Aalborg Universitet



Machine learning based downscaling of GRACE-estimated groundwater in Central Valley, California

Agarwal, Vibhor ; Akyilmaz, Orhan ; Shum, CK; Feng, Wei; Yang, Ting-Yi ; Forootan, Ehsan; Syed, Tajdarul Hassan ; Haritashya, Umesh K. ; Uz, Metehan

Published in: Science of the Total Environment

DOI (link to publication from Publisher): 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.161138

Creative Commons License CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Publication date: 2023

Document Version Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

Link to publication from Aalborg University

Citation for published version (APA):

Agarwal, V., Akyilmaz, O., Shum, CK., Feng, W., Yang, T.-Y., Forootan, E., Syed, T. H., Haritashya, U. K., & Uz, M. (2023). Machine learning based downscaling of GRACE-estimated groundwater in Central Valley, California. *Science of the Total Environment*, *865*, Article 161138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.161138

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
 You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
 You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from vbn.aau.dk on: February 07, 2025

Machine learning based downscaling of GRACE-estimated groundwater in Central Valley, California.

Vibhor Agarwal^{1,2,3}, Orhan Akyilmaz⁴, C.K. Shum^{3,5}, Wei Feng^{5,6}, Ting-Yi Yang⁷, Ehsan Forootan⁸, Tajdarul Hassan Syed⁹, Umesh K. Haritashya², Metehan Uz³

¹ Department of Earth Sciences, College of Wooster, USA

² Department of Geology and Environmental Geosciences, University of Dayton, USA

³ Division of Geodetic Science, School of Earth Sciences, The Ohio State University, USA

⁴ Department of Geomatic Engineering, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey

⁵ Innovation Academy for Precision Measurement Science and Technology, Chinese Academy

of Sciences, China

⁶ School of Geospatial Engineering and Science, Sun Yat-sen University, China;

⁷ Polaris Geospatial Services, Columbus, Ohio, USA;

⁸ Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Denmark;

⁹ Department of Earth Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India

Corresponding Author: Vibhor Agarwal, agarwal.282@osu.edu agarwal.vibhor.phd@gmail.com

1	
2	Machine learning based downscaling of GRACE-estimated groundwater in
3	Central Valley, California.
4	Vibhor Agarwal ^{1,2,3} , Orhan Akyilmaz ⁴ , C.K. Shum ^{3,5} , Wei Feng ^{5,6} , Ting-Yi Yang ⁷ , Ehsan
5	Forootan ⁸ , Tajdarul Hassan Syed ⁹ , Umesh K. Haritashya ² , Metehan Uz ³
6	
7	¹ Department of Earth Sciences, College of Wooster, USA
8	² Department of Geology and Environmental Geosciences, University of Dayton, USA
9	³ Division of Geodetic Science, School of Earth Sciences, The Ohio State University, USA
10	⁴ Department of Geomatic Engineering, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey
11	⁵ Innovation Academy for Precision Measurement Science and Technology, Chinese Academy
12	of Sciences, China
13	⁶ School of Geospatial Engineering and Science, Sun Yat-sen University, China;
14	⁷ Polaris Geospatial Services, Columbus, Ohio, USA;
15	⁸ Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Denmark;
16	⁹ Department of Earth Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India
17	Corresponding Author: Vibhor Agarwal, agarwal.282@osu.edu agarwal.vibhor.phd@gmail.com
18	
19	
20	

21 Abstract

22 California's Central Valley, one of the most agriculturally productive regions, is also one of the 23 most stressed aguifers in the world due to anthropogenic groundwater over-extraction primarily 24 for irrigation. The groundwater depletion is further exacerbated by climate-stressed droughts. 25 Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) satellite gravimetry has demonstrated the 26 feasibility of quantifying global groundwater storage changes at uniform monthly sampling, 27 though at a coarse resolution and is thus impractical for effective water resources 28 management). Here, we employ the Random Forest machine learning algorithm to establish 29 empirical relationships between GRACE-derived groundwater storage and in-situ groundwater level variations over the Central Valley during 2002-2016 and achieved downscaling of 30 31 GRACE-observed groundwater storage changes from 666 km to 5 km. Validations of our 32 modeled groundwater level with in situ groundwater level indicate excellent Nash-Sutcliffe 33 Efficiency coefficients ranging from 0.94–0.97. In addition, the modeled groundwater trends 34 have good agreements with two independent measurements of vertical land subsidence 35 measured rates using GPS, and CryoSat-2 radar altimetry. Our estimated groundwater loss is about 30 km³ during 2002–2016, which agrees well with previous studies. We find the maximum 36 37 groundwater storage losses of -5.7 ± 1.2 km³ yr⁻¹ and -9.8 ± 1.7 km³ yr⁻¹ occurred during the extended drought periods of January 2007-December 2009, and October 2011-September 38 39 2015, respectively. We observed that Central Valley experienced groundwater recharges during abrupt winter flood episodes. The 5-km resolution Central Valley-wide groundwater storage 40 41 trends reveal that groundwater depletion occurs mostly in southern San Joaquin Valley and is collocated with sites showing severe land subsidence due to aquifer compaction from 42 groundwater over withdrawal. 43

44 **Keywords:** Machine Learning, Groundwater, GRACE, Remote Sensing

45 **1. Introduction**

46 Groundwater is an important freshwater resource that meets agricultural, industrial, and domestic needs (Siebert et al., 2010; Wada et al., 2014; Zekster and Everett, 2004). Over the 47 past few decades, several aguifers worldwide such as Central Valley, High Plains, Indus Plain, 48 49 middle East, and others, have faced unprecedented human-induced stress due to the 50 population growth, expansion of the irrigated areas, and other economic activities causing a 51 drastic increase in groundwater usage (Bierkens and Wada, 2019; Famiglietti, 2014). 52 Groundwater abstraction and outflow exceeding groundwater recharge over a long period of 53 time and in large areas has been reported as the main cause of groundwater depletion (Konikow and Kendy, 2005; Wada et al., 2010). Groundwater depletion can lead to global water 54 security and environmental issues (Famiglietti, 2014; Wada et al., 2010). There is an urgent 55 need for quantifying long-term groundwater storage variations (GWS) at frequent temporal 56 samplings that can help characterize the groundwater depletion in these stressed regions. 57

58 Several approaches for quantifying GWS variations have been applied (e.g., Bierkens and Wada, 2019). Groundwater levels from *in-situ* ground wells provide essential information about 59 stresses acting on the aquifers and play a key role in developing groundwater models (Taylor 60 and Alley, 2001). Continuous groundwater level observations may further help quantify GWS 61 62 and predict future trends in storage (Butler et al., 2013; Sun et al., 2013). However, it is infeasible to use only these data for quantifying regional GWS for several reasons. Firstly, 63 monitoring wells required to accurately estimate groundwater levels are expensive to install and 64 maintain. Therefore, several aquifers have poor coverage of such wells. Secondly, spatio-65 66 temporal gaps in the coverage of ground wells might necessitate the interpolation of groundwater level data, leading to interpolation errors (Ahamed et al., 2022; Thomas et al., 67 2017). Thirdly, uncertainties in the value of storage coefficient at well sites might translate into 68 69 errors in GWS (Scanlon et al., 2012; Alam et al., 2021). Since 2002, the Gravity Recovery and 70 Climate Experiment (GRACE) twin-satellite mission gravimetry data have enabled a continuous

71 global Terrestrial Water Storage (TWS) record for over a decade and a half, at a spatial resolution larger than 333 km (half-wavelength) and monthly sampling, e.g., Frappart et al., 72 (2018). Innovative processing of GRACE data has enabled the uniform global guantification of 73 74 GWS change for the first time by removing surface water storage changes using hydrologic data 75 and model outputs (Famiglietti et al., 2011; Rodell et al., 2009), as well as data assimilation (50 76 km resolution in Mehrnegar et al., (2021); 12.5 km resolution in Schumacher et al., (2018)). However, due to the limited spatial resolution and the associated errors in disaggregating 77 GRACE-derived TWS (Scanlon et al., 2012), the application of GRACE data directly for 78 groundwater assessment is not feasible at the local scale (Alley and Konikow, 2015), including 79 in Central Valley in California which is the subject of the present study. Moreover, most GRACE-80 based groundwater studies estimate GWS variations by removing soil moisture estimates 81 82 simulated by Land Surface Models (LSMs) from GRACE observations of terrestrial water 83 storage (Scanlon et al., 2012). However, LSMs do not simulate irrigation water use; hence soil moisture values will be particularly erroneous in the Central Valley, where groundwater irrigation 84 is predominant (Famiglietti et al., 2011). 85

Other methods of GWS computation include the water balance method, where several hydro-86 87 meteorologic quantities, such as the difference between stream inflow and outflow, precipitation, and evapotranspiration, along with several of the storage changes (soil moisture, snow water 88 equivalent, reservoir storage) are computed for a given aquifer (Ahamed et al., 2022; Xiao et al., 89 90 2017). Several remote sensing, in-situ, and modeled datasets can be used to estimate the 91 above quantities. However, these quantities might be subject to sources of uncertainties that creep into the water balance equation (Ahamed et al., 2022; Bierkens and Wada, 2019). 92 Further, vertical deformation from GPS and Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) 93 94 can provide regional estimates of groundwater storage changes (Ojha et al., 2018) or trends in 95 the case of InSAR. With the availability of Sentinel-1 data since 2014, this method holds

promise for revealing aquifer dynamics and storage variations at high spatial resolutions
(Castellazzi et al., 2016; Vasco et al., 2021). However, often in lieu of missing a continuous and
uniform time series, InSAR land velocity or trend/subsidence estimates could potentially be
biased due primarily to interannual or longer signals in the land deformation data.

