



The University of  
**Nottingham**

UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

Masaki, Yoshimitsu and Hanasaki, Naota and Biemans, Hester and Müller Schmied, Hannes and Tang, QiuHong and Wada, Yoshihide and Gosling, Simon and Takahashi, Kiyoshi and Hijioka, Yasuaki (2017) Intercomparison of global river discharge simulations focusing on dam operation --- Part II: Multiple models analysis in two case-study river basins, Missouri-Mississippi and Green-Colorado. *Environmental Research Letters* . ISSN 1748-9326 (In Press)

**Access from the University of Nottingham repository:**

[http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/39765/1/Masaki\\_etal\\_2017\\_AAM.pdf](http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/39765/1/Masaki_etal_2017_AAM.pdf)

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by researchers of the University of Nottingham available open access under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution licence and may be reused according to the conditions of the licence. For more details see:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.5/>

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the repository url above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact [eprints@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@nottingham.ac.uk)

## Intercomparison of global river discharge simulations focusing on dam operation --- Part II: Multiple models analysis in two case-study river basins, Missouri-Mississippi and Green-Colorado

This content has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text.

### Download details:

This content was downloaded by: sigosling

IP Address: 128.243.2.30

This content was downloaded on 09/01/2017 at 13:48

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Masaki et al

To cite this article before publication: Masaki et al, 2017, Environ. Res. Lett., at press:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa57a8>

This Accepted Manuscript is copyright Copyright 2017 IOP Publishing Ltd

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY 3.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY 3.0 licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions will likely be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected, unless specifically stated otherwise in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

When available, you can view the Version of Record for this article at:

<http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aa57a8>

# Intercomparison of global river discharge simulations focusing on dam operation — Part II: Multiple models analysis in two case-study river basins, Missouri-Mississippi and Green-Colorado

Yoshimitsu Masaki<sup>1,2</sup>, Naota Hanasaki<sup>1</sup>, Hester Biemans<sup>3</sup>, Hannes Müller Schmied<sup>4,5</sup>, Qihong Tang<sup>6</sup>, Yoshihide Wada<sup>7,8,9,10</sup>, Simon N. Gosling<sup>11</sup>, Kiyoshi Takahashi<sup>1</sup>, and Yasuaki Hijioka<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Institute for Environmental Studies, 16-2 Onogawa, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8506, Japan

<sup>2</sup> *Current Affiliation:* Graduate School of Science and Technology, Hirosaki University, Bunkyocho-3, Hirosaki, Aomori, 036-8561, Japan

<sup>3</sup> Wageningen University and Research, P.O. Box 47, 6700 AA Wageningen, the Netherlands

<sup>4</sup> Institute of Physical Geography, Goethe-University, Frankfurt, Germany

<sup>5</sup> Senckenberg Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre (BiK-F), Frankfurt, Germany

<sup>6</sup> Key Laboratory of Water Cycle and Related Land Surface Processes, Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences Beijing 100101, China

<sup>7</sup> NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, New York, USA

<sup>8</sup> Center for Climate Systems Research, Columbia University, New York, USA

<sup>9</sup> Department of Physical Geography, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>10</sup> International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria

<sup>11</sup> School of Geography, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, UK

E-mail: ymasaki@hirosaki-u.ac.jp

## Abstract.

We performed a twofold intercomparison of river discharge regulated by dams under multiple meteorological forcings among multiple global hydrological models for a historical period by simulation. Paper II provides an intercomparison of river discharge simulated by five hydrological models under four meteorological forcings. This is the first global multimodel intercomparison study on dam-regulated river flow. Although the simulations were conducted globally, the Missouri-Mississippi and Green-Colorado Rivers were chosen as case-study sites in this study. The hydrological models incorporate generic schemes of dam operation, not specific to a certain dam. We examined river discharge on a longitudinal section of river channels to investigate the effects of dams on simulated discharge, especially at the seasonal time scale. We found that the magnitude of dam regulation differed considerably among the hydrological models. The difference was attributable not only to dam operation schemes but also to the magnitude of simulated river discharge flowing into dams. That is, although a similar algorithm of dam operation schemes was incorporated in

*Intercomparison of regulated river discharge — II: Multiple models*

2

42 different hydrological models, the magnitude of dam regulation substantially differed  
43 among the models. Intermodel discrepancies tended to decrease toward the lower  
44 reaches of these river basins, which means model dependence is less significant toward  
45 lower reaches. These case-study results imply that, intermodel comparisons of river  
46 discharge should be made at different locations along the river's course to critically  
47 examine the performance of hydrological models because the performance can vary  
48 with the locations.

49 PACS numbers: 92.40qf, 92.40qh, 92.40qp, 92.40Xx, 92.70Mn

50 *Keywords:* river discharge, reservoir, flow regimes, flood control

51 Submitted to: *Environ. Res. Lett.*

Accepted Manuscript

## 1. Introduction

Humans have constructed approximately 60,000 dams and reservoirs worldwide (Avakyan and Iakovleva, 1998; ICOLD, 2016) with the aim of providing stable access to water resources and preventing riverine disasters. Humans also use riverine water for irrigation, and municipal and industrial purposes. Currently, most world's large rivers are regulated by dams (Nilsson *et al* , 2005). To simulate river discharge affected by human impacts worldwide, global hydrological models (GHMs) implementing dam regulation and water abstraction schemes are necessary (Biemans *et al* , 2011; Bierkens, 2015; Nazemi and Wheater, 2015a, 2015b).

Hydrological simulations are subject to uncertainties arising from various factors. Among them, uncertainties from meteorological forcings and hydrological models are predominant. Firstly, the various global meteorological data sets compiled from observed data with various compilation methodologies may contain different atmospheric conditions (including precipitation), which affects simulated runoff and river discharge (e.g., Müller Schmied *et al* , 2016a). This topic was addressed in Paper I (Masaki *et al* , 2016), which focused on how reservoirs behave during extreme flood events.

Secondly, hydrological models themselves are also sources of uncertainty. Each model implements different schemes for land surface processes (e.g., runoff, evapotranspiration, and infiltration) or river routing processes and also uses different parameters. As a result, even simulations of natural flow (unregulated flow without water withdrawal) differ considerably among GHMs (Haddeland *et al* , 2011). Moreover, human interventions in river flow, such as dam operation and water withdrawal from surface water bodies (e.g., rivers and lakes) and groundwater, are additional sources of uncertainty among GHMs. Although a variety of dam operation strategies exist to meet local water resource requirements/uses, weather conditions, social/political demands and so forth, operational rules and historical records of operations are not available to the public except for a limited number of cases. Therefore, present GHMs incorporate generic schemes of dam operation (e.g., Hanasaki *et al* , 2006; Haddeland *et al* , 2006). Hereafter, the term 'generic schemes' indicates schemes that are not specific to a certain dam but are applicable to a group of dams. Such schemes fundamentally shift the timing of outflows by temporarily storing water without changing the total volume of river flow, insofar as evaporation from open water surfaces of dam reservoirs is considered to be secondary. Generic schemes can successfully reduce errors of simulated river discharge compared with observed discharge. However, practical application of these schemes to actual riverine management has room for further improvement due to their simplification of dam functions (Hanasaki *et al* , 2006).

