

Spatial organisation of groundwater dynamics and streamflow response from different hydrogeological units in a montane catchment

Journal:	<i>Hydrological Processes</i>
Manuscript ID	HYP-15-0734.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Blumstock, Maria; University of Aberdeen, School of Geosciences Tetzlaff, Doerthe; University of Aberdeen, School of Geosciences Dick, Jonathan; University of Aberdeen, School of Geosciences Nuetzmann, Gunnar; Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries, Ecohydrology Soulsby, Chris; University of Aberdeen, School of Geosciences
Keywords:	groundwater, runoff processes, storage-discharge relationships, thresholds, hillslope hydrology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Spatial organisation of groundwater dynamics and streamflow response from different hydroopedological units in a montane catchment

Running head: Groundwater & stream dynamics across different hydroopedological units

Blumstock, M., Tetzlaff, D., Dick, J. J., Nuetzmann, G.¹ and Soulsby, C.

School of Geosciences, University of Aberdeen

¹Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries, D-12587 Berlin, Germany

Abstract

Groundwater dynamics play an important role in runoff generation and hydrologic connectivity between hillslopes and streams. We monitored a network of 14 shallow groundwater (GW) wells in a 3.2km² experimental catchment in the Scottish Highlands. Wells were placed in three contrasting landscape units with different hydroopedological characteristics and different topographic position relative to the stream network, encompassing a catena sequence from free draining podzols on steeper hillslopes to increasingly thick peats (histosols) in the valley bottom riparian zone. GW dynamics were characterised by statistical analyses of water table fluctuations, estimation of variabilities in lag times and hysteresis response in relation to streamflow. The three landscape units had distinct storage-discharge relationships and threshold responses with a certain GW level above which lateral flow dominates. Steeper hillslopes with freely draining podzols were characterised by GW fluctuations of around 150cm in the underlying drift. GW usually showed peak response up to several hours after stream flow. During persistent wet periods the water table remained in the soil profile for short spells and connected shallow flow paths in the near surface horizons to the lower hillslopes. In the peaty gleys in the lower foot slopes, GW was characterised by a water table generally within 20cm of the soil surface, though at some locations this could fall to 50cm in extreme dry periods. GW responses were usually a few hours prior to the stream responses. In riparian peats, the water table was also usually less than 20cm deep and responded several hours before the

1
2
3 stream. These riparian peat soils remain at, or very near saturation with near-continuous GW-
4
5 surface water connectivity. In contrast, the steeper slopes remain disconnected for prolonged
6
7 periods and need large recharge events to overcome storage thresholds. Groundwater responses
8
9 vary seasonally, and landscape controls on the spatial organisation of GW dynamics are strongest at
10
11 low flows and in small events. During wettest periods, limited storage and extensive saturation
12
13 weaken such controls. This study demonstrated that montane catchments can have highly dynamic
14
15 GW stores which are important in generating both storm flows and baseflows.
16
17

18
19
20 **Key Words:** Groundwater, runoff processes, storage-discharge relationships, thresholds, hillslope
21
22 hydrology
23
24

25 26 27 **1. Introduction**

28
29 Over the past two decades numerous studies have shown that contrary to traditional assumptions,
30
31 montane catchments can have significant dynamic groundwater (GW) stores (Neal et al., 1997;
32
33 Soulsby et al., 1998; Haria & Shand, 2004). More recent work has demonstrated the importance of
34
35 such stores in generating both storm flows and baseflows in montane headwater catchments
36
37 (Gannon et al., 2014; McMillan & Srinivasan, 2015; Rinderer et al., 2014). Thus, maintaining water
38
39 supplies and other ecosystem services – derived from downstream flows in larger rivers – depend on
40
41 such montane GW sources (Price & Egan, 2014). In addition to the provision of a range of ecosystem
42
43 services, montane GW fluxes also provide buffering against hydroclimatic variability, particularly
44
45 during droughts (Winter, 2007).
46
47

