

Technical Report No: ND18-01

A STUDY OF THE SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF
DROUGHT AND ITS IMPACT IN NORTH DAKOTA

by

Navaratnam Leelaruban
G. Padmanabhan
Adnan Aküz
North Dakota State University
Fargo, ND 58105

August 2018

North Dakota Water Resources Research Institute
North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota
Technical Report No: ND18-01

A STUDY OF THE SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DROUGHT
AND ITS IMPACT IN NORTH DAKOTA

Navaratnam Leelarubant¹

G. Padmanabhan²

Adnan Aküz³

NDWRRRI Graduate Research Fellow¹

Professor Emeritus, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department²

North Dakota State Climatologist & Professor of Climatological Practice³

North Dakota State University

Fargo, ND 58105

August 2018

The work upon which this report is based was supported in part by federal funds provided by the United States of Department of Interior in the form of ND WRRRI Graduate Research Fellowship for the graduate student through the North Dakota Water Resources Research Institute.

Contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the US Department of Interior, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute their endorsement or recommendation for use by the US government.

Project Period: March 1, 2014 – February 28, 2016
Project Number: 2014ND288B and 2015ND298B

North Dakota Water Resources Research
Institute Director: Xuefeng Chu
North Dakota State University

ABSTRACT

Drought is a water related natural hazard. It is difficult to characterize drought because of its diffused nature and spatiotemporal variability. However, understanding the variability of drought characteristics such as severity, frequency, duration, and spatial extent is critical in drought mitigation and planning. Impact of drought on agriculture, water supply, and energy sectors has been long-recognized. The current understanding of drought and its impact is limited due to its complex characteristics and ways in which it impacts various sectors. This study focuses on two important aspects of drought: variability of drought characteristics across different spatial scales, and impact of droughts on crop yield and groundwater. Drought is reported in the United States (U.S.) for different administrative units at different spatial scales. The variation of drought characteristics across different spatial scales and scale dependence was investigated, demonstrating the importance of considering spatial scales in drought management. Artificial Neural Network and regression methods were used to model the impact of drought on crop yield and groundwater resources. Relationships of crop yields and groundwater levels with drought indices were obtained. Overall, this study contributes towards understanding of the spatial variation of drought characteristics across different spatial scales, and the impact of drought on crop yields and groundwater levels.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by the North Dakota Water Resources Research Institute (NDWRRI) Fellowship program and NDSU Graduate School Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship Award. The Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering of North Dakota State University also provided financial support and facilities to accomplish this research. The following people are acknowledged for their contributions and support to this research:

- Dr. G. Padmanabhan, research advisor
- Dr. Dr. Adnan Akyüz, research co-advisor
- Dr. Peter Oduor, doctoral committee member
- Dr. Saleem Shaik, doctoral committee member
- Dr. Xuefeng Chu, doctoral committee member

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. Literature Review.....	2
1.2.1. Drought Definition.....	2
1.2.2. Drought Indices.....	2
1.2.3. Impact of Drought.....	3
1.3. Objectives.....	4
CHAPTER 2. DROUGHT OCCURRENCES AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS ACROSS SELECTED SPATIAL SCALES IN THE CONTIGUOUS UNITED STATES.....	5
2.1. Introduction.....	5
2.2. Study Area and Data.....	5
2.3. Methods.....	6
2.3.1. Occurrences of drought in the contiguous U.S.	6
2.3.2. Drought characteristics across spatial scales in the U.S.....	7
2.4. Results and Discussion.....	8
2.4.1. Drought occurrences in the contiguous U.S.	8
2.4.2. Spatial propagation of drought intensity categories across spatial scales in the U.S.	10
2.4.3. Characteristics of droughts across spatial scales in the U.S.	13
2.5. Conclusion.....	15

CHAPTER 3. EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DROUGHT INDICES AND GROUNDWATER LEVELS ¹	17
3.1. Introduction	17
3.2. Study Area and Methods	18
3.2.1. Study area and groundwater levels data.....	18
3.2.2. Drought indices.....	19
3.2.3. Groundwater level - drought indices correlation	20
3.2.4. Monthly groundwater variation and its correlation with SPI-24	20
3.2.5. Groundwater level fluctuation for specific drought events.....	20
3.3. Results and Discussions	20
3.4. Summary and Conclusion	27
CHAPTER 4. QUANTIFYING IMPACT OF DROUGHTS ON BARLEY YIELD IN NORTH DAKOTA, USA USING MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION AND ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK ¹	28
4.1. Introduction	28
4.2. Data and Methods.....	29
4.2.1. Drought Data.....	29
4.2.2. Crop Data	30
4.2.3. Multiple Linear Regression (MLR)	32
4.2.4. Artificial Neural Network (ANN).....	32
4.3. Results and Discussion.....	33
4.4. Conclusion.....	36
CHAPTER 5. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS.....	37
REFERENCES	38

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 2.1: The percentage areal coverage of different drought intensity categories in the contiguous U.S.....	10
Table 3.1: Correlation coefficients between SPI-24 and b (r'), sample size (n), and average of monthly median values (μ).	24
Table 3.2: Pertinent data showing selected drought events and number of groundwater level records.....	25
Table 3.3: The relationship between b and duration (d) of drought events.....	25
Table 4.1: Barley yield (in bushel/acres) details in ND, U.S. for year 2000 – 2012.....	31
Table 4.2: Results of analysis of variance.	33
Table 4.3: Results of regression analysis.....	33
Table 4.4: Pearson correlation matrix.....	33

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 2.1: Spatial scales considered in this study.	6
Figure 2.2: Drought occurrences (in weeks) of intensity categories D4, D3, D2, and D1 during the years 2000 through 2014 (783 weeks).....	9
Figure 2.3: Areal coverage of the highest intensity of drought that an area experienced for years 2000 – 2014.	11
Figure 2.4: Propagation of areal coverage (AC) of different intensity category droughts over (a) Grant county, ND (b) SCCD, ND, (c) ND State (d) HPR, and (e) Contiguous U.S.	12
Figure 2.5: Areal coverage of drought during Dec 20, 2005 - Oct 23, 2006. (a) exceptional drought (D4), (b) extreme drought (D3), (c) severe drought (D2), (d) moderate drought (D1), (e) abnormally dry (D0), and (f) all categories.	14
Figure 2.6: Comparing spatial scales with: (a) number of events, (b) total duration (weeks) (c) maximum duration (weeks) (d) maximum areal coverage, (e) average areal coverage, and (f) minimum areal coverage for each intensity category and “none” condition.	15
Figure 3.1: Study area showing selected wells’ locations.	19
Figure 3.2: The Pearson correlation coefficient, r , between groundwater level (b) and drought indices.....	21
Figure 3.3: The variation of 24-month Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI-24) and depth to water level, b , for wells MT4, NE1, SD1, and TX5.	22
Figure 3.4: Monthly variation of r' and μ	23
Figure 3.5: The variation of b with SPI-24 and duration (d) of selected drought events for (a) KS2, (b) MT1, (c) MT4, (d) ND3, (e) ND4, (f) ND5, and (g) NE2.	26
Figure 4.1: The North Dakota counties and barley yield in bushel/acres for year 2010.	30
Figure 4.2: Annual average barley yield in ND, U.S. for year 2000 – 2012.	31
Figure 4.3: ANN Scheme for the study problem.	34
Figure 4.4: The relationship between actual and predicted yield of barley using ANN.....	35

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Drought is water related natural hazard and is generally associated with scarcity of freshwater. The main reasons for drought are shortage in precipitation compared to demand for water and poor water management. Unlike other natural hazards such as flood, earthquake, and hurricanes the occurrence and impact of drought are not realized immediately. However, the socio economic impact due to drought is huge. Drought essentially impacts all the water dependent sectors directly including agriculture, water supply, recreation, energy, and social. Even though losses and threat of droughts to society are recognized, the current understanding of drought and the way it impacts the different sectors are limited. Several studies have been conducted on droughts in the past and commendable progress has been made in some areas. Specifically, several drought indices have been developed to define and monitor drought. Those indices are also used extensively to study (a) drought characteristics in both time and space domain (Karl, 1983; Vicente-Serrano, 2006; Logan et al., 2010; Gocic and Trajkovic, 2014), (b) relating the indices with other large scale climate indices (Piechota and Dracup, 1996; Chiew et al., 1998; Shabbar and Skinner, 2004) (c) evaluating impact (Elagib, 2014; Li et al., 2009; Mendicino et al., 2008; Mishra and Cherkauer, 2010; Peters et al., 2005), and (d) assessing and comparing performances of different indices (Dai, 2011; Guttman, 1998; Heim, 2002; Keyantash and Dracup, 2002; Mishra and Singh, 2010; Narasimhan and Srinivasan, 2005; Qin et al., 2015). Severity, duration, frequency, and spatial coverages are four major characteristics necessary to define drought. A clear understanding of drought across different spatial scale is essential since drought is monitored and managed at different spatial units. Studies on drought impact on various sectors based on past data will be helpful in tackling future impact of drought. Numerous studies have been conducted in the past to quantify the impact of drought. Recent modeling tools and data, such as, Artificial Neural Network (ANN); intensity-areal coverage data from USDM, and groundwater levels data from the U.S. Geological Survey Ground-Water Climate Response Network (USGS CRN) wells can be effectively used now to study drought impact. In this study, drought impact on crop yields and groundwater resources were analyzed using such tools and data.

1.1. Background

Drought is a complex natural phenomenon difficult to accurately describe because of its spatially and temporally varying nature and context-dependency (Quiring, 2009). Drought stands apart from other natural hazards in many ways, particularly in that it is difficult to identify and predict its onset and termination (Dracup et al., 1980a; Hisdal and Tallaksen, 2000; McKee et al., 1993; Tallaksen et al., 1997). It is characterized by diffused spatial and temporal bounds. Creeping behavior of droughts makes it difficult to define and understand, and also to quantify its impact (Gillette, 1950; Wilhite et al., 2014).

Drought indices are used to identify and monitor drought conditions, and to decide the timing and level of mitigating actions that need to be taken in response to droughts (Steinemann et al., 2005). Historically, losses from droughts across the world have significantly increased due to an increase in number of droughts; and/or drought severity (Wilhite, 2000). In the past, U.S. had experienced many severe droughts including droughts during 1930-1936 and 1970. Cook et al., (2015) predicted that there is a high risk for severe extended drought in the Southwest and Central Plains of Western North America in coming years due to climate change and warns that

it may lead to a “mega drought.” Impact of drought on agriculture, water resources, and social sectors has been long-recognized.

1.2. Literature Review

1.2.1. Drought Definition

There are more than 150 published definitions of drought (Wilhite and Glantz, 1985). Mishra and Singh (2010) lists several organizations/researchers who use different definitions of drought, for example, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the United Nations (UN) Convention to Combat Drought and Desertification, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the UN, the Encyclopedia of Climate and Weather, Gumbel, 1963, and Palmer, 1965. Although many definitions of drought exist, the central theme in documented literature on drought lies behind the context of water deficiency (Sonmez et al., 2005). The four types of drought commonly recognized are meteorological, agricultural, hydrological, and socioeconomic droughts (Wilhite and Glantz, 1985; American Meteorological Society, 2013). Meteorological drought is usually defined on the basis of the degree of dryness (in comparison to some “normal” or average amount) and the duration of the dry period over a region for a period of time. Generally, meteorological drought is analyzed based on precipitation (Pinkayan, 1966; Santos, 1983). Agricultural drought links various characteristics of meteorological (or hydrological) drought to agricultural impacts, focusing on precipitation shortages, differences between actual and potential evapotranspiration, soil water deficits, reduced groundwater or reservoir levels, and so forth. Hydrological drought is associated with the effects of periods of precipitation (including snowfall) shortfalls on surface or subsurface water supply (i.e., stream flow, reservoir and lake levels, groundwater). Hydrological drought has been widely analyzed using stream flow data (Dracup et al., 1980b; Sen, 1980). Socioeconomic definitions of drought associate the supply and demand of some economic good with elements of meteorological, hydrological, and agricultural drought (American Meteorological Society, 2013).

1.2.2. Drought Indices

Drought index is typically a single number representing the drought condition. The drought indices are derived from meteorological variables (e.g. precipitation, temperature) and/or hydrological variables (e.g. stream flows, reservoir storage, soil moisture, groundwater levels) (Steinemann et al., 2005). The indices are used for drought monitoring and decision making purposes. These indices are used also for categorizing drought based on their threshold values. Numerous drought indices have been developed. The most commonly used indices include: (i) Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI) (Palmer, 1965); (ii) Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) (McKee et al., 1993; 1995); (iii) Crop Moisture Index (CMI) (Palmer, 1968); and (iv) Surface Water Supply Index (SWSI) (Shafer and Dezman, 1982). Several authors have discussed the usability and/or applicability of the indices (Dai, 2011; Guttman, 1998; Heim, 2002; Keyantash and Dracup, 2002; Mishra and Singh, 2010; Narasimhan and Srinivasan, 2005; Qin et al., 2015). A comparison study of Palmer Drought Index and Standardized Precipitation Index based on their spectral characteristics can be found in (Guttman, 1998). Heim (2002) did a comprehensive review of past drought indices used in the U.S. Keyantash and Dracup (2002) evaluated some selected hydrological, agricultural, and meteorological drought indices for their usefulness based on a weighted score of six criteria: robustness, tractability, transparency, sophistication, extendibility, and dimensionality. They found overall rainfall deciles are superior to SPI, cumulative precipitation anomaly, Rainfall Anomaly Index (RAI), Drought Area Index

(DAI), and PDSI for representing the meteorological drought; total water deficit is better than cumulative stream flow anomaly, SWSI, and PHDI for representing the hydrological drought; and computed soil moisture better represents the agricultural drought compared to soil moisture anomaly index, Palmer's Z-index, and CMI. Narasimhan and Srinivasan (2005) discussed the PDSI, CMI, SPI, and SWSI. They also have developed and evaluated Soil Moisture Deficit Index (SMDI) and Evapotranspiration Deficit Index (ETDI) using a hydrologic model, Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT). Mishra and Singh (2010) listed and discussed several commonly used drought indices in their review paper on drought concepts. Dai (2011) compared the calculation method, classification scheme, strength, and weakness of commonly used drought indices. Qin et al. (2015) evaluated the performance of drought indices derived from precipitation and soil moisture. Although there are several drought indices, each index has its own advantages and disadvantages from the users' perspectives. In a 2009 workshop held at Lincoln, Nebraska, on "Indices and Early Warning Systems for Drought" the importance of having a general agreement on standard index for each type of drought (i.e., meteorological, agricultural, and hydrological) was recognized. Although SPI was recommended as a standard index to monitor the meteorological drought universally, the group did not recommend any particular index for agricultural and hydrological droughts. The workshop participants, on the other hand, did not want to diminish the importance of local indices that are currently used (Hayes et al., 2011).

