_A,$$

$$R + \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} = P - E + \epsilon_T,$$

where

- $W$ is the precipitable water content of the atmosphere;
- $\nabla H \vec{Q}$ is the atmospheric moisture convergence;
- $\vec{Q}$ is the vertically integrated horizontal water vapour flux;
- $P - E$ is precipitation minus evaporation;
- $R$ is the land-surface runoff;
- $s$ is terrestrial water storage, including snow pack and soil moisture;
- $\epsilon_A$ is the atmospheric water balance residual;
- $\epsilon_T$ is the terrestrial water balance residual; and
- $t$ is time.

The atmospheric moisture convergence, which reflects how much water is advected into or out of a basin via the atmosphere over a period of time, is a large component of atmospheric water balances, and a detailed description of its computation can be found in Seneviratne et al. (2004). The horizontal water vapour flux was calculated for each grid point by multiplying the specific humidity by the meridional and zonal (south to north and west to east, respectively) wind components, to obtain two respective values of flux for each grid point. The vertical integration of the horizontal water vapour flux was then performed in the Grid Analysis and Display System (GrADS), using the function \texttt{vint()}, which takes the sum of the mass-weighted layers between the surface (as defined by surface pressure) and the top of the atmosphere (as defined by the uppermost pressure level available, 50 hPa). This provided the total vertical column amount of moisture flux in each of the meridional and zonal directions. The divergence of these vertically integrated values was then calculated for the entire basin, the negative of which was the resulting atmospheric moisture convergence.

Tendencies of the precipitable water content ($\partial W/\partial t$) and terrestrial water storage ($\partial s/\partial t$) terms were calculated on a...
For example, the precipitable water tendency value for April resulted from the difference between the value of \( W \) for May and March, divided by \( \partial t \) of two months.

Evaporation was calculated by dividing surface latent heat flux (in watts per square metre) by the latent heat of vaporization of water (the temperature dependent values which are found in Rogers & Yau (1984)). This was necessary because the NARCCAP variable representing evaporation (surface evaporation of condensed water (evps)) was not published for each model. The calculated evaporation was compared with published evps values (when available) over ocean grid points and was found to be identical, confirming the validity of the evaporation calculation.

3 Results

In this section, various components of the atmospheric and terrestrial water balances, including absolute and relative residuals, are discussed. For the 1971–2000 base period the observed mean streamflow of the Churchill River is approximately 1825 m³ s⁻¹ (1.70 mm d⁻¹) (Water Survey of Canada, 2010), and the mean simulated runoff from all NARCCAP ensemble members used here is 1553 m³ s⁻¹ (1.44 mm d⁻¹), with a 90% uncertainty range of 1180 to 1927 m³ s⁻¹. Mean ensemble \( P-E \) is 1618 m³ s⁻¹ (1.51 mm d⁻¹), with a 90% uncertainty range of 1062 to 2173 m³ s⁻¹.

\[ \frac{ds}{dt} = I_N + I_C - O_C. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Here, \( \frac{ds}{dt} \) is the change in reservoir storage, \( I_C \) is the controlled inflow into the reservoir (via control structures), and \( O_C \) is controlled outflow form the reservoir. Direct precipitation and evaporation over the reservoir are considered to be implicit in the measured \( \frac{ds}{dt} \). The mean annual observed streamflow is 1825 m³ s⁻¹, and the mean annual naturalized streamflow is 1875 m³ s⁻¹. Observed streamflow is slightly lower because of the additional evaporation from the reservoirs. Both observed and naturalized flows can be seen in Fig. 2.

The observed precipitation and the naturalized flow both fell within the bounds of the ensemble’s simulations, giving confidence that the simulations provide adequate representations of base period precipitation and runoff. The only exception was runoff simulated for November, December, and January, which was lower than the naturalized flow.

Figure 2 shows base period ensemble member simulations and corresponding observations for precipitation and runoff. Monthly precipitation data were extracted from the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre’s (GPCC) 0.5 degree resolution dataset (Meyer-Christoffer et al., 2011). The gridded GPCC data were checked using four corresponding Environment Canada in situ meteorological stations in, and around, the Churchill River basin and discrepancies in mean monthly values were found to be less than 0.2 mm d⁻¹.