With the rising use of GHMs, it has become increasingly important to examine their performance through intercomparison (Haddeland *et al* , 2011; Schewe *et al* , 2014; Gosling *et al* , 2016), as well as in terms of water withdrawal (Wada *et al* , 2013) and extreme hydrological events (Dankers *et al* , 2014; Prudhomme *et al* , 2014). However,

no intercomparison of flow regulation has been performed. Moreover, since river flow can be regulated by multiple dams in a river channel, the differences in flow regulation among GHMs should be systematically investigated. In this study, the impacts of dam operation on river flow are examined from upstream to downstream. In addition, it is important to compare simulated and observed discharges to check the model performance in hydrological simulations. For global-scale simulations, comparisons have often been performed at one or a few representative gauge stations for each basin (Nijssen *et al* , 2001; Sperna Weiland *et al* , 2010; Hattermann *et al* , 2016). The station which has a long history of observation near the furthest main-stem reach is favorably used because river flow at these locations is considered to reflect the overall characteristics of the basin. However, since highly regulated rivers have variable seasonal behavior, even among river sectors separated by dams, comparisons and validations of river flow at the furthest reach is insufficient to identify sources of intermodel differences. It is important to perform intercomparisons of regulated river flow by decomposing river channels into sectors from the upper to lower reaches, similar to the longitudinal section analysis of Vörösmarty *et al* (1997).

In this paper (Paper II), we simulated of river discharge under multiple meteorological forcings for the historical period of 1971–2000 using multiple models and examined the characteristics of river discharge regulated by dams. The objectives of this paper are twofold. (1) We examine the effects of different models by comparing the simulated seasonality of river discharge obtained using five GHMs (Section 3.1). Here, we compare the alteration of river flow by dams at the seasonal timescale obtained with multiple models. (2) We also discuss discrepancies among the models under multiple forcings (Section 3.2). To elucidate the effects of dam regulation, we examine the Missouri-Mississippi and Green-Colorado River simulations as case studies. This research was performed under the framework of Phase 2a of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP).

The structure of this paper is as follows. We outline the data sets and analytical methods in Section 2. The results are presented in Section 3. We discuss the performance and potential problems of the regulated river flow simulations in Section 4. In Section 5, the conclusions are presented.

## 2. Data and Methods

### 2.1. Historical meteorological data

Four historical meteorological data sets were used in this study, namely GSWP3 (Kim *et al* , 2014), Princeton PGMFD ver2 (Sheffield *et al* , 2006), WFDEI.gpcc (Weedon *et al* , 2014) and WATCH (Weedon *et al* , 2010), hereafter referred to as GSWP3, PGFv2, WFDEI and WATCH, respectively (Table 1). Since WFDEI.gpcc covers 1979 onward, WFDEI is a combination of WATCH (before 1979) and WFDEI.gpcc (after 1979) in ISIMIP2a. Meteorological variables used in this simulation depend on GHMs

**Table 1.** Historical meteorological data sets used in this study. The last column shows whether wind-induced precipitation undercatch is corrected. These data sets were re-gridded and distributed by the ISIMIP. <sup>1</sup>Compo *et al* (2011), <sup>2</sup>Kalnay *et al* (1996), <sup>3</sup>Dee *et al* (2011), <sup>4</sup>Uppala *et al* (2005)

Data sets (Abbreviation)	Reanalysis	Precipitation correction	Undercatch
GSWP3	20th Century <sup>1</sup>	GPCC ver6, CRU TS3.21	Corrected
Princeton PGMFD ver.2 (PGFv2)	NCEP-NCAR <sup>2</sup>	CRU TS3.21	Uncorrected
WFDEI.gpcc (WFDEI)	ERA-Interim <sup>3</sup>	GPCC ver5/6	Corrected
WATCH	ERA-40 <sup>4</sup>	GPCC ver4	Corrected

(see Table A1), employing different land process schemes. Müller Schmied *et al* (2016a) examined these meteorological data sets and pointed out that differences in chronological decadal trends of meteorological variables caused differences in simulated discharge and evapotranspiration.

## 2.2. Hydrological simulations

We used the following five GHMs: DBH (Tang *et al*, 2007), H08 (Hanasaki *et al*, 2008a, 2008b), LPJmL (Rost *et al*, 2008; Biemans *et al*, 2011), PCR-GLOBWB (Wada *et al*, 2014) and WaterGAP (Müller Schmied *et al*, 2014, 2016a). All GHMs included dam operation (in consideration of construction year) in their simulation. Their results were available on January, 2016, in the ISIMIP2a framework. In the main, the model settings followed ISIMIP2a protocol (ISIMIP, 2015), although there were some exceptions. All the models covered the globe at a resolution of  $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$  for the period 1971–2000, which is common simulation periods determined by the ISIMIP protocol for the four meteorological data sets. The hydrological state variables of each model at the beginning of 1971 were stabilized (spun-up) using pre-1970 data. River routing was achieved using DDM30 (Döll and Lehner, 2002) (see Section 2.4 later). Analysis settings and model specifications are briefly summarized in Table 2 and Supplement A.1.

To examine anthropogenic effects on river flow, we used simulations called ‘varsoc’ runs, defined by ISIMIP2a, which included time-varying human interventions (standard analysis settings were dams, water withdrawal, and changes in land use over basins; see also Tables 2 and A1 for details). Historical land use (e.g., type of crop cultivation) is represented annually by Dynamic MIRCA-HYDE. This is a historical extension of MIRCA2000 (Portmann *et al*, 2010), which provides land use data circa 2000 with the extension of time-varying trends given by HYDE3.1 (Goldewijk *et al*, 2011). Dam specifications (location, storage capacity, and construction year) were provided by GRanD ver. 1.1 (Lehner *et al*, 2011a, 2011b). Essentially, the GHMs implemented the dam location data provided as standard data by ISIMIP, which was georeferenced to DDM30. We also used ‘nosoc’ runs in naturalized, control simulations, in which neither human withdrawals nor dam operation were considered.

**Table 2.** Hydrological models used in this study. Abbreviations for water use: (Ir) irrigation, (D) domestic, (In) industry, (Mn) manufacturing, (Lv) livestock, and (C) cooling of thermal power plants. See also Table A1 for other specifications of each model. <sup>1</sup>For WaterGAP, Mn + C = In, <sup>2</sup>Calibration covers 54% of global land surface, according to Müller Schmied *et al* (2016a), <sup>3</sup>See also the Supplement A2.

GHM	Water use	Calibration	River routing	Dam operation scheme	Evaporation from water surface of dams
DBH	Ir	No	linear reservoir, DDM30	Hanasaki <i>et al</i> (2006) <sup>2</sup>	No
H08	Ir,D,In	No	linear reservoir, DDM30	Hanasaki <i>et al</i> (2006) <sup>2</sup> (active only for flood prevention scheme)	No
LPJmL	Ir,D,In,Lv	No	linear reservoir, DDM30	Biemans <i>et al</i> (2011)	Considered
PCR-GLOBWB	Ir,D,In,Lv	No	travel-time routing	Wada <i>et al</i> (2014)	Considered
WaterGAP	Ir,D,Mn,Lv,C <sup>1</sup>	Calibrated on long-term mean annual discharge <sup>2</sup>	linear reservoir, DDM30	Hanasaki <i>et al</i> (2006) <sup>3</sup>	Considered

161 Some GHMs used analysis settings that were different from the standard ones.  
 162 As shown in Table 2, four of the five models included human withdrawals other  
 163 than irrigation. WaterGAP adopts static land use but varies irrigation areas yearly.  
 164 Regarding the dam location data, some GHMs relocated dams in consideration of  
 165 different priorities (Table A2; see also comparison maps by Müller Schmied *et al*  
 166 (2016b)).

### 167 2.3. Post-simulation analysis

168 In this paper, we focused mainly on the climatological seasonality of river discharge for  
 169 two major global rivers, and compared simulated data with observations. We aggregated  
 170 both simulated and observed daily river discharge over three-month periods: December  
 171 to February (DJF), March to May (MAM), June to August (JJA), and September to  
 172 November (SON), which correspond to winter, spring, summer, and fall, respectively.