48
49
50 Montane catchments are usually characterised by thin soils and dynamic GW stores in drift or
51
52 bedrock with poor aquifer properties (Soulsby et al., 2000; Aishlin and McNamara, 2011). Shallow
53
54 GW flow paths usually dominate in smaller headwater catchments, while deeper GW sources
55
56 become more important as catchment size increases (Shaw et al., 2014). Whilst some studies have
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pointed to the importance of fractures and faults in different types of rock formations as important
4
5 conduits for mountain GW movement (Haria et al., 2013, Caulfield et al., 2014, Katsuyama et al.,
6
7 2008), in many glaciated regions, superficial drift deposits often provide larger sources of GW
8
9 (Soulsby et al., 1998; Detty & McGuire 2010). For example, studies in the Brugga catchment in the
10
11 Black Forest mountains, Germany, showed that around 70% of total runoff is generated from
12
13 shallow GW in upper drifts and 20% from deeper bedrock sources (Uhlenbrook et al., 2002; Koch et
14
15 al., 2009). Drift deposits are often highly heterogeneous, and although the permeability and porosity
16
17 is generally low, more permeable units, together with significant thicknesses can result in substantial
18
19 aquifers that can sustain baseflows as well as responding dynamically to storm events (Tetzlaff &
20
21 Soulsby, 2008; Capell et al., 2012).
22
23

24
25
26 The influence of landscape characteristics and hydrogeology on the spatial distribution and
27
28 connectivity of aquifer systems in montane catchments has been elucidated at an increasing number
29
30 of sites. Numerous studies have shown that GW in riparian zones and adjacent upslope zones have
31
32 distinctly different water table level-discharge relationships. GW levels closest to the stream have
33
34 been shown to be more in phase with discharge response while areas further away lagged behind
35
36 (Seibert, 2003). However, the connectivity between these riparian and upland areas can be
37
38 important as hillslope GW seepage often maintains high riparian water tables during low flow
39
40 periods (McGuire & McDonnell, 2010, Camporese et al., 2014). Others have identified threshold-like
41
42 behaviour in these connections with rising GW levels on hillslopes producing transmissivity feedback
43
44 by activating rapid near-surface flow paths through macropores and soil pipes which become
45
46 hydrologically connected to the stream network and result in a rapid increase in runoff (Laudon et
47
48 al., 2007; Haught & Meerveld, 2011). Thus, the influence of landscape structure, topography and
49
50 soils on spatial patterns of GW dynamics can be complex.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Such studies are challenging traditional simplistic concepts of “groundwater-dominated” or “surface
4
5 water dominated” river systems; rather showing frequent strong inter-linkages between deeper GW
6
7 and near-surface flow paths. For example, saturation excess overland flow from histosol soils in
8
9 riparian zones can be the largest source of runoff if seepage from upslope aquifers maintains water
10
11 tables close to the soil surface and near-continuous surface connectivity with the channel network
12
13 (Tetzlaff et al., 2014). In other situations, GW inputs to the stream may be by direct subsurface flow
14
15 paths if surface saturation is not present (Vidon & Hill, 2004). In many cases these spatial
16
17 connections may be time variant: McGlynn et al. (2004) showed that in smaller events runoff was
18
19 generated primarily in headwater riparian zones; while in larger events runoff was generated more
20
21 uniformly across scales as connectedness shifts the system state from a network dominated
22
23 catchment response to riparian–hillslope dominated catchment response. Others have shown
24
25 similar inter-relationships, often with soil cover or hydrogeology having a strong influence on the
26
27 relative importance of shallow and deeper flow paths and water table dynamics (Tetzlaff et al., 2014;
28
29 Gannon et al., 2014). In addition to such longer-term space-time variance, hysteretic behaviour in
30
31 catchment storage-discharge relationships at the storm event scale may result from different
32
33 response times of fast surface and slower subsurface flows. During rainfall events with dry
34
35 antecedent conditions, streamflow peaks can precede hillslope response (clockwise loops), while for
36
37 events with wet antecedent conditions, streamflow lags behind hillslope responses (counter
38
39 clockwise loops) (Ambroise, 2004).
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Despite the evident importance of mountain GW, data collection has been limited compared to
47
48 other environments. Logistical challenges associated with equipment installation and drilling
49
50 through hard rock and bouldery drift in steep, remote and often road-less terrain (Koch et al., 2009;
51
52 Gabrielli et al., 2012) result in high costs (Batlle-Aguilar et al., 2014). Even non-invasive techniques
53
54 such as geophysics are challenging in such environments (Soulsby et al., 2008). Thus, long-term data
55
56 sets are limited and many have focused on GW dynamics and key controls during wet conditions at
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the hillslope scale (Seibert, 2003; Tromp-van Meerveld & McDonnell, 2006a, b) or at the riparian-
4
5 hillslope interface (Detty & McGuire, 2010), but until recently less has been done regarding
6
7 catchment-wide variability in GW levels (Gannon et al., 2014; Rinderer et al., 2014, 2015).
8
9