Because approximately three-quarters of the runoff in the Churchill River basin occurs upstream of Churchill Falls hydroelectric facility, a direct comparison between simulated runoff and observed streamflow at the river’s outlet would not be useful. Naturalized flow, which negates the effects of damming and water management, is preferred for model validation (Music & Caya, 2007). As such, Fig. 2 uses naturalized streamflow data, created by Fortin and Latraverse (2000), which accounts for the impact of the reservoirs and control structures of Churchill Falls. They approximated natural inflows into each reservoir \( (I_N) \) (i.e., runoff) by applying Eq. (3).

\[ \frac{ds}{dt} = I_N + I_C - O_C. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Here, \( \frac{ds}{dt} \) is the change in reservoir storage, \( I_C \) is the controlled inflow into the reservoir (via control structures), and \( O_C \) is controlled outflow form the reservoir. Direct precipitation and evaporation over the reservoir are considered to be implicit in the measured \( \frac{ds}{dt} \). The mean annual observed streamflow is 1825 m³ s⁻¹, and the mean annual naturalized streamflow is 1875 m³ s⁻¹. Observed streamflow is slightly lower because of the additional evaporation from the reservoirs. Both observed and naturalized flows can be seen in Fig. 2.

The observed precipitation and the naturalized flow both fell within the bounds of the ensemble’s simulations, giving confidence that the simulations provide adequate representations of base period precipitation and runoff. The only exception was runoff simulated for November, December, and January, which was lower than the naturalized flow.

Figure 3 plots base period component breakdown of each ensemble member along with the atmospheric and terrestrial residuals. (Note that snow water equivalent (SWE) data were not available for the Hadley Regional Climate Model (HRM3)-Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (GFDL) model, meaning it was impossible to calculate terrestrial water balance residuals.) From Fig. 3 it is apparent that the
precipitable water tendency (the change in precipitable water over time) contributes the least to the water balance from month to month. This is an expected result that has been found by others (Berbery & Rasmusson, 1999; Chen et al., 1996; Dimri, 2012). Similar results were found for the future period; however, the plot was omitted for space considerations.

Over the span of a year, precipitation contributes the most to each water balance ($2602 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ on average), except for the Regional Climate Model, version 3 (RCM3)-Third Generation Coupled Global Climate Model (CGCM3), RCM3-GFDL, and the Pennsylvania State University/National Center for Atmospheric Research Mesoscale Model 5 (MM5I)-Community Climate System Model (CCSM) where atmospheric moisture convergence dominates (with an average of $3595 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$). Noticeable spikes occur during spring runoff, which is a direct result of the spring melt’s decrease in SWE stored on the land surface. Soil moisture also increases as the snowpack melts. The only ensemble member that does not follow this norm—runoff plateaus in April and remains high into the fall—is the HRM3-Hadley Centre Coupled Model, version 3 (HADCM3). Also, the amplitude of its soil moisture tendency is relatively high, with a root mean square (RMS) of 1043 $\text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$, compared with other models that have an average RMS of 277 $\text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$.

Moisture convergence is consistently positive throughout the year for all ensemble members, which indicates that the Churchill River basin is a moisture sink year round. Both precipitation and evaporation are highest in the summer for all ensemble members.

There are clear differences between ensemble members, the largest of which can be found in atmospheric moisture for which RCM3-CGCM3, RCM3-GFDL, and MM5I-CCSM are substantially higher than the bulk of the ensemble members (average of $3595 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ compared with $1539 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$), especially in the summer and fall months.
Although some similarities and differences between moisture balance components for a given time period and ensemble member can be gleaned from the plots, a quantitative summary of the water balance residuals, as found in Tables 3 and 4, will provide more insight into the water balance closure.

