Accepted Manuscript

Dynamic coupling of subsurface and seepage flows solved within a regularized partition formulation

J. Marçais, J.-R. de Dreuzy, J. Erhel

PII: S0309-1708(17)30310-X
DOI: [10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.09.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.09.008)
Reference: ADWR 2941

To appear in: *Advances in Water Resources*

Received date: 12 April 2017
Revised date: 6 September 2017
Accepted date: 6 September 2017

Please cite this article as: J. Marçais, J.-R. de Dreuzy, J. Erhel, Dynamic coupling of subsurface and seepage flows solved within a regularized partition formulation, *Advances in Water Resources* (2017), doi: [10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.09.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.09.008)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Highlights

- Integrating seepage dynamic in subsurface flow modeling at the hillslope scale.
- Coupling storage variation and seepage through a robust partition formulation.
- Smooth convex regularization of seepage onset, sharp seepage retreat.
- Numerical application and demonstration of hillslope storage Boussinesq equations.

DYNAMIC COUPLING OF SUBSURFACE AND SEEPAGE FLOWS SOLVED WITHIN A REGULARIZED PARTITION FORMULATION

J. Marçais^{1a,b}, J.-R. de Dreuzy^b, J. Erhel^c,

^a*Agroparistech, 16 rue Claude Bernard, 75005 Paris, France*

^b*Géosciences Rennes (UMR 6118 CNRS), Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu,
35042 Rennes Cedex, France*

^c*INRIA Rennes-Bretagne Atlantique, campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes, France*

Abstract

Hillslope response to precipitations is characterized by sharp transitions from purely subsurface flow dynamics to simultaneous surface and subsurface flows. Locally, the transition between these two regimes is triggered by soil saturation. Here we develop an integrative approach to simultaneously solve the subsurface flow, locate the potential fully saturated areas and deduce the generated saturation excess overland flow. This approach combines the different dynamics and transitions in a single partition formulation using discontinuous functions. We propose to regularize the system of partial differential equations and to use classic spatial and temporal discretization schemes. We illustrate our methodology on the 1D hillslope storage Boussinesq equations (Troch et al., 2003). We first validate the numerical scheme on previous numerical experiments without saturation excess overland flow. Then we apply our model to a test case with dynamic transitions from purely subsurface flow dynamics to simultaneous surface and subsurface flows. Our results show that discretization respects mass balance both locally and globally, converges when the mesh or time step are refined. Moreover the regularization parameter can be taken small enough to ensure accuracy without suffering of numerical artifacts. Applied to some hundreds of realistic hillslope cases taken from Western side of France (Brittany), the developed method appears to be robust and efficient.

¹Corresponding author: jean.marcais@polytechnique.edu

28 *Keywords:* Subsurface flow, Saturation Excess, Seepage, ODE with
 29 discontinuous right-hand side, Regularization, Boussinesq equations

30 **1. Introduction**

31 Under the same term, runoff gathers several processes of different origins
 32 including infiltration excess overland flow and saturation excess overland flow
 33 (Kirkby, 1978; Bonell, 1998; Horton, 1933; McGlynn et al., 2002; Freeze & Har-
 34 lan, 1969). While infiltration excess overland flow is controlled by rainfall in-
 35 tensity and surface properties like roughness (Horton, 1933; Smith & Goodrich,
 36 2006; Darboux et al., 2002), saturation excess overland flow is generated by
 37 subsurface flow and saturation dynamics (Dunne & Black, 1970; Sophocleous,
 38 2002). It occurs locally in so-called saturated source areas (Ogden & Watts,
 39 2000) when the soil column is saturated up to the surface (Dunne, 1978; Musy
 40 & Higy, 2004). It comes from precipitation that cannot infiltrate (sometimes
 41 called direct precipitations onto saturated areas) and from subsurface flows that
 42 exfiltrate and return to the surface, i.e. seepage flow or return flow (Dunne &
 43 Black, 1970). Once the soil column remains fully saturated, the subsurface flux
 44 stabilizes, remaining equal to the product of the soil transmissivity by the local
 45 hydraulic gradient. At the surface, fluxes can be highly variable depending on
 46 exfiltration and precipitations dynamics. Saturated source areas are found at
 47 the bottom of slopes, in the vicinity of rivers, in wetlands where water table
 48 can quickly rise up to the surface as well as upslope in slope hollows that force

49 flowpaths to converge and exfiltrate (Fan & Bras, 1998; Troch et al., 2002; Brut-
 50 saert, 2005; Birkel et al., 2015). Subsurface and saturation excess overland flow
 51 have been proven to be important for providing water for evapotranspiration
 52 (Maxwell & Condon, 2016), enhancing erosion (Fox & Wilson, 2010), increasing
 53 groundwater flooding risks (Holman et al., 2009; Kreibich & Thieken, 2008; Ha-
 54 bets et al., 2010; Bauer et al., 2006; Miguez-Macho & Fan, 2012), shaping the
 55 residence time distribution (Tetzlaff et al., 2014; Rinaldo et al., 2015; Harman,
 56 2015) maintaining anoxic conditions in the soil and promoting denitrification
 57 hotspots (Pinay et al., 2015).

58 There is a sharp transition when infiltration and subsurface flows do no longer
 59 sustain the full saturation of the soil column (Vivoni et al., 2007). Overland
 60 flow vanishes, a partially saturated area develops in lieu of the saturated source
 61 area, the water table falls down below the surface and subsurface flow becomes
 62 dynamic and non-linearly dependent on saturation. Such transitions between so-
 63 called fully saturated and partially saturated regimes are spatially variable and
 64 dynamic. They have been modeled by coupling shallow water and groundwater
 65 equations (LaBolle et al., 2003; Barthel & Banzhaf, 2016; Camporese et al.,
 66 2010) either by an exchange of fluxes (Govindaraju & Kavvas, 1991; Panday
 67 & Huyakorn, 2004; Markstrom et al., 2008) or by assigning the shallow water
 68 equations as a boundary to the groundwater equations (Kollet & Maxwell, 2006).
 69 Another method is to solve the groundwater equations for a prescribed position

of the saturated source areas (Bresciani et al., 2014, 2016; Beaugendre et al., 2006) and to iterate until convergence is met (Diersch, 2013; Harbaugh, 2005). The seepage front (defined as the intersection of the subsurface water table with the land surface) is deduced accordingly (Anderson et al., 2015; Batelaan & De Smedt, 2004) and saturation excess overland flow is eventually derived from mass balance computations.

While these integrated hydrological surface-subsurface models (for a comprehensive review, see Fatichi et al. (2016)) are adapted to well instrumented catchments or critical zone observatories, they require high computation capacities (Putti & Paniconi, 2004) and a lot of data to be calibrated with (Reggiani et al., 1998) making them difficult to parametrize because of their long run time. They are also prone to equifinality issues (Beven, 2006) and are sometimes subject to numerical instabilities (Doherty & Christensen, 2011). For applications where the only available information are a DEM, the rainfall time series and a discharge time series, non intensive process-based models have been proposed (Troch et al., 2003; Broda et al., 2012) but, to the best of our knowledge, they do not take into account the non linearity, described above, coming from the dynamic interactions between the water table and the land surface.