100 Machine Learning (ML) has been used for solving several non-linear complex problems in 101 geoscience, e.g., Dramsch et al. (2020) and Sun and Scanlon (2019), as it does not require the knowledge of exact physical relationships between input and target variables. Machine Learning 102 103 can also be used to estimate GWS variations at a higher resolution if GRACE-derived TWS 104 variations can be downscaled to model in-situ groundwater level variations. A suitable combination of hydro-meteorological variables should be identified as input variables to build a 105 106 robust machine-learning algorithm to model groundwater variations (Adamowski and Chan, 107 2011). Several studies in the past have incorporated machine learning models like Artificial 108 Neural Network (ANN) model, Random Forest, Boosted Regression Tree, and Deep Learning to downscale GRACE satellite data to produce GWS variations at high resolution (Chen et al., 109 110 2019; Chen et al., 2020; Miro and Famiglietti, 2018; Rahaman et al., 2020).

Quantifying GWS variations is especially important for Central Valley. Here, ever-increasing 111 112 irrigation demands, limited availability of surface water, and climate extremes such as prolonged 113 and intensified droughts resulting from climate change have forced farmers to depend more on groundwater. As a result of the continuing groundwater depletion, several adverse impacts such 114 as falling groundwater levels, decreasing groundwater yields, increase in pumping costs, 115 degrading water quality, and damage to the aquatic ecosystems and wetlands have been 116 117 observed (Faunt, 2009; Faunt and Sneed, 2015; Konikow, 2015). San Joaquin Valley, a major agricultural region in Central Valley, has witnessed the largest share of such adverse impacts, 118 119 which have become more severe during prolonged and recurrent droughts in California.

120 Several of the methods mentioned above have been applied to quantify the GWS in Central 121 Valley. Famiglietti et al., (2011) used GRACE-derived TWS variations and other hydrological variables to quantify GWS variations during 2002-2011. Scanlon et al., (2012) used updated 122 123 GRACE processing and in-situ groundwater level variations to compute groundwater depletion 124 from 2002-2011. Ojha et al., (2018) used vertical deformation derived from InSAR to derive the 125 storage changes. Alam et al., (2021) used a combination of GRACE, wells, water balance, and 126 hydrological modeling to quantify GWS variations from 2003-2019. Ahamed et al., (2022) used remote sensing data and an ensemble of water balance methods to quantify groundwater 127 storage variations in Central Valley during 2002-2020. Miro and Famiglietti, (2018) implemented 128 ANN using GRACE-derived TWS variations along with hydro-meteorologic variables to model 129 annual amplitudes of GWS variations at 4 km spatial resolution over a small portion of the San 130 131 Joaquin Valley in Central Valley during 2002-2010. All the above studies have confirmed the 132 continued loss of groundwater losses along with dramatic rates of subsidence due to groundwater overdrafts during the last two decades. 133

134 All the above methods, except those utilizing in-situ wells and machine learning techniques, have limited capability to model GWS variations at high spatial resolutions at frequent temporal 135 136 intervals. Groundwater levels in Central Valley can reflect complex variations due to withdrawal for irrigation, recharge due to partial infiltration of irrigation water, surface water impoundment, 137 or precipitation. Further, climate extremes such as drought have put unprecedented stress on 138 139 groundwater reserves which might be reflected in the groundwater fluctuations (Faunt, 2009). 140 Compared to interpolation and kriging, more robust approaches are needed to fill the spatiotemporal gaps in in-situ groundwater levels and possibly obtain regional storage variations 141 (Alam et al., 2021; Thomas et al., 2017). Previous machine learning-based approaches (Miro 142 143 and Famiglietti, 2018) can be further expanded to the whole of Central Valley to cover broader

spatio-temporal scales and improve the accuracy of modeled results using a suitable choice ofinput variables, models and better approaches for training the machine learning model.

The primary objective of this study is to downscale GRACE-derived GWS variations in 146 147 Central Valley, California, using the Random Forest machine learning algorithm. We chose the 148 period from October 2002-September 2016, which covers most of the operational phase of 149 GRACE satellite data. We use GRACE along with hydro-meteorologic/geologic data as input and in-situ groundwater level data as the target data for the model. Further, the Central Valley 150 151 has a record of geodetic measurements from GPS, extensioneters, and remote sensing 152 observations, which have been used to quantify the subsidence due to groundwater overdraft (Ojha et al., 2018; Sneed and Brandt, 2015). These data can provide us with ancillary 153 information against which we can further validate our modeled results as a part of our second 154 155 objective. Primarily, we compared the modeled groundwater level with the vertical deformation 156 obtained from GPS and altimeter and obtained an inelastic storage coefficient for a portion of Central Valley. This approach of combining multiple hydrological and geodetic data can further 157 158 enhance our understanding of aquifer dynamics, which is important for regional studies such as 159 the one presented here. A machine learning approach might help provide relevant local-scale 160 data on groundwater depletion to Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to make informed management decisions required to support the goals of the Sustainable Groundwater 161 Management Act. 162

163

164 **2. Study area**

The Central Valley aquifer system in California covers an area of 52,000 km² (Figure 1) and produces one-fourth of the food in the US (Faunt, 2009). Central Valley is primarily semi-arid and most precipitation occurs during the winter and early spring months and not in summer

when it is needed for irrigation and drinking (Jasechko et al., 2020). San Joaquin Valley is the major agricultural region and surface water quantity here depends on seasonal snowmelt from the Sierra Nevada in the East and Sacramento Valley in the North, which varies from year to year. Consequently, supplies for irrigation must be met through diverted surface water sources, and through groundwater from confined and unconfined aquifers. Groundwater is, therefore, an essential/persistent freshwater source accounting for up to 40% or more of the required water supply in Central Valley.

175 Central Valley lost approximately 113 km³ of groundwater in the 20th century and 20 percent 176 of this depletion is estimated to be contributing to land subsidence (Faunt, 2009). Consequently, 177 groundwater levels have been declining since the 1930s when the first in-situ measurement was 178 made (Bertoldi, 1989; Williamson et al., 1989). Groundwater storage losses from GRACE 179 satellite observations and Central Valley Hydrological Model for the first decade of the 21st 180 century is 25-30 km³ (Konikow, 2013).

As groundwater depletion continues in Central Valley and other nearby regions, Sustainable Groundwater Management Act was passed in 2014 in California to promote better groundwater management and governance. Through this act, more emphasis is laid on the sustenance of groundwater resources for all regions by optimizing the water consumption by agricultural and other sectors. This issue is extremely critical for Central Valley as impacts of depletion here are visible from the 1920s on the local scale.

187





Figure 1. Location of Central Valley and two major basins, Sacramento (black) and San
Joaquin (blue) Valley in north and south, respectively. The location of wells used in this study

191	and the number of measurements over the study period is also shown with filled red circles. 7
192	GPS sites used in this study are shown by black triangles. The green stars represent the wells
193	used for plotting in Figure

194 **3. Data and Methods**

- 195 We implemented the Random Forest (RF) machine learning (ML) model and followed the data
- 196 processing workflow as in Figure 2.



198	Figure 2. The workflow used for modeling groundwater level
199	3.1. Input and target data
200	
201	3.1.1. Precipitation and temperature
202	Here monthly precipitation and temperature data is obtained from Parameter-Elevation
203	Regression on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM) dataset at 4 km spatial resolution (Daly et
204	al., 2008). PRISM simulates the spatial variations of the weather and climate using in-situ data.
205	It uses a "weighted regression scheme" to account for different physiographic features and
206	climate regimes when providing final estimates of precipitation and temperature.
207	Since precipitation can take a few months to recharge groundwater, we use 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4-
208	month lags for precipitation labeled as PPT0, PPT1, PPT2, PPT3, and PPT4, respectively, in
209	this study.
210	
211	3.1.2. Terrestrial Water Storage and Soil Moisture Variations
212	For the computation of TWS, we used the latest GRACE data product, the Release (RL) 06
213	Level 2 (L2) monthly gravity field solutions provided by the University of Texas at Austin Center
214	for Space Research (CSR). This solution consists of monthly spherical harmonic coefficients
215	(SHC) complete to degree and order 60. This truncation represents low pass filtering in the
216	spatial domain, causing a limited spatial resolution of GRACE data due to signal dampening.
217	Consequently, the above processing step causes GRACE signal to represent 666 km (half-
218	wavelength) resolution on the ground. The post-processing involves standard steps such as

replacing the degree d the zonal degree 2 coefficients from satellite laser ranging solutions,