10
11 In this paper, we report the results of monitoring 14 shallow GW wells in the Bruntland Burn, an
12
13 intensively studied sub-basin of the Girnock experimental catchment in the Scottish Highlands.
14
15 Previous field and modelling work has identified dominant sources of runoff at the catchment-scale
16
17 and the associated landscape controls on their dynamics and associated transit times (Soulsby et al.,
18
19 2007; Tetzlaff et al., 2007; Birkel et al., 2011a). More recent work has integrated hydrometric and
20
21 tracer based studies to examine catchment storage dynamics (Birkel et al., 2011b). Whilst these
22
23 studies have emphasised the importance of riparian wetlands as the dominant source of runoff
24
25 (Tetzlaff et al., 2014), GW discharge provides both a major source of water to these wetlands
26
27 throughout most of the year, as well as a direct flux into the channel network to sustain the lowest
28
29 flows (Birkel et al., 2011a; 2014). GW also provides a large store of water that mixes with incoming
30
31 precipitation to affect the attenuation and lag observed in stream water conservative stable isotope
32
33 tracers compared to isotopes in precipitation (Tetzlaff et al., 2014). However, despite this, little is
34
35 known about the heterogeneous nature of GW dynamics at the catchment scale for the Bruntland
36
37 Burn, the associated landscape and hydrogeological controls and how they affect stream flow
38
39 response. In this study, we sought to address this knowledge gap through the following specific
40
41 objectives: to (a) characterise the spatial organisation and temporal dynamics of shallow GW levels
42
43 under different hydrogeological units; (b) identify the dominant landscape controls on GW
44
45 dynamics and (c) assess the effects of these dynamics on runoff generation.
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 53 **2. Study site**

54
55 The Bruntland Burn catchment (BB, 3.2km², Lat.: 57.043576, Long.: -3.1219050) is located in the
56
57 Cairngorms National Park, NE Scotland (Figure 1, Table 1). A detailed description of the catchment is
58
59
60

1
2
3 provided elsewhere (Birkel et al., 2010; Birkel et al., 2011a, b). It spans an elevation range from 248
4
5 to 539m.a.s.l with the highest point located at the south western edge of the catchment. The climate
6
7 is at the temperate/boreal transition, with a maritime influence usually giving mild winters and cool
8
9 summers. Daily average air and stream temperatures are 7.4°C and 6.3°C, respectively (Hannah et
10
11 al., 2008). Annual mean precipitation is 1000mm with limited seasonality, though the wettest
12
13 months are usually November to January. Half of the rain usually falls during low intensity events of
14
15 less than 10mm d⁻¹; 75% are below 20mm d⁻¹. Usually less than 5% of the annual precipitation falls
16
17 as snow. Evapotranspiration typically accounts for around 400mm (Birkel et al., 2011a). Stream
18
19 discharge is monitored at the catchment outlet. Mean annual discharge is 1.6mm d⁻¹. High and low
20
21 annual discharges, expressed as Q₅ and Q₉₅, are 6.2 mm d⁻¹ and 0.4 mm d⁻¹, respectively (for period
22
23 June 2013-May 2014). Modelling studies suggest that GW accounts for about 25-35% of annual
24
25 stream discharge (Birkel et al., 2011a, b).
26
27
28
29
30