Here, we propose an integrated approach to simultaneously solve the subsurface flow, locate the potential saturated source areas and deduce the generated saturation excess overland flow. This approach is well suited to the sharp

transitions presented previously. We hypothesize that surface processes can be simplified as follows. We assume instantaneous flood routing as surface flows are some orders of magnitude faster than subsurface flows (Dunne & Black, 1970; Fan & Bras, 1998). We consider infiltration processes as negligible. In temperate climates, most of the saturation excess overland flow occurs downhill and only a small amount of this flow is likely to infiltrate (Musy & Higy, 2004).

We model subsurface flow with the Boussinesq hydraulic groundwater theory based on Darcy's law and Dupuit-Forchheimer assumption (Boussinesq, 1877; Brutsaert, 2005; Troch et al., 2013). It expresses that hydraulic head responds to flow through transmissivity feedbacks without inertial effects (Rodhe, 1987; Bishop et al., 2011). We work at the hillslope scale with the hillslope storage Boussinesq equations (Troch et al., 2003), which include the geologic, pedologic and geomorphologic controls on subsurface flow dynamics (Bachmair & Weiler, 2012; Savenije, 2010; Freer et al., 1997; Lanni et al., 2013). They indeed model subsurface flow at the soil/bedrock interface (Freer et al., 2002; Tromp-van Meerveld & McDonnell, 2006), which is the most likely to generate saturation excess overland flow in humid and steep terrains with conductive soils (Weiler et al., 2006). They have also been extended to model the coupling between shallow and deep groundwater flow (Broda et al., 2012).

First, we describe the partially saturated and fully saturated flow regimes

that can be encountered on hillslopes following the two cases of Fan & Bras (1998) (section 2.1) and combine them in a partial differential system deriving from partition considerations (section 2.2). We regularize this system for numerical integration, discretize it spatially with a mixed finite element scheme and obtain a system of differential equations (section 2.3). Second, we validate the method and analyze its convergence properties (sections 3.1 and 3.2). Finally we discuss its efficiency and robustness on realistic hillslope cases (section 3.3).

2. Methods

We first recall the hillslope storage Boussinesq equations (Troch et al., 2003; Hilberts et al., 2004; Paniconi et al., 2003) and add to them the overflow condition when saturation reaches the surface. We show how the two regimes of partial and total saturation are generally formalized and further propose an alternative integrated partition formulation. The issued differential discontinuous equations are then regularized for numerical integration and spatially discretized with a mixed finite element scheme.

2.1. Hillslope storage Boussinesq equations

2.1.1. Case 1: Subsurface flow only

Below land surface, when the soil is not fully saturated, only subsurface flow occurs. Hillslope storage Boussinesq equations physically describe the relation

132 between subsurface flow and saturation (Troch et al. (2003), case 1 of Figure
 133 1a). Following Dupuit-Forchheimer assumption, discharge is proportional to
 134 the saturated thickness. Discharge is further integrated transversally to the
 135 main slope direction to yield a 1D continuity problem where discharge is also
 136 proportional to the width w [m] of the transect profile (Figure 1b). The other
 137 key physical characteristic of the hillslope is its slope θ [rad] describing the
 138 mean evolution of the soil layer height. The integrated flux over the transect
 139 $Q(x, t)$ [m³ s⁻¹] is linked to the subsurface water storage $S(x, t)$ [m²] through
 140 the following set of equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\partial S}{\partial t}(x, t) = -\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t)w(x) \\ Q(x, t) = -\frac{kS(x, t)}{f} \left(\cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{S}{fw} \right)(x, t) + \sin \theta \right) \\ 0 \leq S(x, t) \leq S_c(x) \\ S(x, t) < S_c(x) \text{ or } -\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t)w(x) < 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (1)$$

141 where x [m] represents the distance to the channel varying between 0 at the
 142 river and L at the water divide, N [m s⁻¹] is the infiltration, k [m s⁻¹] is the
 143 hydraulic conductivity, f [-] is the drainable porosity. The subsurface water
 144 storage $S(x, t)$ is defined in Troch et al. (2003) by $S(x, t) = f w(x) h(x, t)$ where
 145 h is the groundwater elevation height [m] (Figure 1). $S(x, t)$ cannot exceed
 146 the maximum subsurface water storage S_c [m²] defined by $S_c(x) = f w(x) d$

where d [m] is the soil depth. For illustration purposes and with no loss of generality, we assume in what follows that k , f , θ and d are constant. The first equation of system (1) is the mass balance equation stating that the temporal variation of storage results from the local variation of subsurface flows and from the infiltration. The second line is Darcy's equation, integrated vertically and laterally, written as a function of the subsurface water storage S . The third equation just reminds that S is positive and cannot exceed the maximum subsurface water storage S_c . This system applies as long as the condition of the fourth line is fulfilled, i.e. for partially saturated soil columns ($S(x, t) < S_c(x)$) or for fully saturated soil columns desaturating ($-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t)w(x) < 0$).

Figure 1: (a) Cross-section view of the hillslope with a constant slope θ . The water table location $S(x, t)$ is indicated in blue. The subsurface flux $Q(x, t)$ is marked by the blue arrow. The saturation excess overland flow $q_s(x_s, t)$ (case 2) is materialized by the purple arrow and the surface by $S_c(x)$. Cases 1 and 2 represent partially saturated and locally fully saturated hillslopes respectively. (b) 3D view of the hillslope with an illustration of the width function $w(x)$ (Adapted from Troch et al. (2003)).

2.1.2. Case 2: Subsurface flow and dynamic saturation excess overland flow

If, at the location x_S , the soil is fully saturated and there is a positive flux balance, the excess in the flux balance is identified to the saturation excess overland flow q_S [$\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$] as it cannot be assigned to storage temporal variations ($\frac{\partial S}{\partial t}(x_S, t) = 0$, case 2 of Figure 1a). The system of equations becomes:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} q_S(x_S, t) = -\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x_S, t) + N(t) w(x_S) \\ \frac{\partial S}{\partial t}(x_S, t) = 0 \\ Q(x_S, t) = -\frac{kS_c(x_S)}{f} \left(\cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{S_c}{fw} \right) (x_S, t) + \sin \theta \right) \\ S(x_S, t) = S_c(x_S) \text{ and } -\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x_S, t) + N(t) w(x_S) \geq 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (2)$$

The fourth line ensures that the soil is fully saturated and that there is a positive flux balance ($-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x_S, t) + N(t) w(x_S) \geq 0$). As shown by the first equation, saturation excess overland flow is made up of two terms representing the seepage flow ($-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}$) and the direct precipitations onto saturated areas (Nw) (Dunne & Black, 1970).

Solving the dynamic transition between these two regimes (essentially due to interactions between the soil water table and the land surface) requires to change of system of equations (system (1) or (2)) depending on the state of saturation and subsurface flow (S and Q). It is the last equation in systems (1)

171 and (2) that controls the transition.