220 correcting for Glacial Isostatic Adjustment (GIA) process using a forward model, destriping using

the Swenson method (Swenson and Wahr, 2006), and smoothing using a Gaussian filter of 300

222	km half-radius. Further signal leakage correction is performed by the iterative forward modeling
223	approach (Chen et al., 2014). More detailed descriptions for GRACE post-processing are
224	available in supplementary section 1. We finally obtained monthly TWS anomaly grids
225	oversampled at 0.25° resolution.
226	We obtained the monthly soil moisture from the GLDAS Noah Land Surface Model L4 monthly
227	0.25° x 0.25° V2.1 (GLDAS_NOAH025_M) [accessed October 2020]. We compute soil moisture
228	anomaly (SMA) by removing the mean soil moisture over the study period. We further computed
229	TWSA-SMA, which provides useful information on spatio-temporal groundwater storage
230	variations continuously over the study period covering the whole Central Valley. However, it is
231	with the coarsest resolution of 0.25° amongst the predictor variables.
232	
233	3.1.3. Saturated hydraulic conductivity (K)
234	Saturated hydraulic conductivity data is available at 1 km spatial resolution (Zhang et al., 2019).
235	To our knowledge, this is the only publicly available global dataset at such fine resolution.
236	
237	3.1.4. Texture
238	Faunt et al., (2009) compiled texture data from the lithological drill holes, which range in depth
239	from 12 to 1200 feet below the ground level. Faunt et al., (2009) used this textural data to
240	simulate the geological model for Central Valley Hydrologic Model.
241	
242	3.1.5. Percent Slope

Percent slope is derived from the National Elevation Dataset (NED) at 1/3 arc second (~10 m)
resolution.

245

246 **3.1.6. Groundwater level**

247 The target variable against which we train for our machine learning model is the in-situ

groundwater level obtained from the California Department of Water Resources (DWR)

249 California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) database (DWR CASGEM,

250 2021 a, b) and the United States Geological Survey (<u>http://water.usgs.gov/ogw/data.html</u>).

Though Central Valley consists of ~10,000 wells, we chose 586 wells for the entire Central

252 Valley with good spatio-temporal coverage over our study period. We only chose a well if it has

at least biannual measurement or continuous measurement over a shorter time scale within our
study period (Figure 1).

255

256 **3.1.7. Deformation data**

The vertical deformation data from GPS and CryoSat-2 (CS2) radar altimeter was not used for
 ML model development but rather as independent data to validate our modeled groundwater
 level results. GPS data is available from

260 <u>https://sideshow.jpl.nasa.gov/pub/JPL_GPS_Timeseries/repro2018a/post/point/</u>, NASA Jet

261 Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), California Institute of Technology. We also use the CS2 low-

resolution mode (LRM) radar altimetry data sensing solid Earth deformation time series in an

263 innovative method applied to Central Valley (Yang, 2020). CS2 data was waveform retracked

and spatially interpolated to obtain the 2-D vertical deformation maps for the southern San

265 Joaquin Valley (Figure S1).

266	Finally, to overcome the problem of mismatch in the spatial resolution of various input and target
267	variables, all the inputs except the TWSA-SMA are interpolated at the ground well locations
268	using the 'scatteredInterpolant' function in MATLAB and all input variables were aggregated to
269	monthly sampling. The variable TWSA-SMA is used without further interpolations or resampling
270	at the 0.25° spacing interval.
271	
272	3.2 Machine Learning Modeling
272	J.Z. Machine Learning Modeling
273	
274	3.2.1. Random Forest
275	Random Forest is a robust model which has shown the capability to produce highly accurate
276	results for several geological applications, e.g., Hengl et al., (2018) and Tyralis et al., (2019).
277	Random Forest is an ensemble of decision trees (DTs) consisting of decision-making units
278	known as nodes arranged in the form of a tree. Each DT is trained by passing data down from
279	the node at the top (root node) to the leaf node (the node at which splitting stops), each splitting
280	of a node result in two child nodes. Out of all the input variables at a node, the one chosen for
281	splitting should be such that the child nodes are "purer", i.e., homogeneous in terms of the
282	target variable than the parents. The metric that is commonly used in regression problems is the
283	sum of squared error (SSE) between all the observations at a particular node, and the mean of
284	all the observations. Thus, SSE should be lower for the child nodes compared to the parent
285	nodes for a valid split.
286	In the algorithm described in Breiman, (2001), the observations are randomly sampled with
287	replacement at each DT, a process known as bagging. Approximately two-thirds of observations
288	are used for model building in each DT and are known as "in-bag" samples. The remaining one-

third of the samples are called "out of bag" (OOB) samples used for internal validation by the RF

model. Each DT has a different combination of in-bag and OOB data, and by combining
predictions on OOB data from each DT, we can get a secondary validation of whether our RF
model is over-fitted. Randomness in an RF is further increased by only selecting a few input
variables for each DT, reducing the correlation between individual DTs and preventing
overfitting.

295

296

3.2.2. Development of model

297 During the development of any machine learning model, a small portion of the dataset is 298 isolated, known as the test dataset. The remaining dataset is then split into a training dataset, 299 using which a model is built, and a validation dataset, against which the accuracy of the model is evaluated. This process of developing and fine-tuning the model on the training and validation 300 301 dataset is iterative and repeated until the desired number of steps or accuracy is achieved. The 302 predictive accuracy of the model is evaluated against the independent test dataset. Here we randomly select a test dataset spread throughout the study period and it constitutes 20% of the 303 overall dataset. Previous studies have used 10-44% of the overall dataset as test data (Rajaee 304 et al., 2019). 305

306

307

3.2.3. Cross-validation of model

Several studies (Hawkins et al., 2003; Molinaro et al., 2005) have pointed out that for smaller sample sizes, a single validation dataset does not provide an unbiased estimate of model performance. We, therefore, use the k-fold cross-validation technique wherein a training dataset is further split into multiple folds, each containing a unique combination of training and validation dataset. A separate model is then built and evaluated for each fold of the data. This way, model parameters are optimized for the entire dataset and overfitting is minimized. Finally, an

ensemble of models is formed, and their predictive accuracy is quantified with the test dataset.

315 Since k-fold cross validation makes machine learning model development slower, we use k=5 or

317

316

318

3.2.4. Hyperparameter optimization

5-fold for model development.

Random Forest model has several hyperparameter values which need to be initialized by the 319 320 user (Biau and Scornet, 2016; Probst and Boulesteix, 2017). They include the number of decision trees, the number of samples in the leaf node, and the number of variables to consider 321 322 for splitting in each decision tree. While previous studies have attempted to improve machine 323 learning predictions by increasing the complexity of model architecture (Nourani et al., 2013; Seyoum et al., 2019; Yin et al., 2022) or by optimizing the number of input variables (Rajaee et 324 325 al., 2019; Tyralis and Papacharalampous, 2019), fewer studies have implemented strategies for optimizing hyperparameters. While random search and grid search algorithms for 326 hyperparameter optimization are time-consuming and might not lead to the best 327 hyperparameters (Feurer and Hutter, 2019; Yin et al., 2021), we fine-tune the machine learning 328 329 models by implementing a Bayesian Hyperparameter Optimization (Snoek et al., 2012). This 330 optimization algorithm first builds a probability model of the objective function (such as RMSE) 331 during model training using different hyperparameters. It then uses the Bayesian distribution to 332 find the most promising hyperparameter to evaluate the true (actual) objective function.

333

334

3.2.5. Assessment of model accuracy and feature importance

The modeled results are validated against selected *in situ* groundwater level observations located in the Central Valley using statistical estimates, correlation coefficient, root mean squared error (RMSE), Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE) coefficient, and scaled RMSE (R*).

338 Supplementary section contains detailed information on these quantities. Correlation quantifies 339 the interdependence between two datasets. It ranges in value from -1 to +1, which represents a perfect negative and positive relationship, respectively, while a value of 0 represents no 340 relationship. RMSE quantifies the standard deviation of residuals of the best fit line between 341 342 observed and modeled values. NSE has been used to quantify the predictive power of hydrological models (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970) and ranges from $-\infty +1$. Values below 0 suggest 343 unacceptable predictions, while above 0 are good predictions, with 1 being the perfect 344 prediction. 345

We also compute the feature importance by permuting out of bag (OOB) observations (Breiman, 2001). The underlying concept of this approach is that permuting the values of the most influential predictor should lead to the most increase in modeling error.

To further understand the dependence of modeling accuracy of the model on the input variables, we use the drop-column method (Jyolsna et al., 2021; Parr et al., 2020). We consider the model developed above after Bayesian Hyperparameter Optimization using all the input variables as the base model. Models are retrained without the dropped input variables and the increase in RMSE on test data compared to the base model is noted.

354

355 3.3. Computation of inelastic storage coefficient and groundwater storage

We use the modeled monthly groundwater level variations obtained above and the vertical deformation data from GPS and CS-2 altimeter to obtain the inelastic storage coefficient S_{kv} . The formula for computing S_{kv} is mentioned in Supplementary section 3. Since GPS measures daily vertical deformation, we averaged them to monthly values when correlating them with monthly groundwater level.