### a Mean Annual Residuals

The mean terrestrial water balance residual ($e_T$) was always much less than the atmospheric residual ($e_A$) for all models and time periods. The average magnitudes for the base period $e_T$ and $e_A$ were 122 and 647 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$, respectively, while for the future period they were 166 and 738 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$, respectively. The magnitudes of the future period $e_A$ were larger than those for the base period for five out of the seven models (HRM3-HADCM3 and MM5I-CCSM did not have sufficient data published at the time of analysis for water balance analyses), the exceptions being CRCM-CGCM3 and Weather Research and Forecasting Grell (WRFG)-CGCM3 model which, respectively, had base period $e_A$ magnitudes of 71 and 326 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$ and future period $e_A$ magnitudes of 35 and 281 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$. The magnitudes for $e_T$ from base to future periods increased in two-thirds of the models, while the remaining two models, CRCM-CGCM3 and WRFG-CGCM3, once again saw small decreases of 1 and 11 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$, respectively.

The CRCM and HRM3 ensemble members typically had the lowest mean residuals for both base and future periods (ranging from 35 to 229 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$ for $e_A$ and from 2 to 32 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$ for $e_T$), while WRFG was only slightly larger (55 to 326 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$ for $e_A$ and from 29 to 63 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$ for $e_T$). The RCM3 models consistently had the highest $e_A$ magnitudes (1616 to 2206 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$) and $e_T$ magnitudes (391 to 443 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$). The MM5I-CCSM ensemble member had a relatively high atmospheric residual of 1475 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$ but a relatively low terrestrial residual of 59 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$ (future period data for MM5I-CCSM were not published at the time of analysis).

For both time periods, CRCM ensemble members had an overall negative mean $e_A$, indicating that $P-E$ was typically greater than the contributions of the atmospheric moisture convergence and the precipitable water tendency. All other ensemble members had overall positive mean $e_A$, though 27% of months for WRFG models and 46% of months for HRM3-GFDL showed negative residuals. Both RCM3 ensemble members had negative mean terrestrial water balance residuals for both time periods (ranging from $-391$ to $-443$ m$^3$ s$^{-1}$), meaning that $P-E$ was typically greater than the combined contributions of runoff and the terrestrial water storage terms. The other models tended to be on the positive side (though close to zero), with the exception of future period CRCM-CGCM3 (−32 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$).

### b Annual Cycle of Residuals

In the discussion of the annual cycle, the root mean square residual (RSMR) gives a better idea of the magnitude of variations from zero than the means of $e_A$ and $e_T$ for each

### Table 3. Base period atmospheric and terrestrial water balance residual values for all available ensemble members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRCM</th>
<th>CRCM</th>
<th>HRM3</th>
<th>HRM3</th>
<th>MM5I</th>
<th>MM5I</th>
<th>RCM3</th>
<th>RCM3</th>
<th>RCM3</th>
<th>RCM3</th>
<th>WRFG</th>
<th>WRFG</th>
<th>WRFG</th>
<th>WRFG</th>
<th>RSMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCSM</td>
<td>CGCM3</td>
<td>GFMDL</td>
<td>HADCM3</td>
<td>CCSM</td>
<td>CGCM3</td>
<td>GFMDL</td>
<td>CCSM</td>
<td>CGCM3</td>
<td>GFMDL</td>
<td>CCSM</td>
<td>CGCM3</td>
<td>GFMDL</td>
<td>CCSM</td>
<td>CGCM3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atmospheric Residual (m$^3$ s$^{-1}$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>−109</td>
<td>−96</td>
<td>−100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>−240</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−12</td>
<td>−30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>−50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>−35</td>
<td>−46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>−209</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>−103</td>
<td>−58</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>−98</td>
<td>−4</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun.</td>
<td>−127</td>
<td>−44</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>3157</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul.</td>
<td>−320</td>
<td>−213</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>3949</td>
<td>4044</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>−365</td>
<td>−194</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>3327</td>
<td>2798</td>
<td>−171</td>
<td>−23</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>−85</td>
<td>−107</td>
<td>−198</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>3417</td>
<td>2976</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>−140</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>−33</td>
<td>−155</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>−593</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>−164</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>−147</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RMSR</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>−71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial Residual (m$^3$ s$^{-1}$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>−139</td>
<td>−113</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>−53</td>
<td>−337</td>
<td>−108</td>
<td>−152</td>
<td>−35</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>−805</td>
<td>−14</td>
<td>−301</td>
<td>−112</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>−69</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>−69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>−156</td>
<td>−59</td>
<td>−83</td>
<td>−207</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>−159</td>
<td>−6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>−184</td>
<td>−512</td>
<td>−170</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>−139</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>−664</td>
<td>−1029</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>−711</td>
<td>−683</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>−389</td>
<td>787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>−681</td>
<td>−725</td>
<td>−386</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun.</td>
<td>−1044</td>
<td>−460</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>−1172</td>
<td>−326</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>−35</td>
<td>−147</td>
<td>947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>−282</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>−1606</td>
<td>−2287</td>
<td>−157</td>
<td>−19</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>−172</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>−531</td>
<td>−685</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>−15</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>−506</td>
<td>−540</td>
<td>−82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>−72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>−407</td>
<td>−591</td>
<td>−194</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>−30</td>
<td>−41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>−97</td>
<td>−630</td>
<td>−711</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>−391</td>
<td>−406</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RMSR</strong></td>
<td>640</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ensemble member throughout the year (RMSR rows in Tables 3 and 4) and across the entire ensemble for each month (RMSR columns).