Kallis (2008) discussed the drought in detail from an interdisciplinary perspective, and emphasized the usage of multiple indices and qualitative judgments in drought monitoring. Drought monitoring products using multiple indices include USDM data (Svoboda et al., 2002), Joint Deficit Index (JDI) (Kao et al., 2009), and Multivariate Standardized Drought Index (MSDI) (Hao and AghaKouchak, 2013). JDI and MSDI were developed using multiple drought indices based on probabilistic concepts. USDM drought indicator is a combination of agricultural, meteorological, and hydrological severity indicators plus a subjective assessment of the impact of drought conditions by the community of drought observers (Svoboda et al., 2002).

There are several other notable sources also available for drought indices data. For example, (i) NOAA's National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) has in its database monthly climate indices including the suite of PDSI and SPI on a climate division scale. (ii) the University of Washington Surface Water Monitor (SWM) publishes hydrologic and drought condition data (soil moisture (SM), snow water equivalent (SWE), runoff, SPI, Standardized Runoff Index (SRI)) for contiguous U.S. and Mexico at half degree resolution on a daily basis (Wood, 2008). (iii) US-Mexico Drought Prediction Tool uses probabilistic prediction of SPI and publishes the data (Lyon et al., 2012; Quan et al., 2012). (iv) Global Integrated Drought Monitoring and Prediction System (GIDMaPS) is another data source for drought indices at different spatial and temporal scales (Hao et al., 2014). (v) Western Regional Climate Center's WestWide Drought Tracker (WWDT) provides monthly drought conditions at county scale (Abatzoglou, 2013).

1.2.3. Impact of Drought

Drought has been one of the costliest natural disasters to strike the U.S. (Cook et al., 2007; Lott and Ross, 2006; Smith and Katz, 2013). Mishra and Singh (2010) discussed the recent droughts around the world and their impact. It is estimated that drought costs the U.S. \$6–8 billion annually (FEMA, 1995). Drought creates stress on water resources (i.e., surface water, groundwater), and on soil moisture which in turn impact water-dependent industries including agriculture, water supply, energy, and recreation (Kumar and Panu, 1997). There have been

numerous studies on impact of droughts (Elagib, 2014; Leelaruban et al., 2012; Li et al., 2009; Lott and Ross, 2006; Mendicino et al., 2008; Mishra and Cherkauer, 2010; Peters et al., 2005). Drought impact quantification is not an easy task because of the difficulty of precisely defining droughts and the complex dynamics of impact sectors.

1.3. Objectives

This study will contribute to understanding the characteristics of droughts better especially the spatial aspects of droughts across spatial scales, and the impact of drought on agriculture and groundwater. Main objectives of this study were to:

1. Discern drought occurrences and their characteristics across of county, climate division, state, region and contiguous U.S. scales.
2. Evaluate groundwater level responses to drought, and;
3. Study the impact of drought on crop yield.

Though the major portion of this study mainly focuses on the state of North Dakota (ND), U.S., the methodologies used in this study are not specific to ND and can be adapted to other study sites.

CHAPTER 2. DROUGHT OCCURRENCES AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS ACROSS SELECTED SPATIAL SCALES IN THE CONTIGUOUS UNITED STATES¹

2.1. Introduction

A study of variation in severity, duration, frequency, areal coverage, and impact of drought events at different spatial scales will be helpful in understanding the mechanism of drought propagation and to plan for future drought events. There are many studies in the literature that address drought characteristics from different study areas. For example, spatiotemporal characteristics of drought for the U.S. using PDSI (Karl, 1983); spatiotemporal properties of droughts and their impacts in North Dakota, U.S. using a refined county-level drought index from USDM data (Leelaruban et al., 2012); spatial pattern of drought in Iberian Peninsula based on SPI using Principal Component Analysis (Vicente-Serrano, 2006); spatiotemporal variability of drought using SPI for central plains region of the U.S. (Logan et al., 2010); and drought characteristics in Serbia (Gocic and Trajkovic, 2014). However, none of these studies investigated the effect of spatial scale on drought characteristics. Only recently, some studies have been reported on this aspect. Russo et al. (2015) studied the effect of Circulation Weather Types (CWT) on variability of drought at different spatial scales in the Iberian Peninsula. Mishra and Singh (2011) summarized some of the studies on spatiotemporal drought analysis. Wang et al. (2014) listed selected drought studies on global, continental, and regional scales. They also studied the area and frequency of severe droughts on a global and continental scale using Standardized Precipitation Evaporation Index (SPEI). Panu and Sharma (2002) emphasized the need to study spatial behaviour of droughts at different spatial scales. It is possible that drought characteristics and mechanics of propagation may be different not only across different spatial scales in one region, but also across multiple scales in different geographic regions.

Focus of this part of the study was the pattern and frequency of occurrences of droughts, their spatiotemporal characteristics, and their variation over different spatial scales in the contiguous U.S. The USDM data from years 2000 to 2014 was used. The occurrences of droughts of different intensity categories, spatiotemporal propagation of drought at different spatial scales, and the characteristics of droughts under different spatial scales were analysed. The results could help identify the areas in contiguous U.S. that have been exposed to frequent and intense droughts in recent years, and potentially in the future; and also, identify the characteristics of different intensity categories from different spatial scales perspective.

2.2. Study Area and Data

USDM data on droughts is available to the public from the NDMC since the year 2000. This part of the study used USDM weekly percentage area coverage of different drought intensity categories (D0, D1, D2, D3, and D4) for the years 2000 to 2014. This study does not involve time series analyses in the strict sense except for comparison of yearly values in one of the components of the study. Spatial scales chosen for the study were national, regional, state, climatic division, and county. Contiguous U.S., High Plains Region (HPR), North Dakota (ND) State, South Central Climate Division (SCCD) in ND, and Grant County in ND were the areas

¹This chapter was adopted from a published article in *Geosciences* (Leelaruban. N., and G. Padmanabhan., 2017. Drought Occurrences and Their Characteristics across Selected Spatial Scales in the Contiguous United States. *Geosciences*, Vol 7(3), No. 59, doi:10.3390/geosciences7030059).

selected to gauge drought characteristics variation under the selected spatial scales (Figure 2.1). Percentage area coverage values for different USDM drought intensity categories were derived for years 2000 – 2014 (15 years) from the USDM web portal for the areas representing the selected spatial scales.




Figure 2.1: Spatial scales considered in this study.

2.3. Methods

2.3.1. Occurrences of drought in the contiguous U.S.

The contiguous U.S. has experienced several drought episodes during the study period (2000 – 2014). In this part of the study, the goal was to analyse the occurrences of different drought intensity categories. The weekly USDM GIS shapefiles were obtained from USDM web portal for years 2000 to 2014 and were used in ArcGIS10.3[®]. A series of batch commands were executed to clip the shapefiles into contiguous U.S., and extract areal extents pertinent to different USDM drought intensity categories (i.e., D0, D1, D2, D3, and D4).

The number of weeks that an area has been hit by D1, D2, D3, and D4 drought intensity category during years 2000 to 2014 was extracted first. It was decided not to include D0 because of two reasons: (i) due to the difficulty in processing a large number of multiple intersections (as subsequently described), and (ii) also D0 is an “abnormally dry” condition not significant enough in terms of its intensity to qualify for a “drought” condition. The following steps were implemented in ArcGIS 10.3[®] to count the number of weeks that an area has been hit by D1, D2, D3, and D4: (a) The “Union” tool was used to combine all 783 weekly shapefiles of selected intensity drought. (b) Weekly USDM shapefiles had several attributes including drought intensity category (DM). The final shapefile, after combining all 783 weekly data, contained all

the attributes from 783 weekly files in different columns. Except for the attributes that indicated the drought category (DM) all the other fields were deleted. (c) The attribute table was exported to Microsoft EXCEL sheet and the “*countif*” function was used to count the number of drought occurrences within each feature. Each weekly shapefile for particular intensity had several polygonal features. The union of 783 weekly shapefile inputs created numerous features in the output as a result of multiple intersections (output of union for 783 weeks of D4, D3, D2, and D1 category droughts had 63453, 683381, 2115430, 38994466 polygon features respectively). Each feature had attributes from 783 input shapefiles which included the occurrences of drought categories. The attribute from output of union were exported to Microsoft Excel and number of occurrences were counted.

The drought coverage areas were also extracted for all intensity categories (D0, D1, D2, D3, and D4) on a yearly basis for the period 2000 to 2014. The D0 was included for this and following part of the analysis because an understanding of variation in areal coverages of D0 will help to understand the drought, and can be related to other intensity categories. The extracted drought intensity categories from the weekly data for each year were grouped, and spatially combined to get the yearly intensity coverage. The intensity coverages were mapped for each year from 2000 to 2014. The total area coverage queried was one that experienced a particular intensity of drought at least once/year in the contiguous U.S.

2.3.2. Drought characteristics across spatial scales in the U.S

The study also investigated how droughts evolve at five different spatial scales: contiguous U.S., HPR, ND State, SCCD in ND, and Grant County in ND. The areal coverage of weekly drought intensity categories was plotted with time for the study period (2000 – 2014). USDM also provides similar graphical plots based on their traditional statistics, which is a percent of an area that is in or worse than a certain drought category. However, the purpose of this part of the study was to analyse how areal extent of different intensity categories evolved with different spatial scales. Spatiotemporal behaviour of the drought during the period December 20, 2005 to October 23, 2006 (44 weeks) was further investigated. This was one of the periods in which all intensity categories occur at least in some part of the contiguous U.S., and for all spatial scales considered.

Based on years 2000 - 2014 (783 weeks) of USDM weekly data, the drought characteristics for different spatial scales: contiguous U.S., HPR, ND State, SCCD in ND, and Grant County in ND were derived. The following drought characteristics were extracted:

2.3.2.1. Number of events

A drought event was defined as the occurrence of “greater than zero” drought intensity coverage anywhere in the considered area in any week during the study period. However, occurrences in consecutive weeks were considered as one event. Total number of drought events for the different intensity categories (D0, D1, D2, D3 and D4) were determined.

2.3.2.2. Total duration

The total number of weeks (not necessarily consecutive) in the study period in which the area covered by different intensity categories (D0, D1, D2, D3 and D4) were greater than zero.

2.3.2.3. Maximum duration

This was the maximum number of consecutive weeks that were subject to a drought event as defined previously. This was extracted for each drought intensity category (D0, D1, D2, D3 and D4).

2.3.2.4. Minimum, maximum, and average percentage area coverage

Minimum and maximum weekly percentage area coverage of different drought intensity categories (D0, D1, D2, D3 and D4) were identified over the study period. The average of weekly percentage area coverage was also calculated for different intensity categories over the study period, that is, 2000 to 2014.

2.4. Results and Discussion

2.4.1. Drought occurrences in the contiguous U.S.

Drought occurrence (in number of weeks) in the contiguous U.S. is shown in Figure 2.2. Fig. 2.2 shows the distribution of drought occurrences for intensity categories D4, D3, D2, and D1 during years 2000 to 2014 (783 weeks). Mapping the occurrences of drought using USDM data helps identify the areas that are vulnerable to droughts. In the contiguous U.S., during years 2000 to 2014 about half of the (51.7%) area had experienced D4, and almost the entire area (99.8%) had D1 at least once (Figure 2.2). D2 and D3 drought occurred at least once in 86.4% and 97.4% of the area respectively. The southern part of the contiguous U.S. has experienced all intensity droughts in the study period, and some areas including areas in north-eastern part have been free of high intensity droughts (D4 and D3). Each drought occurrence had different spatial pattern. Parts of several counties Wilbarger, Wichita, and Baylor in Texas; and Tillman in Oklahoma experienced with a range of 168-156 weeks (out of 783 weeks) D4 intensity drought (Figure 2.2). Other areas affected by D4 at least 96 weeks during years 2000 to 2014 can be found in Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Utah states (Figure 2.2). Frequent occurrences of D3 are mostly in western U.S. Parts of counties: Pershing and Humboldt in Nevada; and Apache in Arizona experienced D3 drought between 223 to 231 weeks out of 783 weeks. The areas that had been hit by D3 more than 130 weeks during years 2000 to 2014 can be found in Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Wyoming states (Figure 2.2).

D2 occurred mostly in the western part of the U.S similar to D3. Parts of Arizona, California, Nevada, and Oregon states have been in D2 condition at least 312 weeks out of 783 weeks (Figure 2.2). Figure 2.2 also shows that most of the eastern states were in D2 less frequently. Some areas in Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and West Virginia have never been under a D2 drought. Occurrences of D1 can be seen almost in the entire contiguous U.S. Some parts of Nevada, and Oregon were in D0 at least 335 weeks out of 783 weeks (Figure 2.2).

Overall, the western part of the US experienced droughts frequently compared to the east (Figure 2.2), however, spatial patterns of occurrences varied significantly. For example, Alabama was the only state that was in D4 entirely at least once during years 2000 to 2014 but with relatively less frequency, whereas parts of Oklahoma and Texas were in D4 category very frequently. Some parts of Colorado were in D4 category frequently whereas some parts have never experienced D4. The characteristics of drought can be understood and/or interpreted differently observing from different spatial scales perspective. For example, southeast part of Colorado is exposed to higher intense drought frequently compared to the north central part of the state. Considering the value of drought index reported for the state, it is possible that the reported value may reflect the drought condition differently for each state. One may get a completely different picture of the drought conditions from the state level compared to a county

or climate division. The drought information of a smaller area such as at the county extents could be masked when the drought is reported at the state level.




Figure 2.2: Drought occurrences (in weeks) of intensity categories D4, D3, D2, and D1 during the years 2000 through 2014 (783 weeks).