172 2.2. Partition Problem

173 To avoid switching between regimes and equation sets, we propose an alter-
 174 native partition formulation. This formulation reconciles systems (1) and (2) in
 175 a single system by partitioning the incoming flux $-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} + N w$ in the variation
 176 of the subsurface water storage $\frac{\partial S}{\partial t}$ and in the saturation excess overland flow
 177 q_S :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\partial S}{\partial t}(x, t) + q_S(x, t) = -\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t) w(x) \\ q_S(x, t) = \mathcal{G}\left(\frac{S(x, t)}{S_c(x)}\right) \mathcal{R}\left(-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t) w(x)\right) \\ Q(x, t) = -\frac{kS(x, t)}{f} \left(\cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{S}{fw} \right) (x, t) + \sin \theta \right) \\ 0 \leq S(x, t) \leq S_c(x) . \end{array} \right. \quad (3)$$

178 $\mathcal{G}$ (Figure 2a) is the function defined in $[0, 1]$ by $\mathcal{G}(u) = \mathcal{H}(u - 1)$, $\mathcal{R}$ is the
 179 ramp function (Figure 2b) defined in $\mathbb{R}$ by $\mathcal{R}(u) = u \mathcal{H}(u)$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is the
 180 Heaviside step function (Figure 2c):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} : \quad \mathbb{R} &\longrightarrow \{0, 1\} \\ u &\longmapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u < 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } u \geq 0 . \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

181 In fact, system (3) can be readily expressed as a partition formulation by
182 rewriting its first two equations:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial S}{\partial t}(x, t) = \left(1 - \mathcal{G}\left(\frac{S(x, t)}{S_c(x)}\right) \mathcal{H}\left(-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t) w(x)\right)\right) \left(-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t) w(x)\right) \\ q_S(x, t) = \left(\mathcal{G}\left(\frac{S(x, t)}{S_c(x)}\right) \mathcal{H}\left(-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t) w(x)\right)\right) \left(-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t) w(x)\right) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

183 It is the quantity $\mathcal{G}(S/S_c) \mathcal{H}(-\partial Q/\partial x + N w)$ that triggers the dynamic
184 transitions between the two regimes. When it is null, system (3) reduces to (1).
185 When it is equal to 1, system (3) reduces to (2).

186 The fourth line of system (3) ensures that the subsurface water storage S
187 remains positive and lower than S_c .

Figure 2: Illustration of (a) the discontinuous function $\mathcal{G}$ (b) the ramp function $\mathcal{R}$ (c) the Heaviside function $\mathcal{H}$ defined by equation (4).

188 2.3. Numerical methods

189 System (3) is a set of partial differential equations with discontinuous right-
190 hand sides which can be formally defined in the weak sense of distributions. To
191 solve the partial differential system (3) numerically, $\mathcal{G}$ is challenging because
192 of its discontinuity at $u = 1$. Various numerical techniques exist to handle

the discontinuous functions present in partial derivatives systems (Agosti et al., 2015; Bouillard et al., 2007; Kumar et al., 2014; Hoffmann et al., 2016). System (3) can be rewritten, still in a weak sense, as a non linear complementarity problem, solved with a semi-smooth Newton method (Pang & Gabriel, 1993; De Luca et al., 1996). Here, to solve system (3), we choose to regularize the discontinuous function $\mathcal{G}$, discretize in space using a mixed finite element method and use classic methods for temporal integration (variable-step, variable-order solver).

2.3.1. Regularization

To smoothen the transition between partially and fully saturated regimes, we use the convex function $\mathcal{G}_r$ (Haddou & Migot, 2015) defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_r : [0, 1] &\longrightarrow [0, 1] \\ u &\longmapsto \exp\left(-\frac{1-u}{r}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $r > 0$. The regularized function $\mathcal{G}_r$ converges to $\mathcal{G}$ when r tends to 0. The function $\mathcal{G}_r$ is continuous in $[0, 1]$, convex and differentiable in $[0, 1[$. The left derivative in 1 ($\lim_{\substack{x \rightarrow 1 \\ x < 1}} \mathcal{G}'_r(x) = \mathcal{G}'_r(1^-) = \frac{1}{r}$) ensures a sharp transition between the partially and fully saturated regimes. The regularization coefficient $r > 0$ controls the stiffness of the transition between the two states (Figure 3).

Replacing the discontinuous function $\mathcal{G}$ by its continuous counterpart $\mathcal{G}_r$ leads to the system:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\partial S}{\partial t}(x, t) + q_S(x, t) = -\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t) w(x) \\ q_S(x, t) = \mathcal{G}_r\left(\frac{S(x, t)}{S_c(x)}\right) \mathcal{R}\left(-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}(x, t) + N(t) w(x)\right) \\ Q(x, t) = -\frac{kS(x, t)}{f} \left(\cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{S}{fw} \right) (x, t) + \sin \theta \right) \\ 0 \leq S(x, t) \leq S_c(x) \end{array} \right. \quad (7)$$

Figure 3: Function $\mathcal{G}_r$ regularized from function $\mathcal{G}$ (figure 2). Function $\mathcal{G}_r$ is defined by equation (6) and represented for different values of the regularization parameter r .

2.3.2. Space and time discretization

We discretize the 1D hillslope in N_x elements and use a mixed finite element method to derive from the system (7) estimates of the soil storage S , the subsurface flux Q and the excess overland flux q_S (Douglas & Roberts, 1985). S and q_S are discretized at the cell centers and Q at their edges following the

classic mixed finite element methodology. As for regular grids, finite differences lead to the same expression as mixed finite element (Chavent & Roberts, 1991), we express spatial derivatives by their finite difference approximation. In practice, the continuity equation (third equation in system 7) is discretized at the cell centers and the integrated Darcy equation (second equation of system 7) is discretized at the edges. Q and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{S}{fw} \right)$ are defined at the cell edges by imposing their continuity between two adjacent cells. The multiplicative factor $\frac{kS}{f}$ at the cell edge is taken as the arithmetic average between the neighboring cell centres. The discretization in space of the system (7) eventually leads to a semi-discrete system of ordinary differential equations. We use the variable time step and variable order ode15s MATLAB[®] solver based on the backward differentiation formulas (BDF) of orders 1 to 5 (Shampine et al., 1999).

2.3.3. Metrics for convergence analysis

We define the metrics for the convergence analysis of the discretization scheme using a discrete L^2 norm. Let $\{t_i, i = 1, \dots, N_t\}$ a set of given times in $[0, T]$ with $t_0 = 0$ and $\{x_k, k = 1, \dots, N_{ref}\}$ a set of given points in $[0, L]$ with $x_0 = 0$. We define the discrete norm of a function $f(x, t)$ with given values $f(x_k, t_i)$ by:

$$\|f\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{ref}} |f(x_k, t_i)|^2 (t_i - t_{i-1}) (x_k - x_{k-1}) \quad (8)$$

In order to compare a function f with a reference function g , we introduce the relative error metric ϵ_f defined by:

$$\epsilon_f = \frac{\|f - g\|}{\|g\|} \quad (9)$$

with adapted computations when f and g display different spatial discretization schemes. In practice, the times t_i are provided by user-defined external time steps and the points x_k are cell centers or cell edges of a reference mesh.

3. Results

We assess the partition formulation (7) discretized with a mixed finite element scheme on several numerical experiments. We use two numerical experiments of Troch et al. (2003) without any overland flow generated for the first one, and with locally saturated hillslope for the second one. First, we use one of the numerical experiments of Troch et al. (2003) where no overland flow is generated. Then we use a numerical experiment of Troch et al. (2003) where the hillslope saturates locally. We also design experiments with transitions from purely subsurface flow dynamics to simultaneous subsurface and saturation excess overland flows. On this latter experiment, we exhibit that the choice of the discretization scheme preserves the mass balance, we determine the convergence of the spatial discretization scheme, analyze the internal time steps influence and assess the sensitivity of the partition formulation to the regular-

ization parameter r . Third we carry extensive numerical testing to assess the robustness of the regularized partition formulation on realistic experiments.