For unconfined aquifers, the storage coefficient is the specific yield (S_y) —the volume of water released due to drainage from an unconfined aquifer per unit decline in groundwater level. In the Central Valley, typical values range from 0.06 to 0.3 (Faunt, 2009). We obtained the groundwater storage in terms of equivalent water height (EWH) for the whole of Central Valley by multiplying groundwater level changes with the specific yield of 0.1 for the unconfined wells (<60 m deep) (Faunt, 2009). The groundwater storage, when multiplied by the area of Central Valley (~52,000 km²), gives the volumetric GWS estimate of Central Valley.

368

369 **4. RESULTS**

370

371 4.1 Overall results

Modeled results show a high accuracy for both San Joaquin and the Sacramento Valley (Figure 3a). For San Joaquin Valley, correlation, root mean square error, NSE, and R* for training (test) data are 0.99(0.97), 1.35 (2.72), 0.99 (0.95), and 0.12(0.21), respectively. For Sacramento valley, correlation, root mean square error, Nash Sutcliffe efficiency, and normalized RMSE for training (test) data is 0.99(0.95), 1.21(2.12), 0.98(0.94), and 0.14(0.26), respectively. Additional validations of modeled results with respect to the out-of-bag data are provided in Supplementary file (Figure S2, Table S1).

For the computation of feature importance in Figure 3b, we summed the contributions from
different lags of precipitation, i.e., PPT0, PPT1, PPT2, PPT3 and PPT4, in terms of one
variable, PPT, to make it easier for analysis (Figure S3, we show feature importance
considering all lag components for precipitation). For San Joaquin Valley, texture, hydraulic
conductivity, slope, GWS (TWSA-SMA), temperature and precipitation are the most important
features in decreasing order. For Sacramento Valley, precipitation is the most important,

followed by hydraulic conductivity and temperature. Texture, slope and groundwater storage
 (TWSA-SMA) show almost similar importance.

Using the drop-column method, we find that groundwater storage causes the most increase in
RMSE compared to the base model for both Sacramento and San Joaquin valley (Table S2).
Removal of geological factors, texture and hydraulic conductivity, along with topographic slope,
also significantly increases the RMSE of the models.



393 between the modeled results and in-situ groundwater level variations for training and test 394 data for (a) San Joaquin and (b) Sacramento Valley respectively. Feature importance plots 395 for (c) San Joaquin and (d) Sacramento Valley. 396 397 The modeled results also compare well with the *in-situ* groundwater level from several 398 ground wells (Figure 1, Figure S3) as they show similar seasonality and trends, and the 399 largest groundwater level declines can be seen during the drought periods (Figure 4, Figure 400 S4). Some mismatches can be seen, and they indicate that the modeled results are not 401 perfect. These reflect remaining unmitigated errors or noise in in-situ data which cannot be 402 modeled. Wells in San Joaquin valley generally show higher declines than those in

Sacramento valley. We can also effectively fill the data gaps in in-situ groundwater levels
through machine learning modeling.



Figure 4. Modeled and in-situ groundwater level time series for wells in San Joaquin (left) 406 and Sacramento valley (right). The location of the wells can be seen in Figure 1. Table S3 407 shows the statistic). 408 409 4.2 Comparison of modeled results with vertical deformation data 410 Inelastic storage coefficients from vertical deformation measured at GPS sites and modeled 411 groundwater level varies from 0.15-4.02×10⁻² for GPS sites P544 and P303, respectively 412 (Figure 5a-b; Table 1). In addition, we find a good correlation between the long-term 413 414 subsidence and the modeled groundwater level at the selected GPS locations (Table 1). Skv computed from groundwater level and CS2 varies among the subbasins. The mean S_{ky} over 415 the subbasins is 5.89×10⁻². 416



Figure 5. Computation of inelastic storage coefficient. (a) and (b) shows modeled groundwater
level and vertical deformation from GPS at P304 and P545 (shown in Figure 1). (c) shows the

420 inelastic storage coefficients for subbasins computed from modeled groundwater level and
 421 deformation data from CS-2 altimeter.

422

GPS	S _{kv}	Correlation between groundwater	S _{kv}		
	(This study)	level and deformation from GPS	(Ojha et al., 2019)		
P303	3.46	0.90	1.87		
P304	0.9	0.96	1.38		
P307	1.94	0.89	1.14		
P544	0.15	0.85	0.19		
P565	4.02	0.91	-		
P566	0.86	0.86	0.76		
P545	0.42	0.94	0.33		
P563	0.38	0.96	-		

423

424	Table 1. Computation of Skv from modeled groundwater level and vertical deformation. Skv
425	from Ojha et al., (2019) is shown for reference

426

427

428 **4.3 Spatio-temporal variations of groundwater variations**

429 Central Valley lost approximately 30 km³ of groundwater from October 2002 - September 2016

430 (Figure 6a). The most rapid decline in groundwater occurs during the two drought periods,

431 January 2007- December 2009, and October 2011 - September 2015 (Table). These periods of

decline usually follow or happen during phases of low/negative annual precipitation anomalies
(Figure 6b). Periods of positive annual precipitation anomalies usually are followed by periods of



434 increase in groundwater storage.



Figure 6. (a) Temporal variations of groundwater storage in Central Valley and San Joaquin
Valley (shown for comparison), and (b) annual precipitation anomalies in the Central Valley.

Time period	Annual groundwater volume loss (km³ yr-¹)						
	This Study	Previous Results	Study				
April 2006 -	-51+12	-78+08	(Scanlon et al. 2012)				
	-0.1 ± 1.2	-7.0 ± 0.0					
September 2009		-4.2 ± 0.3	(Xiao et al., 2017)				
April 2006 – March	-4.2 ± 1.0	-6.0 ± 1.5	(Famiglietti et al.,				
2010		-4.1 ± 0.2	2011)				
January 2007 –	-5.7 ± 1.2	-7.1 ± 2.4	(Ojha et al., 2018)				
December 2009		-5.5 ± 0.3	(Xiao et al., 2017)				
		-6	(Alam et al., 2021)				
		-(3-10)	(Ahamed et al., 2022)				
October 2011 –	-7.6 ± 1.5 (San	-6.1 * (San Joaquin	(Ojha et al., 2019)				
September 2015	Joaquin Valley only)	Valley only)					
	0.0.1.7	7					
	-9.8 ± 1.7	-7	(Alam et al., 2021)				
		-(6-17)	(Ahamed et al., 2022)				
October 2012 –	-7.7 ± 1.8	-10.0 ± 0.2	(Xiao et al., 2017)				
September 2016							

 Table 2. Comparison of GWS loss obtained from this study with previously published estimates.

GWS declines over San Joaquin valley are more prominent than declines over Sacramento valley (Figure 7). The decline during the latter drought period can be seen in wider areas and have a higher magnitude compared to the declines during the former period. Groundwater depletion can be seen mainly in Tulare Lake, Tule, and Kern subbasins, although lower groundwater depletion can be observed in Kings, Westside, and Kaweah subbasins.



450

451 Figure 7. Spatial variations in modeled groundwater storage trends at 5-km resolution for (a)
 452 January 2007- December 2015 (b) October 2011–September 2015

453

454 **Discussion**

455

1. Choice of predictor variables in ML modeling

456 Several hydrological and geological datasets have been used in past studies for modeling groundwater storage variations in previous studies. These include temperature, precipitation, 457 soil type, soil moisture, land cover, evapotranspiration, canopy water, and surface runoff 458 459 (Jyolsna et al., 2021; Milewski et al., 2019; Seyoum et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2013; Yin et al., 460 2022). The choice of these predictors depends on the study area and type of aquifer and obviously on the availability of reliable data. For example, evapotranspiration is difficult to model 461 reliably for heavily irrigated regions like Central Valley (Allen et al., 2011) and was not used. 462 Surface water changes for Central Valley might be available at sufficient resolution through the 463 Surface Water Ocean Topography (SWOT) mission to be launched after 2022. Several of the 464 465 predictors chosen in this study, such as precipitation, temperature, topographic slope, and 466 texture, have also been used in the numerical groundwater models as they hold importance for 467 hydrological balances (Faunt, 2009; Faunt et al., 2016).

468 RF moel also estimated that input data used in modeling has different importance for Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley (Figure 3b), suggesting that different processes are 469 ongoing in the two regions. Texture or percentage of coarse-grained material is an important 470 471 indicator of the lithological variations in Central Valley. While Sacramento valley shows fine-472 grained texture as it majorly consists of sediments derived from fine-grained volcanic rocks, San Joaquin Valley shows spatial variation in texture from east to west. The eastern region near the 473 474 Sierra Nevada has coarser-grained sediments, making this region a good aguifer. The western part near the Coast Ranges has a fine-grained texture, being richer in shale. San Joaquin Valley 475 476 and Tulare Basin consist of alternating layers of coarse and fine material, creating a mix of confined, unconfined, and semi-confined units. 477

Saturated hydraulic conductivity (K) describes the ease with which water moves through the
pore spaces in the soil and is considered an important quantity in groundwater modeling

(Sanchez-Villa et al., 2006). Its order of importance is second and third for Sacramento and San
Joaquin valley based on permutation of OOB data. Together, hydraulic conductivity and texture
provide important geological information about groundwater flow patterns in the whole Central
Valley at high spatial resolutions and the removal of both predictors causes a significant
increase in RMSE of models. Variations in topographic slopes lead to differences in
groundwater recharge (Satapathy and Syed, 2015). Its importance is, however, lesser than
other geological variables.

