

WATER FLOW AND SOLUTE TRANSPORT ACROSS THE SURFACE-  
SUBSURFACE INTERFACE IN FULLY INTEGRATED HYDROLOGICAL  
MODELS

Submitted by:

Jessica Erin Liggett, B.Sc. (Hons.), M.Sc.

As a requirement in full for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the  
School of the Environment,  
Faculty of Science,  
Flinders University, South Australia

November 2014

## Summary

Modelling studies often separate surface water and groundwater, despite the known connection between the two. Physically based, fully integrated hydrological codes that simulate both surface and subsurface processes have proved useful for capturing the complex dynamics of entire catchments in a single model. While the coupling of surface and subsurface hydrologic processes in these codes is a major advantage, few studies address the impacts of the coupling method on dynamic catchment processes such as overland flow, streamflow generation and solute transport. This thesis examines the implementation of surface-subsurface coupling approaches in fully integrated codes, evaluates their controls on simulating integrated flow and solute transport, and provides guidance for model users.

The influence of a commonly used approach to couple surface and subsurface flows (first-order exchange coefficient; FOEC) is systematically explored in the first half of this thesis using different hydrological scenarios of overland flow generation, infiltration, and exfiltration. In a mesh-centred code (HydroGeoSphere), results converge on the more accurate, but more computationally intensive, continuity of pressure coupling approach as the coupling length parameter ( $l_e$ ) within the FOEC is decreased. Lower  $l_e$  values are required for infiltration under Hortonian conditions, in lower permeability soils, and to capture the initiation of overland flow. A threshold value of  $l_e$  is found to be equal to rill storage, above which inaccurate simulations can occur.

The FOEC approach is explored further with an analysis of its numerical implementation in a block-centred code (MODHMS), where a half-cell distance

separates the surface and uppermost subsurface nodes. Defining the FOEC based on the uppermost grid size inhibits accurate prediction of infiltration and the time to initiate overland flow under Hortonian conditions. Increasing the FOEC independently of the grid allows for accurate simulation of infiltration, but not the timing of overland flow. The addition of a thin layer at the surface improves model accuracy substantially.

In the second half of the thesis, the effects of solute dispersion across the surface-subsurface interface, versus within the subsurface, on integrated solute transport and tracer hydrograph separation are evaluated. In 2D hypothetical hillslopes, the pre-event water contribution from the tracer-based separation agrees well with the hydraulically determined value of pre-event water, despite dispersion occurring in the subsurface. In this case, subsurface dispersion parameters have little impact on the tracer-based separation results. The pre-event water contribution from the tracer-based separation is larger when dispersion across the surface-subsurface interface is considered. In a 3D catchment model, solute discharge is compared to field measurements during a rainfall event. Adding solute transport into a fully integrated 3D flow model can improve the assessment of internal model dynamics, but transport results are highly sensitive to model parameters and must be interpreted with caution.

The results of this thesis show that although fully integrated codes do not require an explicit boundary condition between the surface and subsurface, the coupling parameters can highly influence both the integrated and distributed response of flow and solute transport. As such, it is important that these parameters are carefully chosen and sensitivity analyses be performed to ensure robust model performance.

## **Declaration**

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate, without acknowledgment, any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any other university; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

---

Jessica E. Liggett

## **Co-Authorship**

Jessica E. Liggett is the primary author of this thesis, including the published documents. Co-supervisors Assoc. Prof. Adrian Werner and Prof. Craig Simmons provided intellectual supervision and editorial comments on this thesis and the associated published manuscripts. Preliminary work for Chapter 3 was undertaken by Matthew Knowling for his B.Sc. Honours thesis “Partitioning Infiltration and Overland Flow Using a Block-Centred Coupled Surface-Subsurface Code (MODHMS)” (2010, Flinders University, School of the Environment), under supervision from Ms. Liggett and Assoc. Prof. Werner. This work was subsequently re-modelled, re-interpreted, and re-written by Ms. Liggett for this thesis. Dr. Brian Smerdon provided intellectual discussion and editorial help with Chapter 4. Dr. Dan Partington provided code support and intellectual discussion for Chapters 4 and 5. And finally, Dr. Sven Frei provided intellectual discussion and background data for Chapter 5.