31 The landscape is of glacial origin. Flat wide valley bottoms feature large dynamic saturation areas in
32
33 the riparian zone with high Topographic Wetness Index (TWI, $\ln(\alpha/\tan\beta)$, where α is the upslope
34
35 contributing area per unit contour length and β is the local slope) values, spanning 2-40% of the total
36
37 catchment area dependent on wetness conditions (Figure 1b; Birkel et al., 2011b). Due to the glacial
38
39 past, most of the catchment is underlain by at least several meters of low-permeability glacial drift
40
41 deposits, generally consisting of medium textured sandy-gravelly till with abundant clasts. The drift
42
43 has a porosity of around 20% and permeabilities in the range 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻² m d⁻¹ (Blumstock et al.,
44
45 2015). Bedrock outcrops are found at higher elevation at the northern edge of the catchment.
46
47 Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT) surveys in 2013 revealed drift depths of 7 to 40m in the
48
49 valley bottom (Soulsby et al., in review).
50
51
52
53
54

55 The stream flows across two distinct geologic units (Figure 1c) with low permeability igneous rock
56
57 (granite) dominating downstream areas in the north-eastern sector of the catchment. Further
58
59
60

1
2
3 upstream, to the south-west, the bedrock is comprised of low permeability schist and other
4
5 metasediments in higher elevation areas. Due to the poor aquifer properties of the bedrock and the
6
7 overlying extensive drift cover, the drifts are expected to be the largest source of GW storage in the
8
9 BB. Previous studies by Soulsby et al. (2005) have indicated that GW recharge mainly occurs through
10
11 more freely draining peaty podzols at the steeper hillslopes. A fraction of the GW might then drain
12
13 quickly through the shallow fracture systems or glacial deposits and discharge in valley bottom
14
15 areas, either emerging as seepage on lower hillslopes or directly into the stream (Malcolm et al.,
16
17 2006).
18
19

20
21
22 The catchment is characterised by three major hydrogeological units: The quasi-permanently
23
24 saturated areas in the valley bottoms are comprised of 50-200cm deep poorly draining peat (P,
25
26 Histosols). The lower footslopes are comprised of peaty gleyed (PG) soils with 30-40cm of peat.
27
28 These soils are saturated for the majority of the year and generate substantial amounts of saturation
29
30 excess overland flow and shallow lateral flow in more permeable organic surface horizons in the
31
32 upper 20cm of the soil profile (Tetzlaff et al., 2007). Below this layer, the older peat (or mineral
33
34 horizons in the gley soils) is less permeable and vertical drainage is impeded. Drier, peaty podzols
35
36 (PP) are located on the steeper hillslopes which are primarily dominated by heather (*Calluna*
37
38 *vulgaris*). Here, vertical drainage facilitates GW recharge with the possibility of deeper sub-surface
39
40 flow at the soil-bedrock interface (Birkel et al., 2011a). However, the podzol soil profile is
41
42 characterised by a well-structured porous O horizon in the upper 20cm which is more permeable
43
44 than the underlying mineral subsoil and can generate lateral subsurface storm flow if the profile
45
46 becomes saturated (Soulsby et al., 2015). The upper hillslopes are comprised of rankers, 20 to 50cm
47
48 in depth which overly the bedrock or frost shattered regolith and have limited storage.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 As in most parts of the Scottish Highlands, extensive land management together with high levels of
56
57 grazing by red deer (*Cervus elaphus*), sheep and (historically) cattle have resulted in widespread
58
59
60