487 TWSA-SMA, though at coarse resolution, provides valuable information about the continuous 488 spatio-temporal groundwater storage variations over the last decade and a half. However, removal of this predictor alone causes the most increase in RMSE for models built for 489 490 Sacramento and San Joaquin valley. Based on OOB permutation, it is of mid-importance. The 491 above two findings seem contradictory. However, they can be explained by the fact that this 492 predictor has crucial information for modeling groundwater variations, though at the lowest resolution of all predictors. Therefore, the permutation of this predictor might not significantly 493 494 affect the predictions, while its removal affects the modeling results.

Precipitation is the dominant source of groundwater recharge and is, therefore, most significant for determining groundwater level patterns in Sacramento Valley based on OOB permutation. In contrast, San Joaquin Valley majorly depends on other surface water sources for recharge and anthropogenic sources might influence the groundwater withdrawal significantly. Its significance is, therefore, least for San Joaquin Valley. However, based on the drop-column method, precipitation has the least impact if removed from modeling in both Sacramento and San

501 Joaquin valley.

Temperature consists of seasonal signals, which might also help capture seasonal groundwater
 signals. It is the least important for San Joaquin valley based on OOB permutation. However, its
 removal significantly affects the accuracy of modeling in Sacramento valley.

505

506

2. Accuracy of machine learning results

507 Our study achieved high accuracy for both cross-validated and test data in Sacramento and San 508 Joaquin valleys (Figure 3a). Therefore, we minimized the overfitting, which reduces the 509 confidence of machine learning results (Roelofs, 2018). Overall results indicate excellent NSE 510 coefficients at 0.94–0.97 for validation data, revealing superior model predictive capability. These results are similar to Agarwal (2020), that used only 180 wells for modeling in Central 511 512 Valley using the Random Forest model. As our accuracy estimates are similar to Agarwal. 513 (2020), we can conclude that Random Forest can accommodate additional data without 514 sacrificing accuracy.

515 An earlier study in southern San Joaquin Valley by Miro and Famiglietti, (2018) also used ANN 516 and therefore we compared similarities and differences between this study, Agarwal, (2020) and 517 Miro and Famiglietti, (2018). Miro and Famiglietti (2018) obtained validation NSE ranging from 518 0.039 to 0.751 when modeling annual groundwater storage variations in southern San Joaquin valley using ANN. We obtained a better validation NSE of 0.95 for San Joaquin Valley when 519 520 modeling monthly groundwater variations using random forest. Even Agarwal (2020) obtained a 521 validation NSE of 0.86 using ANN. This is despite the fact that our study used similar predictors 522 such as precipitation, temperature, and topographic slope from the same source as Miro and Famiglietti, (2018). We have processed GRACE L2 data along with leakage correction, while 523 524 Miro and Famiglietti, (2018) used GRACE L3 monthly mass grids. A possible reason for the 525 lower accuracy in their study might be because they model groundwater storage for each year, 526 leaving less spatio-temporal data for modeling groundwater storage. Miro and Famiglietti (2018) 527 use kriging to interpolate groundwater level changes for each year, a process that might lead to further errors (Deutsch, 2003; Sun et al., 2009). Since these kriged groundwater levels were 528 529 used for training the model, kriging errors can further propagate in the modeled groundwater

storage variations. The choice of geological variables like texture and/or hydraulic conductivity
might have further improved the accuracy. Further, since Random Forest is less prone to
overfitting compared to ANN (Agarwal, 2020), Miro and Famiglietti, (2018) could have
considered random forest for comparison with their results.

We have directly used groundwater level as the output variable in ML modeling and then used
the modeled results to compute groundwater storage. Several studies in the past have focused
on groundwater level modeling and forecasting using fuzzy logic, ANN, Support Vector
Machine, and other computational algorithms (see a comprehensive review by Rajaee et al.,
(2019) and references therein). Nonetheless, several studies have been conducted lately on
modeling groundwater storage using RF and other algorithms.

540 Jyolsna et al. (2021) obtained a correlation of 0.50-0.83 when modeling TWSA in different 541 Indian aquifers using RF, while Seyoum and Milewski, (2017) found a correlation of 0.86 when 542 modeling TWS in Northern High Plains using ANN. Koch et al., (2019) obtained a correlation of 0.78 when modeling depth to shallow water table for aquifers in Denmark using RF. Seyoum et 543 al., (2019) obtained an NSE value of 0.45 when downscaling groundwater level anomalies for 544 glacial aquifers in Illinois using a two-stage boosted regression tree. Rahaman et al., (2020) 545 546 downscaled GRACE-derived groundwater storage variations in Northern High Plains to 0.25° 547 resolution and produced NSE in the range of 0.5-0.8 using RF. Although our study and past studies have used different output variables related to groundwater in machine learning 548 549 modeling, better validation accuracy achieved in this study might also be attributed to improvements in model choice and model development as well as the choice of input predictors. 550 551 The modeled groundwater level fits closely to the in-situ data from individual ground wells. They can capture the long-term decline in groundwater, accelerated depletion during the two drought 552 periods, recovery during the wet years, and seasonal variations, which are essential for 553 554 groundwater modeling in Central Valley (Ahamed et al., 2022).

555

556

579

3. Spatio-temporal variations in groundwater storage

557 The groundwater storage losses or drought 1 range from 27 km³ (Scanlon et al., 2012) to 29 km³ (Ahamed et al., 2022), while losses for drought 2 are 71 km³ (Ahamed et al., 2022). 558 559 Groundwater storage losses from the ensemble water balance method (Ahamed et al., 2022) 560 range from 8 to 31 km³ for drought 1 and vary from 22 to 67 km³ for drought 2. Variations in the 561 estimate are due to different combinations of remote sensing, in-situ, and model data used in 562 the water balance approach. Xiao et al., (2017) estimated groundwater storage loss of 16.5 km³ 563 and 40.0 km³ during drought 1 and 2, respectively, using the water balance approach, which 564 also matched with the estimates from GRACE in their study. Oiha et al., (2018) estimated groundwater loss of 21.32 ± 7.2 km³ during drought 1 Ojha et al., (2019) estimated that San 565 566 Joaquin valley lost 24.2 ± 9.3 km³ lost groundwater from October 2011 to September 2015 based on GRACE data. Based on the GPS vertical deformation data, groundwater loss was 567 568 29.25 ± 8.7 km³ for the same region and period (Ojha et al., 2019). Groundwater storage losses for droughts 1 and 2 are 17.1 ± 3.6 and 39.2 ± 5.1 km³, respectively, from this study which lie 569 within the range of previous estimates. 570

571 There is significant variability of storage losses for similar time periods using similar 572 approaches. The causes of the variations include different methods and datasets along with their errors. Scanlon et al., (2012) used a distributed specific yield ranging from 0.05-0.3 in their 573 574 study to estimate groundwater storage variations from in-situ groundwater levels (Faunt, 2009). Since regions with high groundwater level declines in southern San Joaquin valley have higher 575 576 specific yields, it might be one of the reasons for higher groundwater storage estimated by their 577 study. Water balance approach also has errors related to input variables, such as evapotranspiration which was identified as the most uncertain variable (Xiao et al., 2017; 578

Ahamed et al., 2022). Estimates of regional groundwater storage from in-situ groundwater level

data will require significant spatio-temporal interpolation due to issues with coverage in many
 regions (Figure 1). GRACE-derived TWS is also affected by several errors during data
 processing, which might also impact our machine learning model.

583

584

4. Comparison with vertical deformation data

Several past studies have combined groundwater levels from in-situ wells with geodetic 585 586 observations from GPS and InSAR to obtain inelastic storage coefficient. Calculated inelastic storage coefficients for individual subbasins in southern San Joaquin valley from this study is 587 comparable to past studies (Ojha et al., 2018). Ojha et al., (2018) computed S_{ky} of 4.08 x 10⁻² 588 for the whole of Central Valley, with San Joaquin having a higher S_{kv}. Ojha et al., (2019) 589 computed a mean value of as 2.3×10^{-2} , while Smith et al., (2017) reported a computed mean 590 with the range of 2.3×10^{-2} - 11.0×10^{-2} using estimates of aquifer compaction modeling for the 591 San Joaquin Valley. These estimates compare to 5.8 x 10⁻² from our study. 592

593 At GPS sites, P304 and P545, vertical deformation can be seen mostly in times of drought with 594 the groundwater level dropping. Between drought periods, the groundwater level was rising due to the availability of surface water; hence, little deformation occurred. Further, at the well site 595 596 near P304, the lowest water level was recorded in 1992 at 45 m below the land surface (Faunt 597 egt al., 2016). At the end of drought1, and most of the drought 2, modeled groundwater level at the site of P304 was below the previous lowest level (pre-consolidation stress level). The 598 correlation between subsidence and long-term groundwater levels suggests that groundwater 599 600 overdraft was the cause of the subsidence (Liu et al., 2019). Further analysis could be done with 601 long-term modeled groundwater level data and vertical deformation data for other sites to understand the aquifer compaction. Higher groundwater depletion can be combined with 602 603 geological models to study sites that might be further vulnerable to subsidence.

