



**Fully integrated modelling of surface-subsurface flow
processes: quantifying in-stream and overland flow
generation mechanisms.**

by
Daniel Joseph Partington
BEng (Civil & Environmental) Hons, BSc (Maths and Computer Science)

Thesis submitted to The University of Adelaide
School of Civil, Environmental & Mining Engineering in
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Submitted December 2012

Contents

Contents	iii
Abstract.....	vii
Statement of Originality	ix
Acknowledgements.....	xi
List of Figures.....	xiii
List of Tables	xvii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1. Research Objectives.....	4
1.2. Thesis Overview	6
2 A hydraulic mixing-cell method to quantify the groundwater component of streamflow within spatially distributed fully integrated surface water - groundwater flow models (Paper 1)	9
2.1. Introduction.....	13
2.2. Existing methods for extracting streamflow generation components.....	16
2.2.1. Summed exfiltration along the length of the stream	16
2.2.2. Tracer based hydrograph separation	17
2.3. A hydraulic balance using a hydraulic mixing-cell method	19
2.3.1. Theory	19
2.3.2. Implementation of the HMC method in HydroGeoSphere	23
2.3.3. Verification of mass conservation in the HMC method.....	25
2.3.3.1. <i>Test case 1</i>	25
2.3.3.2. <i>Test case 2</i>	30
2.4. Discussion and Conclusions.....	38
3 Evaluation of outputs from automated baseflow separation methods against simulated baseflow from a physically based, surface water-groundwater flow model. (Paper 2).....	41

4.4.1. Separating flow hydrographs by in-stream and overland flow generation mechanisms	97
4.4.2. Analysing spatiotemporal variability of in-stream and overland flow generation.....	97
4.4.3. Analysing active and contributing processes	98
4.5. Results and discussion	98
4.5.1. Wetland model	98
4.5.1.1. <i>In-stream and overland flow generation mechanisms driving flow</i>	98
4.5.1.2. <i>Spatiotemporal variability of in-stream and overland flow generation</i>	100
4.5.2. Catchment model	104
4.5.2.1. <i>In-stream and overland flow generation mechanisms driving flow</i>	105
4.5.2.2. <i>Spatiotemporal variability of in-stream and overland flow generation</i>	106
4.5.2.3. <i>Active versus contributing flow generation mechanisms</i>	111
4.5.3. Comparison of wetland and catchment models	112
4.5.4. Limitations of wetland and catchment models.....	113
4.5.5. Evaluation of HMC method implementation	115
4.6. Conclusions.....	115
5 Thesis Conclusions	119
5.1. Research contributions	120
5.2. Research limitations	122
5.3. Recommendations for future work	123
References.....	127
Appendix A.....	141
Appendix B.....	149

Abstract

The understanding and effective management of flood and drought issues within catchments, are critical to sustaining such systems and the environments they support. Surface water and groundwater systems within catchments exhibit important feedbacks and therefore must be considered as a single resource. Holistic consideration of these systems in catchment hydrology requires the understanding and quantification of both surface and subsurface flow processes and their interactions. This requires that the physics driving the interactions/processes are well understood. Consequently, a need has arisen for physics-based models that can aid in building intuition about these interactions/processes, and also assist in quantifying these interactions/processes. In the last decade, physics-based fully integrated surface-subsurface flow models have become an important tool in understanding and quantifying flow generation processes and surface-subsurface interactions. However, due to the relatively short history of fully integrated models, the analysis and interpretation of outputs is often incommensurate with the spatiotemporal information within the outputs. A key shortcoming of these models is the inability to use model outputs to properly analyse and interpret flow generation mechanisms and surface water-groundwater interactions with respect to the streamflow hydrograph.

In this research, a new Hydraulic Mixing-Cell (HMC) method for quantifying in-stream and overland flow generation mechanisms within physics-based models of surface-subsurface flow is developed. The HMC method is implemented and tested within the fully integrated surface-subsurface flow model code HydroGeoSphere. The HMC method is used in a series of applications to quantify the contributions to total streamflow of groundwater discharge to the stream and hillslope, and direct rainfall to the stream and hillslope.