173 The observed discharge data were obtained from the archive of the Global Runoff  
 174 Data Centre (GRDC) and the United States Geological Survey (USGS). To compare  
 175 simulated and observed discharge, we georeferenced the river gauge station to DDM30  
 176 so that the catchment area of the station agreed with that of DDM30. We divided the  
 177 analysis period 1971–2000 into three 10-yr time spans in our analysis because not all  
 178 gauge stations had been in operation over the entire 30-yr analysis period. To utilize as



1  
2  
3  
4  
5 179 many gauge stations as possible for comparison with simulated discharge and to suppress  
6 180 meteorological year-to-year variability, we considered the 10-year period is adequate for  
7  
8 181 our purpose.

#### 10 182 *2.4. Case studies*


11  
12 183 In this paper, the Missouri-Mississippi and Colorado River basins were chosen as case  
13 184 studies. We chose these river basins because (1) historical river discharge records are  
14 185 available, particularly for gauge stations in different river sectors separated by large  
15 186 dams, (2) there is clear seasonality in the river discharge, (3) the flow is significantly  
16 187 regulated by large reservoirs, and (4) both river basins have large catchment areas so that  
17 188 differences in geographical characteristics inside these river basins can be resolved at a  
18 189 resolution of  $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ . In fact, the levels of flow regulation are 15.5% and 280% for the  
19 190 Mississippi and Colorado River Basins, respectively, estimated as the percentage of total  
20 191 reservoir capacity within a river system relative to volumetric annual discharge, following  
21 192 Nilsson *et al* (2005)(Table S1). Moreover, historical reservoir operation records for major  
22 193 dams on these rivers are available. In this study, we performed both multiforcing and  
23 194 multimodel comparisons for the Missouri-Mississippi River and a multimodel comparison  
24 195 for the regulated flow of the Green-Colorado River.

25  
26 196 To analyze discharge on a longitudinal section of these rivers, we allocated the  
27 197 sequential cell number (SCN) along the main channel from the upper to the lower  
28 198 reaches (Figure 1) of these rivers. Figure 1 also shows the land cells with simulated  
29 199 annual mean river discharge (varsoc run)  $> 100 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  for each GHM. Since these major  
30 200 rivers have high water flux, land cells with low discharge (those in dark gray in Figure  
31 201 1) were not considered as part of the main stem in each GHM.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 202 *2.4.1. Missouri-Mississippi River Basin* The Mississippi River is the third largest river  
41 203 basin in the world (including its tributaries) and travels through a wide range of climates  
42 204 and geography from snow-packed mountainous areas to temperate plains. The flow has  
43 205 clear natural seasonality due to spring snowmelt in the mountainous areas and heavy  
44 206 rain in the plains during warm months, but is heavily regulated by large dams on the  
45 207 Missouri River.


46  
47  
48 208 Large dams have been constructed since the mid-20th century to maintain the  
49 209 riverine environment. Five large dams (Table A3) have significant impacts on seasonal  
50 210 river flow due to their large storage capacity (see US Army Corps (2006) for dam  
51 211 management details). In this study, historical dam operation data obtained from the  
52 212 US Army Corps of Engineers (Northwest Division) were also used in the analysis. To  
53 213 compare simulated and observed discharges, 12 gauge stations (Table A4 and Fig. A1)  
54 214 along the Missouri-Mississippi River were used.

55  
56  
57  
58  
59 215 *2.4.2. Green-Colorado River Basin* The Colorado River starts in the Rocky Mountains,  
60 216 travels through a dry region, and flows into the Gulf of California. The river is known



**Figure 1.** Example of major river channels implemented in each global hydrological model (GHM) in the central part of the United States. Black grid lines separate land cells with the dimensions of  $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ . To visualize the channels, symbols were added to the land cells with an annual average discharge (varsoc run) of greater than  $100 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ . Different symbols were marked for each GHM (see the inserted box). The numbers superimposed on the land cells show the sequence of land cells along the longest stems of the Missouri-Mississippi (flowing from the top center to the bottom right in the map) and Green-Colorado (from the center to bottom left) Rivers. Owing to the instability of hydrological simulation over a small catchment area, we omitted the first 10 cells of the river from the source in the intermodel comparison.

217 to be one of the most regulated rivers in the world (Glen Canyon and Hoover Dams; see  
 218 Table A5). We chose this basin expecting that uncertainty in operation schemes would  
 219 be clearly detected in simulated river discharge because of the high ratio of the dam  
 220 capacity to the annual discharge. Moreover, the water is also supplied for irrigation and  
 221 municipal use in the basin and its neighborhood. Thus, hydrological simulation using a  
 222 generic dam operation scheme in this river basin is not only challenging, but also useful  
 223 to examine intermodel discrepancies due to dam operation. Historically, the discharge of



**Figure 2.** Major tributaries (indicated in blue) directly flowing into the Missouri-Mississippi or Green-Colorado Rivers (red). IDs were assigned to each tributary. The individual river names are: (1) Missouri, (3) Yellowstone, (4) Platte, (6) Arkansas, (12) Red, (15) (Upper) Mississippi, and (21) Ohio for the Missouri-Mississippi River System, and (a) Green and (b) Gila for the Green-Colorado River System. Only river sectors more than 10 cells from the source are indicated.

224 this river system was drastically changed by the construction of Hoover Dam (storage:  
 225  $3.670 \times 10^{10} \text{ m}^3$ ) in 1935 and Glen Canyon Dam (storage:  $2.507 \times 10^{10} \text{ m}^3$ ) in 1963.  
 226 The peak river flow in the upper basin occurs in spring due to snowmelt. Note that the  
 227 Green River is also regulated by Flaming Gorge Dam (storage:  $4.336 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3$ ).

228 We focused on a longitudinal section along the Green and Colorado Rivers, the  
 229 longest reach of the river system. Five gauge stations (Table A6) were used for  
 230 comparison.

### 231 3. Results

#### 232 3.1. Intercomparison of the seasonal fraction of river discharge among hydrological 233 models

234 The seasonal fraction of river discharge varied among the GHMs. To visualize the  
 235 effects of dam operation on the seasonal flow at different river sectors fragmented by  
 236 dams, we drew a longitudinal section along each river channel (Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2)  
 237 and interpreted the results with hydrographs (Section 3.1.3). In this section, we used  
 238 the simulation results forced by GSWP3 for simplicity. Since the seasonality of main  
 239 channel flow is altered not only by dams but also by the confluence of major tributaries  
 240 under natural conditions, we also accounted for major tributaries in the interpretation  
 241 (see also Figure 2).

*Intercomparison of regulated river discharge — II: Multiple models*

10

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 242 *3.1.1. Missouri-Mississippi River* Figure 3 shows the results of the seasonal fraction  
6 243 of discharge for the Missouri-Mississippi River. The horizontal axis gives the location  
7 244 along the main stem in terms of the SCN from the upper (leftward) to lower (rightward)  
8 245 reaches. For each GHM, seasonal fractions relative to annual discharge are shown, with  
9 246 corresponding heights presented in different colors. Although only river discharge for the  
10 247 decade 1971–1980 is shown, similar seasonality was observed in other decades. Figure 4  
11 248 extracts the seasonal fractions at three representative sites on the channel from Figure  
12 249 3 for intermodel comparison.


13  
14  
15  
16 250 Among the GHMs, a high flow was generally observed in spring-summer due to  
17 251 mountain snowmelt in the upper reaches. As the river flows down to the plains, the  
18 252 climate becomes warmer and precipitation increases, peaking in summer. An evenly  
19 253 distributed flow throughout the seasons can be observed in the middle reach of the  
20 254 Mississippi River. Seasonal behavior also changes downstream from the confluence of  
21 255 tributaries, such as the Arkansas (#6), (Upper) Mississippi (#15) and Ohio (#21)  
22 256 Rivers. In the lower reaches of the Mississippi River, water is abstracted for irrigation  
23 257 (Figure C2 includes only the results from H08), but withdrawal is sufficiently smaller  
24 258 than the river discharge so it did not markedly alter the river flow seasonality.