3.1. Comparison with previous numerical experiments

3.1.1. Case without overland flow

We check the partition formulation (7) on the numerical experiments of Troch et al. (2003). We choose the straight hillslope experiments with a slope of 5% as it is the less likely to fully saturate the soil column and to generate saturation excess overland flow. For this case, boundary conditions are $S(x = 0, t) = 0$ at the channel outlet and $Q(x = L, t) = 0$ at the water divide. The hillslope is 100 m long, spatially discretized with $N_x = 100$ elements. We apply a regularization parameter $r = 1 \times 10^{-3}$ and consider two infiltration cases. The first case is a recharge experiment with a constant infiltration ($N = 10 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$) on an initially dry hillslope ($S(x, t = 0) = 0$). The second case is a free drainage experiment ($N = 0 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$) on a hillslope initially partially saturated (uniformly saturated at 20% of its maximum capacity i.e. $S(x, t = 0) = 0.2 \times S_c(x)$).

Figure 4 shows a close agreement of the two methods in both recharge and drainage experiments with the marked storage accumulation near the river (left part of the graphs). The sharp saturation gradient next to the river comes from the imposed Dirichlet condition of zero storage at the river. This test demonstrates the consistency of our numerical approximation of system (7) with the method of Troch et al. (2003) which is based on the discretization of

273 system (1).

Figure 4: Relative subsurface water storage $S(x,t)/S_c(x)$ (expressed in %) along the hillslope for the (a) recharge and (b) drainage experiments. Insert shows a sketch of the hillslope of slope 5% (Troch et al., 2003).

274 3.1.2. Case with overland flow

275 We further assess the partition formulation on a steep convergent hillslope
 276 (insert of Figure 5, slope of 30%, Troch et al. (2003)). The hillslope saturates
 277 close to its outlet. It is initially partially saturated, $S(x, t = 0) = 0.2 S_c(x)$,
 278 and progressively drains to the river where the saturation remains imposed
 279 $S(x = 0, t) = 0$. Hillslope is limited on its upper side by a water divide condi-
 280 tion $Q(x = L, t) = 0$.

281 The saturation profiles and the subsurface flow to the river remain close to
 282 those of Troch et al. (2003) (Figure 5). The main benefit of the partition for-
 283 mulation (7) is to provide the saturation excess overland flow generated both
 284 spatially and temporally, which amounts to 16% of the total outflow to the river
 285 (Figure 5b). The river outflow is not bounded by the limited interface of the

subsurface to the river in this convergent configuration. It may be significantly enhanced by the generation of saturation excess overland flow when the water table intercepts the land surface (Figure 5b).

Figure 5: (a) Relative subsurface water storage $S(x,t)/S_c(x)$ (expressed in %) along the 30% sloping convergent hillslope shown in the insert (Troch et al., 2003) during the drainage of partially saturated initial conditions. (b) Outflow evolution in the river for the same drainage experiment.

3.2. Saturation excess overland flow on a convergent hillslope

To check that the saturation excess overland flow is well modeled, we consider a steep periodic hydrologic forcing $N(t)$ on a hillslope with another convergent shape (shown in insert of Figure 6, Troch et al. (2003)). Both the convergence of the hillslope and the high value of infiltration tend to generate saturation excess overland flow with dynamically generated fully saturated areas. Boundary conditions are modified at the river to fully saturated soil ($S(x = 0, t) = S_c(x)$) but remain no flow at the water divide ($Q(x = L, t) = 0$). Initially, the hillslope is dry ($S(x, t = 0) = 0$). $N(t)$ is a square wave with a period of 10 days and values alternating between 0 and 30 mm d⁻¹. We spatially discretize the hillslope

with $N_x = 100$ elements and apply a regularization parameter $r = 1 \times 10^{-3}$.

Starting from dry conditions, hillslope progressively fills with quickly rising saturation next to the river because of the convergence conditions (Figure 6a or Video 1). The saturation profile at $t = 12$ days does not show any seepage while at $t = 26$ days and at $t = 35$ days, an extended seepage front has developed in the 20 m next to the river. Even though saturation profiles are close at $t = 26$ days and $t = 35$ days, seepage is almost twice as large at $t = 26$ days because of the presence of direct precipitations onto saturated areas (Figure 6b or Video 1). At $t = 35$ days, only seepage flow occurs. Breakdown of the mass balance at the hillslope scale shows the partition of the incoming infiltration in global storage variations, saturation excess overland flow generated and outflow in the river (Figure 7 or Video 1). Despite the intermittent infiltration, the discharge in the river is steadily increasing because of the progressive filling of the hillslope after the dry initial conditions. Discharge in the river remains always larger than the saturation excess overland flow.

3.2.1. Mass balance error analysis

Interest of the mixed finite element scheme is to preserve mass balance at the scale of the discretized spatial elements. A detailed analysis of the local mass balance error with the numerical experiment described previously shows that statistics (mean and 99th percentile) carried on the spatial and temporal distributions of the mass balance errors are of the order of $10^{-13} \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and

Video 1: Video representing (a) the temporal evolution of the terms of the hillslope mass balance (infiltration, storage, river discharge, saturation excess overland flow) and the total mass balance error (b) the subsurface water storage profile measured on the left axis (blue line) and the saturation excess overland flow measured on the right axis (red line). River is on the left at $x=0$ m, hillslope divide is on the right at $x=100$ m.

Figure 6: (a) Subsurface water storage and (b) Saturation excess overland flow profile along a convergent hillslope. Sketch of the convergent hillslope is shown in the insert (Troch et al., 2003).

remain smaller than the tolerance of the ode15s solver (absolute tolerance fixed at $10^{-10} \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$). When **normalized** by the forcing terms (second line of table 1), mass balance errors are not found significative (in average equal to 1.6×10^{-7}). Thus the applied spatial discretization scheme guarantees local mass conservation. At the scale of the entire hillslope, Figure 7 illustrates this mass balance preservation globally.

Figure 7: Temporal evolution of the terms of the hillslope mass balance (first equation in system 7) in terms of storage variation, river discharge and saturation excess overland flow. The sum of the terms (the mass balance error) remains equal to 0.

	mean	std	1 st %ile	99 th %ile
Mass balance [$\text{m}^3 \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$]	3.0×10^{-13}	6.0×10^{-12}	0	3.8×10^{-13}
Normalized Mass balance [-]	1.6×10^{-7}	3.2×10^{-6}	0	2.0×10^{-7}

Table 1: First line: statistics on the mass balance error [$\text{m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$] for the 100 discretized elements of the hillslope. Second line: normalized mass balance statistics [-] adimensioned by the rainfall (30 mm d^{-1}). Absolute tolerance of the ode15s solver was set to 10^{-10} for this numerical experiment.

3.2.2. Convergence with the spatial discretization

Following the convergence metrics defined in equation (9), we compare different simulations of the same numerical experiments with N_x varying between 300 and 700 to the reference simulation composed of 1100 cells. The regularization parameter r is fixed to 1×10^{-3} . Thus we determine the convergence rate $\epsilon_{Q_{N_x}}$ as a function of N_x . We show the convergence results only for Q (figure 8) as they are similar for S and q_S . It shows a fast increase in precision compared to the reference solution. The magnitude of the slope in a log/log scale is equal to -0.95. Convergence rate is close to the theoretical rate equal to -1 demonstrated for linear and smooth problems, $\epsilon_{Q_{N_x}} = O(\frac{1}{N_x})$ (Chavent & Roberts, 1991).