The WRFG and MM5I ensemble members had the lowest overall terrestrial RMSR for both time periods, and CRCM-CCSM had an equally low RMSR for the future period (from 328 to 378 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$). The RCM3-CGCM3 and RCM3-GFDL ensemble members had the highest overall terrestrial RMSR for the base period (747 and 933 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$), respectively while CRCM-CGCM3 had the highest for the future period (700 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$). The RCM3 members had the highest overall atmospheric RMSR for both time periods (2025 to 2627 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$), while MM5I-CCSM was a distant second for the base period (1606 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$). The CRCM-CCSM and CRCM-CGCM3 ensemble members had the lowest atmospheric RMSR for both time periods (70 to 238 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$).

Whether the terrestrial or atmospheric RMSR was larger depended on the time period in question and on individual ensemble members. Overall 57% of the simulations had a larger atmospheric RMSR than terrestrial.

The low mean annual $e_T$ and high terrestrial RMSR for the CRCM ensemble members means that the month-to-month residuals almost cancel each other over the span of a year, but there are substantial residuals when examining individual months, especially during the spring melt (on the order of 2000 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$). A similar, but less severe, situation occurs in the WRFG and MM5I ensemble members (around 1000 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$).

The highest atmospheric RMSR for both time periods occurred in July (1925 and 2409 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$), though the RMSR for September was similar for the future period (2299 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$). The lowest RMSRs (between 486 and 839 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$) occurred in February, while the lowest for the future period (164 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$) occurred in May, but July was a close second for the base period (1006 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$). The lowest RMSR for the base period (112 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$) occurred in February, while the lowest for the future period (164 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$) occurred in January. Periods with large $e_t$ correspond with those summers when atmospheric moisture transport, precipitation, and evaporation are highest, while large $e_T$ corresponds with the transition period of the spring melt.

c Relative Residuals

Table 5 presents the mean atmospheric and terrestrial water balance residuals relative to simulated climatological $P$–$E$ values. The magnitudes of the atmospheric residuals range from $-10.1$ to $102.8\%$, while the terrestrial residuals range from $-19.5$ to $5.5\%$.

There is a very high correlation between the relative magnitudes of the residuals between the base and future periods for each ensemble member (Pearson’s $r = 0.99$). All CRCM and HRM3 relative residuals as well as WRFG and RCM3 relative
terrestrial residuals are consistent between time periods to within three percentage points. This indicates the residuals are systemic. The primary exceptions are WRFG’s atmospheric residuals, which change from 5.1 to 18.8% and from 28.4 to 20.4%. RCM3’s relative atmospheric residuals have similar percentage point changes, though consistency between time periods can still be inferred because of the much larger size of their relative residual magnitudes compared with those of WRFG (average of 91.4% compared with 18.2%, respectively). This is beneficial for climate change analyses because it is still possible to gain insight from the differences between base and future periods, even if the residuals are larger than the climate change signal (which is the case for several ensemble members).