1
2
3 deforestation. Thus, areas of coniferous forest (primarily Scots Pine (*Pinus sylvestris*)) cover only 11%
4
5 of total catchment area, and are only found in plantations within fenced areas near the BB outlet, or
6
7 naturally forested parts along the steeper more inaccessible areas at higher altitude. P and PG soils
8
9 are dominated by blanket bog vegetation such as *Sphagnum spp.* mosses, bog myrtle (*Myrica gale*)
10
11 and purple moor grass (*Molinia caerulea*) (Figure 1d).
12

13 14 15 16 **3. Data and Methods**

17
18 Shallow GW wells were constructed from PVC pipes (3.2cm internal diameter) with holes pierced
19
20 every 10cm in the lower screened length. Eleven wells were installed by hand augering in June 2011
21
22 and supplemented by three additional ones in May 2013. Water levels were recorded with Odyssey
23
24 capacitance loggers (1-1.5m length, approx. 0.8cm resolution, Odyssey by Dataflow Systems Pty Ltd,
25
26 New Zealand), at various distances away from the stream (1-544m). GW loggers were stratified
27
28 according to the surrounding dominant soil type, with six loggers being installed in peaty soils (P1-6),
29
30 five in peaty gleyed soils (PG1-5) and three (PP1-3) are located in peaty podzols (Figure 1d; Table2).
31
32 GW dynamics were recorded at 15min intervals and checked manually approximately every 2
33
34 months as well as corrected for potential offset. Depth to GW table was related to soil surface (\pm
35
36 0cm), with negative values indicating a water table below soil surface and positive values indicating
37
38 standing water or surface runoff which is common in the peaty soils in the valley bottom. The glacial
39
40 drift deposits with many large boulders complicated borehole installations, especially along the
41
42 upper hillslope, hence the lower number of installations. Thus, maximum recordable water level
43
44 depth varied between -50 to -125cm, though the ERT surveys indicated that most of the drift was
45
46 saturated below these depths. Prior to installation, the loggers were calibrated following the
47
48 Odyssey manual (Dataflow Systems Pty Ltd). Site maintenance and data downloads were done on a
49
50 monthly basis. There were some periods when GW levels at a few loggers were below the maximum
51
52 recordable GW level depth. In these cases, the actual GW levels have been interpolated on the basis
53
54 of assuming a constant rate of recession prior to the recovery in levels.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 A 0.2mm Davis tipping bucket rain gauge connected to an Odyssey data logger has been located at
6
7 the BB outlet since June 2011. A second rain gauge was installed near GW loggers PG1 and PG2 in
8
9 December 2013 (Figure 1). Data from a nearby (~2km) weather station operated by Marine Science
10
11 Scotland's Freshwater Laboratory were used to correct obviously spurious or missing precipitation
12
13 data. Stream stage height was monitored from 2011 at the BB outlet at a 15min interval, also using
14
15 an Odyssey capacitance logger. Stream discharge was calculated using a regularly updated stage-
16
17 discharge rating equation.
18
19

20
21
22 We based most of our statistical analysis on data from the period 1st of June 2013 to 31st of May
23
24 2014. This comprised a full year with complete data capture from all the loggers. It also showed the
25
26 GW response to an unusually warm, dry summer in 2013 (which equated to a drought of ~10 year
27
28 return period), the subsequent re-wetting and an extremely wet winter period in January 2014
29
30 (which also had ~10 year return period). Multivariate statistical (Principal Components Analysis, PCA;
31
32 Hierarchical Cluster Analysis, HCA) and correlation analyses were performed in order to identify
33
34 factors controlling spatio-temporal GW dynamics. Two individual runs were conducted for PCA and
35
36 HCA analysis. The first run was based on topographical landscape characteristics (slope, wetness
37
38 index etc.) and the second on characteristics during precipitation events (median and range of each
39
40 GW level, GW peak to runoff peak lag times etc.). PCA was applied to identify factors that explain the
41
42 spatial variability of the water table and to find groups of variables influencing GW response on the
43
44 basis of correlation. HCA focused on identifying similar GW locations with distinct hydrological
45
46 characteristics using the Ward method "Ward.D2" and the Euclidean distance as a measure of
47
48 dissimilarity (R Development Core Team, 2009).
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Additionally, cross correlation was used to determine if the GW response at a certain point in the
56
57 catchment precedes or lags the stream response. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient of the
58
59
60