Application of the HMC method to a hypothetical catchment is used to investigate the importance of in-stream flow travel time and losses. Results showed that it is necessary to account for in-stream travel time and stream losses in order to accurately quantify the contribution of groundwater to streamflow. The HMC method is then used with another hypothetical catchment model to investigate the potential error in 10 commonly used automated baseflow separation methods.

Simulations with a range of hydrological forcing, soil characteristics and antecedent moisture conditions showed the potential error to be significant for these automated methods; this warrants caution in overvaluing their outputs. Finally, the HMC method is employed in a case study of the Lehstenbach catchment, which included a model of a riparian wetland and catchment. Application of the HMC method in this case study was used to investigate wetland and catchment processes through separation of streamflow hydrographs and spatiotemporal analysis of flow generation mechanisms. This analysis elucidated the dynamics of overland and in-stream flow generation processes. This research has opened up a new way of analysing and interpreting flow generation mechanisms using fully integrated surface-subsurface flow models. The analysis and interpretation techniques implemented in this thesis form the basis for comprehensive analysis of outputs from physics-based modelling of catchment hydrological processes.

Statement of Originality

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to Daniel Partington and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed below) resides with the copyright holders of those works.

List of works:

Partington, D., P. Brunner, C. T. Simmons, R. Therrien, A. D. Werner, G. C. Dandy, and H. R. Maier. 2011. A hydraulic mixing-cell method to quantify the groundwater component of streamflow within spatially distributed fully integrated surface water - groundwater flow models. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 26:886-898.

Partington, D., P. Brunner, C. T. Simmons, A. D. Werner, R. Therrien, G. C. Dandy, and H. R. Maier. 2012. Evaluation of outputs from automated baseflow separation methods against simulated baseflow from a physically based, surface water-groundwater flow model. *Journal of Hydrology*, 458-459: 28-39.

Partington, D., P. Brunner, S. Frei, C. T. Simmons, R. Therrien, A. D. Werner, H. R. Maier, G. C. Dandy, J. H. Fleckenstein. Interpreting flow generation mechanisms from integrated surface water-groundwater flow models of a riparian wetland and catchment. Submitted to *Water Resources Research* on 9 November, 2012.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signed: Date:

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors: Holger Maier, Graeme Dandy, Craig Simmons, Adrian Werner and Philip Brunner, for their encouragement, support, engaging exchange of ideas, and review of manuscripts over the course of my PhD. I am especially grateful to Holger Maier for the opportunity to undertake this PhD, and for his sincerity and understanding since my time as an undergraduate. I am also grateful to Graeme Dandy for the always interesting scientific discussions. I thank Craig Simmons for his untiring reassurance and uplifting enthusiasm. I am also very grateful to Adrian Werner for constantly challenging me to develop my critical thinking abilities. I am deeply indebted to Philip Brunner for his unrelenting faith in my research, and for his guidance in modelling.

I am very grateful to Rene Therrien, for the opportunity to work with the HydroGeoSphere source code, for his instrumental guidance with the code, and valuable assistance with running models. I was fortunate to collaborate with Sven Frei and Jan Fleckenstein on a case study of the Lehstenbach catchment, and I thank them for this fruitful collaboration.

I acknowledge Rob McLaren for his help in resolving modelling issues. I also acknowledge Matt Gibbs, Aaron Zecchin and Jerry Vaculik, for generously giving their time to impart their coding wizardry on me. I also thank all of the students at the University of Adelaide and Flinders University whom I have worked with and who have inspired me over the years.

I would like to thank my mother Virginia, and siblings Libby, Bill, Ben, Tom, and Lucy for their support over the years. I thank all of my friends for enduring me and my rants on hydrological modelling over the course of my study. Lastly I would like to thank my number one, Grace Lin for her amazing unwavering support on this journey; without her, I would not have come this far. I dedicate this thesis to my father, John Partington.