Figure 8: Spatial convergence analysis of Q on the convergent hillslope. Simulations with N_x varying from 100 to 1000 are compared to the reference simulation with $N_x = 1100$. The error metric $\epsilon_{Q_{N_x}}$ is defined by equation (9).

336 3.2.3. Time steps analysis

337 Accuracy is also obtained by adapting the time step and the order of the
 338 scheme in ode15s to solve system (7). Figure 9a shows that the total number
 339 of internal timesteps n_t increases approximately linearly with N_x ($n_t \simeq 40N_x$).
 340 The adaptive method used by ode15s is efficient to provide optimal balance
 341 between accuracy and efficiency. We cannot separate the effects of the spatial
 342 discretization from the number of computed internal timesteps on the gain in
 343 accuracy as we use the integrated solver ode15s which automatically adapts
 344 its timesteps. Figure 9b highlights at which time ode15s refines its internal
 345 timesteps during the simulation. It shows the cumulated number of internal
 346 timesteps used by ode15s as a function of the time simulated for different spatial
 347 discretization (N_x between 100 and 700). The number of internal timesteps
 348 increases rapidly at the beginning of the simulation (for $t < 5$ days) and just
 349 after the infiltration events ($t \geq 10, 20$ or 30 days). These refinements are
 350 due to strong gradients appearing in the soil matrix at the beginning of the
 351 simulation when the hillslope discretized elements equilibrates with the fixed
 352 saturated channel bank and when the infiltration stops. The more the hillslope
 353 is discretized, the more pronounced is the refinement. This may be to satisfy the
 354 relative error tolerance which is more difficult to attain for finer discretizations.

Figure 9: (a) Total number of internal timesteps n_t used by ode15s as a function of the number of the elements N_x used to discretize the hillslope. (b) Evolution of the cumulative number of internal timesteps used by ode15s during a simulation for different numbers of cells N_x .

3.2.4. Convergence with the regularization parameter r

We also determine the convergence rate of ϵ_{S_r} and $\epsilon_{q_{S_r}}$ as a function of the regularization parameter r (equation (9)) for a fixed spatial discretization with $N_x = 100$. The number r varies between 0.2 and 10^{-6} and is compared to the reference solution with $r_{ref} = 2 \times 10^{-7}$ ($N_{ref} = N_x = 100$). We only consider ϵ_{S_r} and $\epsilon_{q_{S_r}}$ since the regularization parameter controls the presence or absence of saturation excess overland flux depending on soil saturation. ϵ_{S_r} and $\epsilon_{q_{S_r}}$ scale with $r^{1.4}$ and $r^{0.94}$ demonstrating the fast convergence with the regularization parameter r . The built-in ode15s solver performs well even with stiff partition functions ($r = 2 \times 10^{-7}$).

We have assessed the numerical methods proposed in section 2.1. The mixed finite element method gives an accurate estimation of fluxes and subsurface

Figure 10: Convergence of (a) q_S and (b) S with the regularization parameter r . Errors are compared to the reference solution taken at $r = 2 \times 10^{-7}$.

water storage, as shown by the comparison with the previous results of Troch et al. (2003). It ensures accurate local and global mass balance preservation. The partition formulation with discontinuous functions and the proposed regularization are relevant methods to account for seepage in efficient and simple ways. They are well suited to follow dynamic transitions between partially and fully saturated regimes. They show good convergence rates with the regularization parameter and lead to problems that can be integrated with classic ordinary differential equation solvers.

3.3. Extensive testing for robustness evaluation

To evaluate the robustness of the method, we run realistic simulations on 1109 real hillslope shapes, with varied geologic parametrizations and with five different infiltration time series. This represents 8320 simulations. Hillslope structures are extracted from a 5m LiDAR Digital Elevation Model of Brittany. Hillslope shapes can be classified in the two categories of the head basin hill-

slopes (Figure 11a) and the riverside hillslopes (i.e. the hillslopes located along river channels, Figure 11b). Head basins hillslopes have a typical divergent and then convergent shape favoring the apparition of saturated source areas near the streams. Hillslopes located along river channels are mainly divergent. Both hillslope types display some complexities in their width functions. Several geologic parametrizations are tested with different values of hydraulic conductivities, soil depths and drainable porosities. These parameters are drawn from truncated lognormal distributions for the hydraulic conductivity and the soil depth and from a truncated normal distribution for drainable porosity (Table 2). Infiltration time series are taken as simple synthetic cases or deduced from real precipitations. The two synthetic cases are a steady infiltration time series of 0.75 mm d^{-1} and a square periodic (period of 10 days) infiltration time series of 35 days varying between 0 and 1.5 mm d^{-1} . Three realistic infiltration cases are derived from three different precipitation chronicles of 15, 61 and 365 days. For the steady infiltration time series, we start the simulation from an initially dry soil profile. For the other infiltration time series, we take the steady subsurface water storage profile under the average infiltration of the time series as initial conditions.

Figure 12 illustrates the simulation methodology for a 1 km^2 hillslope of the Pleine Fougères watershed (Kolbe et al., 2016) located in North Brittany (Figure 12a) with the realistic 61 days infiltration time series (Figure 12b). Hy-

Figure 11: Two major classes of hillslopes: (a) Head basin hillslopes located at the spring of river. (b) Riverside hillslopes located along the river channel. Notice the different behaviour of their width functions.

Parameters	Distribution type	mean	std	Interval
f [%]	Normal	30	10	[5,50]
k [m h ⁻¹]	Log Normal	1	10	[0.05,15]
d [m]	Log Normal	1	10	[0.2,11]

Table 2: Parameters of the truncated distributions used for the parametrization of the geological properties f (drainable properties), k (hydraulic conductivity) and d (soil depth). Intervals indicate the truncation range.

draulic conductivities, soil depth and drainable porosity are respectively set at
 1 m/h, 2 m and 10%. The simulation exhibits a coexistence of subsurface flow
 along with saturation excess overland flow with two different dynamics (Figure
 12c). Subsurface flow dynamic displays smooth response following infiltration
 events while saturation excess overland flow, made up of both seepage flow and
 direct precipitations onto saturated areas, responds instantaneously to infiltra-
 tions with highly peaked flows. Out of the 8320 cases tested, no errors were
 reported by the MATLAB[®] ode15s solver. These extensive numerical experi-
 ments on contrasted hillslopes with sharp infiltration times series demonstrate
 the robustness of the numerical methods proposed, even in the case of steep
 rainfall time series (Figure 12).

4. Conclusion

Hillslope response to precipitations is characterized by sharp transitions be-
 tween two different regimes defined as a function of soil saturation. For partial
 soil column saturation, flows are restricted to the subsurface. For fully saturated
 soil column, flows occur both in the subsurface and on the surface as saturation
 excess overland flow. The hillslope response is highly impacted by the dynamic
 transition between these regimes. We propose a partition formulation with a
 mass balance equation where the storage variation is equal to the sum of the lo-
 cal variation of the infiltration and the subsurface flow minus the overland flow.
 We derive a regularized model which can be discretized in space and time by

Figure 12: Results of the simulation for a real hillslope from a catchment in Brittany (France) (Kolbe et al., 2016) with (a) the infiltration chronicle, (b) the hillslope shape and properties (width function and pedologic parameters) and (c) the hillslope response as subsurface and saturation excess overland flow and the sum of both (outflow in the river).

classic schemes. We choose a mixed finite element method which ensures local and global mass balance preservation along with an implicit temporal scheme to deal with sharp transitions.