1
2
3 relation between discharge and transient GW level was optimized by varying lag times for 24
4 individual rainfall events (six for each season) to find the peak-to-peak lag time giving the best
5 correlation. This was necessary for the loggers in the peat and peaty gley soils as the water table
6 rises were often small and multi-peaked due to high sensitivity to sub-hourly variability in
7 precipitation inputs. The peak-to-peak lag time was defined as the time difference between the time
8 of peak GW table and the time of peak discharge. Thus, a positive lag time means that discharge
9 peaks earlier than the water table and vice versa for a negative lag time. The analysis was done with
10 15min data. The 24 rainfall events were identified manually from the stream flow records,
11 considering that data from at least six GW wells per rainfall event were needed to be available per
12 event. For further interpretation, only lag times based on a statistically significant correlation
13 ($p < 0.05$) between GW levels and discharge were used. Rejections of events on the basis of low
14 correlations were taken as indicative of weaker relationships between GW response and stream
15 flow.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Furthermore, a kriging method was applied to investigate the response of the monitored part of the
34 BB catchment GW system using “gstat” (R Development Core Team, 2009). Kriging is a geostatistical
35 technique which was used to interpolate water table levels at an unobserved location based on
36 nearer water table measurements and random function theory to produce an interpolated 2D GW
37 spatial distribution image. Kriging analysis was undertaken on the responses for several precipitation
38 events, including the pre-event, peak-event and post-event periods.

4. Results

4.1. Spatial and temporal variability in groundwater response

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 Most of P and PG site loggers showed very small variability in GW levels in the valley bottom (Fig. 2).
53
54
55 The mean and median water table depth was within the upper 35cm of the soil with a low standard
56
57
58
59
60 deviation (Table 2). Within the P sites, P3 was anomalous in having a deeper water table falling

1
2
3 below -50cm in the driest period. However, like the other sites, the GW logger frequently detected a
4
5 water table within 5cm of the ground surface and was responsive to all precipitation events.
6
7 Likewise, there were some differences within the PG sites, with PG1 and PG2 showing more marked
8
9 evidence of dry season drawdown, though this was restricted to the summer drought of 2013. On
10
11 the steeper slopes, the PP loggers had mean GW levels deeper than -35cm and much higher water
12
13 table fluctuations of around 100-150cm. For wet periods the water-table remained within the soil
14
15 profile (upper 40cm), but receded into the drift during the drier periods.
16
17