List of Figures

- Figure 1.1: Streamflow generation at the plot scale by both in-stream (groundwater discharge and rainfall to the stream channel) and overland (groundwater discharge and rainfall to the hillslope) flow generation processes.2
- Figure 1.2: Research objectives and their hierarchy. Objectives are denoted by the superscript numbers in each of the flowchart boxes.....6
- Figure 1.3: Linkage of research objectives and publications.7
- Figure 2.1: Conceptual diagram of a surface water-groundwater catchment (left hand side) featuring different flow regimes (as illustrated in the right part of the figure). The white sections of the catchment adjacent to the stream represent the groundwater discharge upslope of the stream (return flow). The dashed lines on the right part of the figure represent the water table. The flow direction is towards the reader. 16
- Figure 2.2: Hydrograph at cross sections A, B and C of the catchment shown in Figure 2.1. The streamflow and corresponding component of groundwater flowing through cross sections A, B and C are shown. Also, the summed exfiltration upstream of cross sections A, B and C, respectively, are shown..... 17
- Figure 2.3: The theoretical hydrograph at cross section C of the catchment shown in Figure 2.1. The streamflow, groundwater discharge component and tracer based separation (for dispersivity values of α_{L1} and α_{L2}) are shown. 18
- Figure 2.4: Test case 1: “two-region” model grid, and HMC cells for HGS nodes in “two-region” model grid. In the right part of the figure the two nodes at $y = 0$ belong to HMC cell 1, the two nodes at $y = 1$ belong to HMC cell 2 and the nodes at $y = 3$ belong to HMC cell 3.26
- Figure 2.5: HMC cell, SW and GW balances (top panel) and fractions (bottom panel) for test case 1. The volumetric balance in the top row shows the HMC calculated balances for SW and GW in the HMC cells as well as the total volume in the cell which is calculated directly from the model outputs. The HMC cell SW and GW fractions in the bottom panel are calculated independently of each other.....28
- Figure 2.6: The 21 HMC cells for the "two-region" model with $dy = 10$ cm.29
- Figure 2.7: Effect of temporal discretisation on the SW and GW fractions in HMC cells 1, 11 and 21.29
- Figure 2.8: Test case 2 catchment model (modified version of the V-catchment in Panday and Huyakorn (2004)). The contours correspond to the elevation.31
- Figure 2.9: Part cross section of hypothetical catchment highlighting the raised plane which is used to create a greater hydraulic gradient next to the stream leading to constant subsurface to surface exchange along the

	entire length (from $x = 790 - 810$ m, at $y = 0$ m and $z = -4$ to 2 m). The plane (left), bank (middle) and streambed (right) are seen in the division of top cells.	32
Figure 2.10:	Evolution of the losing section of the stream in the hypothetical catchment. A positive exchange in the top panel of plots denotes subsurface to the surface exchange and vice versa for a negative exchange. The depth and velocity profile along the stream are shown below. At $t = 1$ second, the stream is gaining along the full length. At b.) $t = 12$ days, the pumping has reduced the positive exchange section of the stream adjacent to the pumping location. At c.) $t = 40$ days, the stream is partially losing along a small section whilst maintaining flow along the losing section.....	35
Figure 2.11:	HMC direct rainfall (RF) and groundwater (GW) component fractions before and after the first rainfall event for cells 1, 13, and 21. Note the time lags of rainfall in the downstream cells 13 and 21 (~3.5hrs).	37
Figure 2.12:	Hyetograph for catchment and Hydrograph at the catchment outlet, showing separation of direct rainfall and groundwater components of streamflow, as well as the summed exfiltration from the overall water balance. The summed exfiltration (SE) from the water balance is clearly seen to exceed the outflow in this hypothetical catchment. The HMC direct rainfall and groundwater components of streamflow are calculated using the HMC fractions in HMC cell 21.	38
Figure 3.1:	Modified tilted V-catchment used for simulation of the synthetic catchment's rainfall response. Points 1 and 2 denote locations of groundwater pumps. Note that due to the symmetry of the catchment, only half of it is shown.....	51
Figure 3.2:	Streamflow hydrograph at the outlet and HMC flow components for scenario 1 (without pumping), with highlighted events. An apparent steady-state baseflow rate was observed in the first event (10.5-11 days) and second event (21.4-23 days).....	60
Figure 3.3:	Streamflow hydrograph at the outlet and HMC flow components for scenario 2 (with pumping), with highlighted events. An apparent steady-state baseflow rate was observed in the first two rainfall events.	60
Figure 3.4:	Streamflow hydrograph at the outlet and HMC flow components for modified scenario 1 (with 5mm/day ET), with highlighted events. An apparent steady-state baseflow rate was still observed in the first event (10.5-11 days) and second event (21.4-23 days).	61
Figure 3.5:	Values of recession constant a and R^2 value for the linear regression of Q_t vs Q_{t+1} , for sand and initial conditions WT1, WT2, WT3 and without/with pumps 1 and 2 active. The high value of R^2 suggests a linear storage-discharge relationship at the outlet during recession periods.	62
Figure 3.6:	Performance based ranking using BFI over the whole simulation for HYSEP, PART, BFLOW and the Eckhardt separation methods. 1 indicates best performance, 10 indicates worst performance.	69