The climate change signal for \(P-E\) ranges from 5.8 to 20.1%, with a mean increase of 8.6%. For a detailed look at the climate change signal of NARCCAP’s models over the Churchill River basin see Roberts and Snelgrove (2015).

### 4 Discussion

Now that the atmospheric and terrestrial water balance residuals have been identified, this section will shed some light on the sources of imbalance in the current study. As discussed in the literature review, there are many possibilities including choice of sampling frequency, coordinate system, post-processing, model processes, and parameterizations. The impact of each of these will vary and is quantified when possible.

#### a Sampling Frequency

Published precipitation, evaporation, and runoff data are averages over a 3-hour time step (so 3-hour totals can easily be found), whereas specific humidity, wind components, precipitable water content, SWE, and soil moisture are instantaneous values. The 3-hour sampling frequency of the RCMs in this study was adequate for capturing the diurnal cycle for all averaged and instantaneous variables (Chen et al., 1996; Roads et al., 1998); however, there is some imbalance introduced when sampling instantaneous variables. This is especially true for atmospheric moisture convergence, which is the result of multiplying one instantaneous variable (specific humidity) by others (meridional and zonal wind components). That being said, the sampling frequency was the same for RCM3 as it was for other models and both RCM3 ensemble members experienced relatively similar and anomalously large budget residuals for both the base period (91.6 and 77.3%) and the future period (102.8 and 94.0%) (as did NCEP driven runs, Fig. 4, 105.6%). One would expect the non-linear impact of sampling to be considerably different across ensemble members, even if they employ the same RCM. As such, it is unlikely that sampling frequency contributed substantially to water balance residuals, especially \(\varepsilon_r\). In order to isolate the impact of sampling frequency, cumulative atmospheric moisture convergence values for each time step would be needed in addition to the instantaneous values.

#### b Coordinate Systems and Post-Processing

All ensemble members operate in their own native coordinate systems (see Table 1), but published NARCCAP data have all been interpolated to a common set of pressure levels (by the respective modelling groups) for the sake of data consistency. Published precipitable water values are calculated within each model’s native vertical coordinate system. As such, by comparing the manual calculation of precipitable water (from specific humidity at each pressure level) with published values (calculated in a model’s native coordinates) the residual introduced to a single variable by converting to NARCCAP’s pressure levels and undertaking a vertical integration can be quantified. The range of these results, calculated using Eq. (4), can be found in Table 6.

\[
\varepsilon_{\text{relative}} = \left( \frac{W_{\text{published}} - W_{\text{calculated}}}{W_{\text{published}}} \right) \times 100% \tag{4}
\]

This effect would be compounded when investigating moisture convergence because the specific humidity must be multiplied by wind at each level (meaning the values in Table 6 are conservative estimates). The mean values are relatively consistent for each RCM regardless of the forcing GCM or the time period, implying that these residuals are systemic. By considering the range of relative residuals the potential contribution of conversion to pressure levels and vertical integration can be appreciated. Minimum and maximum values refer to residuals from individual 3-hour time steps, whereas the mean spans the 30-year climatology. Some of the more extreme relative residuals were found when a precipitable water value (be it published or calculated) was anomalously small.

### Table 5. Atmospheric and terrestrial residuals relative to climatological \(P-E\) for base and future periods, as well as \(P-E\) climate change signal \(\Delta (P-E)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>RCM</th>
<th>CCSM</th>
<th>CCGM3</th>
<th>HRM3</th>
<th>GFDL</th>
<th>HRM3</th>
<th>HADCM3</th>
<th>CCSM</th>
<th>MM5I</th>
<th>RCM3</th>
<th>GCGM3</th>
<th>WRFG</th>
<th>CCSM</th>
<th>GCGM3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971–2000</td>
<td>( P-E ) (m(^3) s(^{-1}))</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \varepsilon_a ) (%)</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \varepsilon_r ) (%)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-19.3</td>
<td>-19.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041–2070</td>
<td>( P-E ) (m(^3) s(^{-1}))</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \varepsilon_a ) (%)</td>
<td>-10.1</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \varepsilon_r ) (%)</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-19.4</td>
<td>-19.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta (P-E) ) (%)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately, published precipitable water data were not available for RCM3 or MM5I. Manual vertical integration was used to derive their precipitable water tendencies for the water balances of Eq. (1). Comparing tendencies calculated using published precipitable water data with those derived from manual vertical integration of other ensemble members showed this contributed on the order of 1% to precipitable water tendency values and made no substantial contribution to the overall residuals.