## **Acknowledgements**

A great many people have been part of this PhD journey and have contributed to who I am today, both personally and professionally. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors, Professors Adrian Werner and Craig Simmons, for providing stimulating discussions, guidance, and encouragement throughout my PhD. I admire Adrian's attention to detail and ability to focus in on the very essence of a research question, and Craig's wonderful perspective to frame research questions within the big picture. My PhD experience benefited from these complimentary supervisory styles.

Being part of the National Centre for Groundwater Research and Training (NCGRT) has been an amazing opportunity. I am grateful to have been able to attend numerous short courses and workshops, to have interacted with many top-class researchers from around the world, and to have the opportunity to share my research at numerous conferences. The NCGRT has been a place to thrive, both academically and personally, and I thank all the staff, students, and post-docs/researchers for making the time so wonderful.

I also gratefully acknowledge funding from an Australian Postgraduate Award, the Goyder Institute for Water Research, and the NCGRT. The Goyder Institute also provided me with numerous opportunities to connect with state government and industry stakeholders to present and discuss my research.

Thank you to Dan Partington for great discussions about fully integrated modelling, support with HGS, and using the HMC method. I enjoyed the opportunity to work with Matthew Knowling and Megan Sebben on their honours' projects, and thank

them for their patience and collaboration. Thank you to Ed Sudicky and René Therrien for the use of HydroGeoSphere, Rob McLaren, Young-Jin Park, and Jon Paul Jones for support.

The last part of this thesis would not have been possible without the contributions by Sven Frei and Jan Fleckenstien, who generously let me work with the Lehstenbach catchment, provided field data collected by others, contributed their knowledge of the catchment functioning, and brought a new perspective into the work.

I strive to maintain a balanced life, and this would not be possible without family and friends. Thanks to my fellow Tuesday morning Cake Clubbers for delicious conversation and treats each week, and to my office-mates (especially Tariq). Thank you to the “Adelaide Family” – the Gardners, the Smiths, the Harringtons, Chani, Lieke, and Jordi – for support both inside and outside the university walls, and for providing so many wonderful escapes from what can sometimes be an all-consuming task. Of course, there’s the unending support from my actual family: my parents, sister, husband, and daughter. Words cannot describe the gratitude for my husband Brian, who dealt with everything from post-dinner paper discussions and edits, to actually making dinner in the first place. Finally, thank you to my daughter Orla, who came along in the middle of all this, and as is totally cliché but totally true, put all of it into perspective.

# Table of Contents

<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Declaration</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Co-Authorship</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Research overview .....	1
1.2 Aim and Objectives .....	3
<b>2. Influence of the first-order exchange coefficient on simulation of coupled surface–subsurface flow</b> .....	<b>9</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	9
2.2 FOEC coupling approach .....	14
2.3 Methods .....	17
2.3.1 <i>HydroGeoSphere</i> .....	17
2.3.2 <i>Hydrological Scenarios and Model Setup</i> .....	18
2.3.3 <i>Estimate of Appropriate Coupling Length for Hortonian Conditions</i> ...	24
2.3.4 <i>Extension to a Hypothetical 3D Catchment</i> .....	25
2.4 Results .....	26
2.4.1 <i>S3 Dunne Overland Flow Scenario</i> .....	32
2.4.2 <i>Hypothetical 3D Catchment</i> .....	34
2.4.3 <i>Model Run Times</i> .....	37
2.5 Discussion .....	38
2.6 Summary and Conclusions .....	43
<b>3. On the implementation of the first-order exchange coefficient approach using a block-centred surface–subsurface hydrology model</b> .....	<b>46</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	46
3.2 Background .....	49
3.2.1 <i>FOEC coupling approach</i> .....	49
3.2.2 <i>MODHMS and HGS</i> .....	52
3.3 Methods .....	56
3.3.1 <i>Conceptual Model</i> .....	56
3.3.2 <i>Numerical Experiments</i> .....	57
3.4 Results .....	61
3.5 Discussion .....	65
3.6 Conclusions .....	69
<b>4. Fully integrated modelling of surface-subsurface solute transport and the effect of dispersion in tracer hydrograph separation</b> .....	<b>71</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	71
4.2 Background .....	74
4.3 Methods .....	77
4.4 Results .....	83
4.4.1 <i>Hydraulic Response</i> .....	83
4.4.2 <i>Dispersion at the surface-subsurface interface</i> .....	85
4.4.3 <i>Dispersion in the subsurface</i> .....	92
4.5 Discussion .....	94
4.5.1 <i>Modelling surface-subsurface solute exchange</i> .....	94
4.5.2 <i>Tracer hydrograph interpretation</i> .....	97