- Figure 3.7: Comparison of simulated daily baseflow and baseflow estimated using HYSEP, PART, BFLOW and the Eckhardt separation methods for scenario 1.70
- Figure 4.1: Location of the Lehstenbach catchment, after *Frei et al. (2010)*.83
- Figure 4.2: Conceptual diagram of in-stream and overland flow generation mechanisms typical of the Lehstenbach catchment during intense storm events. The in-stream and overland flow generation mechanisms shown are groundwater discharge to the channel (GW-CH) and wetland surfaces (GW-WL), direct rainfall to the channel (RF-CH) and wetland surfaces (RF-WL), and runoff from the forest.84
- Figure 4.3: Geometry of the wetland segment: a) planar reference model showing the main drainage direction and channel location; b) smoothed realisation of the wetlands' hummocky micro-topography, with simulation results of developed overland flow in the wetland (after *Frei et al. (2010)*); c) cross section ($Y = 5$ m) of the micro-topography model (after *Frei et al. (2010)*). The division of overland flow into two distinct flow networks (denoted as FN1 and FN2) is shown by the surface flow lines. The model observation points for flow in this study are denoted by the red arrows, which correspond to surface water discharge from the wetlands to the channel from FN1 and FN2, and channel discharge at the outlet.....86
- Figure 4.4: Model spatial discretisation of the Lehstenbach catchment and distribution of the stream, wetland and forest areas (the z-axis is exaggerated by a factor of 5). Model observation points are at locations 1 to 6 and the outlet.....89
- Figure 4.5: Hyetograph, simulated outlet hydrograph, simulated FN1 hydrograph, simulated FN2 hydrograph and simulated surface water storage graph for the wetland model during a large storm event. GW-CH and RF-CH are direct groundwater discharge and rainfall to the channel. GW-WL and RF-WL represent groundwater discharge and rainfall to the surface of the wetland area respectively. Initial represents the initial water in the surface domain at the beginning of the simulation. The reset fraction of flow was negligible and hence is not shown.....99
- Figure 4.6: Wetland HMC fractions at day 14 (pre-storm event). The in-stream and overland flow generating mechanisms shown are: a) groundwater discharge to the channel (GW-CH), b) groundwater discharge to the wetland surface (GW-WL). The initial and reset fractions are also shown in c) and d) respectively. A GW-WL fraction of 0.5 denotes that 50% of the water at that cell was generated from groundwater discharging to the wetland surface...101
- Figure 4.7: Wetland HMC fractions at day 20 (during the storm event). In-stream and overland flow generating mechanisms shown are: a) groundwater discharge to the channel, b) groundwater discharge to the wetland surface, c) rainfall to the channel, d) rainfall to the wetland. The remaining initial water (e) and the reset fraction (f) for reset cells are also shown.....102