604 Significant groundwater depletion can be seen for subbasins in the Tulare basin and western 605 San Joaquin valley for both the droughts. These regions have also been subjected to subsidence (Faunt et al., 2016, Sneed et al., 2013; Farr et al., 2015). It is an expected 606 607 consequence because this region requires water for *intensive* irrigation and drinking water 608 needs. Due to climate extremes such as droughts, surface water has dwindled over the years. 609 Consequently, groundwater from the deeper confined aguifers is usually extracted and the 610 overlying aquitard belonging to the Corcoran clay layer undergoes compaction. Due to the 611 continued groundwater losses in this region exacerbated during droughts, irreversible compaction of the clay layers results in subsidence signals and might reflect the permanent loss 612 in groundwater (Smith et al., 2017; Vasco et al., 2019). 613

It is important to note that the groundwater storage variations reflect the balance between
groundwater recharge and abstractions in an area or region and directly reflect groundwater
depletion. Magnitude and rate of subsidence, on the other hand, might also depend on the
hydraulic and mechanical properties of the aquifer along with the past stress regime in the region.
Our results are, therefore, an important contribution to the study of localized groundwater
variations in the Central Valley for the study period longer than one and a half decades.

620

621

622 5. Future perspectives

The approach presented here has some limitations. The Random forests, like most of the other machine learning models, cannot predict reliably outside the training range (Hengl et al., 2019). We might not be able to use the model developed here in a new region with different geology and groundwater conditions. We will have to build a new model which can be applied to a specific region. However, this limitation is also applicable to numerical groundwater models or

the water balance approach. We propose building deep learning networks incorporating largerdatasets and wider regions to model more complex variations in the future.

Further, unlike the water balance method of Ahamed et al., (2022), which predicted groundwater storage variations for 2002-2020 in Central Valley, our method is currently limited by the temporal coverage of the GRACE. The GRACE mission operated from 2002-2017, followed by a gap of 1 year, after which GRACE-FO was launched. Several studies have filled the data gap using deep learning (e.g., Uz et al., 2021), and modeled GRACE data from such studies can be used to extend the study for a longer time.

636 Conclusions

This study advances the application of remote sensing data in the field of hydrological 637 sciences by demonstrating an effective and improved downscaling of GRACE-estimated 638 639 groundwater storage variations in Central Valley to a spatial resolution of 5 km using Random 640 Forest ML approach and other hydrologic, meteorologic, and geologic datasets. We applied it in the Central Valley region, which has developed an ever-increasing groundwater demand for 641 642 irrigation given the lack of surface water supplies within most parts and has also been impacted 643 by two droughts during our study period. Making the information about local-scale groundwater 644 variations across Central Valley will be crucial to help twitch the groundwater management as per the plans of SGMA. 645

We obtained good modeling accuracy for San Joaquin and Sacramento Valley, proving that Random Forest is a robust machine learning model for such applications. We obtained similar or better prediction accuracy than other studies implementing machine learning to quantify groundwater storage variations, possibly because of the choice of predictors, choice and development of machine learning models. Development of better models, including deep

learning, can further improve modeling. However, the Random Forest model developed here issuited for studies wherein predictor importance is required.

We also suggest new approaches for validating machine learning modeled results by 653 654 comparing long-term modeled groundwater level changes with vertical deformation from GPS 655 and CS-2 altimeter. The produced inelastic storage coefficient is an important aquifer 656 mechanical reflecting deformation caused due to groundwater withdrawal. Since 2014, Sentinel-1 can provide information about continuous vertical deformation using Interferometric Synthetic 657 Aperture Radar (InSAR) technique. Using a similar approach as in this study, new information 658 659 about the aquifer dynamics using Sentinel-1, GRACE-FO, and in-situ groundwater level data 660 can be generated.

661 Central Valley exhibits groundwater loss of ~ 30 km³ during October 2002 - September 2016; 662 however, there are periods of depletion and recharge during or followed by precipitation. 663 Maximum amount of groundwater depletion occurs during the drought of January 2007-664 December 2009 and October 2011-September 2015, with rates of -5.7 \pm 1.2 and -9.8 \pm 1.7 km³ 665 yr¹, respectively. We produced groundwater depletion maps at 5 km resolution for these 666 drought periods that can identify groundwater overdraft areas. These areas have also exhibited 667 land subsidence.

668 We conclude that the resulting modeled time series of groundwater storage variations at 5 km 669 resolution over a decade and a half time period is effective for practical groundwater resources 670 management.

671

672

673

675	
-----	--

676

677 **'References**

- Adamowski, J., Chan, H.F., 2011. A wavelet neural network conjunction model for groundwater
- level forecasting. Journal of Hydrology 407, 28–40.
- 680 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2011.06.013</u>
- Agarwal, V. (2021). Machine Learning Applications for Downscaling Groundwater Storage
- 682 Changes Integrating Satellite Gravimetry and Other Observations [Doctoral dissertation,
- 683 Ohio State University]. OhioLINK Electronic Theses and Dissertations Center.
- 684 <u>http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1609914912574523</u>
- A, G., Wahr, J., Zhong, S., 2013. Computations of the viscoelastic response of a 3-D
- 686 compressible Earth to surface loading: an application to Glacial Isostatic Adjustment in
- 687 Antarctica and Canada. Geophysical Journal International 192, 557–572.
- 688 <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggs030</u>
- Ahamed, A., Knight, R., Alam, S., Pauloo, R., Melton, F., 2022. Assessing the utility of remote
- sensing data to accurately estimate changes in groundwater storage. Science of The Total
- 691 Environment 807, 150635. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2021.150635</u>
- Alam, S., Gebremichael, M., Ban, Z., Scanlon, B.R., Senay, G., Lettenmaier, D.P., 2021b. Post-
- Drought Groundwater Storage Recovery in California's Central Valley. Water Resources
- 694 Research 57, e2021WR030352. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2021WR030352</u>

695	Alam, S., Gebremichael, M., Li, R., Dozier, J., Lettenmaier, D.P., 2020. Can Managed Aquifer
696	Recharge Mitigate the Groundwater Overdraft in California's Central Valley? Water
697	Resources Research 56, e2020WR027244. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027244</u>
698	Alley, W.M., Konikow, L.F., 2015. Bringing GRACE Down to Earth. Groundwater 53, 826–829.
699	https://doi.org/10.1111/gwat.12379
700	Bertoldi, G.L., 1989. Ground-water resources of the Central Valley of California.
701	Biau, G., Scornet, E., 2016. A random forest guided tour. Test 25, 197–227.
702	https://doi.org/10.1007/S11749-016-0481-7/FIGURES/4
703	Bierkens, M.F.P., Wada, Y., 2019. Non-renewable groundwater use and groundwater depletion
704	a review. Environmental Research Letters 14, 063002. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-
705	<u>9326/AB1A5F</u>
706	Breiman, L., 2001. Random forests. Machine Learning 45, 5–32.
707	https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324
708	Butler, J.J., Stotler, R.L., Whittemore, D.O., Reboulet, E.C., 2013. Interpretation of Water Level
709	Changes in the High Plains Aquifer in Western Kansas. Groundwater 51, 180–190.

- 710 https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1745-6584.2012.00988.X
- 711 Castellazzi, P., Martel, R., Galloway, D.L., Longuevergne, L., Rivera, A., 2016. Assessing
- groundwater depletion and dynamics using GRACE and InSAR: Potential and limitations.
- 713 Groundwater 54, 768–780. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/gwat.12453</u>
- Chen, J., Li, J., Zhang, Z., Ni, S., 2014. Long-term groundwater variations in Northwest India
- from satellite gravity measurements. Global and Planetary Change 116, 130–138.
- 716 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2014.02.007</u>

717	Chen, C., He, W., Zhou, H., Xue, Y., Zhu, M., 2020. A comparative study among machine
718	learning and numerical models for simulating groundwater dynamics in the Heihe River
719	Basin, northwestern China. Scientific Reports 10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-
720	<u>60698-9</u>
721	Chen, L., He, Q., Liu, K., Li, J., Jing, C., 2019. Downscaling of GRACE-Derived Groundwater
722	Storage Based on the Random Forest Model. Remote Sensing 11, 2979.
723	https://doi.org/10.3390/RS11242979
724	Cheng, M.K., Ries, J.R., 2018. Monthly estimates of C20 from 5 SLR satellites based on
725	GRACE RL06 models.
726	Daly, C., Halbleib, M., Smith, J.I., Gibson, W.P., Doggett, M.K., Taylor, G.H., Curtis, J., Pasteris,
727	P.P., 2008. Physiographically sensitive mapping of climatological temperature and
728	precipitation across the conterminous United States. International Journal of Climatology
729	28, 2031–2064. https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.1688
730	Department of Water Resources California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (DWR
731	CASGEM), 2021b. Periodic groundwater level measurements. [Data file].
732	https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/periodic-groundwater-level-measurements.
733	Department of Water Resources California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (DWR
734	CASGEM), 2021b. Continuous groundwater level measurements. [Data file].
735	https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/continuous-groundwater-level-measurements.
736	Dramsch, J.S., 2020. 70 years of machine learning in geoscience in review. Advances in

737 Geophysics 61, 1–55. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/BS.AGPH.2020.08.002</u>

- 738 Erban, L.E., Gorelick, S.M., Zebker, H.A., 2014. LETTER OPEN ACCESS Groundwater
- extraction, land subsidence, and sea-level rise in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam.