The variation of areal coverage of droughts in the contiguous U.S. on an annual basis was also analysed. The percentage area covered by different drought intensity categories for each drought during specific years are tabulated in Table 2.1. In the contiguous U.S., 16.9 % of the area experienced exceptional drought (D4) at least once in the year 2012 whereas none of the areas had D4 in 2010. In 2012, the extreme drought (D3) occurred in 42.6 % of the area at least once, and only 4.4 % area had D3 in 2010. The percentage areal coverage ranges for severe drought (D2) from 67.5 in 2012 to 20.1 in 2009, moderate drought (D1) 81.6 in 2012 to 42.8 in 2014, abnormally dry condition (D0) 91.2 in 2001 to 62.6 in 2014. Figure 2.3 shows the highest intensity drought that an area has experienced for each year from 2000 to 2014 in the U.S. Although the total areal coverage may be the same in different years, it may be distributed differently in those years (Figure 2.3). For example, in the year 2011 and 2012, the total percentage area coverage of D4 intensity is 16.1 and 16.9 respectively (Table 2.1). It is spread out in 2012 whereas in 2011 it is concentrated in one region (Figure 2.3). This type of spatial characteristics of drought significantly influences drought management and resource allocation, and emphasizes the need of addressing drought at different spatial scales. Also from these yearly maps, the progression and onset of intensifying drought in the state of California can be seen in the years 2011 and 2014. In Texas D4 intensity drought occurred in the years 2009 and 2011, but not in 2010. The maps in Figure 2.3 are helpful in extracting information of this type of areal extent and pattern of droughts over the years in a region. In general, the contiguous U.S. was


covered by higher intensity droughts in 2012 whereas in 2010 had less coverage by higher intensity droughts. Over the study period, occurrence of drought in the contiguous U.S. varied spatially, and a state like Texas had repeatedly experienced higher intensity drought.

Table 2.1: The percentage areal coverage of different drought intensity categories in the contiguous U.S.

Year	Drought intensity categories				
	D4	D3	D2	D1	D0
2000	6.2	17.8	43.7	70.8	90.1
2001	0.8	16.6	41.0	63.2	91.2
2002	12.3	38.3	58.7	77.5	90.1
2003	7.4	34.5	53.5	58.4	63.0
2004	5.4	23.0	36.4	46.1	63.0
2005	2.4	14.5	37.6	64.0	90.3
2006	5.6	27.7	49.0	68.4	82.8
2007	6.2	24.1	50.8	70.5	89.0
2008	4.2	12.5	36.5	60.4	80.9
2009	2.2	5.7	20.1	47.5	78.1
2010	0.0	4.4	22.5	54.1	86.6
2011	16.1	24.3	33.9	47.6	70.3
2012	16.9	42.6	67.5	81.6	83.9
2013	11.7	33.5	58.5	66.6	72.0
2014	7.3	19.0	31.8	42.8	62.6

2.4.2. Spatial propagation of drought intensity categories across spatial scales in the U.S.

Figure 2.4 (a-e) shows how the areal extent of different intensity categories evolved at different spatial scales. In HPR and contiguous U.S. scales, several long episodes of drought can be seen at different intensity levels (Figure 2.4d-e). The onset, progress and termination of drought were gradual for larger scales such as HPR and contiguous U.S. However, it can be seen from Figure 2.4 a-c that for the smaller scales, the duration of certain intensity drought was short and had sudden onset and termination. At the greater spatial scales, it was observed that the dynamics were smoother than those observed for the smaller spatial scales. This may be because at the greater spatial scale, i.e. at the contiguous U.S. scale, when a given sub-area changes its intensity category (e.g. from D3 to D2), another sub-area could assume D3 category, leading to a diminished D3 areal coverage. This occurrence becomes more and more unlikely as the spatial scale decreases due to more homogenous hydrological conditions allowing sudden variations of the area coverage of certain drought intensity. Recognition of this feature is important from a drought management perspective across scales because the small scales are subject to sudden drought and can be unnoticed at larger spatial scales.



Legend



Figure 2.3: Areal coverage of the highest intensity of drought that an area experienced for years 2000 – 2014.




Figure 2.4: Propagation of areal coverage (AC) of different intensity category droughts over (a) Grant county, ND (b) SCCD, ND, (c) ND State (d) HPR, and (e) Contiguous U.S.

From the Figure 2.4 it can be seen that the Dec 20, 2005 to Oct 23, 2006 shown in box, was the only period where all the categories were present in all spatial scales considered. D4 occurred at least in some part of the contiguous U.S throughout the 44 week period, and D4 existed 8 weeks in HPR, 5 weeks in ND, 5 weeks in SCCD in ND, and 2 weeks in Grant County in ND.

Figure 2.5 (a-e) shows the area that had experienced drought at least once during Dec 20, 2005 to Oct 23, 2006 period (44 weeks) at different intensity levels. Figure 2.5(f) shows the highest intensity drought that an area has experienced within the same time frame. The areal coverage maps show that more intense droughts (D4 and D3) occur as spatially disjointed areas, and less intense droughts were spatially connected. It should be noted that the coverage was for the whole 44 weeks drought period considered, and might not be spatially connected at any given week. The spatiotemporal features of drought propagation significantly change with spatial scale. A same drought may appear to have different characteristics when viewed at different spatial scales, and that need to be considered in drought management.

2.4.3. Characteristics of droughts across spatial scales in the U.S.

Figure 2.6 shows the characteristics of drought occurrences of different USDM intensity categories and at different spatial scales in the U.S.: number of drought events, total and maximum duration, and maximum, average, and minimum areal coverages. From the number of events and total duration it can be concluded that at any given time in the time frame (2000 – 2014), at least some part of contiguous U.S. experienced; no drought (None), D0, D1, and D2 conditions (Figure 2.6a-b). Extreme drought (D3) and exceptional drought (D4) drought persisted continuously 269 and 196 weeks respectively in the contiguous U.S. to their maximum duration (Figure 2.6c). Contiguous U.S. experienced D3 drought for 751 weeks out of 783 weeks, as three separate events, D4 drought 590 weeks out of 783 weeks as nine different events (Figure 2.6a-b).

The High Plains Region experienced the D0 condition throughout the study period. The “None” condition occurred 771 weeks in the region while D4 condition existed 332 weeks with the maximum duration of 154 weeks (Figure 2.6b-c). The North Dakota state experienced the absence of all drought conditions at least once in the past (Figure 2.6b,f). The state had its 100 % of area covered by “None” and D0 conditions at their maximum coverages (Figure 2.6d). The state has experienced the D4 category only once for a duration of 5 weeks with a maximum areal coverage of 2.4 % (Figure 2.6a-d). The South Central climate division in ND experienced the “None” condition for 539 weeks, and has experienced the D4 condition only for about 5 weeks as a single event with a maximum coverage of 21.32 % (Figure 2.6a-d). The Grant County in ND is covered 100% by None, D0, D1, D2, and D3 conditions at their maximum coverages (Figure 2.6d). The county experienced the D4 condition only once for a 2 weeks period with the maximum coverage of 16.36% (Figure 2.6c-d).

The number of events for D0 condition appears as increasing from a larger spatial scale to smaller spatial scale. However, for all other drought conditions numbers of events do not show any relation with spatial scales (Figure 2.6a). The total and maximum duration for all conditions are decreasing from larger to smaller spatial scales (Figure 2.6b-c). It was an expected observation since smaller spatial scales are subset of larger spatial scales. The average areal coverage of drought conditions did not show any trend with spatial scales (Figure 2.6e). The maximum percentage area coverages were increasing from the larger spatial scales to smaller spatial scales for “None”, D0, and D1 conditions (Figure 2.6d). All the spatial scales had been free of D4 and D3 at least once as seen in the minimum area percentage coverage. All the spatial scales except contiguous U.S had been totally covered by D0 or higher intense drought at least once (i.e., zero percentage covered by “None”) whereas contiguous U.S 80.75% covered by D0 or higher intense drought at least once (i.e., 19.25% covered by “None”). The minimum percentage area coverages of D0 for the contiguous U.S and HPR were 5.42% and 0.38% respectively. The other spatial scales were devoid of D0 category at least once. A section of

contiguous U.S. was covered by D1 and D2 categories, at 4.80% and 1.08% areal extents respectively, and all the other spatial scales were free of D1 and D2 at least once. In general, the minimum areal percentage coverages are decreasing towards the smaller spatial scales (Figure 2.6f).




Figure 2.5: Areal coverage of drought during Dec 20, 2005 - Oct 23, 2006. (a) exceptional drought (D4), (b) extreme drought (D3), (c) severe drought (D2), (d) moderate drought (D1), (e) abnormally dry (D0), and (f) all categories.




Figure 2.6: Comparing spatial scales with: (a) number of events, (b) total duration (weeks) (c) maximum duration (weeks) (d) maximum areal coverage, (e) average areal coverage, and (f) minimum areal coverage for each intensity category and “none” condition.

2.5. Conclusion

This study shows that southern and western parts of contiguous U.S. experienced higher intense drought frequently whereas northeast part less frequently. A combination of hydro-climatology and management practices of those areas could be the driver for the obtained spatial distribution and frequency of droughts. The spatial distribution of areal coverage of droughts of different intensities also varied significantly from year to year. The propagation of different intensity drought shows dissimilar patterns across different spatial scales. Depending on the size

of the governing unit such as a county or state, an understanding of this scale-dependency is important for drought management and resource allocation.

The spatiotemporal characteristics of drought under different spatial scales show that the total duration, average percentage area, and maximum percentage areas are decreasing with increasing intensity for all spatial scales; and in the smaller spatial scale, the drought persists for a smaller duration compared to larger spatial scale. There have been discussions about appropriate temporal scale for reporting drought. It may be useful to consider a finer temporal scale for smaller spatial scales and larger temporal scaling for larger spatial scales. This study demonstrates that there is clear variation in the drought characteristics such as intensity coverage, duration, and occurrence at different spatial scales. The findings emphasize that drought management and resource allocation policies need to be developed for different spatial scales, even for smaller administrative units such as a county. In order to manage drought impact in any administrative areal unit in any geographic location better, the dependence of drought characteristics on spatial scales need to be studied at that location to derive drought characteristics appropriate for that scale.

CHAPTER 3. EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DROUGHT INDICES AND GROUNDWATER LEVELS¹

3.1. Introduction

Establishing a parametric linkage between groundwater level fluctuations and drought is vital for water monitoring and management. In most areas, groundwater is used as an alternative water source during drought events. Groundwater and drought have inherent complexities, yet are relatively concomitant. Although drought is contextual without a universally accepted definition (Wilhite and Glantz, 1985) its central theme is related to a period of water deficiency in relation to demand. Since it is inherently difficult to identify or predict drought's onset and offset, indices are predominantly used (Dracup et al., 1980; Tallaksen et al., 1997). These indices are utilized categorically to identify and monitor drought (Steinemann et al., 2005). The four types of drought generally recognized include (i) meteorological, (ii) agricultural, (iii) hydrological, and (iv) socio-economic drought (AMS, 2013; Wilhite and Glantz, 1985). The first two types, that is, meteorological and agricultural droughts, are defined on the basis of precipitation and soil moisture deficits respectively (AMS, 2013; Wilhite and Glantz, 1985). On the other hand, hydrological drought is applicable to shortfalls on surface/subsurface water supply whereas socioeconomic drought is associated with the supply and demand of some economic good (AMS, 2013; Wilhite and Glantz, 1985). Mishra and Singh (2010) suggested that groundwater deficit should be classified as a type of drought in addition to the aforementioned four types. Groundwater drought can be defined only in terms of groundwater level decline due to difficulties of quantifying groundwater storage, recharge, aquifer type and areal extents (Chang and Teoh, 1995; Eltahir and Yeh, 1999).

Various authors emphasize the need for evaluating the relationship of stream flow and groundwater with meteorological variables based drought indices (Chen et al., 2002; Chen et al., 2004; Haslinger et al., 2014; Jan et al., 2007; Lorenzo-Lacruz et al., 2010; Mall et al., 2006; Panda et al., 2007; Tirogo et al., 2016; Vasiliades and Loukas, 2009; Vicente-Serrano et al., 2012). The relationship of stream flow with drought indices has been studied by several authors. For example, Haslinger et al. (2014) established a methodology for directly relating various meteorological drought indices and stream flow data for northern Austria gauging stations. These indices included: (i) Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI), (ii) Standardized Precipitation Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI), (iii) Palmer's Z-Index, and (iv) self-calibrating Palmer Drought Severity Index (scPDSI). Vasiliades and Loukas (2009) used Palmer drought indices to ascertain hydrological drought using simulated river discharges and soil moisture for riverine systems in Thessaly, Greece. Vicente-Serrano et al. (2012) extensively studied the correlation between select drought indices and stream flow data from 151 basins worldwide. Lorenzo-Lacruz et al. (2010) evaluated the performance of SPI and SPEI drought indices to correlate river discharge, investigate reservoir storage, and determine reservoir release.

The knowledge base of studies linking drought and groundwater levels is limited, although Mall et al. (2006) emphasized the need to study the impact of climate change and drought on groundwater resources in depth. Most studies have used precipitation and temperature to study drought relationship with groundwater levels. For example, Panda et al.

¹This chapter was adopted from a published article in *Water* (Leelaruban, N., and G. Padmanabhan, P. Oduor., 2017. Examining the Relationship between Drought Indices and Groundwater Levels. *Water*, Vol.9, No. 82, doi:10.3390/w9020082).

(2007) reported the relationship between monsoon rainfall and groundwater fluctuation. Tirogo et al. (2016) reported the groundwater response to rainfall for a study area in Burkina Faso, West Africa. The relationship between groundwater level fluctuation and rainfall was also studied for a selected well in Central Taiwan by Jan et al. (2007). Chen et al. (2004) found that groundwater levels greatly depended on precipitation and annual mean temperature, with a delayed response time. An empirical model developed by Chen et al. (2002) linked annual precipitation and average temperature to groundwater levels based on water budget and groundwater flow. The relationship between drought indices and groundwater level fluctuation has not been explored much in the past.