25  
26  
27  
28 259 The intermodel comparison of river flow seasonality frequently showed the greatest  
29 260 proportion of river flow in spring to summer, but the seasonal fraction of river flow  
30 261 differed among the GHMs (Figures 3 and 4). H08 had higher flow in spring, whereas  
31 262 DBH had higher flow in summer. Note that high annual variations can be seen in the  
32 263 upper reaches, whereas there were lower annual variations among the GHMs in the lower  
33 264 reaches.


34  
35  
36 265 Next, we focused on flow regulation by dams. Judging by the discontinuity in the  
37 266 seasonal fraction of river flow due to the impact of dams (e.g., Fort Peck Dam at SCN  
38 267 22), the magnitude of seasonal flow regulation differed markedly among the GHMs.  
39 268 H08, LPJmL, and WaterGAP introduced greater seasonal flow modulation than DBH  
40 269 and PCR-GLOBWB. Intermodel differences in seasonality were weakened as the river  
41 270 flowed downstream, possibly because of flows merging according to various seasonal  
42 271 behaviors of tributaries. The seasonality of the five-GHM ensemble mean reproduced  
43 272 the seasonality observed at land cells where gauge stations were located. However,  
44 273 discontinuity at dams was unclear as a result of averaging. Moreover, whether regulated  
45 274 flows began in land cells where dams were located, or in an adjacent cell, depended on  
46 275 the GHM.

47  
48  
49  
50  
51 276 Based on the observed seasonality at the gauges, each model has advantages and  
52 277 disadvantages with respect to reproducing seasonality along the whole channel (Table  
53 278 C1). Even if a GHM performs well for some river sectors, it does not perfectly reproduce  
54 279 seasonality for other river sectors. Note that the seasonality of WaterGAP was not  
55 280 affected from calibration because WaterGAP was calibrated with long-term mean annual  
56 281 discharge, not seasonal discharge.

57  
58  
59  
60



**Figure 3.** Seasonal fraction of river discharge simulated using five hydrological models (varsoc run) and basic hydroclimatological parameters (runoff and evapotranspiration by H08) on a longitudinal section along the Missouri-Mississippi River. The horizontal axis gives the sequential cell number (SCN) from the uppermost reach of the Missouri River (as indicated in Figure 1). (a) Historical changes in precipitation, evapotranspiration, and runoff are shown as blue, green, and red lines for 1951–1960, 1971–1980, and 1991–2000, respectively. Tributaries that meet the Missouri-Mississippi River are indicated by numbers in the upper panel. See also Tributary IDs in Figure 2. (b) The seasonal fraction of river flow for 1971–1980 is indicated by different colors: cyan (DJF), green (MAM), orange (JJA), and magenta (SON). Gray cells indicate land cells through which the river channels used by each GHM did not pass (see Figure 1). The observed seasonality at gauge stations is indicated by the ladder-shaped boxes. White broken lines show equal partitions among seasons (25% each). (c) Dam capacity is indicated in the same colors as (a). Fort Peck (F), Garrison (G), and Oahe (O) Dams are located at SCNs 22, 33, and 42, respectively.




**Figure 4.** Intermodel comparison of seasonal fraction of river discharge, shown in Figure 3, at three selected sites on the Missouri-Mississippi River. Three sites are representative of the upper (SCN 12), middle (SCN 50) and lower (SCN 90) reaches. The seasonal fractions of river flow for 1971–1980 are indicated by different colors: cyan (DJF), green (MAM), orange (JJA), and magenta (SON). The outermost circle represents the ensemble mean of the five GHMs.

3.1.2. *Green-Colorado River* Figure 5 shows the results for the Green-Colorado River for 1971–1980. Since the seasonality of the observed river discharge changed somewhat over the decades, we also included the results for 1991–2000 in the Supplement (Figure C1). The seasonal fractions at two representative sites on the channel are shown in Figure 6. As mentioned earlier, reproducing the seasonal flow of the Colorado River is challenging for all hydrological models, owing to multiple human interventions. The simulated discharge of the Green River tended to be higher in spring than in other seasons, whereas the observed discharge was higher in both spring and summer. At Glen Canyon Dam (SCN 17) in the Colorado River, the seasonal flow variation was markedly reduced. All the GHMs showed less seasonality toward the river mouth. In the lower reaches, river water was abstracted for irrigation (which can also be seen in Figure C3 in the results for H08), but the withdrawal was sufficiently small compared with the river discharge. Thus, irrigation was hardly noticeable in the river flow seasonality.

The magnitude of flow regulation at the dams differed among the models. H08, LPJmL, and WaterGAP showed strong flow regulation, whereas the other models showed weaker regulation. The five-GHM ensemble mean reproduced the observed seasonality with reasonable accuracy. We note that discontinuity in the seasonality simulated with WaterGAP at the three cells from the lowermost reach was generated by strong calibration of the simulated discharge (reduced to ca. 25%), intended to match the long-term mean of the observed annual discharge. This feature was also observed as a sudden decrease in annual discharge at SCNs 36–38 in Figure 1.


3.1.3. *Different magnitudes of flow regulation across GHMs* These results showed that flow regulation differed considerably across the GHMs. What explains these differences? We examined their causes by using simulated hydrographs at sites downstream of large dams (Fort Peck Dam in the Missouri River and Glen Canyon Dam in the Colorado River). We focused on how the river flow was modulated by the dams in each GHM. For this purpose, we analyzed land cells where the dams are located in each GHM because the location could differ by one cell upstream or downstream along the main channel among the GHMs.

Tables 3 and 4 show mean river discharge at the dam sites. The ranges of the forcing-ensemble means among the GHMs were markedly larger than those of the GHM-ensemble means among the meteorological forcings. The ranges of the final columns were 725.3 m<sup>3</sup>/s for Fort Peck Dam and 669.9 m<sup>3</sup>/s for Glen Canyon Dam, whereas those of the final rows were 105.6 m<sup>3</sup>/s and 227.3 m<sup>3</sup>/s, respectively. These results indicate that the spread of the simulated river discharge depended more strongly on the GHM than on the meteorological forcing, which is consistent with published intercomparison studies using multiple general circulation models and multiple GHMs (e.g., Wada *et al* , 2014; Hattermann *et al* , 2016). These large intermodel differences in mean discharge were not attributable to the variations in catchment area that resulted from differences in the dam locations used by the GHMs. If we re-evaluate the range of mean river discharge at the common land cell (SCN 22 for Fort Peck Dam and SCN 17 for Glen



**Figure 5.** Same as Figure 3 but for the longitudinal section along the Green-Colorado River, with river discharge data for 1971–1980. The horizontal axis gives the SCN from the uppermost reach of the Green River (as indicated in Figure 1). Glen Canyon (C) and Hoover (H) Dams are located at SCNs 17 and 28, respectively.





**Figure 6.** Intermodel comparison of the seasonal fraction of river discharge shown in Figure 5 at two selected sites on the Green-Colorado River. Two sites are representative of the upper (SCN 12) and lower (SCN 36) reaches. A similar representation to Figure 4 is used.

323 Canyon Dam, following the standard dam data distributed by ISIMIP, the intermodel  
 324 ranges ( $725.3 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  for Fort Peck Dam and  $642.2 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  for Glen Canyon Dam) are still  
 325 larger than the interforcing ranges ( $112.1 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  and  $229.0 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ , respectively).