740 <u>https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/8/084010</u>

- Famiglietti, J.S., 2014. The global groundwater crisis. Nature Climate Change 2014 4:11 4,
- 742 945–948. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2425</u>
- Famiglietti, J.S., Lo, M., Ho, S.L., Bethune, J., Anderson, K.J., Syed, T.H., Swenson, S.C., de
- Linage, C.R., Rodell, M., 2011. Satellites measure recent rates of groundwater depletion in
- 745 California's Central Valley. Geophysical Research Letters 38, 2010GL046442.
- 746 <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL046442</u>
- 747 Farr, T.G., Jones, C., Liu, Z., 2015. Progress Report: Subsidence in the Central Valley,
- 748 California.
- Farr, T.G., Liu, Z., 2014. Monitoring Subsidence Associated with Groundwater Dynamics in the
- 750 Central Valley of California Using Interferometric Radar, in: Remote Sensing of the
- 751 Terrestrial Water Cycle. Wiley Blackwell, pp. 397–406.
- 752 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118872086.ch24</u>
- Faunt, C.C., 2009. Groundwater Availability of the Central Valley Aquifer, California: U.S.
 Geological Survey Professional Paper, 1766.
- Faunt, C.C., Belitz, K., Hanson, R.T., 2009. Development of a three-dimensional model of
- sedimentary texture in valley-fill deposits of Central Valley, California, USA. Hydrogeology
- 757 Journal 2009 18:3 18, 625–649. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10040-009-0539-7

- Faunt, C.C., Sneed, M., 2015. Water availability and subsidence in California's Central Valley.
- 759 San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science 13.
- 760 <u>https://doi.org/10.15447/SFEWS.2015V13ISS3ART4</u>
- Faunt, C.C., Sneed, M., Traum, J., Brandt, J.T., 2016. Water availability and land subsidence in
- the Central Valley, California, USA. Hydrogeology Journal 24, 675–684.
- 763 <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-015-1339-x</u>
- Feng, W., 2019. GRAMAT: a comprehensive Matlab toolbox for estimating global mass
- variations from GRACE satellite data. Earth Science Informatics 12, 389–404.
- 766 <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s12145-018-0368-0</u>
- Feurer, M., Hutter, F., 2019. Hyperparameter Optimization, in: Automated Machine Learning.
- 768 Springer, Cham, pp. 3–33. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05318-5_1</u>
- Fowler, H.J., Wilby, R.L., 2007. Beyond the downscaling comparison study. International
- Journal of Climatology 27, 1543–1545. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.1616</u>
- 771 Frappart, F., Ramillien, G., 2018. Monitoring Groundwater Storage Changes Using the Gravity
- 772 Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) Satellite Mission: A Review. Remote Sensing
- 773 10, 829. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10060829</u>
- Hawkins, D.M., Basak, S.C., Mills, D., 2003. Assessing model fit by cross-validation. Journal of
- Chemical Information and Computer Sciences 43, 579–586.
- 776 <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/CI025626I/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/CI025626IF00006.JPEG</u>
- Hengl, T., Nussbaum, M., Wright, M.N., Heuvelink, G.B.M., Gräler, B., 2018. Random forest as
- a generic framework for predictive modeling of spatial and spatio-temporal variables. PeerJ
- 779 2018. <u>https://doi.org/10.7717/PEERJ.5518</u>

780	Hoffmann,	J., Galloway,	D.L.,	Zebker,	H.A.,	2003.	Inverse	modeling	of interbed	storage
		•						-		•

781 parameters using land subsidence observations, Antelope Valley, California. Water

782 Resources Research 39. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2001WR001252</u>

- Jasechko, S., Perrone, D., 2020. California's Central Valley Groundwater Wells Run Dry During
- 784 Recent Drought. Earth's Future 8, e2019EF001339. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001339</u>
- Jekeli, C., 1981. Modifying Stokes' function to reduce the error of geoid undulation

computations. Journal of Geophysical Research 86, 6985.

- 787 <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/JB086iB08p06985</u>
- Jyolsna, P.J., Kambhammettu, B.V.N.P., Gorugantula, S., 2021. Application of random forest
- and multi-linear regression methods in downscaling GRACE derived groundwater storage
- changes. Hydrological Sciences Journal 66, 874–887.

791 <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2021.1896719</u>

- Koch, J., Berger, H., Henriksen, H.J., Sonnenborg, T.O., 2019. Modelling of the shallow water
- table at high spatial resolution using random forests. Hydrology and Earth System

794 Sciences 23, 4603–4619. <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/HESS-23-4603-2019</u>

- Konikow, L.F., 2015. Long-Term Groundwater Depletion in the United States. Groundwater 53,
- 796 2–9. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/gwat.12306</u>
- 797 Konikow, L.F., Kendy, E., 2005. Groundwater depletion: A global problem. Hydrogeology
- 798 Journal 13, 317–320. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-004-0411-8
- Kuhn, M., Johnson, K., 2013. Over-Fitting and Model Tuning, in: Applied Predictive Modeling.
- 800 Springer New York, pp. 61–92. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-6849-3_4</u>

- Landerer, F.W., Swenson, S.C., 2012. Accuracy of scaled GRACE terrestrial water storage
 estimates. Water Resources Research 48, 4531. https://doi.org/10.1029/2011WR011453
- Liu, Z., Liu, P.-W., Massoud, E., Farr, T.G., Lundgren, P., Famiglietti, J.S., 2019. Monitoring
- 804 Groundwater Change in California's Central Valley Using Sentinel-1 and GRACE
- 805 Observations. Geosciences (Basel) 9, 436. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences9100436</u>
- Liu, Z., Liu, P.-W., Massoud, E., Farr, T.G., Lundgren, P., Famiglietti, J.S., 2019. Monitoring
- 807 Groundwater Change in California's Central Valley Using Sentinel-1 and GRACE
- 808 Observations. Geosciences (Basel) 9, 436. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences9100436</u>
- Lo, M., Famiglietti, J.S., 2013. Irrigation in California's Central Valley strengthens the
- southwestern U.S. water cycle. Geophysical Research Letters 40, 301–306.
- 811 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50108</u>
- Mehrnegar, N., Jones, O., Singer, M.B., Schumacher, M., Jagdhuber, T., Scanlon, B.R., Rateb,
- A., Forootan, E., 2021. Exploring groundwater and soil water storage changes across the
- CONUS at 12.5 km resolution by a Bayesian integration of GRACE data into W3RA.
- Science of The Total Environment 758, 143579.
- 816 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2020.143579</u>
- Miro, M., Famiglietti, J., 2018. Downscaling GRACE Remote Sensing Datasets to High-
- 818 Resolution Groundwater Storage Change Maps of California's Central Valley. Remote
- 819 Sensing 10, 143. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10010143</u>
- Molinaro, A.M., Simon, R., Pfeiffer, R.M., 2005. Prediction error estimation: a comparison of
- resampling methods. Bioinformatics 21, 3301–3307.
- 822 https://doi.org/10.1093/BIOINFORMATICS/BTI499

823	Nash, J.E., Sutcliffe, J. V., 1970. River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I — A
824	discussion of principles. Journal of Hydrology 10, 282–290. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-
825	1694(70)90255-6

Nourani, V., Hosseini Baghanam, A., Adamowski, J., Kisi, O., 2014. Applications of hybrid

827 wavelet–Artificial Intelligence models in hydrology: A review. Journal of Hydrology 514,

828 358–377. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2014.03.057</u>

Ojha, C., Shirzaei, M., Werth, S., Argus, D.F., Farr, T.G., 2018. Sustained Groundwater Loss in

830 California's Central Valley Exacerbated by Intense Drought Periods. Water Resources

831 Research 54, 4449–4460. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2017WR022250</u>

Ojha, C., Werth, S., Shirzaei, M., 2019. Groundwater Loss and Aquifer System Compaction in

San Joaquin Valley During 2012–2015 Drought. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid
Earth 124, 3127–3143. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JB016083

Parr, T., Wilson, J.D., Hamrick, J., 2020. Nonparametric Feature Impact and Importance. arXiv
1–17.