On a climatological basis, mean annual residuals have a smaller magnitude than month-to-month values. During analysis, the time frame over which soil moisture, SWE, and precipitable water tendencies were calculated was found to have an impact on the magnitude of the month-to-month residuals, predominantly with SWE tendency during the spring melt. The storage tendency terms were calculated with a $\partial t$ of two months, as represented in seconds (on average, 5,256,000 seconds per two months). If the tendency calculation was

![Figure 4](image_url)  
Fig. 4 RCM water balance component breakdown (1980–2004) driven by NCEP Reanalysis II.

### Table 6. Range of relative residuals ($\epsilon_{\text{relative}}$) resulting from conversion to pressure levels and the subsequent vertical integration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRCM CCSM</th>
<th>CRCM CGCM3</th>
<th>HRM3 GFDL</th>
<th>HRM3 HADCM3</th>
<th>WRFG CCSM</th>
<th>WRFG CGCM3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. (%)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041–2070</td>
<td>Min. (%)</td>
<td>–7.4</td>
<td>–10.4</td>
<td>–37.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>–60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. (%)</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This value was not available because some precipitable water values were published as zero (an unrealistic value), resulting in an infinite residual.
performed with a \( \Delta t \) of one month (i.e., if April’s value was the difference between April and March or the difference between May and April) then the magnitude of the storage tendency terms would be different. The effect of this even out over the span of a year and did not substantially affect mean or RMS residuals.

Residuals at the 3-hour time interval of published data were also calculated and found to be almost identical to the mean annual residuals found above (\(< 1\%\) difference) despite varying wildly from time step to time step. The annual cycles of 3-hour residuals followed the same patterns as monthly residuals.

**c Modelling Processes and Parameterization Schemes**

Labrador has a precipitation recycling ratio (i.e., the percentage of precipitation that originates from local evaporation) of roughly 6 to 9\%, and a high recycling ratio is considered to be greater than 20\% (Trenberth, 1998). Evidence of this can be found in Fig. 3 where both atmospheric moisture convergence and land-surface evaporation play a significant role. A high recycling ratio implies atmospheric water balances are strongly influenced by parameterizations because of the increased role of evaportranspiration and land-surface schemes. Conversely, a low recycling ratio implies atmospheric water balances are more strongly influenced by model dynamics (i.e., resolved moisture convergence). The Churchill River basin’s mid-range recycling ratio implies that atmospheric water balances are influenced relatively equally by parameterizations and dynamical processes. Large-scale moisture advection is the only water balance process that is adequately resolved in most ensemble members. As such, parameterization is required to represent the unresolved processes (e.g., turbulence, convection, evaporation, condensation, and radiative fluxes) with impacts on the water budgets that vary depending on the respective schemes. Some parameterization schemes allow a certain amount of water to be lost within specified accuracy limits (e.g., the Canadian Land Surface Scheme (CLASS) used in the CRCM has an accuracy limit of 1 \( \times 10^{-3} \) kg m\(^{-2}\) (0.001 mm) per time step (Verseghy, 2009)). More examples of variation in evaporation and soil moisture schemes have been found by others (see literature review). The fallibility of parameterizations is further evidenced by unrealistic output values found in NARCCAP data, such as negative runoff and zero precipitable water content.