4.6	Conclusions .....	100
<b>5.</b>	<b>Surface-subsurface solute transport in a fully integrated catchment model</b>	<b>102</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	102
5.2	Study Area .....	104
5.3	Model Set-Up and Numerical Experiments .....	106
5.4	Results .....	112
5.5	Discussion .....	121
5.6	Conclusions .....	125
<b>6.</b>	<b>Thesis summary and conclusions</b> .....	<b>126</b>
6.1	Recommendation for future work .....	128
	<b>References</b> .....	<b>130</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Schematic of the a) COP and b) FOEC coupling approaches for surface-subsurface exchange. The FOEC coupling approach is shown here as a conceptualisation of flow through an exchange interface, which creates a hydraulic separation between the surface and subsurface (shown in grey); however, the nodes are co-located in the model. The concept of total obstruction height ( $H_s$ ) shown in b), comprised of sub-grid depression storage ( $H_d$ ) and obstruction storage exclusion ( $H_o$ , e.g. grass, trees), also applies to the COP approach. $h_s$ is the surface head, $h_{ss}$ is the subsurface head at the uppermost node, $d_o$ is the depth of water in the surface domain, and $l_e$ is the coupling length. ....	11
Figure 2.2 a) Hydrological scenarios and boundary conditions, and b) expected infiltration and exfiltration responses from each hydrological scenario .....	19
Figure 2.3 Simulated trends for the S2 SL-1 simulation for a) $q_{ex}$ , b) $q_{OLF}$ , c) $h_{ss}$ and d) $S_{ss}$ for the first 0.5 d of simulation. Results converge on the COP case as $l_e$ decreases, and some of the lines become obscured.....	27
Figure 2.4 Steady-state $q_{ex}$ , steady-state $h_{ss}-h_s$ , steady-state $S_{ss}$ and $t_{OLF}$ as a function of $l_e$ for each of the scenarios and the SL-1, SiL-1 and CL-1 soil columns. Note the different y-axes between soil types. ....	28
Figure 2.5 Time to reach within 1% of each simulation's steady-state $q_{ex}$ ( $t_{q_{ex}}$ ) against $l_e$ . Note the different y-axes.....	33
Figure 2.6 a) Integrated response of the V-catchment using the discharge hydrograph, and b) $h_{ss}-h_s$ at the top and c) outlet of the catchment for the non-Hortonian conditions. Note the COP case is not plotted on parts b) and c) as $h_{ss}-h_s$ is zero. ....	35
Figure 2.7 a) Integrated response of the V-catchment using the discharge hydrograph, and b) $h_{ss}-h_s$ at the top and c) outlet of the catchment for Hortonian conditions. Note the COP case is not plotted on parts b) and c) as $h_{ss}-h_s$ is zero. ....	36
Figure 3.1 Conceptual nodal-scale representation of the FOEC approach in a) a mesh-centred code, and b) and c) a block-centred code. The squares and circles represent surface and subsurface nodes, respectively. The shaded area symbolises the surface-subsurface exchange interface. ....	51
Figure 3.2 Comparison of the pressure-saturation relationship in the uppermost subsurface node (black line) and the underlying subsurface nodes in MODHMS (grey line). The simulation is for Hortonian conditions with a uniform vertical grid discretisation of 50 cm and model parameters as in Table 3.1 (i.e. the BC simulation described in Chapter 3.3). Dashed lines illustrate pressure heads of 0 m (i.e. total head equals nodal elevation) and 0.25 m (i.e. total head at top of cell), upon which saturation will reach unity. ....	54
Figure 3.3 a) $q_{ex}$ and b) $q_{OLF}$ from the MODHMS BC and HGS BC simulations compared to the COP BM simulation for the first day of the 5-day simulation.....	61
Figure 3.4 Relationship between $\log \alpha$ and a) steady-state $q_{ex}$ , and b) $t_{OLF}$ . The enlarged markers show $\alpha$ values using $l_e = \Delta z/2$ for each of the MODHMS BC and HGS BC simulations. ....	63