837 Parr, T., Wilson, J.D., Hamrick, J., n.d. Nonparametric Feature Impact and Importance.

838 Probst, P., Boulesteix, A.L., 2017. To tune or not to tune the number of trees in random forest?

Journal of Machine Learning Research 18, 1–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1705.05654</u>

- Rahaman, M., Thakur, B., Kalra, A., Li, R., Maheshwari, P., 2019. Estimating High-Resolution
- Groundwater Storage from GRACE: A Random Forest Approach. Environments 6, 63.
- 842 https://doi.org/10.3390/environments6060063

Rajaee, T., Ebrahimi, H., Nourani, V., 2019. A review of the artificial intelligence methods in
groundwater level modeling. Journal of Hydrology 572, 336–351.

845 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2018.12.037</u>

846 Rodell, M., Velicogna, I., Famiglietti, J.S., 2009. Satellite-based estimates of groundwater

847 depletion in India. Nature 460, 999–1002. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/NATURE08238</u>

- Roelofs, R., 2019. Measuring Generalization and Overfitting in Machine Learning. University of
 California, Berkeley.
- 850 Sanchez-Vila, X., Guadagnini, A., Carrera, J., 2006. Representative hydraulic conductivities in

saturated groundwater flow. Reviews of Geophysics 44, 3002.

- 852 <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2005RG000169</u>
- 853 Satapathy, I., Syed, T.H., 2015. Characterization of groundwater potential and artificial recharge

sites in Bokaro District, Jharkhand (India), using remote sensing and GIS-based

techniques. Environmental Earth Sciences 74, 4215–4232. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/S12665-</u>

856 <u>015-4474-8/TABLES/10</u>

857 Scanlon, B.R., Longuevergne, L., Long, D., 2012. Ground referencing GRACE satellite

estimates of groundwater storage changes in the California Central Valley, USA. Water

859 Resources Research 48. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2011WR011312</u>

860 Schumacher, M., Forootan, E., van Dijk, A.I.J.M., Müller Schmied, H., Crosbie, R.S., Kusche, J.,

Döll, P., 2018. Improving drought simulations within the Murray-Darling Basin by combined

- calibration/assimilation of GRACE data into the WaterGAP Global Hydrology Model.
- 863 Remote Sensing of Environment 204, 212–228. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSE.2017.10.029</u>

864	Seyoum, W.M., Milewski, A.M., 2017. Improved methods for estimating local terrestrial water
865	dynamics from GRACE in the Northern High Plains. Advances in Water Resources 110,
866	279–290 https://doi.org/10.1016/i.advwatres.2017.10.021

- Siebert, S., Henrich, V., Frenken, K., Burke, J., 2010. Update of the Global Map of Irrigation
 Areas to version 5.
- Siebert, S., Henrich, V., Frenken, K., Burke, J., n.d. Update of the Global Map of Irrigation Areas
 to version 5.
- 871 Smith, R., Knight, R., Fendorf, S., 2018. Overpumping leads to California groundwater arsenic

threat. Nature Communications 9, 1–6. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04475-3</u>

873 Smith, R.G., Knight, R., Chen, J., Reeves, J.A., Zebker, H.A., Farr, T., Liu, Z., 2017. Estimating

the permanent loss of groundwater storage in the southern San Joaquin Valley, California.

875 Water Resources Research 53, 2133–2148. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2016WR019861</u>

- 876 Snoek, J., Larochelle, H., Adams, R.P., 2012. Practical Bayesian optimization of machine
- 877 learning algorithms, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 2951–
 878 2959.
- Sun, A.Y., 2013. Predicting groundwater level changes using GRACE data. Water Resources
 Research 49, 5900–5912. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/WRCR.20421</u>
- 881 Swenson, S., Chambers, D., Wahr, J., 2008. Estimating geocenter variations from a
- combination of GRACE and ocean model output. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid
- 883 Earth 113, 8410. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JB005338</u>
- 884 Swenson, S., Wahr, J., 2006. Post-processing removal of correlated errors in GRACE data.
- 885 Geophysical Research Letters 33, L08402. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL025285</u>

- Taylor, C.J., Alley, W.M., 2001. Ground-water-level monitoring and the importance of long-term
 water-level data, Circular. <u>https://doi.org/10.3133/CIR1217</u>
- 888 Taylor, R.G., Scanlon, B., Döll, P., Rodell, M., van Beek, R., Wada, Y., Longuevergne, L.,
- Leblanc, M., Famiglietti, J.S., Edmunds, M., Konikow, L., Green, T.R., Chen, J., Taniguchi,
- 890 M., Bierkens, M.F.P., Macdonald, A., Fan, Y., Maxwell, R.M., Yechieli, Y., Gurdak, J.J.,
- Allen, D.M., Shamsudduha, M., Hiscock, K., Yeh, P.J.F., Holman, I., Treidel, H., 2012.
- Ground water and climate change. Nature Climate Change 2012 3:4 3, 322–329.
- 893 <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1744</u>
- Thomas, B.F., Famiglietti, J.S., Landerer, F.W., Wiese, D.N., Molotch, N.P., Argus, D.F., 2017.
- 895 GRACE Groundwater Drought Index: Evaluation of California Central Valley groundwater
- drought. Remote Sensing of Environment 198, 384–392.
- 897 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSE.2017.06.026</u>
- 898 Tyralis, H., Papacharalampous, G., 2017. Variable Selection in Time Series Forecasting Using
- 899 Random Forests. Algorithms 2017, Vol. 10, Page 114 10, 114.
- 900 <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/A10040114</u>
- Tyralis, H., Papacharalampous, G., Langousis, A., 2019. A Brief Review of Random Forests for
- 902 Water Scientists and Practitioners and Their Recent History in Water Resources. Water
- 903 2019, Vol. 11, Page 910 11, 910. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/W11050910</u>
- 904 USGS Professional Paper 1766: Groundwater Availability of the Central Valley Aquifer,
- 905 California [WWW Document], n.d. URL<u>https://pubs.usgs.gov/pp/1766/</u> (accessed 4.1.21).
- Vasco, D.W., Farr, T.G., Jeanne, P., Doughty, C., Nico, P., 2019. Satellite-based monitoring of
- groundwater depletion in California's Central Valley. Scientific Reports 9, 1–14.
- 908 <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-52371-7</u>

909	Wada, Y., van Beek, L.P.H., van Kempen, C.M., Reckman, J.W.T.M., Vasak, S., Bierkens,
910	M.F.P., 2010. Global depletion of groundwater resources. Geophysical Research Letters

911 37.<u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL044571</u>

- 912 Wada, Y., Wisser, D., Bierkens, M.F.P., 2014. Global modeling of withdrawal, allocation and
- consumptive use of surface water and groundwater resources. Earth System Dynamics 5,
- 914 15–40. <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/ESD-5-15-2014</u>
- Wahr, J., Molenaar, M., Bryan, F., 1998. Time variability of the Earth's gravity field: Hydrological
- and oceanic effects and their possible detection using GRACE. Journal of Geophysical
- 917 Research: Solid Earth 103, 30205–30229. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/98JB02844</u>
- 918 Wahr, J., Swenson, S., Velicogna, I., 2006. Accuracy of GRACE mass estimates. Geophysical

919 Research Letters 33, L06401. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL025305</u>

- 920 Williamson, A.K., Prudic, D.E., Swain, L.A., 1989. Ground-water flow in the Central Valley,
- 921 California: Professional Paper 1401-D.
- 922 Xiao, M., Koppa, A., Mekonnen, Z., Pagán, B.R., Zhan, S., Cao, Q., Aierken, A., Lee, H.,
- Lettenmaier, D.P., 2017. How much groundwater did California's Central Valley lose during
- the 2012-2016 drought? Geophysical Research Letters 44, 4872–4879.
- 925 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL073333</u>
- Yang, T.-Y., 2020. Satellite Altimetry Applications on Lake Ice Thickness and Land Subsidence.
 The Ohio State University.
- Yin, W., Fan, Z., Tangdamrongsub, N., Hu, L., Zhang, M., 2021a. Comparison of physical and
 data-driven models to forecast groundwater level changes with the inclusion of GRACE: a

- 930 case study over the state of Victoria, Australia. J Hydrol 602, 126735.
- 931 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.126735</u>
- Yin, W., Fan, Z., Tangdamrongsub, N., Hu, L., Zhang, M., 2021b. Comparison of physical and
- 933 data-driven models to forecast groundwater level changes with the inclusion of GRACE A
- case study over the state of Victoria, Australia. Journal of Hydrology 602, 126735.
- 935 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2021.126735</u>
- Yin, W., Zhang, G., Liu, F., Zhang, D., Zhang, X., Chen, S., 2022. Improving the spatial
- 937 resolution of GRACE-based groundwater storage estimates using a machine learning
- algorithm and hydrological model. Hydrogeology Journal 30, 947–963.
- 939 <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/S10040-021-02447-4/FIGURES/11</u>
- 240 Zektser, Igor S., Everett, L.G., 2004. Groundwater resources of the world and their use,
- 941 UNESCO IHP-VI series on groundwater no. 6. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- 242 Zhang, Y., Schaap, M.G., Zha, Y., 2018. A High-Resolution Global Map of Soil Hydraulic
- 943 Properties Produced by a Hierarchical Parameterization of a Physically Based Water
- 944 Retention Model. Water Resources Research 54, 9774–9790.
- 945 <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR023539</u>
- 946