326 Figure 7 shows hydrographs and cumulative discharge at the dam sites (note that  
 327 a plot of the cumulative discharge of natural flow with a longer time is known as a mass  
 328 curve or Rippl diagram, which is useful for designing the dam capacity (Rippl, 1883;  
 329 Adeloye, 2012)). By comparing regulated flow with natural flow, we found that seasonal  
 330 variability was suppressed by dam regulation, i.e., decreased discharge in the high-flow  
 331 season and increased discharge in the low-flow season. As a result, the mass curve in  
 332 the high-flow season (spring to summer) had a more gradual slope and less curvature  
 333 for regulated flow than for natural flow.

334 DBH gave larger estimates of the mean river discharge for 1971–1980 than the other  
 335 GHMs (Figure 7; Tables 3 and 4). Since the effective magnitude of flow regulation by  
 336 dams is given approximately by the ratio of dam capacity to mean annual discharge,  
 337 DBH regulates river flow more weakly than the other models. This is one reason why

**Table 3.** Mean river discharge at Fort Peck Dam for 1971–1980. The numbers in brackets show the turnover (detention) period required to fill the nominal dam capacity ( $2.356 \times 10^{10} \text{ m}^3$ ) at the rate of the mean river discharge.

GHM	SCN	GSWP3		PGFv2		WFDEI		WATCH		Ensemble	
		m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)	m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)	m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)	m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)	m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)
DBH	22	832.4	(327.6)	914.2	(298.3)	1137.7	(239.7)	1157.1	(235.7)	1010.4	(269.9)
H08	22	275.6	(989.4)	218.9	(1245.7)	322.3	(846.1)	323.9	(841.9)	285.1	(956.5)
LPJmL	21	454.3	(600.2)	495.7	(550.1)	614.0	(444.1)	618.3	(441.0)	545.6	(499.8)
PCR-GLOBWB	22	415.2	(656.8)	402.5	(677.5)	401.0	(680.0)	383.4	(711.2)	400.5	(680.9)
WaterGAP	21	287.5	(948.5)	327.1	(833.6)	295.4	(923.1)	310.4	(878.5)	305.1	(893.8)
Ensemble		453.0	(602.0)	471.7	(578.1)	554.1	(492.1)	558.6	(488.2)	509.3	(535.4)

**Table 4.** Mean river discharge at Glen Canyon Dam for 1971–1980. The numbers in brackets show the turnover (detention) period required to fill the nominal dam capacity ( $2.507 \times 10^{10} \text{ m}^3$ ) at the rate of the mean river discharge.


GHM	SCN	GSWP3		PGFv2		WFDEI		WATCH		Ensemble	
		m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)	m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)	m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)	m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)	m <sup>3</sup> /s	(d)
DBH	17	849.7	(341.5)	1024.2	(283.3)	1349.4	(215.0)	1386.5	(209.3)	1152.5	(251.8)
H08	17	549.4	(528.1)	600.2	(483.4)	772.0	(375.9)	797.8	(363.7)	679.8	(426.8)
LPJmL	19	882.1	(328.9)	1056.8	(274.6)	1151.2	(252.1)	1150.8	(252.1)	1060.2	(273.7)
PCR-GLOBWB	17	590.9	(491.1)	700.3	(414.3)	667.2	(434.9)	632.9	(458.5)	647.8	(447.9)
WaterGAP	18	447.1	(649.0)	487.9	(594.7)	507.8	(571.4)	487.6	(595.1)	482.6	(601.2)
Ensemble		663.8	(437.1)	773.9	(374.9)	889.5	(326.2)	891.1	(325.6)	804.6	(360.6)

the flow regulation was marginal in DBH. On the other hand, the mean discharge of LPJmL at Glen Canyon Dam was comparable to that of DBH (Table 4). However, the hydrographs (Figure 7) showed that its seasonal peak flow was larger and lasted for a shorter duration than LPJmL. The clear seasonal contrast in the LPJmL simulation helped the dam to act as a stronger regulator than it did in the DBH simulation.

The magnitude of flow regulation at the seasonal scale was not determined principally by the dam manipulation scheme adopted by each GHM. Although DBH, H08, and WaterGAP implemented the flow regulation scheme proposed by Hanasaki *et al* (2006), the simulated flow regulation contrasted clearly between DBH (with weak regulation) and H08 or WaterGAP (with strong regulation). Dam outflow is primarily determined as a function of the mean annual inflow in the scheme of Hanasaki *et al* (2006) (see A.1 in the Supplement). Therefore, simulated variables such as dam water storage at the beginning of the operational year, water demand (dams for irrigation purposes only), inflow variability, and the consequent differences in water storage are considered as the actual causes of the discrepancies in seasonal-scale dam flow regulation among the GHMs.

## Intercomparison of regulated river discharge — II: Multiple models

17



**Figure 7.** Hydrograph and cumulative discharge (so-called mass curve or Rippl diagram) based on the mean daily discharge for 1971–1980 at a site downstream of Fort Peck and Glen Canyon Dams. Green and black lines show the results of the nosoc (without human influences) and varsoc (with water withdrawal and dam regulation) runs. The horizontal axis is the day of the year (DOY in calendar year). The meteorological forcing is GSWP3. Horizontally aligned panels show the results of each GHM. From left to right, DBH, H08, LPJmL, PCR-GLOBWB, and WaterGAP. The location (shown as SCN) is indicated in each panel.


### 3.2. Differences in the seasonal fraction of river discharge under four meteorological forcings

The discrepancies in flow regulation among the GHMs also varied with the rivers' courses. To quantify the variance in the seasonal fraction of river discharge among the five GHMs, we calculated the standard deviation (SD) of the five GHMs from their ensemble mean for each season under four meteorological forcings. Figures 8 and 9 show the results for the Missouri-Mississippi and Green-Colorado Rivers, respectively. Since the seasonal fraction is a normalized value by the annual discharge, the fraction is comparable with ones at different locations.


Three major characteristics were observed in the results for the multiple GHMs and forcings. First, the obtained SDs were generally independent of the meteorological forcing for a large proportion of the river sectors. This indicates that SDs were explained primarily by differences among GHMs rather than meteorological forcings. This finding is consistent with Tables 3 and 4 at the two selected sites. Second, larger SDs were observed more frequently in upper reaches than in lower reaches: SDs generally decreased downstream. This means that even if GHMs generally agree in the lower reaches, larger discrepancies may still exist in the upper reaches. Third, SDs in absolute terms tended to be larger during high-flow seasons (spring to summer for both rivers) than during low-flow seasons (fall to winter).

Next, we examined the differences in the results between natural and regulated flows. Overall, natural flow (crosses) tended to have slightly higher SD values than regulated flow (filled circles) for MAM, JJA, and SON. This implies that implementing dam regulation schemes contributes to small discrepancies among the GHM results. Large intermodel discrepancies in natural flow were observed more frequently in high-flow seasons than in low-flow seasons (e.g., Figure 7) because of high variability in precipitation events. Dams contributed to a flattening of the variability and redistribution of water among the seasons, which lowered the SD of regulated flow during high-flow seasons. By contrast, the regulated flow for DJF had slightly higher SD values than the natural flow in some river sectors. Winter had the lowest discharge for both rivers because of the accumulation of snowpack in mountainous areas and the weak rainfall over the catchment area. Thus, a stable and low flow was observed for all the GHMs, along with a similar temporal profile. Dam operation in low-flow seasons increased the discharge, but its amplification was different among the GHMs (Figure 7). This explains the larger SDs for regulated flow compared to natural flow for DJF.

Note that these findings did not always hold true. For example, at Fort Peck Dam (SCN 22) on the Missouri-Mississippi River (Figure 8), the SD of the regulated flow discontinuously increased downstream for DJF but decreased for MAM and SON. Because flow seasonality drastically changed into less seasonal variability by the dam (Figure 3), MAM seasonal fraction of discharge converged among the GHMs, even though MAM was a high-flow season for natural flow.