Figure 3.5 a) $q_{ex}$ and b) $q_{OLF}$ from the simulations that incorporate a single thin layer into the MODHMS BC simulation, compared to the COP BM simulation, for the first day of the 5-day simulation.....	64
Figure 4.1 2D model dimensions, boundary conditions, and initial conditions for both hypothetical hillslopes (convex and concave). The domain is a unit width (i.e. 1m).....	78
Figure 4.2 $Q_T$ and hydraulic $Q_p$ (HMC method) for the a) convex and b) concave hillslopes.....	83
Figure 4.3 Tracer-based $Q_p$ , hydraulic $Q_p$ , and $Q_T$ for each surface-subsurface transport condition and level of subsurface dispersion for both the a) convex and b) concave hillslopes. Note that the tracer-based $Q_p$ under the AO condition (for all levels of subsurface dispersion) plot on top of one another as well as the hydraulic $Q_p$ .....	86
Figure 4.4 a) Pre-event tracer $F_{ex}$ at the end of the rainfall period for each surface-subsurface transport condition along the bottom 3 m of the convex hillslope under intermediate subsurface dispersion, and b) corresponding subsurface head and water table. Note that the horizontal scale is the same for both a) and b), and there is no vertical exaggeration.....	87
Figure 4.5 a) Pre-event tracer $F_{ex}$ at the end of the rainfall period for each surface-subsurface transport condition along the bottom 8 m of the concave hillslope under intermediate subsurface dispersion, and b) corresponding subsurface head and water table. Note that the horizontal scale is the same for both a) and b), and there is no vertical exaggeration.....	88
Figure 4.6 Surface-subsurface fluxes for each surface-subsurface transport condition, with intermediate subsurface dispersion, at Point A on the convex hillslope (Figure 4.4). a) fluid flux, b) advective pre-event tracer flux, c) dispersive pre-event tracer flux, d) net surface-subsurface pre-event tracer flux, and e) concentration difference between the surface and uppermost subsurface nodes. ....	90
Figure 4.7 Pre-event water tracer concentrations near the stream for the concave hillslope at the end of the rainfall event. ....	93
Figure 4.8 Sensitivity of $Q_T$ and $Q_p$ for each surface-subsurface condition with intermediate subsurface dispersion. ....	99
Figure 5.1 Lehstenbach catchment model domain. ....	103
Figure 5.2 a) observed vs. modelled discharge, and b) HMC components at the catchment outlet. ....	113
Figure 5.3 Surface-subsurface exchange flux a) before the rainfall event (0.7 d), b) at the peak of the event (1.1 d), and c) after the cessation of rainfall (2.6 d).....	114
Figure 5.4 Total DOC mass flux at the catchment outlet with each interface transport condition and intermediate subsurface dispersion.....	115
Figure 5.5 Percent of total DOC at the catchment outlet for the a) wDOC and b) dDOC components for each surface-subsurface interface condition and intermediate subsurface dispersion. ....	115
Figure 5.6 a) the total DOC surface-subsurface mass exchange and surface concentration for the b) wDOC and c) dDOC components for each of the	

surface-subsurface transport conditions, with intermediate subsurface dispersion, and at the peak of the rainfall event (1.1 d). .....	117
Figure 5.7 Influence of subsurface dispersion on mass flux of total DOC at the catchment outlet. ....	118
Figure 5.8 Total DOC mass exchange across the surface subsurface interface at the peak of the rainfall event (t = 1.1 d). ....	119
Figure 5.9 Total DOC concentration vs. discharge for each of the surface-subsurface solute transport conditions and intermediate subsurface dispersion. The A+Diff simulation with low subsurface dispersion is also shown. ....	120

## List of Tables

Table 2.1 Soil column parameters. SL = sandy loam, SiL = silty loam, CL = clayey loam. ....	22
Table 2.2 Soil hydraulic properties. ....	23
Table 2.3 Log of threshold $l_e$ for each scenario and soil column. Blue shading = low threshold $l_e$ , red shading = high threshold $l_e$ . ....	30
Table 2.4 Differences between the FOEC and COP approaches for steady-state $q_{ex}$ and $t_{OLF}$ when $l_e = 1$ mm for each scenario and soil column. Steady-state $h_{ss}-h_s$ (FOEC approach only) is also shown and is $> 1$ mm for the S1 scenario due to unsaturated conditions at the uppermost subsurface node. ....	40
Table 3.1 Model input parameters.....	57
Table 3.2 Simulations performed in this chapter .....	58
Table 4.1 Model parameters.....	79
Table 4.2 Volumetric pre-event water delivered to the stream, as interpreted from the tracer-based hydrograph separation, during the rainfall period for the AO condition. ....	92