This study differs from the aforementioned studies because this study focused on groundwater response to drought by deriving a parametric relationship between drought indices and groundwater data. Bloomfield and Marchant (2013) developed a Standardized Groundwater Level Index (SGI) incorporating an approach similar to the computation of SPI using groundwater level data from select wells in United Kingdom. Mendicino et al. (2008) proposed a Groundwater Resource Index (GRI) for drought monitoring and forecasting. This was based on a simple water balance model approach. Li and Rodell (2014) empirically derived a groundwater drought index (GWI) based on Catchment Land Surface Model (CLSM) output. Li and Rodell (2014) found strong regional correlation between CLSM (Koster et al., 2000) based GWI and in situ data based GWI, and both GWIs displayed a higher correlation with SPI-12 and SPI-24. However, CLSM requires substantial modeling effort. Other studies have used remote sensing techniques to quantify the groundwater storage decline (Castle et al., 2014; Famiglietti et al., 2011; Rodell et al., 2009; Voss et al., 2013). Most of these studies used precipitation and temperature as indicators of drought. Groundwater systems are influenced by many factors including hydrological properties of recharge area, hydraulic properties of aquifer, and climate variables. Therefore, deterministic approaches to quantify groundwater level dynamics require aquifer properties, recharge rates, amongst other factors. Due to limitations of such data, deterministic approaches may be difficult to implement (Chen et al., 2002) which leaves statistical analyses as a viable alternative.

In this study, groundwater level data from the U.S. Geological Survey Ground-Water Climate Response Network (USGS CRN) wells was used. Wells in this network have the least anthropogenic-induced disturbances (Cunningham et al., 2007). A total of 8 indices were tested and a correlation matrix was developed between groundwater levels and drought indices to evaluate the capability of indices to elucidate dynamics of groundwater level fluctuations. The seasonal variability of groundwater level, and its relationship with drought was also studied for selected wells. An event by event analysis was also conducted to capture the specific behaviour of groundwater level fluctuation during individual drought episodes. Duration of drought events and lag times of groundwater responses with respect to onset and termination of drought events were also studied.

3.2. Study Area and Methods

3.2.1. Study area and groundwater levels data

The study area and the selected well locations are shown in Figure 3.1. Criteria for the selection of CRN wells included: (a) located in unconfined aquifers or near-surface confined aquifers, (b) had minimum artificial influences (e.g. pumping, irrigation, canals, and artificial recharge), and (c) have never gone dry (Cunningham et al., 2007). Thirty-two USGS CRN wells from the Great Plains States of the U.S. were analysed. One well located in Colorado (CO), two

wells from Kansas (KS), five wells in Montana (MT), six wells in Nebraska (NE), five wells in North Dakota (ND), two wells in Oklahoma (OK), six wells in South Dakota (SD), and five wells located in Texas (TX)) (Figure 3.1). The beginning of time span of groundwater level data was chosen based on the beginning of available consistent groundwater level records. December 2013 was chosen as the end of time span.




Figure 3.1: Study area showing selected wells' locations.

3.2.2. Drought indices

Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI) (Palmer, 1965), Palmer Hydrological Drought Index (PHDI) (Karl, 1986), Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) (McKee et al., 1993; McKee et al., 1995); and meteorological parameters such as Precipitation (PCP) and Average Temperature (TMP) were used in this study. The Monthly values of PDSI, PHDI, SPI, TMP, and PCP were derived from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) [Currently part of NOAA's National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI)]. The NCDC maintains historic data from 1895 to present in climatic division scale. NOAA's Gridded Climate Divisional Dataset (nCLIMDIV formerly known as Traditional Climate Division Dataset (TCDD) data) from NOAA NCDC were also used in this study. nCLIMDIV replaced the previous Traditional Climate Division Dataset (TCDD) in March 2014. The detailed description and major impacts of this transition can be found in Fenimore et al. (Fenimore et al., 2011). Vose et al. (2014) discussed the improvement in the nCLIMDIV data and suggested that this can be used in applied research and climate monitoring.

3.2.3. Groundwater level - drought indices correlation

The linear relationship between monthly median depth to water level from land surface, b , and corresponding monthly values of PCP, TMP, PDSI, PHDI, SPI-06, SPI-09, SPI-12, and SPI-24 indices was analysed using Pearson correlation coefficient. SPI can be calculated for multiple timescales which indicate the impact on different water sectors. In this study, SPI with timescales of at least six months was used since it was suitable for analyzing hydrological drought impact such as groundwater decline (Svoboda et al., 2012). Drought indices used for each well were for the respective climate division where the well was located.

3.2.4. Monthly groundwater variation and its correlation with SPI-24

The monthly variations of groundwater levels, and correlations between SPI-24 with b were studied for select wells. The rationale for focusing on SPI-24 is its inherent concomitancy with groundwater levels. A subset of wells which had at least 25 years records of monthly groundwater level data was demarcated from the rest of the dataset. This was done to identify the seasonal variability of groundwater level and its relation to drought.

3.2.5. Groundwater level fluctuation for specific drought events

For each well, the duration in number of months under moderate or more severe drought conditions were derived based on SPI-24. Drought is reported moderate or more severe when $\text{SPI-24} \leq -0.8$ by NOAA's NCEI. Therefore, the drought events for each well were delineated based on $\text{SPI-24} \leq -0.8$ for at least 30 consecutive months. Corresponding groundwater b values were also noted. From this data, groundwater level decline and, lag and recovery time of groundwater level in relation to the selected drought events were determined.

3.3. Results and Discussions

The Pearson correlation coefficients between b and climate indices such as PCP, TMP, PDSI, PHDI, and SPI for 6, 9, 12, and 24 monthly scales are shown in Figure 3.2. The results show that precipitation and temperature have relatively low correlation with groundwater level. Twenty-nine out of 32 wells show r for b and precipitation in the range -0.3 to 0.21. The highest correlation of b and precipitation (-0.51) is observed for well OK2. The r values of b and temperature vary between -0.23 and 0.19. Precipitation, by and large, correlates negatively as expected. Temperature, on the other hand, shows a positive and negative correlation with b .

Since b correlates negatively with drought indices; the more negative the index value, the more severe the drought. The more negative the indices, the greater the depth to groundwater. The PHDI and SPI-24 displayed better correlations with groundwater levels, albeit inconsistently (Figure 3.2). 12/32 wells show r value of -0.6 or better with SPI-24; nine wells show r of -0.6 or better with PHDI. Detailed description of r with indices follows: NE4 and NE5 displayed r of -0.9 and -0.8, for SPI-24. For (i) wells KS2 and MT5 with respect to SPI-24; (ii) OK1 with respect to PHDI; (iii) OK2 with respect PDSI; and (iv) TX2 with respect to SPI-9 r was $-0.8 \leq r \leq -0.7$. For wells KS1, MT2, ND5, NE2, SD3, & SD4 with SPI-24, r was $-0.7 \leq r \leq -0.6$ similar to wells ND1 and ND3 with respect to PHDI. The correlation values for wells MT1 and SD6 considering SPI-24; and CO1 with respect to SPI-9 r can be expressed as $-0.6 \leq r \leq -0.5$. Four wells (ND4, SD5 & TX4 with SPI-24; and MT3 with SPI-12) correlation values ranged between -0.5 and -0.4; one well (ND2 with SPI-24) with a correlation value of -0.32; 4 wells (TX3 with SPI-24; NE3 & SD2 with PHDI; and TX1 with SPI-12) correlation values between -0.3 and -0.2; and one well (NE6 with SPI-24) with a correlation value of -0.05. Wells MT4, NE1, SD1, and

TX5 displayed positive correlation values with respect to drought indices. Some factors that can possibly be attributed to the inconsistent correlation may be due to each wells' heterogeneity owing to various geophysical and hydrological conditions. We can still unequivocally state that the results show that drought indices can be used as a proxy indicator of groundwater levels.




Figure 3.2: The Pearson correlation coefficient, r , between groundwater level (b) and drought indices.

Based on the results of overall correlation between b values and drought indices, SPI-24 index is a viable candidate in monitoring groundwater level fluctuations during a discernible drought. SPI is a simple index based on solely precipitation records. A study of groundwater level responses to SPI will be advantageous in groundwater management and monitoring during discernible drought episodes owing to the fact that precipitation records are widely available. Thus, SPI-24 may be regarded as a proxy and/or a direct measure of groundwater levels. The variation of b and SPI-24 for four wells that displayed positive correlation as opposed to the expected negative r is shown in Figure 3.3. From Figure 3.3, we can see that the b values are not reflecting any drought conditions. The inclusion of these wells in the CRN network may need further reconsideration beyond the scope of this study.

The variation of groundwater level and its correlation with SPI-24 were further analysed in a monthly time basis for a select set of wells. The selected wells were KS2, ND1, ND2, ND3, ND4, ND5, NE6, OK1, and TX2. These wells had at least 25 years of reported monthly records. TX5 had more than 25 years of monthly records for each month but was not used for this part of study because its water level variation was declining irrespective of any established drought episodes (Figure 3.3). The tabulated results in Table 3.1 include correlation coefficient values between SPI-24 and, b , for each month, r' , and average values of depth to water level from land surface (b), μ .

Figure 3.4 shows variation between r' , and μ . The μ values for well KS2 vary between 6.03 m in June and 6.39 m in February. The r' values for KS2 vary between -0.84 in January and -0.75 in September. The μ and r' values for KS2 well are relatively stable, and groundwater level had a strong linear correlation with SPI-24. The highest differential value for r' is observed for ND1 where r' values range between -0.75 for the month of January and -0.57 for May and June months. On the other hand, μ value varies between 1.97 m in February and 1.18 m in May.




Figure 3.3: The variation of 24-month Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI-24) and depth to water level, b , for wells MT4, NE1, SD1, and TX5.

The highest differential μ value was observed for OK1 well where the highest μ was 34.49 m for October and lowest μ value was 32.14 m for June months. μ values for ND4 vary between 7.14 m for September and 7 m for June which was the lowest differential μ value. The r' values for NE6 are very low for all the months over the entire period. Overall for all the wells, μ values were low during summer months, that is, from May to August. This study did not explore any general specific patterns for seasonal variability of r' . The r' values are relatively the same throughout the year for the studied wells. It implies that drought influence the groundwater regardless of the season of the year for the studied wells. Knowing the variation of groundwater level and its correlation with drought in monthly basis will be helpful in identification of seasonal groundwater availability and its susceptibility to drought, and to better planning and utility of groundwater resources.




Figure 3.4: Monthly variation of r' and μ .

To study the effects of drought duration on groundwater decline, seven different events were identified that could satisfy the criteria of $SPI-24 \leq -0.8$ in the area surrounding the well for at least 30 consecutive months. This was also complementary with complete well data spanning a similar time frame of 30 months. Table 3.2 shows the timeline of drought events (year and month of starting and ending), duration of drought events (number of months under moderate or more severe drought), and available monthly median records of groundwater level records within established drought events.

The monthly SPI-24 values variation with temporal groundwater levels is shown in Figure 3.5(a-1 to g-1). The x -axis shows the year and month. The time frame commences two years before the beginning of drought, and ends two years after the drought event. As such, we can extract information on lag and recovery times of groundwater levels to drought. From Figure 3.5 (a-2 to g-2), we can see the relationship between b and duration, d , of a moderate or more severe drought, that is, $SPI-24 \leq -0.8$ condition. Wells MT1, MT4, ND3, ND4, and ND5 display a prominent linear relationship with respect to the duration of drought events ($r > 0.9$) compared to wells KS2 and NE2 (Figure 3.5: a-2 to g-2). Table 3.3 shows the results of: (i) total groundwater decline values during each drought event, (ii) correlation coefficient between depth to water level and duration, r , (iii) fitted linear regression model equations for depth to water level with duration, and (iv) coefficient of determination, R^2 . The total groundwater decline was determined from the difference in groundwater levels at the beginning and end of each drought event. The highest R^2 value was obtained for well ND5 which indicated that 97.41% of variation in groundwater level may be attributed to duration of moderate or more severe drought, that is, $SPI-24 \leq -0.8$ conditions. Well NE2 displayed the lowest R^2 value of 39%. The water levels for

Table 3.1: Correlation coefficients between SPI-24 and b (r'), sample size (n), and average of monthly median values (μ).

ID (time frame)	Pr	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
KS2 (1953 – 2013)	r'	-0.84	-0.82	-0.82	-0.78	-0.81	-0.79	-0.77	-0.76	-0.75	-0.80	-0.81	-0.82
	n	61	60	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	60
	μ	6.38	6.39	6.34	6.24	6.14	6.03	6.12	6.31	6.38	6.32	6.32	6.35
ND1 (1964 – 2013)	r'	-0.75	-0.72	-0.73	-0.60	-0.57	-0.57	-0.60	-0.65	-0.67	-0.68	-0.69	-0.69
	n	49	44	48	49	46	47	47	47	47	48	48	49
	μ	1.92	1.97	1.83	1.21	1.18	1.31	1.48	1.79	1.87	1.77	1.67	1.77
ND2 (1979 – 2013)	r'	-0.42	-0.38	-0.31	-0.36	-0.30	-0.33	-0.32	-0.31	-0.29	-0.29	-0.24	-0.28
	n	29	28	33	33	35	35	35	35	34	35	35	32
	μ	6.52	6.52	6.48	6.41	6.36	6.36	6.47	6.65	6.69	6.58	6.50	6.51
ND3 (1969 – 2013)	r'	-0.68	-0.68	-0.67	-0.60	-0.73	-0.64	-0.55	-0.58	-0.65	-0.66	-0.67	-0.72
	n	36	37	39	36	32	42	39	41	36	44	40	36
	μ	5.77	5.76	5.64	5.45	5.45	5.40	5.47	5.58	5.68	5.66	5.67	5.73
ND4 (1966 – 2013)	r'	-0.43	-0.34	-0.34	-0.38	-0.36	-0.48	-0.43	-0.35	-0.36	-0.38	-0.37	-0.41
	n	45	45	47	46	46	46	45	46	47	46	47	47
	μ	7.07	7.08	7.11	7.06	7.03	7.00	7.03	7.11	7.14	7.09	7.08	7.07
ND5 (1981 – 2013)	r'	-0.68	-0.68	-0.67	-0.64	-0.68	-0.73	-0.58	-0.64	-0.63	-0.61	-0.62	-0.65
	n	31	29	29	31	33	33	30	31	30	33	32	31
	μ	2.96	3.01	3.04	3.03	3.03	2.95	2.90	2.85	2.93	2.93	2.93	2.93
NE6 (1967 – 2013)	r'	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	-0.08	-0.02	-0.04	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.04	-0.05
	n	46	46	47	47	47	47	46	46	47	47	47	47
	μ	14.18	14.17	14.11	14.06	14.01	13.98	14.02	14.24	14.35	14.37	14.35	14.33
OK1 (1960 – 2013)	r'	-0.75	-0.71	-0.73	-0.62	-0.73	-0.76	-0.71	-0.69	-0.75	-0.75	-0.71	-0.70
	n	52	52	52	54	52	53	54	52	53	54	53	54
	μ	33.71	33.75	33.42	32.66	32.27	32.14	32.79	33.80	34.44	34.49	34.20	34.02
TX2 (1981 – 2013)	r'	-0.52	-0.54	-0.50	-0.48	-0.59	-0.62	-0.53	-0.52	-0.55	-0.62	-0.59	-0.55
	n	28	25	30	28	27	27	29	27	28	28	27	26
	μ	7.44	7.44	7.56	7.56	7.59	7.37	7.40	7.59	7.69	7.74	7.59	7.48

Pr- Parameters; r' -correlation coefficient; n -number of monthly records; μ -average values of monthly median records in meters.

wells KS2 and NE2 started to recover a few months ahead of the end to the associated drought event thus displaying a relatively low linear correlation value (Figure 3.5).