**Figure 8.** Standard deviations (SDs) of the seasonal fraction of river discharge in the longitudinal section along the Missouri-Mississippi River among the five GHMs. The seasonal fraction for each GHM is shown in Figure 3. The horizontal axis is the SCN from the uppermost reach of the Missouri River (as indicated in Figure 1). Meteorological forcing data sets are indicated by different colors: purple (GSWP3), red (PGFv2), blue (WFDEI), and green (WATCH). Results of the varsoc and nosoc runs are shown by filled circles and crosses, respectively. Blank cells indicate that SDs were not calculated because of missing data for some GHMs. Fort Peck (F), Garrison (G), and Oahe (O) Dams are located at SCNs 22, 33, and 42, respectively.



**Figure 9.** Same as Figure 8 but for the longitudinal section along the Green–Colorado River. The seasonal fraction for each GHM was shown in Figure 5. The horizontal axis is the sequential cell number (SCN) from the uppermost reach of the Green River (as indicated in Figure 1). Glen Canyon (C) and Hoover (H) Dams are located at SCNs 17 and 28, respectively.

#### 4. Discussion

##### 4.1. Interpretation of hydrological simulation of river discharge regulated by dams

In this study, we examined the uncertainties among GHMs and the potential errors along river channels and obtained new insights and caveats through case studies for the interpretation of simulated river discharge specific to regulated rivers.

First, differences in the seasonal fraction were detected among the GHMs. This is likely attributable to two factors: natural flow and dam regulation. (1) Regarding natural flow, differences among the GHMs were expected based on previous studies (e.g., Haddeland *et al* , 2011). Moreover, difficulties in reproducing snowmelt may also be a source of intermodel differences because both river basins used in this study are covered by a thick snowpack in winter (e.g., Slater *et al* , 2001; Rutter *et al* , 2009). In fact, over the catchment areas of Fort Peck Dam and Glen Canyon Dam, winter precipitation occurs as snow (Figures B1 and B2, respectively). Small differences in meteorological conditions (especially temperature) triggering snow melt can result in divergence in the timing of floods.

(2) Regarding dam regulation, dams fundamentally alter the timing of flow without changing absolute volumes of water when the dam capacity is large compared to the mean annual flow, and when secondary effects (local inflow to the dam, evaporation loss from the water surface, withdrawal or diversion for water supply and so forth) are regarded as sufficiently small compared with river flow. That is, the long-term average annual volume of discharge is considered to be independent of the dam operation scheme. To the best of our knowledge, generic dam operation schemes are fundamentally based on a function of inflow to the dam and the water demand for each purpose of the dam (Hanasaki *et al* , 2006; Haddeland *et al* , 2006). Recall that the natural inflow was different among the GHMs. Even if the same dam capacity was adopted for multiple GHMs, differences in dam inflows can cause simulated river discharge to diverge downstream among the GHMs due to different responses to the simulated inflow.

There are intrinsic difficulties in constructing advanced generic schemes for dam regulation. Dam operation data are generally not publicly available. The dams along the Missouri River represent a very rare case in which the operation strategy is publicly available (US Army Corps, 2006). Although the actual operation of multiple dams in the same river basin is more complex because they are mutually linked (e.g., Nagy *et al* , 2002), this is not taken into account by the operation schemes implemented in the GHMs.

In this study, we used the seasonal fractions of river flow, not the absolute seasonal volumes, because Haddeland *et al* (2011) revealed that annual river discharge values also differ among GHMs with a wide range of runoff coefficients (runoff divided by precipitation) at the basin scale. By introducing the seasonal fraction normalized by the annual volume, we expect that seasonal dam operation behavior can be focused on by artificially cancelling the effect of differences among runoff coefficients.

Secondly, the case studies also showed decreasing intermodel differences moving

toward the lower reaches. This probably reflects the fact that averaging over a larger catchment area helps stabilize simulated river discharges, which are susceptible to local instabilities. In most hydrological analyses, the performance of a simulation is evaluated at gauge stations at the farthest reach of the river, because river flow there reflects the overall characteristics of the catchment area, namely, the whole river basin. This is convenient for obtaining an overall picture of the basin. However, we should keep in mind that larger intermodel discrepancies may exist at gauge stations upstream.

In this paper, we only discussed two case-study river basins. However, notice that we used only simulated river discharge, one of fundamental variables in hydrological simulations, to depict dam functions. Visualizing methods like Figures 3 and 5 are applicable to other river basins in the world, if river discharge data are available.

GHMs will play an increasingly important role in evaluating hydrological impacts on societies as global climates and environments change rapidly, because they can simulate water availability with human interventions at the global scale under given meteorological conditions. Currently, most rivers flowing through populated areas are regulated by dams. In the future, GHMs will still strongly rely on generic dam operation schemes to make them applicable at the global scale.

Both river discharge and storage in dams have been attracting interest. For example, hydropower generation is increasingly seen as a means of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases while meeting the increasing demand for electricity. Hydrological simulation can also be used to assess the future potential of hydropower generation (e.g., Lehner *et al* , 2005; Masaki *et al* , 2014; Liu *et al* , 2016). Moreover, large dams create an anaerobic environment at the bottom and emit methane to the atmosphere, especially in tropical regions (Fearnside, 1995; Abril *et al.*, 2005; Kemenes *et al.*, 2007). From an ecological viewpoint, aquatic environments and ecosystems are of great concern. Physical aspects (e.g., surface area, level, and storage) of the water surface are observed with various techniques, such as remote sensing imagery, satellite altimetry, and bathymetry, to study aquatic environments. Accurate estimation of dam storage using GHMs will be welcomed not only by hydrological scientists, but also by those in the related fields of environmental and social sciences.

#### 4.2. Future improvement of GHMs with regulated rivers

There is a considerable trade-off, specific to GHMs, in pursuing global applicability and high-performance reproductions of observed river discharge at the cost of ignoring local diversity in the natural and social environments of each river basin. In practice, GHMs with a spatial resolution of  $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$  can neither consider all local conditions nor implement dam operation schemes for the over 60,000 dams across the world. This is in clear contrast to regional hydrological models (RHMs), which can be tuned to a certain river basin and its environment, and can potentially implement an actual dam manipulation scheme. We consider there to be no essential differences between GHMs and RHMs in terms of model structure, analytical scheme, and the physics



of hydrological processes, as summarized in Table A3 of Hattermann *et al* (2016). Moreover, as discussed in detail in Hattermann *et al* (2016), the high performance of RHMs is considered to be partly due to calibration, which poses the simultaneous risk of over-calibration. In addition, Gosling *et al* (2016) found little difference in the simulations from an ensemble of GHMs and an ensemble of RHMs, when the individual models were forced with meteorological projections from climate models.

Despite such a trade-off relationship, high-accuracy reproduction of the world's river discharge using GHMs should be the ultimate goal to improve our understanding of surface waters. Multimodel intercomparison studies carried out in the last several years have revealed broader differences among GHMs. It is critical to examine the reasons for this, identify sources of error, and improve models (e.g., Huber *et al* , 2014), as is being attempted currently. As we showed in this study, dam regulation is a source of differences among GHMs. Amending these models would result in high-performance simulations and greatly benefit hydrological science.

Some of our intercomparison results are degraded because of inconsistencies in simulation settings and conditions (i.e., the location of major dams), as we showed earlier. However, we emphasize that, in any types of gridded dam location data (Table A2), which stemmed from the GRanD data, dams were not simply placed on a land cell where the actual geographical coordinates indicated. The location was adjusted to harmonize the river channels, catchment area, and so on. The adjustment to different extents or with different priorities diverged the dam location. There are fundamental difficulties for such multimodel intercomparisons when using completely identical conditions, because each GHM has a different model structure and development history. On the other hand, this study provides a good opportunity to consider how dam locations should be assigned in the river network for hydrological simulations.