For a comparison of the isolated effects of the RCMs for which the driving model is consistent across all models, Fig. 4 presents the water balance component breakdown for four of NARCCAP’s RCMs driven by NCEP Reanalysis II (Kanamitsu et al., 2002), for the 1980–2003 period (there were insufficient MM5I data and no HRM3 SWE data available for analysis). Table 7 explicitly lists the corresponding residuals. The differences in residuals between models emphasizes the role that individual RCMs and their respective coordinate systems, parameterizations, and modelling processes play in atmospheric and terrestrial water balances. There are strong similarities between the water balance components and residuals in Fig. 4 and those in Fig. 3 for each RCM, confirming the dominant role of the RCM over the forcing model.

**d Geographical Considerations**

The influence of regional variation and basin size are also worth discussing. Dimri (2012) found that a similar version of CRCM3-NCEP had a much smaller water budget residual over the western Himalayas, despite the complex terrain, than was found over the Churchill River basin. Their study region was over 3.5 times larger, and they investigated a rectangular domain because they were not interested in a single basin. Music and Caya (2007) studied a similar version of CRCM-NCEP over the Mississippi River basin (3.2 \( \times 10^6 \) km\(^2\)) and found that their water balance residuals followed a similar annual cycle to those in Fig. 4 (with largest positive \( \varepsilon_4 \) occurring in late spring and largest negative \( \varepsilon_A \) in autumn), though they had a consistently smaller magnitude. The largest monthly \( \varepsilon_A \) was approximately 0.2 mm d\(^{-1}\) compared with 0.4 mm d\(^{-1}\) found here. (A previous version of CRCM had larger mean annual and monthly imbalances. This was
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**Table 7. Atmospheric and terrestrial water balance residual values for all available models driven by NCEP Reanalysis II.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRCM</th>
<th>HRM3</th>
<th>RCM3</th>
<th>WRFG</th>
<th>RMSR</th>
<th>CRCM</th>
<th>RCM3</th>
<th>WRFG</th>
<th>RMSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>–173</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual (m^3 s(^{-1}))</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>–96</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>Residual (m^3 s(^{-1}))</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>–70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>–806</td>
<td>–1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>2983</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>–162</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>4516</td>
<td>–426</td>
<td>2308</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>–302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>–142</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>–54</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>–128</td>
<td>–319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>–72</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>2997</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSR</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>3430</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>RMSR</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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mitigated in the current version by an adjustment applied to specific humidity values at each grid point.)

Another geographical consideration is that the Churchill River basin is near the eastern lateral boundary of the NARCCAP domain. Because the basin lies in a predominantly westerly atmospheric flow it is near the outflow region of each of the RCMS. This relative proximity to the lateral boundary may be introducing residual, particularly in the atmospheric water balance. It has been found that the outflow region in limited area models, such as RCMS, can exhibit physically inconsistent behaviour because of the requirement for the RCM data to align with that of the forcing GCM (Lucarini, Danihlik, Kriegerova, & Speranza, 2007; Marbaix, Gallee, Brasseur, & van Ypersele, 2003). This alignment occurs in the buffer zone where moisture imbalances are common and may result in numerical errors bouncing back into the RCM domain (Liang, Kunkel, & Samel, 2001).

### Various

While condensed moisture (e.g., as clouds) is not included in the specific humidity or precipitable water variables used in this analysis, the contribution it makes is typically small (on the order of 1%). A similar argument can be made for sources of terrestrial water storage other than soil moisture and snow pack (e.g., canopy interception).

The only RCM in the current ensemble that used spectral nudging (pushing variable values closer to those found in the driving GCM) was CRCM and, as shown in Table 3, both CRCM ensemble members had relatively low residuals. It should not be assumed that spectral nudging implies a smaller residual because the onus of water balance closure is then shifted to the driving GCM, which is not guaranteed to be more physically consistent than the RCM. That being said, GCMs do not need to accommodate prescribed lateral boundaries and their respective buffer zones, discussed above. More insight will be gained once simulation results are published for the Experimental Climate Prediction Center Regional Spectral Model (ECP2; another NARCCAP RCM), which also uses spectral nudging.