The regularized discrete scheme has been validated against previously published results without saturation excess overland flow. With saturation excess overland flow, additional numerical experiments on a convergent hillslope show good convergence properties for both flow and saturation. Extensive tests on 8320 cases with different hillslope shapes and infiltration time series demonstrate the overall robustness of the method. The regularized and discretized partition formulation thus appears accurate and robust.

This model may be especially relevant for hillslopes with steep, shallow and conductive soils on top of poorly weathered bedrocks that promote the generation of saturation excess overland flow in riparian areas where surface flow routing can be neglected (Weiler et al., 2006). These conditions are typically encountered in Brittany (Merot et al., 2003; Montreuil & Merot, 2006). Integrating this model at the regional scale requires to subdivide the watershed into representative sub-units hillslopes. This can be done by automatically extracting contour-based hillslopes (Moretti & Orlandini, 2008) based on the representative elementary watersheds (Reggiani et al., 1998).

More generally this formulation provides a well-established mathematical formulation for dynamic transitions between partially and fully saturated regimes.

444 It might be extended to 2D shallow aquifers. Adapted partition conditions
 445 might also be formulated for shallow water equations on top of 2D Boussinesq
 446 subsurface flows with the additional capacity to account for infiltration pro-
 447 cesses.

448 ***Acknowledgements:***

449 We thank Tangi Migot and Mounir Haddou for insightful discussions. Work
 450 was partly funded by the project H2MNO4 under the N°ANR-12-MONU-0012-
 451 01.

452 **References**

- 453 Agosti, A., Formaggia, L., & Scotti, A. (2015). Analysis of a model for precipita-
 454 tion and dissolution coupled with a darcy flux. *Journal of Mathematical Anal-*
 455 *ysis and Applications*, 431, 752–781. doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2015.06.003.
- 456 Anderson, M. P., Woessner, W. W., & Hunt, R. J. (2015). *Applied groundwater*
 457 *modeling: simulation of flow and advective transport*. Academic press, Second
 458 edition.
- 459 Bachmair, S., & Weiler, M. (2012). Hillslope characteristics as controls
 460 of subsurface flow variability. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 16, 3699–3715.
 461 doi:10.5194/hess-16-3699-2012.
- 462 Barthel, R., & Banzhaf, S. (2016). Groundwater and surface water interaction at
 463 the regional-scale - a review with focus on regional integrated models. *Water*
 464 *Resource Management*, 30, 1–32. doi:10.1007/s11269-015-1163-z.
- 465 Batelaan, O., & De Smedt, F. (2004). Seepage, a new modflow drain package.
 466 *Ground Water*, 42, 576–588. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2004.tb02626.x.

- 467 Bauer, P., Gumbrecht, T., & Kinzelbach, W. (2006). A regional coupled surface
468 water/groundwater model of the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Water Resources*
469 *Research*, 42. doi:10.1029/2005WR004234.
- 470 Beaugendre, H., Ern, A., Esclaffer, T., Gaume, E., Ginzburg, I., & Kao, C.
471 (2006). A seepage face model for the interaction of shallow water tables with
472 the ground surface: Application of the obstacle-type method. *Journal of*
473 *Hydrology*, 329, 258–273. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2006.02.019.
- 474 Beven, K. (2006). A manifesto for the equifinality thesis. *Journal of Hydrology*,
475 320, 18 – 36. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2005.07.007.
- 476 Birkel, C., Soulsby, C., & Tetzlaff, D. (2015). Conceptual modelling to assess
477 how the interplay of hydrological connectivity, catchment storage and tracer
478 dynamics controls nonstationary water age estimates. *Hydrological Processes*,
479 29, 2956–2969. doi:10.1002/hyp.10414.
- 480 Bishop, K., Seibert, J., Nyberg, L., & Rodhe, A. (2011). Water storage in a
481 till catchment. II: Implications of transmissivity feedback for flow paths and
482 turnover times. *Hydrological Processes*, 25, 3950–3959. doi:10.1002/hyp.
483 8355.
- 484 Bonell, M. (1998). Selected challenges in runoff generation research in forests
485 from the hillslope to headwater drainage basin scale. *Journal of the Ameri-*
486 *can Water Resources Association*, 34, 765–785. doi:10.1111/j.1752-1688.
487 1998.tb01514.x.
- 488 Bouillard, N., Eymard, R., Herbin, R., & Montarnal, P. (2007). Diffusion with
489 dissolution and precipitation in a porous medium: Mathematical analysis
490 and numerical approximation of a simplified model. *ESAIM - Mathematical*
491 *Modelling and Numerical Analysis - Modélisation Mathématique et Analyse*
492 *Numérique*, 41. doi:10.1051/m2an:2007047.
- 493 Boussinesq, J. (1877). *Essai sur la théorie des eaux courantes*. Mémoires présen-
494 tées par divers savants à l'Académie des Sciences, Extrait des tomes XXIII et
495 XXIV. Imprimerie Nationale.

- 496 Bresciani, E., Davy, P., & de Dreuzy, J.-R. (2014). Is the Dupuit assumption
497 suitable for predicting the groundwater seepage area in hillslopes? *Water*
498 *Resources Research*, 50, 2394–2406. doi:10.1002/2013WR014284.
- 499 Bresciani, E., Goderniaux, P., & Batelaan, O. (2016). Hydrogeological controls
500 of water table-land surface interactions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43,
501 9653–9661. doi:10.1002/2016GL070618.
- 502 Broda, S., Larocque, M., Paniconi, C., & Haitjema, H. (2012). A low-
503 dimensional hillslope-based catchment model for layered groundwater flow.
504 *Hydrological Processes*, 26, 2814–2826. doi:10.1002/hyp.8319.
- 505 Brutsaert, W. (2005). *Hydrology: an introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- 506 Camporese, M., Paniconi, C., Putti, M., & Orlandini, S. (2010). Surface-
507 subsurface flow modeling with path-based runoff routing, boundary condition-
508 based coupling, and assimilation of multisource observation data. *Water Re-*
509 *sources Research*, 46, n/a–n/a. doi:10.1029/2008WR007536. W02512.
- 510 Chavent, G., & Roberts, J. (1991). A unified physical presentation of mixed,
511 mixed-hybrid finite elements and standard finite-difference approximations
512 for the determination of velocities in waterflow problems. *Advances in Water*
513 *Resources*, 14, 329–348. doi:10.1016/0309-1708(91)90020-0.
- 514 Darboux, F., Davy, P., Gascuel-Oudou, C., & Huang, C. (2002). Evolution of
515 soil surface roughness and flowpath connectivity in overland flow experiments.
516 *CATENA*, 46, 125–139. doi:10.1016/S0341-8162(01)00162-X.
- 517 De Luca, T., Facchinei, F., & Kanzow, C. (1996). A semismooth equation ap-
518 proach to the solution of nonlinear complementarity problems. *Mathematical*
519 *Programming*, 75, 407–439. doi:10.1007/BF02592192.
- 520 Diersch, H.-J. (2013). *FEFLOW: finite element modeling of flow, mass and*
521 *heat transport in porous and fractured media*. Springer Science & Business
522 Media. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-38739-5.
- 523 Doherty, J., & Christensen, S. (2011). Use of paired simple and complex models
524 to reduce predictive bias and quantify uncertainty. *Water Resources Research*,
525 47. doi:10.1029/2011WR010763. W12534.