This paper is the first study that reports intermodel comparison of dam functions. Uncertainties always accompany with hydrological simulations. This study reveals that dam function, as well as natural flow, affects uncertainties in hydrological simulations. In particular, since this study used historical meteorological data, simulated results can be directly compared with observation. Such validation is crucial for future projections of climate change impacts because of substantial difficulties in validating future simulation results.

Despite such difficulties, this study revealed that seasonality in simulated river flow is the result of both simulated natural flow and flow regulation by dams. There are still arguments about the level of consistency needed in analysis settings for intercomparisons. If dam settings across GHMs are perfectly consistent, then more meaningful intercomparisons of dam functions can be realized, from shorter (e.g., heavy rainfall and flood prevention by dams) to longer (e.g., seasonal flow regulation at large dams) time scales.

## 5. Conclusions

We performed an intercomparison of river discharge regulated by large dams along the Missouri-Mississippi and Green-Colorado Rivers in the United States to examine the impacts of dam operation on river flow. Seasonality in river discharge was examined in longitudinal sections of the rivers to visualize seasonal modulation by dams and its downstream effects. We confirmed that the magnitude of dam regulation differs among GHMs. The differences in flow regulation are attributable not only to dam operation schemes but also to the magnitude of the simulated dam inflow and subsequent dam storage. Each GHM has advantages and disadvantages in reproducing the seasonality of river discharge. We observed decreasing intermodel discrepancies in the seasonal fraction towards the lower reaches of rivers in this study. Since model characteristics were more clearly detected in upper reaches, intermodel comparisons should be made in both upstream and downstream sections.

This is the first study to examine the performance of dam regulation in hydrological simulations using multiple models and forcings. Here, we demonstrated that model characteristics of the magnitude of flow regulation are formed not only by the dam operation itself, but also by the river discharge under natural (i.e., unregulated) conditions. GHMs incorporating dam operation are becoming increasingly important for hydrological simulations because most major global rivers are regulated by dams. This study implies that both natural river flow simulations and dam operation schemes must be improved to increase the performance of regulated river flow simulations.

GHMs have a trade-off between high performance and global applicability. Steady efforts toward improved modeling of both the natural flow and human impact will expand their applicability and improve the reliability of global hydrological simulations in an era characterized by increasing concern about the global environment.

## Acknowledgments

We acknowledge two anonymous reviewers for their fruitful suggestions to this manuscript. This research was supported by the Environment Research and Technology Development Fund (S-10) of the Ministry of the Environment, Japan. This work has been conducted under the framework of ISIMIP. Observation data on river discharge were provided from the Global Runoff Data Center (GRDC) and from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) through the web interface, National Water Information System (<http://nwis.waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis>). Dam operation data were provided from the US Army Corps of Engineers, Northwest Division.

## References

Abril G, Guérin F, Richard S, Delmas R, Galy-Lacaux C, Gosse P, Tremblay A, Varfalvy L, Dos Santos M A and Matvienko B 2005 Carbon dioxide and methane emissions and the carbon budget of a 10-year old tropical reservoir (Petit Saut, Grench Guiana) *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **19** GB4007

*Intercomparison of regulated river discharge — II: Multiple models*

25

- 552 Adelaye A J 2012 Hydrological sizing of water supply reservoirs *Encyclopedia of Lakes and Reservoirs*  
553 (ed L Bengtsson, R W Herschy and R W Fairbridge) 346–55 (Dordrecht, The Netherlands:  
554 Springer)
- 555 Avakyan A B and Iakovleva V B 1998 Status of global reservoirs: The position in the late twentieth  
556 century *Lakes Reserv. Res. Manag.* **3** 45–52
- 557 Biemans H, Haddeland I, Kabat P, Ludwig F, Hutjes R W A, Heinke J, von Bloh W and Gerten D  
558 2011 Impacts of reservoirs on river discharge and irrigation water supply during the 20th century  
559 *Water Resour. Res.* **47** W03509
- 560 Bierkens M F P 2015 Global hydrology 2015: State, trends, and directions *Water Resour. Res.* **51**  
561 4923–47
- 562 Compo G P *et al* 2011 The twentieth century reanalysis project *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* **137** 1–28
- 563 Dankers R *et al* 2014 First look at changes in flood hazard in the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model  
564 Intercomparison Project ensemble *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111** 3257–61
- 565 Dee D P *et al* 2011 The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation  
566 system *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* **137** 553–597
- 567 Döll P and Lehner B 2002 Validation of a new global 30-min drainage direction map *J. Hydrol.* **258**  
568 214–31
- 569 Fearnside P M 1995 Hydroelectric dams in the Brazilian Amazon as sources of ‘greenhouse’ gases  
570 *Environ. Conserv.* **22** 7–19
- 571 Goldewijk K K, Beusen A, van Drecht G and de Vos M 2011 The HYDE 3.1 spatially explicit database  
572 of human-induced global land-use change over the past 12,000 years *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* **20** 73–86
- 573 Gosling S N *et al* 2016 A comparison of changes in river runoff from multiple global and catchment-  
574 scale hydrological models under global warming scenarios of 1°C, 2°C and 3°C *Climatic Change*  
575 doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1773-3
- 576 Haddeland I, Skaugen T and Lettenmaier D P 2006 Anthropogenic impacts on continental surface  
577 water fluxes *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33** L08406
- 578 Haddeland I *et al* 2011 Multimodel estimate of the global terrestrial water balance: setup and first  
579 results *J. Hydrometeorol.* **12** 869–84
- 580 Hanasaki N, Kanai S and Oki T 2006 A reservoir operation scheme for global river routing models *J.*  
581 *Hydrol.* **327** 22–41
- 582 Hanasaki N, Kanai S, Oki T, Masuda K, Motoya K, Shirakawa N, Shen Y and Tanaka K 2008a An  
583 integrated model for the assessment of global water resources – Part 1: Model description and  
584 input meteorological forcing *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **12** 1007–25
- 585 Hanasaki N, Kanai S, Oki T, Masuda K, Motoya K, Shirakawa N, Shen Y and Tanaka K 2008b  
586 An integrated model for the assessment of global water resources – Part 2: Applications and  
587 assessments *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **12** 1027–37
- 588 Hattermann F F *et al* 2016 Cross-scale intercomparison of climate change impacts simulated by regional  
589 and global hydrological models in eleven large river basins *Climatic Change* (submitted)
- 590 Huber V *et al* 2014 Climate impact research: beyond patchwork *Earth Syst. Dynam.* **5** 399–408
- 591 The Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Integration and Intercomparison Project 2015 ISIMIP2a Simulation  
592 protocol (<https://www.isimip.org/protocol/>)
- 593 International Commission on Large Dams 2016 ([http://www.icold-  
594 cigb.org/GB/Worldregister/general\\_synthesis.asp](http://www.icold-cigb.org/GB/Worldregister/general_synthesis.asp))
- 595 Kalnay E *et al* 1996 The NCEP/NCAR 40-year reanalysis project *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **77** 437–71
- 596 Kemenes A, Forsberg B R and Melack J M 2007 Methane release below a tropical hydroelectric dam  
597 *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **34** L12809
- 598 Kim H 2014 (<http://hydro.iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp/GSWP3/index.html>)
- 599 Lehner B, Czisch G and Vassolo S 2005 The impact of global change on hydropower potential of Europe:  
600 a model-based analysis *Energy Policy* **33** 839–55
- 601 Lehner B *et al* 2011a High-resolution mapping of the world’s reservoirs and dams for sustainable river-  
602 flow management *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **9** 494–502