- Figure 4.8: Comparison of different streamflow generation mechanism contributions at the outlet, FN1 and FN2. The initial and reset fractions and the cumulative error in the cells were insignificant, as can be seen at the top of the stacked columns. 103
- Figure 4.9: Simulated surface saturation (a), exchange flux (b) and surface water depth (c), prior to the storm, at the storm peak and 2 days after the storm peak. A losing section on the right arm of the stream is highlighted in the third frame of row b). Positive values of exchange flux indicate groundwater discharge to the surface and negative values indicate infiltration of surface water to the subsurface. 104
- Figure 4.10: Hyetograph (a), separated discharge hydrographs at the outlet (b), as well as the HMC fractions in surface-storage across the catchment (c). Note that overland flow from the forest was negligible ($< 0.2\%$) in contributing to streamflow and so is not shown in (b). 106
- Figure 4.11: HMC calculated in-stream and overland flow generation for the Lehstenbach catchment – before peak (day 216), at peak (day 218) and after the peak (day 220). The flow generation components are: a) groundwater discharge to the channel (GW-CH), b) rainfall to the channel (RF-CH), c) groundwater discharge to the wetlands surfaces (GW-WL), and d) rainfall to the wetlands (RF-WL). The initial fractions are not shown as all initial water has been flushed from the catchment. The reset fractions are shown in row e). 108
- Figure 4.12: Box plots showing the spread of the average in-stream and overland flow generation mechanism contributions for the entire year and during the large storm event, across the 7 different model observation points. The thick black line represents the median; the box covers the inter quartile range (IQR) bounded by the lower and upper quartiles; the whiskers extend to the lowest and highest data point within the fences (where the fences are $1.5 \times$ IQR above and below the upper and lower quartiles respectively); the circles represent data above and below the upper and lower fences respectively. 110
- Figure 4.13: Comparison of active and contributing processes with respect to a) GW-CH, b) RF-CH, and c) WL-CH (where $WL-CH = RF-WL + GW-WL$). Note that the contributing component is superimposed on top of the active component in each of these graphs, i.e. they are not stacked. The long-term ratio of contributing to active processes is also noted in each of the plots, which highlights the average difference between the two. The dashed and dotted lines on each plot represent respectively the cumulative active and contributing components. 112
- Figure 5.1: Comprehensive conceptualisation of catchment response to rainfall (adapted from *Sklash and Farvolden, 1979*). The dashed red line indicates the aspects considered in this research, although without distinction of overland rainfall driven mechanisms (i.e. infiltration excess (Hortonian) or saturation excess (Dunne)). 124

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Maximum relative error in the HMC method, and the global volume error (GVE) for the HMC method.	30
Table 2.2: Surface and subsurface parameters for test case 2.	33
Table 3.1: Surface and subsurface parameters for the synthetic catchment model. For a detailed description of these model parameters see <i>Therrien et al. (2009)</i>	52
Table 3.2: Scenarios for simulating catchment response. Scenarios with an asterisk denote scenarios where groundwater pumping is applied in the catchment.	56
Table 3.3: <i>BFI</i> , <i>NSE</i> and <i>PBIAS</i> for simulated baseflow and estimated baseflow during event 1 using HYSEP, PART, BFLOW and the Eckhardt separation methods. Lightly shaded cells highlight a $NSE < 0.5$ and darkly shaded cells highlight $ PBIAS > 25\%$. Scenarios with an asterisk denote where groundwater pumping is applied in the catchment.	65
Table 3.4: <i>BFI</i> , <i>NSE</i> and <i>PBIAS</i> for simulated baseflow and estimated baseflow during event 2 using HYSEP, PART, BFLOW and the Eckhardt separation methods. Lightly shaded cells highlight a $NSE < 0.5$ and darkly shaded cells highlight $ PBIAS > 25\%$. Scenarios with an asterisk denote where groundwater pumping is applied in the catchment.	66
Table 3.5: <i>BFI</i> , <i>NSE</i> and <i>PBIAS</i> for simulated baseflow and estimated baseflow during event 3 using HYSEP, PART, BFLOW and the Eckhardt separation methods. Lightly shaded cells highlight a $NSE < 0.5$ and darkly shaded cells highlight $ PBIAS > 25\%$. Scenarios with an asterisk denote where groundwater pumping is applied in the catchment.	67
Table 3.6: Comparison of <i>BFI</i> , <i>NSE</i> and <i>PBIAS</i> for (scenario 1 with and without ET) simulated baseflow and estimated baseflow during event 2 using HYSEP, PART, BFLOW and the Eckhardt separation methods. Lightly shaded cells highlight a $NSE < 0.5$ and darkly shaded cells highlight $ PBIAS > 25\%$	68
Table 4.1: Surface and subsurface parameters used in the Lehstenbach catchment model. For a detailed description of all model parameters used in HGS, see <i>Therrien et al. (2009)</i>	90
Table 4.2: Considered flow generation mechanisms, HMC unique fractions, and HMC fraction types.	97