- 526 Douglas, J., & Roberts, J. (1985). Global estimates for mixed methods for
527 2nd order elliptic-equations. *Mathematics of computation*, 44, 39–52. doi:10.
528 1090/S0025-5718-1985-0771029-9.
- 529 Dunne, T. (1978). Field studies of hillslope flow processes. *Hillslope hydrology*,
530 227, 227–293.
- 531 Dunne, T., & Black, R. D. (1970). Partial area contributions to storm runoff
532 in a small new england watershed. *Water Resources Research*, 6, 1296–1311.
533 doi:10.1029/WR006i005p01296.
- 534 Fan, Y., & Bras, R. L. (1998). Analytical solutions to hillslope subsurface storm
535 flow and saturation overland flow. *Water Resources Research*, 34, 921–927.
536 doi:10.1029/97WR03516.
- 537 Fatichi, S., Vivoni, E. R., Ogden, F. L., Ivanov, V. Y., Mirus, B., Gochis, D.,
538 Downer, C. W., Camporese, M., Davison, J. H., Ebel, B., Jones, N., Kim,
539 J., Mascaro, G., Niswonger, R., Restrepo, P., Rigon, R., Shen, C., Sulis, M.,
540 & Tarboton, D. (2016). An overview of current applications, challenges, and
541 future trends in distributed process-based models in hydrology. *Journal of*
542 *Hydrology*, 537, 45 – 60. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.03.026.
- 543 Fox, G. A., & Wilson, G. V. (2010). The role of subsurface flow in hillslope and
544 stream bank erosion: A review. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 74,
545 717–733. doi:10.2136/sssaj2009.0319.
- 546 Freer, J., McDonnell, J., Beven, K., Brammer, D., Burns, D., Hooper, R.,
547 & Kendal, C. (1997). Hydrological processes letters: Topographic controls
548 on subsurface storm flow at the hillslope scale for two hydrologically dis-
549 tinct small catchments. *Hydrological Processes*, 11, 1347–1352. doi:10.1002/
550 (SICI)1099-1085(199707)11:9<1347::AID-HYP592>3.0.CO;2-R.
- 551 Freer, J., McDonnell, J. J., Beven, K. J., Peters, N. E., Burns, D. A., Hooper,
552 R. P., Aulenbach, B., & Kendall, C. (2002). The role of bedrock topography
553 on subsurface storm flow. *Water Resources Research*, 38, 5–1–5–16. doi:10.
554 1029/2001WR000872. 1269.

- Freeze, R. A., & Harlan, R. (1969). Blueprint for a physically-based, digitally-simulated hydrologic response model. *Journal of Hydrology*, 9, 237–258. doi:10.1016/0022-1694(69)90020-1.
- Govindaraju, R. S., & Kavvas, M. L. (1991). Dynamics of moving boundary overland flows over infiltrating surfaces at hillslopes. *Water Resources Research*, 27, 1885–1898. doi:10.1029/91WR00689.
- Habets, F., Gascoin, S., Korkmaz, S., Thiery, D., Zribi, M., Amraoui, N., Carli, M., Ducharne, A., Leblois, E., Ledoux, E., Martin, E., Noilhan, J., Ottele, C., & Viennot, P. (2010). Multi-model comparison of a major flood in the groundwater-fed basin of the Somme River (France). *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 14, 99–117. doi:10.5194/hess-14-99-2010.
- Haddou, M., & Migot, T. (2015). A Smoothing Method for Sparse Optimization over Polyhedral Sets. In H. A. L. Thi, T. P. Dinh, & N. T. Nguyen (Eds.), *Modelling, computation and optimization in information systems and management sciences* (pp. 369–379). Springer volume 359 of *Advances in intelligent systems and computing*. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-18161-5_31 proceedings of the 3rd International conference on modelling, computation and optimization in information systems and management sciences - MCO 2015 - Part 1.
- Harbaugh, A. W. (2005). *MODFLOW-2005, the US Geological Survey modular ground-water model: the ground-water flow process*. US Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey Reston, VA, USA.
- Harman, C. J. (2015). Time-variable transit time distributions and transport: Theory and application to storage-dependent transport of chloride in a watershed. *Water Resources Research*, 51, 1–30. doi:10.1002/2014WR015707.
- Hilberts, A. G. J., van Loon, E. E., Troch, P. A., & Paniconi, C. (2004). The hillslope-storage boussinesq model for non-constant bedrock slope. *Journal of Hydrology*, 291, 160–173. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.12.043.
- Hoffmann, J., Kräutle, S., & Knabner, P. (2016). Existence and uniqueness of a global solution for reactive transport with mineral precipitation-dissolution and aquatic reactions in porous media, .

- 586 Holman, I. P., Tascone, D., & Hess, T. M. (2009). A comparison of stochastic
587 and deterministic downscaling methods for modelling potential ground-
588 water recharge under climate change in East Anglia, UK: implications for
589 groundwater resource management. *Hydrogeology Journal*, 17, 1629–1641.
590 doi:10.1007/s10040-009-0457-8.
- 591 Horton, R. E. (1933). The role of infiltration in the hydrologic cycle. *Eos, Trans-*
592 *actions American Geophysical Union*, 14. doi:10.1029/TR014i001p00446.
- 593 Kirkby, M. J. (1978). *Hillslope Hydrology*. John Wiley.
- 594 Kolbe, T., Marçais, J., Thomas, Z., Abbott, B. W., de Dreuz, J.-R., Rousseau-
595 Gueutin, P., Aquilina, L., Labasque, T., & Pinay, G. (2016). Coupling 3d
596 groundwater modeling with CFC-based age dating to classify local ground-
597 water circulation in an unconfined crystalline aquifer. *Journal of Hydrology*,
598 543, 31–46. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.05.020.
- 599 Kollet, S. J., & Maxwell, R. M. (2006). Integrated surface-groundwater
600 flow modeling: A free-surface overland flow boundary condition in a par-
601 allel groundwater flow model. *Advances in Water Resources*, 29, 945–958.
602 doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2005.08.006.
- 603 Kreibich, H., & Thielen, A. H. (2008). Assessment of damage caused by
604 high groundwater inundation. *Water Resources Research*, 44. doi:10.1029/
605 2007WR006621.
- 606 Kumar, K., Pop, I. S., & Radu, F. A. (2014). Convergence analysis for a confor-
607 mal discretization of a model for precipitation and dissolution in porous media.
608 *Numerische Mathematik*, 127, 715–749. doi:10.1007/s00211-013-0601-1.
- 609 LaBolle, E., Ahmed, A., & Fogg, G. (2003). Review of the integrated
610 groundwater and surface-water model (igsm). *Ground Water*, 41, 238–246.
611 doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2003.tb02587.x.
- 612 Lanni, C., McDonnell, J., Hopp, L., & Rigon, R. (2013). Simulated effect
613 of soil depth and bedrock topography on near-surface hydrologic response
614 and slope stability. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 38, 146–159.
615 doi:10.1002/esp.3267.