*Intercomparison of regulated river discharge — II: Multiple models*

26

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- 603 Lehner B *et al* 2011b Global Reservoir and Dam (GRanD) database, Technical documentation Version  
604 1.1 ([http://www.gwsp.org/fileadmin/downloads/GRanD\\_Technical\\_Documentation\\_v1.1.pdf](http://www.gwsp.org/fileadmin/downloads/GRanD_Technical_Documentation_v1.1.pdf))
- 605 Liu X, Tang Q, Voisin N and Cui H 2016 Projected impacts of climate change on hydropower potential  
606 in China *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **20** 3343–59
- 607 Masaki Y, Hanasaki N, Takahashi K and Hijioka Y 2014 Future changes in theoretical hydropower  
608 potential and hydropower generation based on river flow under climate change *J. Japan Soc. Civil  
609 Engineers, Ser. G* **70** I\_111–I\_120 doi:10.2208/jscejer.70.I\_111 (in Japanese)
- 610 Masaki Y *et al* 2016 (Paper I) Intercomparison of regulated river discharge among multiple hydrological  
611 models under multiple forcings along two major rivers in the United States — (I) Effects of multiple  
612 forcings *Environ. Res. Lett.* (submitted)
- 613 Müller Schmied H, Eisner S, Franz D, Wattenbach M, Portmann F T, Flörke M and Döll P 2014  
614 Sensitivity of simulated global-scale freshwater fluxes and storages to input data, hydrological  
615 model structure, human water use and calibration, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **18** 3511–38
- 616 Müller Schmied H *et al* 2016a Variations of global and continental water balance components as  
617 impacted by climate forcing uncertainty and human water use *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **20** 2877–98
- 618 Müller Schmied H, Zhao F, and Ostberg S 2016b Visualization of the three reservoir datasets used in  
619 ISIMIP2a, <http://arcg.is/2cn93Km>
- 620 Nagy I V, Asante-Duah K and Zsuffa I 2002 *Hydrological dimensioning and operation of reservoirs:  
621 Practical design concepts and principles* p 225 (Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic  
622 Publishers)
- 623 Nazemi A and Wheater H S 2015a On inclusion of water resource management in Earth system models  
624 – Part 1: Problem definition and representation of water demand *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **19** 33–61
- 625 Nazemi A and Wheater H S 2015b On inclusion of water resource management in Earth system models  
626 – Part 2: Representation of water supply and allocation and opportunities for improved modeling  
627 *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **19** 63–90
- 628 Nijssen B, O’Donnell G M, Lettenmaier D P, Lohmann D and Wood E F 2001 Predicting the discharge  
629 of global rivers *J. Clim.* **14** 3307–23
- 630 Nilsson C, Reidy C A, Dynesius M and Revenga C 2005 Fragmentation and flow regulation of the  
631 world’s large river systems *Science*, **308**, 405–08
- 632 Norton P A, Anderson M T and Stamm J F 2014 *Trends in annual, seasonal, and monthly streamflow  
633 characteristics at 227 streamgages in the Missouri River Watershed, water years 1960–2011  
634 (US Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2014-5053)* p 128 (Reston, VA, USA: US  
635 Geological Survey)
- 636 Portmann, F. T., S. Siebert and P. Döll (2010), MIRCA2000–Global monthly irrigated and rainfed  
637 crop areas around the year 2000: A new high-resolution data set for agricultural and hydrological  
638 modeling, *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles*, **24**, GB1011.
- 639 Prudhomme C *et al* 2014 Hydrological droughts in the 21st century, hotspots and uncertainties from a  
640 global multimodel ensemble experiment *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111** 3262–67
- 641 Rhodes S L, Ely D and Dracup J A 1984 Climate and the Colorado River: The limits of management  
642 *Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc.* **65** 682–91
- 643 Rippl W 1883 The capacity of storage-reservoirs for water-supply *Minutes of Proceedings* **71** 270–78
- 644 Rost S, Gerten D, Bondeau A, Lucht W, Rohwer J and Schaphoff S 2008 Agricultural green and blue  
645 water consumption and its influence on the global water system *Water Resour. Res.* **44** W09405
- 646 Rutter N *et al* 2009 Evaluation of forest snow processes models (SnowMIP2) *J. Geophys. Res.* **114**  
647 D06111
- 648 Schewe J *et al* 2014 Multimodel assessment of water scarcity under climate change *Proc. Nat. Acad.  
649 Sci. U.S.A.* **111** 3245–50
- 650 Sheffield J, Goteti G and Wood E F 2006 Development of a 50-year high-resolution global dataset of  
651 meteorological forcings for land surface modeling *J. Climate* **19** 3088–11
- 652 Slater A G *et al* 2001 The Representation of Snow in Land Surface Schemes: Results from PILPS 2(d)  
653 *J. Hydrometeorol.* **2** 7–25

*Intercomparison of regulated river discharge — II: Multiple models*

27

- 654 Sperna Weiland F C, van Beek L P H, Kwadijk J C J and Bierkens MFP 2010 The ability of a GCM-  
655 forced hydrological model to reproduce global discharge variability *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **14**  
656 1595–621
- 657 Stone M C, Hotchkiss R H, Hubbard C M, Fontaine T A, Mearns L O and Arnold J G 2001 Impacts of  
658 climate change on Missouri River Basin water yield *J. Amer. Water Resour. Assoc.* **37**, 1119–29
- 659 Tang Q, Oki T, Kanae S and Hu H 2007 The influence of precipitation variability and partial irrigation  
660 within grid cells on a hydrological simulation *J. Hydrometeorol.* **8** 499–512
- 661 United States Army Corps of Engineers 2006 *Missouri River Mainstem Reservoirs System master water*  
662 *control manual (Revision 1)* p 432 (Omaha, NE, USA: Northern Division of the United States Army  
663 Corps of Engineers)
- 664 United States Government Accountability Office 2014 *Missouri river flood and drought* (Report to  
665 Congressional Requesters GAO-14-741) p 50 (Washington D.C., DC, U.S.A.: US Government  
666 Accountability Office)
- 667 Uppala S M *et al* 2005 The ERA-40 re-analysis *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* **131** 2961–3012
- 668 Vörösmarty C J, Sharma K P, Fekete B M, Copeland A H, Holden J, Marble J and Lough J A 1997 The  
669 storage and aging of continental runoff in large reservoir systems of the world *Ambio* **26** 210–19
- 670 Wada Y *et al* 2013 Multimodel projections and uncertainties of irrigation water demand under climate  
671 change *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **40** 4626–32
- 672 Wada Y, Wisser D and Bierkens M F P 2014 Global modeling of withdrawal, allocation and consumptive  
673 use of surface water and groundwater resources *Earth Syst. Dynam.* **5** 15–40
- 674 Weedon G P, Gomes S, Viterbo P, Österle H, Adam J C, Bellouin N, Boucher O and Best M 2010 *The*  
675 *WATCH Forcing Data 1958-2001: a meteorological forcing dataset for land surface- and hydrological*  
676 *models* (WATCH Technical Report 22) p 41 ([www.eu-watch.org/publications](http://www.eu-watch.org/publications))
- 677 Weedon G P, Balsamo G, Bellouin N, Gomes S, Best M J and Viterbo P 2014 The WFDEI  
678 meteorological forcing data set: WATCH Forcing Data methodology applied to ERA-Interim  
679 reanalysis data *Water Resour. Res.* **50** 7505–14
- 680 Yasutomi N, Hamada A and Yatagai A 2011 Development of a long-term daily gridded temperature  
681 dataset and its application to rain/snow discrimination of daily precipitation *Global Environmental*  
682 *Research*, **15**, 165–72