Table 3.2: Pertinent data showing selected drought events and number of groundwater level records.

ID	Drought Events			
	Start	End	Duration	# Records
KS2	195307	195710	52	52
MT1	200006	200304	35	35
MT4	200006	200302	33	32
ND3	198905	199207	39	39
ND4	198807	199106	36	36
ND5	198807	199106	36	35
NE2	193508	193808	37	30

Table 3.3: The relationship between b and duration (d) of drought events.

ID	Time Frame		Total Drop (m)	r	Regression model	R^2 (%)
	Start	End				
KS2	195307	195710	0.90	0.831	$b = 0.021d + 6.734$	69.08
MT1	200006	200304	3.05	0.976	$b = 0.074d + 48.478$	95.34
MT4	200006	200302	0.25	0.933	$b = 0.009d + 41.779$	87.11
ND3	198905	199207	1.02	0.962	$b = 0.025d + 5.825$	92.51
ND4	198807	199106	0.84	0.986	$b = 0.022d + 6.653$	97.30
ND5	198807	199106	0.85	0.987	$b = 0.026d + 3.318$	97.41
NE2	193508	193808	0.19	0.625	$b = 0.013d + 1.143$	39.00

The depth to water level increased or continued to remain high even after the end of a drought event for wells MT1 and MT4. The consequent drought pattern after the defined drought event may be the reason for this type of anomaly. Wells MT4 and ND3 show a lag in response to a drought event. In general, we can surmise that the groundwater decline was linear during established drought events defined as moderate more severe, that is, $SPI-24 \leq -0.8$. However, there was variation in groundwater responses before the onset and offset of drought events.

Drought impacts all water dependent sectors, and causes vast economic losses and environmental issues. Hays et al. (2011) emphasizes that an impact assessment is vitally important for decision making, responding, and understanding vulnerabilities of drought. Above ground hydrological responses to drought using stream flow data is a vastly studied area compared to studies of influences of drought on groundwater resources. This study investigated the possibility of utilizing drought indices in exploring groundwater level responses to drought. It should also be recognized that inherent challenges also face establishing an uncontested parametric relationship between drought indices and groundwater dynamics due to complex

nature of aquifers such as varying depth, properties of aquifer and recharge area, and possible anthropogenic influences.




Figure 3.5: The variation of b with SPI-24 and duration (d) of selected drought events for (a) KS2, (b) MT1, (c) MT4, (d) ND3, (e) ND4, (f) ND5, and (g) NE2.

3.4. Summary and Conclusion

This study explored the relationship between groundwater levels and drought indices for wells located in the Great Plains States of the U.S. The groundwater level data from USGS CRN wells with minimum anthropogenic disturbances were used. Thirty-two wells were selected for the study. The correlation matrix of the drought indices and depth to groundwater levels (monthly median values) was calculated and used to identify which reliable drought indices were necessary in monitoring groundwater responses to drought. It should be noted that drought indices used in this study were derived from NOAA NCDC for each climate division where a well was located. It would be more appropriate to consider indices with areal coverage of recharge area of each well although this would be impractical. Regardless, this study found that drought indices fairly reflected groundwater responses to drought. The PHDI and SPI-24 indices superseded other indices used in this study and displayed a higher correlation with groundwater level. Li and Rodell (2014) also reported that SPI-24 is a promising drought index in studying groundwater responses to drought.

The seasonal variability of groundwater levels, and correlation of groundwater levels with SPI-24 were also studied for selected wells especially those that had adequate data. The correlation between average values of monthly median depths to water level remained relatively the same throughout the year. The fluctuations of groundwater levels for specific drought events were also examined. Drought events, for this purpose, were defined by a SPI-24 threshold of less than or equal to -0.8, a category used for moderate or more severe drought. There were seven drought episodes identified using at least 30 months of groundwater level records. During each defined drought event, the duration of drought events was found to have significant influence on groundwater levels response to drought, displaying a prominent linear relationship to groundwater decline. A set of regression equations were developed to establish the relationship between drought duration and depth to water level from land surface for the selected seven drought events. Based on R^2 values, for four wells (MT1, ND3, ND4, and ND5) more than 92% of the variation in groundwater can be explained by the drought duration. Decline and recovery times were also discernible for groundwater levels for the defined drought episodes with respect to each well location. For example, wells MT4 and ND3 had a lag time from the start of a drought event to when the groundwater level decline was perceptible, whereas wells KS2 and NE4 began to recover prior to end of the drought event.

Observation of groundwater level fluctuation is essential for groundwater monitoring and management. However, there is a deficiency of *in situ* observation due to practical limitations of establishment and maintenance of observatory well networks. Alternatively, establishing a relationship between groundwater and meteorological drought indicators as accomplished in this study will be useful in groundwater monitoring and management. Such a study could enable managers to have an estimated groundwater level during drought based on well-established and readily available drought indices from the widely used source, NOAA NCDC. In addition, the current understanding of interaction between drought and groundwater is limited. A study like this can be helpful to understand the response of groundwater levels to various characteristics of drought such as intensity and duration. However, the relationship between drought and groundwater levels may be region- specific and thus needs to be studied for each region of interest.

CHAPTER 4. QUANTIFYING IMPACT OF DROUGHTS ON BARLEY YIELD IN NORTH DAKOTA, USA USING MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION AND ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK¹

4.1. Introduction

Impact of drought on various sectors has long been recognized. Agriculture is one of the major sectors that experiences significant loss during drought events. Agriculture also is the first sector to be affected at the onset of drought because crops at various stages of their growth depend on water and soil moisture (Narasimhan and Srinivasan, 2005). Impact of drought on agriculture has been studied by several investigators (Lott and Ross, 2006; Li et al., 2009; Mishra and Cherkauer, 2010). Li et al. (2009) studied the drought risk for global crop production under current and future climatic conditions by using historical crop yield and meteorological drought. It is anticipated significant losses in yields of major crops in the future due to drought events. There was \$145 billion loss in crop production across the U.S. during the last three decades (Lott and Ross, 2006). A better understanding of the historical drought damages and drought-yield relationship could help reduce any future losses. According to Thomson et al. (2005) crop yield variability is mainly influenced by local weather and climate rather than by large scale climatic patterns. The State of North Dakota, U.S, is a leading producer of many crops. Particularly, it is a leading producer of barley in the nation accounting for 24% of nation's barley production. Since North Dakota is also a drought prone state, it is important to study the drought-barley yield relationship in particular (Karetinkov et al., 2008; Leelaruban et al., 2012).

Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) and Artificial Neural Network (ANN) models are both widely used in many areas for prediction and classification purposes. MLR is a traditional statistical technique, and it has an established methodology. However, ANN is relatively a recent computational modeling tool that is used to solve many complex real world problems due to its remarkable learning and generalization capabilities (Basheer, 2000; Paliwal and Kumar, 2009). ANN has been used in water quality and water resources area to estimate evaporation, evapotranspiration, rainfall, runoff, and nutrient transportation (Tokar and Johnson, 1999; Tayfur and Guldal, 2006), accounting and finance (Lenard et al., 1995), health and medicine (Reggia, 1993; Ottenbacher et al., 2001), engineering and manufacturing (Feng and Wang, 2002; Yesilnacar and Topal, 2005), marketing (Fish et al., 1995; Ainscough and Aronson, 1999), agriculture (Ayoubi and Sahrawat, 2011, Kaul et al., 2005), and forestry science (Aertsen et al., 2010; Ostendorf et al., 2001). ANN has also been used in several drought forecasting studies (Rezaeianzadeh et al., 2016; Belayneh et al., 2014; Barua et al., 2012).

There are ample information in the literature about the application and capabilities of ANN and MLR (Ainscough and Aronson, 1999; Ayoubi and Sahrawat; 2011, Mekanik et al., 2013; Paliwal and Kumar, 2009; Pao, 2008, Yilmaz and Kaynar, 2011). A detailed review of neural networks and statistical techniques can be found in Paliwal and Kumar (2009). A comprehensive list of comparative studies of applications of neural networks and other statistical techniques from various fields can be found in their study. They also discuss the capabilities of each method. Mekanik et al (2013) investigated the capabilities of ANN and MLR to forecast long-term seasonal spring rainfall in Victoria, Australia using lagged El Nino Southern

¹This chapter was adopted from a published article in Neural Network World (Odabas. M., Leelaruban. N., Halis Simsek, and G. Padmanabhan., 2014. Quantifying Impact of Droughts on Barley Yield in North Dakota, USA Using Multiple Linear Regression and Artificial Neural Network. Neural Network World, Vol. 24, No.4, pp. 343-356. doi: 10.14311/NNW.2014.24.020).

Oscillation (ENSO) and Indian Ocean Dipole (IOD). They found that ANN is a better model to find the pattern and trend of observations, and generally had lower error compared to MLR.

Kaul et al. (2005) conducted a study to predict the corn and soybean yield using field-specific rainfall, and Soil Rating for Plant Growth (SRPG), and concluded that ANN has a better prediction capability compared to MLR. Ayoubi and Sahrawat (2011) used ANN and MLR to predict the biomass and grain yield of barley in relation to soil properties. They found that ANN outperformed MLR. There are numerous studies on quantifying barley yield using different input characteristics and methodologies (Ayoubi and Sahrawat, 2011; Mkhabela et al., 2011; Ogunkunle and Beckett, 1988; Ostergard et al., 2008). For example, Mkhabela et al (2011) developed statistical models to predict the yield of different crops including barley using MODIS NDVI data for Canadian Prairies. However, the relationship between different drought conditions and barley yield has not been studied using ANN to the best of authors' knowledge. Though MLR models have been used, the complex nature of drought-yield relationship need better methods of prediction and interpretation (Leelaruban et al., 2012).

ANN methodology is a non-linear data driven self-adaptive approach. ANN can identify and learn correlation patterns between variables (independent) and corresponding target variables (dependent) when the underlying relationship is unknown and consequently can predict the dependent variables based on new independent variable data sets (Suo et al., 2010). Basically, ANN performs the function of nonlinear mapping or pattern recognition. If a set of input data corresponds to a definite signal pattern, the network can be trained to give correspondingly a desired pattern at the output. The network has the capability to learn and estimate the output (Bose, 1994).

The objective of this study is to quantify and compare the impact of different drought conditions on barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) yield using the MLR and ANN models. Though there are few studies relating yield with climate variables using ANN and MLR, the method has not been used to quantify the drought impact on barley yields to the best of our knowledge. In addition, this study uses the U.S. Drought Monitor data which account for areal coverage and severity of drought. This drought data is relatively new (2000- present), and has not been used for similar past studies. North Dakota State is one of the leading producers of barley in U.S. Therefore, it is only appropriate to use data from North Dakota. However, the methodology used in this study can be used for other areas.

4.2. Data and Methods

4.2.1. Drought Data

This study uses United States Drought Monitor (USDM) data. The USDM is a major source of drought data in the U.S available to the public from the National Drought Mitigation Center (NDMC) at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln (Svoboda et al., 2002). NDMC provides various climate and drought information to the public which includes easy to use U.S. Drought Monitor. The purpose of the USDM is not forecasting drought rather it was developed as a comprehensive tool to capture and depict the drought conditions as they exist across the U.S. (Hayes et al., 2005).

The USDM data products (map/table) can be accessed at NDMC's web site (<http://www.drought.unl.edu/dm/monitor.html>). Several federal agencies including U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) also contribute to produce USDM data products. USDM data on areal coverage under different drought intensity categories: D0 (abnormally dry), D1 (moderate drought), D2 (severe drought), D3 (extreme drought), and D4 (exceptional drought) (Svoboda et al., 2002) were

utilized in this study. USDM employs key drought indicators such as Palmer Drought Index, CPC Soil Moisture Model (Percentiles), USGS Weekly Stream flow (Percentiles), Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI), and Objective Short and Long-term Drought Indicator Blends (Percentiles) and numerous supplementary indicators to define the intensity categories. For example, drought category will be designated as D0, if Palmer Drought Index is in the range -1.0 to 1.9, CPC Soil Moisture Model Percentile 21 to 30, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) weekly Stream Flow Percentile 21 to 30, Standardized Precipitation Index -0.5 to -0.7, and Objective Short and Long-term Drought Indicator Blends Percentiles 21 to 30. The ranges of the indicators used in the USDM classification scheme often may not point to the same USDM classification. Therefore, the final USDM category will be defined based on majority of the indicators. In addition, USDM will weigh the indices based on their performances over the time and space and incorporate information from many local experts around the country, and use additional indicators if necessary.

4.2.2. Crop Data

Barley is one of the major agricultural crops grown in North Dakota. County-by-county yield data of barley is derived from USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) web portal for the study period (2000 – 2012) (<http://www.nass.usda.gov/>). Generally, Barley planting will start in later part of April, and harvesting end in early part of September in North Dakota. Figure 4.1 shows the North Dakota counties and barley yield in 2010. North Dakota is one of the north-central states of the U.S and has 53 counties.




Figure 4.1: The North Dakota counties and barley yield in bushel/acres (1 bushel = 0.03524 m³; 1 acre = 4046.86 m²) for year 2010 (barley yield data is derived from USDA NASS web portal).