- 616 Markstrom, S. L., Niswonger, R. G., Regan, R. S., Prudic, D. E., & Barlow,
617 P. M. (2008). GSFLOW-Coupled Ground-water and Surface-water FLOW
618 model based on the integration of the Precipitation-Runoff Modeling System
619 (PRMS) and the Modular Ground-Water Flow Model (MODFLOW-2005).
620 *US Geological Survey techniques and methods*, 6, 240.
- 621 Maxwell, R., & Condon, L. (2016). Connections between groundwater flow and
622 transpiration partitioning. *Science*, 353, 377–380. doi:10.1126/science.
623 aaf7891.
- 624 McGlynn, B. L., McDonnell, J. J., & Brammer, D. D. (2002). A review of the
625 evolving perceptual model of hillslope flowpaths at the maimai catchments,
626 new zealand. *Journal of Hydrology*, 257, 1–26. doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(01)
627 00559-5.
- 628 Tromp-van Meerveld, H. J., & McDonnell, J. J. (2006). Threshold relations
629 in subsurface stormflow: 2. the fill and spill hypothesis. *Water Resources*
630 *Research*, 42, W02411. doi:10.1029/2004WR003800.
- 631 Merot, P., Squidant, H., Aurousseau, P., Hefting, M., Burt, T., Maitre,
632 V., Kruk, M., Butturini, A., Thenail, C., & Viaud, V. (2003). Testing a
633 climato-topographic index for predicting wetlands distribution along an eu-
634 ropean climate gradient. *Ecological Modelling*, 163, 51 – 71. doi:10.1016/
635 S0304-3800(02)00387-3.
- 636 Miguez-Macho, G., & Fan, Y. (2012). The role of groundwater in the Ama-
637 zon water cycle: 1. Influence on seasonal streamflow, flooding and wet-
638 lands. *Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres*, 117. doi:10.1029/
639 2012JD017539.
- 640 Montreuil, O., & Merot, P. (2006). Nitrogen removal in valley bottom wetlands.
641 *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 35, 2113 – 2122. doi:10.2134/jeq2006.
642 0091.
- 643 Moretti, G., & Orlandini, S. (2008). Automatic delineation of drainage basins
644 from contour elevation data using skeleton construction techniques. *Water*
645 *Resources Research*, 44. doi:10.1029/2007WR006309. W05403.

- 646 Musy, A., & Higy, C. (2004). *Hydrologie: Une science de la nature* volume 21.
647 PPUR presses polytechniques.
- 648 Ogden, F. L., & Watts, B. A. (2000). Saturated area formation on nonconvergent
649 hillslope topography with shallow soils: A numerical investigation. *Water*
650 *Resources Research*, *36*, 1795–1804. doi:10.1029/2000WR900091.
- 651 Panday, S., & Huyakorn, P. S. (2004). A fully coupled physically-based spatially-
652 distributed model for evaluating surface/subsurface flow. *Advances in Water*
653 *Resources*, *27*, 361–382. doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2004.02.016.
- 654 Pang, J.-S., & Gabriel, S. A. (1993). Ne/sqp: A robust algorithm for the
655 nonlinear complementarity problem. *Mathematical Programming*, *60*, 295–
656 337. doi:10.1007/BF01580617.
- 657 Paniconi, C., Troch, P. A., van Loon, E. E., & Hilberts, A. G. J. (2003).
658 Hillslope-storage boussinesq model for subsurface flow and variable source
659 areas along complex hillslopes: 2. intercomparison with a three-dimensional
660 richards equation model. *Water Resources Research*, *39*, n/a–n/a. doi:10.
661 1029/2002WR001730. 1317.
- 662 Pinay, G., Peiffer, S., Dreuz, J.-R., Krause, S., Hannah, D. M., Fleckenstein,
663 J. H., Sebilo, M., Bishop, K., & Hubert-Moy, L. (2015). Upscaling nitrogen
664 removal capacity from local hotspots to low stream orders' drainage basins.
665 *Ecosystems*, *18*, 1101–1120. doi:10.1007/s10021-015-9878-5.
- 666 Putti, M., & Paniconi, C. (2004). Time step and stability control for a coupled
667 model of surface and subsurface flow. *Developments in Water Science*, *55*,
668 1391–1402. doi:10.1016/S0167-5648(04)80152-7.
- 669 Reggiani, P., Sivapalan, M., & Hassanizadeh, S. M. (1998). A unifying frame-
670 work for watershed thermodynamics: balance equations for mass, momentum,
671 energy and entropy, and the second law of thermodynamics. *Advances in Wa-*
672 *ter Resources*, *22*, 367 – 398. doi:10.1016/S0309-1708(98)00012-8.
- 673 Rinaldo, A., Benettin, P., Harman, C. J., Hrachowitz, M., McGuire, K. J.,
674 van der Velde, Y., Bertuzzo, E., & Botter, G. (2015). Storage selec-
675 tion functions: A coherent framework for quantifying how catchments store

- and release water and solutes. *Water Resources Research*, 51, 4840–4847.
doi:10.1002/2015WR017273.
- Rodhe, A. (1987). *The origin of streamwater traced by oxygen-18*. Uppsala University, Department of Physical Geography, Division of Hydrology.
- Savenije, H. H. G. (2010). HESS Opinions "Topography driven conceptual modelling (FLEX-Topo)". *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 14, 2681–2692. doi:10.5194/hess-14-2681-2010.
- Shampine, L., Reichelt, M., & Kierzenka, J. (1999). Solving index-1 DAEs in MATLAB and simulink. *SIAM Review*, 41, 538–552. doi:10.1137/S003614459933425X.
- Smith, R. E., & Goodrich, D. C. (2006). Rainfall excess overland flow. In *Encyclopedia of Hydrological Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Sophocleous, M. (2002). Interactions between groundwater and surface water: the state of the science. *Hydrogeology Journal*, 10, 52–67. doi:10.1007/s10040-001-0170-8.
- Tetzlaff, D., Birkel, C., Dick, J., Geris, J., & Soulsby, C. (2014). Storage dynamics in hydrogeological units control hillslope connectivity, runoff generation, and the evolution of catchment transit time distributions. *Water Resources Research*, 50, 969–985. doi:10.1002/2013WR014147.
- Troch, P., Van Loon, E., & Hilberts, A. (2002). Analytical solutions to a hillslope-storage kinematic wave equation for subsurface flow. *Advances in Water Resources*, 25, 637–649. doi:10.1016/S0309-1708(02)00017-9.
- Troch, P. A., Berne, A., Bogaart, P., Harman, C., Hilberts, A. G. J., Lyon, S. W., Paniconi, C., Pauwels, V. R. N., Rupp, D. E., Selker, J. S., Teuling, A. J., Uijlenhoet, R., & Verhoest, N. E. C. (2013). The importance of hydraulic groundwater theory in catchment hydrology: The legacy of Wilfried Brutsaert and Jean-Yves Parlange. *Water Resources Research*, 49, 5099–5116. doi:10.1002/wrcr.20407.

- 704 Troch, P. A., Paniconi, C., & Emiel van Loon, E. (2003). Hillslope-storage
705 boussinesq model for subsurface flow and variable source areas along com-
706 plex hillslopes: 1. formulation and characteristic response. *Water Resources*
707 *Research*, 39, n/a–n/a. doi:10.1029/2002WR001728. 1316.
- 708 Vivoni, E. R., Entekhabi, D., Bras, R. L., & Ivanov, V. Y. (2007). Con-
709 trols on runoff generation and scale-dependence in a distributed hydrologic
710 model. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 11, 1683–1701. doi:10.5194/
711 hess-11-1683-2007.
- 712 Weiler, M., McDonnell, J. J., Tromp-van Meerveld, I., & Uchida, T. (2006).
713 Subsurface stormflow. In *Encyclopedia of Hydrological Sciences*. John Wiley
714 & Sons, Ltd.