### Primary Contributors to Moisture Imbalance

Based on the above analysis, there are three primary factors of comparable importance that contributed to residuals being introduced into the water balances. (Because none of these contributions were able to be quantified, they are not listed in order of importance.) The first is geographical considerations, particularly the proximity of the study region to the RCM’s outflow lateral buffer zone. The second is the interpolation to NARCCAP’s standard pressure levels from each RCM’s native vertical coordinate system and subsequent vertical interpolation using these pressure level data. The third is the various model parameterizations and processes, including land-surface schemes.

There were several other potential contributing factors discussed above, though they were found to have a non-substantial effect on the water balance residuals. These included the 3-hour sampling frequency of the RCMS, sources of moisture not included in the water balance calculations (e.g., clouds), and the various calculations performed (other than the aforementioned vertical integration of pressure levels), especially averaged over the full year.

### 5 Summary and conclusions

Mean annual atmospheric and terrestrial water balance residuals were quantified as were their mean annual cycles. The atmospheric water balance residuals were consistently higher than the terrestrial residuals, regardless of time period or ensemble member. Some of this difference can be attributed to the residual resulting from the interpolation of atmospheric data to pressure levels and its subsequent integration, found in Table 6.

With regard to the annual cycle, the winter and early spring months had the lowest overall RMSRs. The highest atmospheric RMSR occurred in mid- to late summer, while the highest terrestrial RMSR occurred during the spring melt. There was no pattern across time periods or ensemble members that indicated whether terrestrial or atmospheric RMSR was the highest.

Water balance residuals were found to be much more consistent between common RCMS than common GCMs. This implies that residuals are largely a function of RCM and not the driving GCM. Similarly, water balance residuals have been found to be predominantly systemic, implying that anomalies (including interannual variation and the climate signal) are better represented than individual field values.

Although it was not feasible to isolate all root causes of the atmospheric and terrestrial water cycle imbalances, this study was able to explore or quantify some causes and eliminate others. At this point, it would be premature to rank the models for physical consistency because the investigation needs to expand to include additional regions of varying climatologies and sizes. This can be accomplished by expanding the boundaries of the Churchill River basin to cover an area greater than $2 \times 10^5$ km$^2$ and comparing the results with those found here and with an equally sized region (elsewhere in North America) modelled by NARCCAP.

Expanding the geographic focus would also be useful in determining the impact of basin proximity to the lateral buffer zone of each RCM. Until such a comparison is undertaken it must not be assumed that residuals found here would occur in every region of the NARCCAP domain with the same magnitudes. This is especially true for atmospheric water balances because the large-scale circulation of an RCM is more directly influenced by the forcing model (and buffer zone) than the terrestrial water balance components. As such, the terrestrial water balance residuals (relative to other water balance components, as in Table 5) are more likely to be applicable to other regions.

Additional sources of uncertainty that merit further investigation include the impacts of the choice of vertical coordinate...
system (plus vertical coordinate discrepancies between RCM and GCM), parameterization scheme choices, and spectral nudging. Detailed investigation of individual parameterization schemes and dynamic processes is beyond the scope of this paper and would be most effectively investigated by individual modelling teams.

One recommendation that should be incorporated in future ensemble studies is to publish accumulated moisture convergence fields calculated using an RCM’s native vertical coordinate system. This would provide a consistent variable across all ensemble members without the additional residual introduced by converting to, and performing calculations in, a pressure level coordinate system (not to mention drastically reduce the amount of data to download and store).

Although NARCCAP’s ensemble is imperfect (as are all simulations), it is still able to provide much useful information, particularly about the impacts of climate change. Water balance errors were found to be largely systemic, meaning that anomalies and changes over time (e.g., under climate change) are more reliable than individual field values (Berbery & Rasmusson, 1999; Trenberth, 1991). Even if atmospheric and terrestrial water balance residuals exist, models still provide useful information about a basin’s moisture flux (Liu & Stewart, 2003). Additionally, long-term average moisture convergence and $P-E$ should equal long-term average runoff, providing insight for practical applications such as water resource management, as investigated by Roberts and Snelgrove (2015).
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