Table 4.1 shows the barley yield details in ND, U.S. for years 2000 to 2012. For each year, number of counties reported yield (out of 53 counties in ND), average yield, maximum and minimum yield, and corresponding counties are listed. Figure 4.2 shows the average yield variation of barley yield for year 2000 to 2012. The maximum average yield is reported in 2009 (69.22 bu/acres), and minimum average yield is reported in 2002 (40.02 bu/acres) in ND.

Table 4.1: Barley yield (in Bushel/acres) details in ND, U.S. for year 2000 – 2012.

Year	Number of county reported	Average yield	Maximum yield (County)	Minimum yield (County)
2000	53	54.91	71.4 (Pembina)	42.3 (Divide)
2001	53	55.68	66.0 (Slope)	46.0 (Burke/Mckenzie)
2002	51	40.02	55.7 (Traill)	12.6 (Grant)
2003	53	57.60	77.8 (Steele)	29.9 (Grant)
2004	51	59.02	81.6 (Dickey)	27.3 (Grant)
2005	51	53.50	73.3 (Emmons)	40.0 (Divide)
2006	48	46.15	68.6 (Traill)	21.8 (Emmons)
2007	51	53.17	63.3 (Emmons)	37.5 (Richland)
2008	40	54.75	81.1 (Traill)	23.9 (Mckenzie)
2009	41	69.22	91.0 (Emmons)	51.0 (Bowman)
2010	41	64.92	84.2 (Dickey)	42.0 (Golden Valley)
2011	27	43.47	67.1 (Ramsey)	23.3 (Morton)
2012	31	59.01	79.8 (Traill)	31.0 (Slope)




Figure 4.2: Annual average barley yield in ND, U.S. for year 2000 – 2012.

4.2.3. Multiple Linear Regression (MLR)

MLR is a statistical method used to investigate the relationship between several independent variables and a dependent variable. A linear regression model assumes that the relationship between the dependent variable and the p -vector of regressors is linear, where p is the number of independent variables. Thus the model takes the form

$$y_i = \beta_1 \chi_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p \chi_{ip} + \varepsilon_i = \chi_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (4.1)$$

where $'$ denotes the transpose, so that $\chi_i' \beta$ is the inner product between vectors χ_i and β . The y_i is called the *regressand* or *dependent* variable. The decision as to which variable in a data set is modeled as the dependent variable and which are modeled as the independent variables may be based on a presumption that the value of one of the variables is caused by, or directly influenced by the other variables. The χ_i is called regressor or independent variable (Weisberg, 2005). To ascertain the dependency of barley yield on drought categories, Eq. (4.1) was utilized. Average values of A_{D0} , A_{D1} , A_{D2} , A_{D3} , and A_{D4} were calculated between planting and harvesting period from collected data for different drought intensity categories of areal coverage values, where A_{D0} , A_{D1} , A_{D2} , A_{D3} , and A_{D4} are percentage area coverage values for D0, D1, D2, D3, and D4 respectively. Then panel data set was constructed using barley yield, $\text{Avg}(A_{D0})$, $\text{Avg}(A_{D1})$, $\text{Avg}(A_{D2})$, $\text{Avg}(A_{D3})$ and $\text{Avg}(A_{D4})$. For $i=1, 2, \dots, 53$ counties and $t=1, 2, \dots, 13$ years (2000-2012) of observation.

$$\text{Yield}_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \times \text{Avg}(A_{D0})_{it} + \alpha_2 \times \text{Avg}(A_{D1})_{it} + \alpha_3 \times \text{Avg}(A_{D2})_{it} + \alpha_4 \times \text{Avg}(A_{D3})_{it} + \alpha_5 \times \text{Avg}(A_{D4})_{it} + \varepsilon \quad (4.2)$$

where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5$ coefficients were tested for statistical significance at the 5% level fitted models of equation 4.2. Though drought is a continuous phenomenon in terms of space and intensity, the drought monitor data account for areal coverage of drought for defined drought intensity categories. Therefore, it is appropriate to use the drought monitor data to quantify the impact of different drought intensity categories on barley yield.

4.2.4. Artificial Neural Network (ANN)

ANN has been widely used to model complex and non-linear processes and systems (Suo et al., 2010). ANNs are non-linear data driven self-adaptive systems that can identify and learn correlated patterns between input data sets and corresponding output values, even when the underlying data relationship is unknown. ANN resembles human brain in two respects; the network acquires knowledge through a learning process, and the interconnection strengths known as synaptic weights are used to store the knowledge (Bekat et al., 2012; Yilmaz and Kaynar, 2011). The ANN can be explicitly programmed to perform a task by manually creating the topology and then setting the weights and thresholds of each link. The process of determining weights and biases is called training. The observed data set used to train the ANN is called the training data set. The training data set consists of input signals assigned with corresponding target (desired) output. The network training is an iterative process. In each iteration weights coefficients of nodes are modified using new data from training data set. The weight coefficients and biases are adjusted in each iteration so as to minimize the error of prediction of target value. In this study, Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) algorithm was used to train the network.

The Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) algorithm is an intermediate optimization algorithm between the Gauss–Newton (GN) method and Gradient Descent (GD) algorithm (Arfken, 1985). It combines the speed of the Newton algorithm with the stability of the GD method.

4.3. Results and Discussion

In this study, the ANN and MLR models were compared for their performance in explaining the influence of drought conditions on the variability of barley yield in North Dakota. In the MLR analysis, the yield of barley was used as the dependent variable and drought conditions were used as the independent variables.

The following tables list parameters derived from MLR model (Eq. 4.2) for barley using MINITAB® statistical software (Table 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4).

The regression equation can be written as;

$$Yield = (58.6) - 0.0688 \times Avg(A_{D0}) - 0.0959 \times Avg(A_{D1}) - 0.191 \times Avg(A_{D2}) - 0.239 \times Avg(A_{D3}) - 5.16 \times Avg(A_{D4}) \quad (4.3)$$

Negative values for coefficients suggest that yield reduces with increasing drought severity as expected.

Table 4.2: Results of analysis of variance.

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Regression	5	12656.2	2531.2	18.88	0.000
Residual Error	585	78439.6	134.1		
Total	590	91095.8			

Table 4.3: Results of regression analysis.

Predictor	Coefficient	SE coefficient	T	P	VIF
Constant	58.6	0.7584	77.24	0.000	
AvgD ₀	-0.0688	0.0265	-2.60	0.010	1.176
AvgD ₁	-0.0959	0.0380	-2.52	0.012	1.494
AvgD ₂	-0.191	0.0483	-3.95	0.000	1.579
AvgD ₃	-0.239	0.0657	-3.64	0.000	1.171
AvgD ₄	-5.16	2.4930	-2.07	0.039	1.009

$$S = 11.5795 \quad R^2 = 13.9\%, \quad R^2 (adj) = 13.2\%$$

Table 4.4: Pearson correlation matrix.

	AvgD0	AvgD1	AvgD2	AvgD3
AvgD1	0.264			
AvgD2	-0.119	0.472		
AvgD3	-0.128	0.091	0.361	
AvgD4	0.016	0.046	0.054	0.084

Table 4.2 shows the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results for the regression model (Eq. 4.2). The ANOVA table lists the Degree of Freedom (DF), Sum of Square (SS), and Mean Square (MS) for regression model and residual error. The Mean Square for Error (MSE) for the regression model is 134.1. It is high for barley yield value prediction. Overall average barley yield in North Dakota for the study period is only 54.67 bu/acre (1 US Bushel = 0.03524 m³ and 1 acre = 4046.86 m²). Thus, prediction results will be unreliable (Table 4.2). However, global F-test indicates that MLR is useful. The observed significance level for F statistic (p = 0.000) implies there is strong evidence that at least one of the model coefficient is nonzero, and overall model is useful to predict yield (Table 4.2).

Table 4.3 shows the estimated coefficients for the regression model (Eq. 4.3), estimated standard error (SE) of coefficients, t-test statistic values, P-values, and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for coefficients. Results of regression analysis show that all the drought categories coverage has a significant influence in barley yield (Table 4.3). The observed significant values (p-values) in t-tests for all individual coefficients show that all the drought severity coverage categories are significant (at $\alpha = 0.05$) in barley yield prediction (Table 4.3). Negative values suggest that yield reduces with increasing drought severity as expected. Multiple coefficient of determination (R^2) for this model implies that only 13.9 % variation in yield can be explained by drought severity coverage (Table 4.3). It should be noted that the study area experienced only few D4 drought conditions during growing period of barley within the selected time frame for this study.

Low values of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for coefficient (<10), and Pearson correlation values between the drought severity coverage categories (Table 4.4) suggest no serious multicollinearity in the model.

The ANN scheme for the problem at hand is shown in Figure 4.3. ANNs can detect the important features of the input-output relationships with the help of nodes in the hidden layer. The hidden layer and nodes are very important for ANN. The nodes in the hidden layer capture the pattern in the data used (Mishra and Desai, 2006). Best fitting results were obtained for the five inputs AvgD0, AvgD1, AvgD2, AvgD3, and AvgD4, and the one output (yield of barley) using one hidden layer and ten neurons with logsig transfer function, $y=1/(1+e^{-x})$.




Figure 4.3: ANN Scheme for the study problem.

For many practical problems where we need to approximate any function that contains a continuous mapping from one finite space to another, there is no reason to use any more than one hidden layer. The number of neurons used was determined by trial and error. Transfer functions calculate a layer's output from its net input. The function logsig generates outputs between 0 and 1 as the neuron's net input goes from negative to positive infinity. Logsig function is generally used when the network is used for pattern recognition problems such as this.

Predetermined values for the output error (MSE) and maximum iteration number were set to 0.001 and 1000 epoch, respectively. MATLAB[®] software was used for this analysis. Since the accuracy of estimation is highly dependent on covering all level of data, the randomization process was repeated until a satisfactory level of data distribution was reached. The training process will be completed when all weighing indices are fixed and the ANN model can accurately estimate the output data as a function of input values (Kawashima and Nakatani, 1998). Randomly chosen 70% of the data set (414 data) was selected as training data for ANN model. The rest 30% of data set (177 data) was used for testing and validation. An output error of 0.007 mse was determined for generated outputs by logsig transfer function with a maximum iteration number of 300 epochs. The R^2 of ANN was found 0.61 for training, 0.59 for testing, 0.61 for validation and 0.60 for all (Figure 4.4). The MSE value of ANN model for the barley prediction is 4.523 for all data.




Figure 4.4: The relationship between actual and predicted yield of barley using ANN.

Zaefizadeh et al. (2011) conducted a research to predict yield in barley using MLR and ANN methods. They determine the relationship between genotypes and genotype interaction in the environment and its impact on barley yield. They stated that ANN is more effective than MLR for the estimating barley yield since the error for the estimation of barley yield was higher in MLR compared to the error in ANN method. Many researchers agree that ANN is superior to MLR with regard to prediction accuracy since the accuracy in ANN increases as the dimensionality and nonlinearity of the problem increases (Basheer, 2000; Paliwal and Kumar, 2009). Overall, many researchers agree that ANN is an intelligence technique and it is superior to MLR in some aspects.

The precision of the approximation is based on the number of iterations of the simulation done. But the relationship between iterations and precision depends on the relationship between the input and output variables. According to R^2 results, ANN model has been found to quantify better the impact of the different drought conditions on barley yield.

4.4. Conclusion

This study quantified the impact of drought on barley yield in North Dakota, U.S., using MLR and ANN models and compared the results. The developed ANN model is trained using different drought conditions. The ANN model coefficient of determination (R^2) indicates that 60 percent of the variation in yield can be explained by drought whereas only 13 percent by multiple regression. It should be noted that barley yield also depends on other variables such as soil characteristics, and management practices. A perfect prediction model should account for all the variables that influence the yield. However, quantification of drought impact on yield is vital in order to develop more powerful predictive models. Massive parallelism, distributed representation, learning ability, generalization ability, and fault tolerance are some of the attractive features of ANN. When the input and output of the system are complicated (multiple input and output, nonlinearity, etc.), ANN can perform better with the help of its inherent structural advantages. Overall, the information processing capabilities and the ability to recognize and learn from input and output regardless of the problem's dimensionality and nonlinearity makes ANN a more efficient method compared to MLR for estimation of impact of different drought conditions on barley yield. While finding of this study emphasis the need of similar studies in different part of the world in order to proper mitigation strategies to address the drought, this study demonstrates how recent computational tools such as ANN can be effectively used to address this kind of problems. The issues associated with and caused by drought have started to be very real even in world regions where these problems have not been viewed, as yet, important. As drought becomes one of the foremost problems of modern agriculture, the application of ANN or in combination with MLR to investigate the impact of droughts on crop yields would be a promising subject for further research.

CHAPTER 5. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

An understanding of drought occurrences and their characteristics such as intensity, duration, frequency, and areal coverage, and their variations on different spatial scales is crucial to plan for droughts in different regions and in different sized areas. Therefore, the above-mentioned characteristics of droughts in the contiguous U.S were studied using USDM data (2000-2014) across different spatial scales. The findings emphasized the need for studying drought characteristics from the perspectives of different spatial scales. The study also investigated how the weekly percentage area under different intensity categories propagates with time, and extracted the spatiotemporal characteristics of different drought intensity categories at different spatial scales. There is a clear variation in the drought characteristics such as intensity coverage, duration, and occurrence at different spatial scales. The results emphasize that drought management and resource allocation policies need to consider drought analysis across different spatial scales around the region of interest.

The impact of drought on groundwater resources was modeled using linear regression. Of the several drought indices, SPI-24 was found to correlate the best with groundwater levels. The correlation of average monthly groundwater levels with SPI-24 remained relatively the same for all the studied wells. The duration of drought also had significant correlation with groundwater level declines. It is important to monitor groundwater levels during drought for groundwater management. However, there is a deficiency of *in situ* observation wells. Therefore, establishing a relationship between groundwater levels and well-established meteorological drought indicators as accomplished in this study will be useful in groundwater monitoring and management.

This study also investigated the effect of different drought conditions on Barley yield using Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) and Artificial Neural Network (ANN) methods. Though MLR method is widely used, the ANN method has not been used in the past to investigate the effect of droughts on barley yields. This study shows that the ANN model performs better than MLR in estimating barley yield. ANN is proposed as a viable alternative method or in combination with MLR to investigate the impact of droughts on crop yields. The results from ANN model indicate that 60 percent of the variation in yield can be explained by drought whereas only 13 percent by multiple regression.

Drought is a continuing threat all over the world to all the water dependent sectors. It is one of the least understood natural hazards which continue to attract attention of researchers. This study is one among them to further the knowledge base in drought research.

REFERENCES

- Abatzoglou, J.T., 2013. Development of gridded surface meteorological data for ecological applications and modelling. *International Journal of Climatology*, 33(1): 121-131. DOI:10.1002/joc.3413
- Aertsen, W., Kint, V., van Orshoven, J., Ozkan, K., Muys, B., 2010. Comparison and ranking of different modelling techniques for prediction of site index in Mediterranean mountain forests. *Ecological Modelling*, 221(8): 1119-1130. DOI:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2010.01.007
- Ainscough, T.L., Aronson, J.E., 1999. An empirical investigation and comparison of neural networks and regression for scanner data analysis. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 6(4): 205-217. DOI:10.1016/S0969-6989(98)00007-1.
- American Meteorological Society (AMS). AMS information statement on drought. 2013, Available online: <https://www.ametsoc.org/ams/index.cfm/about-ams/ams-statements/statements-of-the-ams-in-force/drought/> (accessed on 24 July 2018).
- Arfken, G., 1985. The method of steepest descents. In: *Mathematical Methods for Physicists*, 3rd (ed.): Academic Press, Orlando, USA. 1985, 428-436.
- Ayoubi, S., Sahrawat, K.L., 2011. Comparing multivariate regression and artificial neural network to predict barley production from soil characteristics in northern Iran. *Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science*, 57(5): 549-565. DOI:10.1080/03650341003631400
- Barua, S., Ng, A.W.M., Perera, B.J.C., 2012. Artificial Neural Network-Based Drought Forecasting Using a Nonlinear Aggregated Drought Index. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 17(12): 1408-1413. DOI:10.1061/(asce)he.1943-5584.0000574
- Basheer, I.A., 2000. Selection of methodology for neural network modeling of constitutive hystereses behavior of soils. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 15(6): 440-458. DOI:10.1111/0885-9507.00206.
- Bekat, T., Erdogan, M., Inal, F., Genc, A., 2012. Prediction of the bottom ash formed in a coal-fired power plant using artificial neural networks. *Energy*, 45(1): 882-887. DOI:10.1016/j.energy.2012.06.075
- Belayneh, A., Adamowski, J., Khalil, B., Ozga-Zielinski, B., 2014. Long-term SPI drought forecasting in the Awash River Basin in Ethiopia using wavelet neural network and wavelet support vector regression models. *Journal of Hydrology*, 508: 418-429. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydro.2013.10.052
- Bloomfield, J.P., Marchant, B.P., 2013. Analysis of groundwater drought building on the standardised precipitation index approach. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 17(12): 4769-4787. DOI:10.5194/hess-17-4769-2013
- Bose, B.K., 1994. Expert-System, Fuzzy-Logic, And Neural-Network Applications in Power Electronics and Motion Control. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 82(8): 1303-1323. DOI:10.1109/5.301690
- Castle, S.L.; Thomas, B.F.; Reager, J.T.; Rodell, M.; Swenson, S.C.; Famiglietti, J.S., 2014. Groundwater depletion during drought threatens future water security of the Colorado River Basin. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41(16): 5904-5911. DOI:10.1002/2014gl061055
- Chang, T.J., Teoh, C.B., 1995. Use of the kriging method for studying characteristics of groundwater droughts. *Water Resources Bulletin*, 31(6): 1001-1007. DOI: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.1995.tb03416.x
- Chen, Z.H., Grasby, S.E., Osadetz, K.G., 2002. Predicting average annual groundwater levels from climatic variables: an empirical model. *Journal of Hydrology*, 260(1-4): 102-117.

DOI:10.1016/S0022-1694(01)00606-0

- Chen, Z.H., Grasby, S.E., Osadetz, K.G., 2004. Relation between climate variability and groundwater levels in the upper carbonate aquifer, southern Manitoba, Canada. *Journal of Hydrology*, 290(1-2): 43-62. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.11.029
- Chiew, F.H.A., Piechota, T.C., Dracup, J.A., McMahon, T.A., 1998. El Niño Southern Oscillation and Australian rainfall, streamflow and drought—links and potential for forecasting. *Journal of Hydrology*. 204 (1–4), 138–149. DOI:10.1016/S0022-1694(97)00121-2
- Cook, B.I., Ault, T.R., Smerdon, J.E., 2015. Unprecedented 21st century drought risk in the American Southwest and Central Plains. *Science Advances*, 1(1), e1400082.
- Cook, E.R., Seager, R., Cane, M.A., Stahle, D.W., 2007. North American drought: Reconstructions, causes, and consequences. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 81(1-2): 93-134. DOI:10.1016/j.earscirev.2006.12.002
- Cunningham, W.L., Geiger, L.H., Karavitis, G.A., US geological survey ground-water climate response network. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet, 2007, 2007-3003, 4p, Available online: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2007/3003/> (accessed on 24 July 2018).
- Dai, A., 2011. Drought under global warming: a review. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews-Climate Change*, 2(1): 45-65. DOI:10.1002/wcc.81
- Dracup, J.A., Lee, K.S., Paulson, E.G., 1980a. On the definition of droughts. *Water Resources Research*, 16(2), 297-302. DOI:10.1029/WR016i002p00297
- Dracup, J.A., Lee, K.S., Paulson, E.G., 1980b. On The Statistical Characteristics of Drought Events. *Water Resources Research*, 16(2): 289-296. DOI:10.1029/WR016i002p00289
- Elagib, N.A., 2014. Development and application of a drought risk index for food crop yield in Eastern Sahel. *Ecological Indicators*, 43: 114-125. DOI:10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.02.033
- Eltahir, E.A.B., Yeh, P., 1999. On the asymmetric response of aquifer water level to floods and droughts in Illinois. *Water Resources Research*, 35(4): 1199-1217. DOI:10.1029/1998wr900071
- Famiglietti, J.S.; Lo, M.; Ho, S.L.; Bethune, J.; Anderson, K.J.; Syed, T.H.; Swenson, S.C.; Linage, C.R.; Rodell, M., 2011. Satellites measure recent rates of groundwater depletion in California's Central Valley. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38. DOI:10.1029/2010gl046442
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Mitigation Strategy., 1995. Partnerships for Building Safer Communities. FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency), Washington DC, p. 2.
- Feng, C.X., Wang, X.F., 2002. Digitizing uncertainty modeling for reverse engineering applications: regression versus neural networks. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 13(3): 189-199. DOI:10.1023/a:1015734805987
- Fenimore, C.; Arndt, D.; Gleason, K.; Heim Jr, R.R.; Transitioning from the traditional divisional dataset to the Global Historical Climatology Network-Daily gridded divisional dataset In Proceedings of the 19th Conference on Applied Climatology, Seattle, WA, USA, 22–27 January 2011; 6B.5, Available online: <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/monitoring-references/docs/GrDD-Transition.pdf> (accessed on 24 July 2018).
- Fish, K.E., Barnes, J.H., Aiken, M.W., 1995. Artificial Neural Networks - A New Methodology for Industrial Market-Segmentation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 24(5): 431-438. DOI:10.1016/0019-8501(95)00033-7

- Gillette, H., 1950. A creeping drought under way. In: *Water and Sewage Works*, March, pp.104–105.
- Gocic, M., Trajkovic, S., 2014. Spatiotemporal characteristics of drought in Serbia. *Journal of Hydrology*, 510: 110-123. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.12.030
- Gumbel, E., 1963. Statistical forecast of droughts. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 8(1): 5-23. DOI: 10.1080/02626666309493293
- Guttman, N.B., 1998. Comparing the Palmer Drought Index and the standardized precipitation index. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 34(1), 113-121. DOI:10.1111/j.1752-1688.1998.tb05964.x
- Hao, Z., AghaKouchak, A., 2013. Multivariate Standardized Drought Index: A parametric multi-index model. *Advances in Water Resources*, 57: 12-18. DOI:10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.03.009
- Hao, Z., AghaKouchak, A., Nakhjiri, N., Farahmand, A., 2014. Global integrated drought monitoring and prediction system. *Scientific data* 1, 140001. DOI:10.1038/sdata.2014.1
- Haslinger, K., Koffler, D., Schoener, W., Laaha, G., 2014. Exploring the link between meteorological drought and streamflow: Effects of climate- catchment interaction. *Water Resources Research*, 50(3): 2468-2487. DOI:10.1002/2013wr015051
- Hayes, M., Svoboda, M., Wall, N., Widhalm, M., 2011. The Lincoln Declaration on Drought Indices. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 92(4): 485-488. DOI:10.1175/2010bams3103.1
- Hayes, M., Svoboda, M., Le Comte, D., Redmond, K.T., Pasteris, P., 2005. Drought monitoring: new tools for the 21st century. In: Wilhite, D.A. (Ed.), *Drought and Water Crisis. Science, Technology, and Management Issues*. CRC Press, pp. 53–69.
- Heim, R.R., 2002. A review of twentieth-century drought indices used in the United States. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 83(8), 1149-1165. DOI: 10.1175/1520-0477(2002)083<1149:AROTDI>2.3.CO;2
- Hisdal, H., Tallaksen, L.M., 2000. Drought Event Definition. ARIDE Technical Report No. 6, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
- Jan, C. D., Chen, T. H., Lo, W. C., 2007. Effect of rainfall intensity and distribution on groundwater level fluctuations. *Journal of Hydrology*, 332(3-4): 348-360. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2006.07.010
- Kallis, G., 2008. Droughts. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 33: 85-118. DOI:10.1146/annurev.enviro.33.081307.123117
- Kao, S.C., Govindaraju, R.S., Niyogi, D., 2009. A spatio-temporal drought analysis for the Midwestern US, *Proceedings of the World Environmental and Water Resources Congress, Great Rivers*, pp. 4654-4663. DOI: 10.1061/41036(342)468
- Karetinkov, D., Parra, N., Bell, B., Ruth, M., Ross, K., Irani, D., 2008. Economic Impacts of Climate Change on North Dakota. A Review and Assessment Conducted by the Center for Integrative Environmental Research (CIER), University of Maryland.
- Karl, T.R., 1983. Some Spatial Characteristics of Drought Duration in the United-States. *Journal of Climate and Applied Meteorology*, 22(8): 1356-1366. DOI:10.1175/1520-0450(1983)022<1356:sscodd>2.0.co;2
- Karl, T.R., 1986. The Sensitivity of the Palmer Drought Severity Index and Palmer Z-Index to Their Calibration Coefficients Including Potential Evapotranspiration. *Journal of Climate and Applied Meteorology*, 25(1): 77-86. DOI:10.1175/1520-0450(1986)025<0077:tsotpd>2.0.co;2

- Kaul, M., Hill, R.L., Walthall, C., 2005. Artificial neural networks for corn and soybean yield prediction. *Agricultural Systems*, 85(1): 1-18. DOI:10.1016/j.agsy.2004.07.009
- Kawashima, S., Nakatani, M., 1998. An algorithm for estimating chlorophyll content in leaves using a video camera. *Annals of Botany*, 81(1): 49-54. DOI:10.1006/anbo.1997.0544
- Keyantash, J., Dracup, J.A., 2002. The quantification of drought: An evaluation of drought indices. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 83(8), 1167-1180. DOI: 10.1175/1520-0477(2002)083<1191:TQODAE>2.3.CO;2.
- Koster, R.D., Suarez, M.J., Ducharne, A., Stieglitz, M., Kumar, P., 2000. A catchment-based approach to modeling land surface processes in a general circulation model 1. Model structure. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 105(D20): 24809-24822. DOI:10.1029/2000jd900327
- Kumar, V., Panu, U., 1997. Predictive assessment of severity of agricultural droughts based on agro-climatic factors. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 33(6): 1255-1264. DOI:10.1111/j.1752-1688.1997.tb03550.x
- Leelaruban, N., Oduor, P.G., Akyuz, A., Shaik, S., Padmanabhan, G., 2012. Leveraging a spatio-temporal drought severity and coverage index with crop yield modelled as a stochastic process. *International Journal of Hydrology Science and Technology*, 2(3): 219-236. DOI: 10.1504/IJHST.2012.049184
- Leelaruban, N., Padmanabhan, G., Droughts-Groundwater Relationship in Northern Great Plains Shallow Aquifers, *Proceeding of the World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2015*, pp. 510-519. DOI: 10.1061/9780784479162.046
- Lenard, M.J., Alam, P., Madey, G.R., 1995. The Application of Neural Networks and A Qualitative Response Model to The Auditors Going-Concern Uncertainty Decision. *Decision Sciences*, 26(2): 209-227. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-5915.1995.tb01426.x
- Li, B., Rodell, M., 2014. Evaluation of a model-based groundwater drought indicator in the conterminous U.S. *Journal of Hydrology*, 526: 78-88, DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.09.027.
- Li, Y., Ye, W., Wang, M., Yan, X., 2009. Climate change and drought: a risk assessment of crop-yield impacts. *Climate Research*, 39(1): 31-46. DOI:10.3354/cr00797
- Logan, K.E., Brunsell, N.A., Jones, A.R., Feddema, J.J., 2010. Assessing spatiotemporal variability of drought in the US central plains. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 74(2): 247-255. DOI:10.1016/j.jaridenv.2009.08.008
- Lorenzo-Lacruz, J.; Vicente-Serrano, S.M.; Lopez-Moreno, J.I.; Begueria, S.; Garcia-Ruiz, J.M.; Cuadrat, J.M., 2010. The impact of droughts and water management on various hydrological systems in the headwaters of the Tagus River (central Spain). *Journal of Hydrology*, 386(1-4): 13-26. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.01.001
- Lott, N., Ross, T., 2006. Tracking and evaluating US billion dollar weather disaster, 1985–2005. Available at: <http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/papers/200686ams1.2nlfree.pdf> (accessed on 24 July 2018).
- Lyon, B., Bell, M. A., Tippett, M. K., Kumar, A., Hoerling, M. P., Quan, X. W., Wang, H., 2012. Baseline Probabilities for the Seasonal Prediction of Meteorological Drought. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 51(7): 1222-1237. DOI:10.1175/jamc-d-11-0132.1
- Mall, R.K., Gupta, A., Singh, R., Singh, R.S., Rathore, L.S., 2006. Water resources and climate change: An Indian perspective. *Current Science*, 90(12): 1610-1626.
- McKee, T.B., Doesken, N.J., Kleist, J., 1993. The Relationship of Drought Frequency and

- Duration to Time Scales, Proceeding of the 8th Conference on Applied Climatology. American Meteorological Society, Anaheim, CA.
- McKee, T.B., Doesken, N.J., Kleist, J., 1995. Drought Monitoring with Multiple Time Scales, Proceeding of the 9th Conference on Applied Climatology. American Meteorological Society, Dallas, Texas.
- Mekanik, F., Imteaz, M.A., Gato-Trinidad, S., Elmahdi, A., 2013. Multiple regression and Artificial Neural Network for long-term rainfall forecasting using large scale climate modes. *Journal of Hydrology*, 503: 11-21. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.08.035
- Mendicino, G., Senatore, A., Versace, P., 2008. A Groundwater Resource Index (GRI) for drought monitoring and forecasting in a mediterranean climate. *Journal of Hydrology*, 357(3-4): 282-302. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.05.005
- Mishra, A.K., Desai, V.R., 2006. Drought forecasting using feed-forward recursive neural network. *Ecological Modelling*, 198(1-2): 127-138. DOI:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2006.04.017
- Mishra, A.K., Singh, V.P., 2010. A review of drought concepts. *Journal of Hydrology*, 391(1-2), 204-216. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.07.012
- Mishra, A.K., Singh, V.P., 2011. Drought modeling - A review. *Journal of Hydrology*, 403(1-2): 157-175. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.03.049
- Mishra, V., Cherkauer, K.A., 2010. Retrospective droughts in the crop growing season: Implications to corn and soybean yield in the Midwestern United States. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 150(7-8): 1030-1045. DOI:10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.04.002
- Mkhabela, M.S., Bullock, P., Raj, S., Wang, S., Yang, Y., 2011. Crop yield forecasting on the Canadian Prairies using MODIS NDVI data. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 151(3): 385-393. DOI:10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.11.012
- Narasimhan, B., Srinivasan, R., 2005. Development and evaluation of Soil Moisture Deficit Index (SMDI) and Evapotranspiration Deficit Index (ETDI) for agricultural drought monitoring. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 133(1-4): 69-88. DOI:10.1016/j.agrformet.2005.07.012
- Ogunkunle, A.O., Beckett, P.H.T., 1988. Combining Soil Map and Soil Analysis for Improved Yield Prediction. *Catena*, 15(6): 529-538. DOI:10.1016/0341-8162(88)90004-5
- Ostendorf, B., Hilbert, D.W., Hopkins, M.S., 2001. The effect of climate change on tropical rainforest vegetation pattern. *Ecological Modelling*, 145(2-3): 211-224. DOI:10.1016/s0304-3800(01)00392-1
- Ostergard, H., Kristensen, K., Pinnschmidt, H.O., Hansen, P.K., Hovmoller, M.S., 2008. Predicting spring barley yield from variety-specific yield potential, disease resistance and straw length, and from environment-specific disease loads and weed pressure. *Euphytica*, 163(3): 391-408. DOI:10.1007/s10681-008-9714-5
- Ottenbacher, K., Smith, P., Illig, S., Linn, R., Fiedler, R., Granger, C., 2001. Comparison of logistic regression and neural networks to predict rehospitalization in patients with stroke. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 54(11): 1159-1165. DOI:10.1016/S0895-4356(01)00395-X
- Paliwal, M., Kumar, U.A., 2009. Neural networks and statistical techniques: A review of applications. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(1): 2-17. DOI:10.1016/j.eswa.2007.10.005
- Palmer, W.C., 1965. Meteorological Drought. US Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau, Research Paper No. 45, p. 58.

- Palmer, W.C., 1968. Keeping track of crop moisture conditions, nationwide: the new crop moisture index. *Weatherwise* 21, 156–161.
- Panda, D.K., Mishra, A., Jena, S.K., James, B.K., Kumar, A., 2007. The influence of drought and anthropogenic effects on groundwater levels in Orissa, India. *Journal of Hydrology*, 343(3-4): 140-153. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.06.007
- Panu, U.S., Sharma, T.C., 2002. Challenges in drought research: some perspectives and future directions. *Hydrological Sciences Journal-Journal Des Sciences Hydrologiques*, 47: S19-S30. DOI:10.1080/02626660209493019
- Pao, H.T., 2008. A comparison of neural network and multiple regression analysis in modeling capital structure. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 35(3): 720-727. DOI:10.1016/j.eswa.2007.07.018
- Peters, E., van Lanen, H.A.J., Torfs, P., Bier, G., 2005. Drought in groundwater - drought distribution and performance indicators. *Journal of Hydrology*, 306(1-4): 302-317. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2006.09.014
- Piechota, T.C., Dracup, J.A., 1996. Drought and regional hydrologic variation in the US: associations with the El Niño-southern oscillation. *Water Resource Research*. 32 (5), 1359–1373. DOI: 10.1029/96WR00353.
- Pinkayan, S., 1966. Conditional Probabilities of Occurrence of Wet and Dry Years Over a Large Continental Area. *Hydrol. Paper 12*, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado
- Qin, Y., Yang, D., Lei, H., Xu, K., Xu, X., 2015. Comparative analysis of drought based on precipitation and soil moisture indices in Haihe basin of North China during the period of 1960-2010. *Journal of Hydrology*, 526: 55-67. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.09.068
- Quan, X.W., Hoerling, M.P., Lyon, B., Kumar, A., Bell, M.A., Tippett, M.K., Wang, H., 2012. Prospects for Dynamical Prediction of Meteorological Drought. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 51(7): 1238-1252. DOI:10.1175/jamc-d-11-0194.1
- Quiring, S.M., 2009. Developing Objective Operational Definitions for Monitoring Drought. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 48(6): 1217-1229. DOI: 10.1175/2009JAMC2088.1
- Reggia, J.A., 1993. Neural computation in medicine. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 5(2): 143-57. DOI:10.1016/0933-3657(93)90014-t
- Rezaeianzadeh, M., Stein, A., Cox, J.P., 2016. Drought Forecasting using Markov Chain Model and Artificial Neural Networks. *Water Resources Management*, 30(7): 2245-2259. DOI:10.1007/s11269-016-1283-0
- Rodell, M., Velicogna, I., Famiglietti, J.S., 2009. Satellite-based estimates of groundwater depletion in India. *Nature*, 460(7258): 999-U80. DOI:10.1038/nature08238
- Russo, A.C., Gouveia, C.M., Trigo, R.M., Liberato, M.L., DaCamara, C.C., 2015. The influence of circulation weather patterns at different spatial scales on drought variability in the Iberian Peninsula. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 3(1). DOI: 10.3389/fenvs.2015.00001
- Santos, M.A., 1983. Regional Droughts - A Stochastic Characterization. *Journal of Hydrology*, 66(1-4): 183-211. DOI:10.1016/0022-1694(83)90185-3
- Sen, Z., 1980. Statistical-Analysis of Hydrologic Critical Droughts. *Journal of the Hydraulics Division-ASCE*, 106(1): 99-115.
- Shabbar, A., Skinner, W., 2004. Summer drought patterns in Canada and the relationship to global sea surface temperatures. *Journal of Climate*. 17, 2866–2880. DOI: 10.1175/1520-0442(2004)017<2866:SDPICA>2.0.CO;2.

- Shafer, B., Dezman, L., 1982. Development of a Surface Water Supply Index (SWSI) to assess the severity of drought conditions in snowpack runoff areas, Proceedings of the Western Snow Conference, pp. 164-175.
- Smith, A.B., Katz, R.W., 2013. US billion-dollar weather and climate disasters: data sources, trends, accuracy and biases. *Natural Hazards*, 67(2): 387-410. DOI:10.1007/s11069-013-0566-5
- Sonmez, F.K., Komuscu, A.U., Erkan, A., Turgu, E., 2005. An analysis of spatial and temporal dimension of drought vulnerability in Turkey using the standardized precipitation index. *Natural Hazards*, 35(2): 243-264. DOI:10.1007/s11069-004-5704-7
- Steinemann, A.C., Hayes, M.J., Cavalcanti, L.F.N., 2005. Drought Indicators and Triggers, in: Wilhite, D.A (eds.), *Drought and Water Crises: Science, Technology, and Management Issues*. CRC Press, pp. 71-92.
- Suo, X.M., Jiang, Y.T., Yang, M., Li, S.K., Wang, K.R., Wang, C.T., 2010. Artificial Neural Network to Predict Leaf Population Chlorophyll Content from Cotton Plant Images. *Agricultural Sciences in China*, 9(1): 38-45. DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1671-2927(09)60065-1
- Svoboda, M., Hayes, M., Wood, D., 2012. Standardized precipitation index user guide. World Meteorological Organization, Tech. Report WMO-1090, Geneva Geneva, Switzerland. pp.24
- Svoboda, M., LeComte, D., Hayes, M., Heim, R., Gleason, K., Angel, J., Rippey, B., Tinker, R., Palecki, M., Stooksbury, D., Miskus, D., Stephens, S., 2002. The drought monitor. *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* 83 (8), 1181–1190. DOI:10.1175/1520-0477(2002)083<1181:TDM>2.3.CO;2.
- Tallaksen, L.M., Madsen, H., Clausen, B., 1997. On the definition and modelling of streamflow drought duration and deficit volume. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 42(1), 15-33. DOI:10.1080/02626669709492003
- Tayfur, G., Guldal, V., 2006. Artificial neural networks for estimating daily total suspended sediment in natural streams. *Nordic Hydrology*, 37(1): 69-79. DOI:10.2166/nh.2005.031
- Thomson, A.M., Brown, R.A., Rosenberg, N.J., Izaurrealde, R.C., Benson, V., 2005. Climate change impacts for the conterminous USA: An integrated assessment - Part 3. Dryland production of grain and forage crops. *Climatic Change*, 69(1): 43-65. DOI:10.1007/s10584-005-3612-9
- Tirogo, J.; Jost, A.; Biauou, A.; Valdes-Lao, D.; Koussoube, Y.; Ribstein, P., 2016. Climate Variability and Groundwater Response: A Case Study in Burkina Faso (West Africa). *Water*, 8(5). DOI:10.3390/w8050171
- Tokar, A.S., Johnson, P.A., 1999. Rainfall-Runoff Modeling Using Artificial Neural Networks. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 4(3): 232-239. DOI:10.1061/(asce)1084-0699(1999)4:3(232)
- Vasiliades, L., Loukas, A., 2009. Hydrological response to meteorological drought using the Palmer drought indices in Thessaly, Greece. *Desalination*, 237(1-3): 3-21. DOI:10.1016/j.desal.2007.12.019
- Vicente-Serrano, S., 2006. Differences in spatial patterns of drought on different time scales: An analysis of the Iberian Peninsula. *Water Resources Management*, 20(1): 37-60. DOI:10.1007/s11269-006-2974-8
- Vicente-Serrano, S.M.; Begueria, S.; Lorenzo-Lacruz, J.; Julio Camarero, J.; Lopez-Moreno, J.I.; Azorin-Molina, C.; Revuelto, J.; Moran-Tejeda, E.; Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., 2012.

- Performance of Drought Indices for Ecological, Agricultural, and Hydrological Applications. *Earth Interactions*, 16. DOI:10.1175/2012ei000434.1
- Vose, R.S.; Applequist, S.; Squires, M.; Durre, I.; Menne, M.J.; Williams, C.N., Jr.; Fenimore, C.; Gleason, K.; Arndt, D., 2014. Improved Historical Temperature and Precipitation Time Series for U.S. Climate Divisions. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 53(5): 1232-1251. DOI:10.1175/jamc-d-13-0248.1
- Voss, K.A.; Famiglietti, J.S.; Lo, M.; de Linage, C.; Rodell, M.; Swenson, S.C., 2013. Groundwater depletion in the Middle East from GRACE with implications for transboundary water management in the Tigris-Euphrates-Western Iran region. *Water Resources Research*, 49(2): 904-914. DOI:10.1002/wrcr.20078
- Wang, Q., Wu, J., Lei, T., He, B., Wu, Z., Liu, M., Mo, X., Geng, G., Li, X., Zhou, H., Liu, D., 2014. Temporal-spatial characteristics of severe drought events and their impact on agriculture on a global scale. *Quaternary International*, 349, 10-21. DOI:10.1016/j.quaint.2014.06.021
- Weisberg, S., 2005. *Applied linear regression*. John Wiley & Sons. pp. 310. doi:10.1002/0471704091.
- Wilhite, D.A., 2000. Drought as a natural hazard: concepts and definitions. *Drought, a global assessment*, 1: 3-18, In: Kallis, G., 2008. *Droughts*. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 33, 85-118. DOI:10.1146/annurev.enviro.33.081307.123117
- Wilhite, D.A., Glantz, M.H., 1985. Understanding: the drought phenomenon: the role of definitions. *Water international*, 10(3): 111-120. DOI: 10.1080/02508068508686328.
- Wilhite, D.A., Sivakumar, M.V.K., Pulwarty, R., 2014. Managing drought risk in a changing climate: The role of national drought policy. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 3(0), 4-13. DOI: 10.1016/j.wace.2014.01.002
- Wood, A.W., 2008. The University of Washington Surface Water Monitor: An experimental platform for national hydrologic assessment and prediction, American Meteorology Society annual meeting, 22nd conference on hydrology, 20–24 January 2008, New Orleans, U.S.
- Yesilnacar, E., Topal, T., 2005. Landslide susceptibility mapping: A comparison of logistic regression and neural networks methods in a medium scale study, Hendek region (Turkey). *Engineering Geology*, 79(3-4): 251-266. DOI:10.1016/j.enggeo.2005.02.002
- Yilmaz, I., Kaynar, O., 2011. Multiple regression, ANN (RBF, MLP) and ANFIS models for prediction of swell potential of clayey soils. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(5): 5958-5966. DOI:10.1016/j.eswa.2010.11.027
- Zaefizadeh, M., Khayatnezhad, M., Gholamin, R., 2011. Comparison of multiple linear regressions (MLR) and artificial neural network (ANN) in predicting the yield using its components in the hulless barley. *American-Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci*, 10(1): 60-64.