18
19
20 These temporal dynamics of GW responses were directly related to precipitation inputs at most sites
21
22 (see examples in Figure 3). Precipitation showed unusual variation during the monitoring period,
23
24 with the dry conditions of summer 2013 (a drought with ~10 year return period), preceding a wet
25
26 autumn and winter with January rainfall having a 10 year return period. Precipitation totals on rain-
27
28 days ranged from 0.02 to 29.0mm d⁻¹, and stream flow ranged from a minimum of 0.3mm d⁻¹ in
29
30 September 2013 to a maximum of 19.2mm d⁻¹ during the wettest period in January. A comparison to
31
32 annual high and low discharges, expressed as Q₅ (6.2 mm d⁻¹) and Q₉₅ (0.4 mm d⁻¹) (for period June
33
34 2012 to May 2013), illustrates these unusual meteorological conditions (Blumstock et al., 2015).
35
36 During the monitoring period, the maximum measured value was 4.5 times higher than the Q₅ value
37
38 and the minimum observed value being half of the Q₉₅ value. Almost all precipitation events >1mm
39
40 caused a response in the stream. The discharge response is very flashy and water table changes
41
42 were evident under all three hydrogeological units in most events. The peat sites usually showed
43
44 almost immediate, but small, water table responses to precipitation (see P1 in Figure 3b). As the
45
46 water table was always close to the soil surface, precipitation triggered shallow lateral flow in the
47
48 very permeable surface horizons of the peat acrotelm (the more permeable upper 20cm of the peat
49
50 profile) generating saturation overland flow which moved directly to the stream (Tetzlaff et al.,
51
52 2007; Geris et al., 2015). This was visually evident in the field and occurred even during the summer
53
54 when the water table was slightly deeper. A broadly similar response was evident in the PG sites, at
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 least during wet periods, when there was a rapid but small water table rise (see PG2 in Fig 3c) which
4
5 again triggered lateral flow and maintained connectivity with the stream. However, during the dry
6
7 period in summer and autumn 2013 the water table dropped into the subsoil and remained there
8
9 until re-wetting in the autumn. The wetter periods in the steeper slopes at the PP sites (see PP2 in
10
11 Fig 3d) resulted in discontinuous periods of high water tables, and during these times responses
12
13 were rapid and the water table extended into the soil profile. However, during prolonged dry
14
15 periods the water table dropped into the drift and depths below -100cm indicating limited recharge
16
17 in summer of 2013. Large precipitation events (>20mm) were then needed to allow sufficient
18
19 recharge for the water table to rise back into soil from the drift layer in the following autumn and
20
21 winter. During wetter periods when the water table extended into the more permeable near-surface
22
23 horizons (i.e. within 20cm of the soil surface), lateral downslope movement can occur connecting
24
25 the steeper hillslopes to the riparian areas downslope (Tetzlaff et al., 2014).
26
27

28
29 The differences in water table behaviour in the different soil units can be summarised in terms of the
30
31 percentage time that a particular soil horizon was saturated and below the water table (Figure 4 and
32
33 Table 3). The peats were fully saturated for 13 to 78% of the period of record (except P1, P2 and 3),
34
35 whilst the base of O-horizon (water table ≥ 20 cm) was 100% saturated at most sites. In contrast, for
36
37 the podzol site, the water table was in the upper 20cm for only 7-18% of the study period, whilst full
38
39 saturation was only observed at site PP1 (14%, Figure 4, Table 3).
40
41
42
43
44

45 The non-linear nature of the relationship between water table variation at selected sites within the
46
47 three landscape units and the stream flow response is shown in Figure 5. The water table variation
48
49 was normalised by the maximum range (Fig 5 a-f) for the two example sites in each hydrogeological
50
51 unit. For the wettest peat sites (P1), which remained saturated with the water table near the soil
52
53 surface, constant seepage occurred throughout the year. The absolute and normalised GW response
54
55 to individual events was small as high precipitation simply resulted in more lateral flow. P2 showed
56
57 more variability which reflects the slightly deeper water table and the effects of differently sized
58
59
60

1
2
3 precipitation events, especially when the data were normalised. However, low correlations (<0.2)
4
5 resulted between GW levels and discharge. For the PG sites, water table drawdown was generally
6
7 limited to the driest periods when stream flow was low. However, during the following re-wetting
8
9 event, PG2 still had a low water table in some of the initial stream flow increases. But generally, the
10
11 high water table resulted in increased lateral flow in most stream flow events, either as overland
12
13 flow (indicated by positive GW level measurements and also observed in the field) or in the
14
15 transmissive upper soil layers (Tetzlaff et al., 2014; Blumstock et al., 2015; Geris et al., 2015). At the
16
17 PP sites, more absolute variability was evident, especially at PP2. Here, there was a clearer threshold
18
19 like behaviour, with some increases in stream flow occurring when the water table was 30-50cm
20
21 deep, but these were only for smaller runoff events. In the largest events the water table rises into
22
23 the upper 20cm of the soil profile, with lateral flow occurring in the more transmissive organic soil
24
25 horizon. Consequently, at the PP sites, there was a strong relationship between discharge and GW
26
27 level with a Spearman rank correlation coefficient varying between 0.8 and 0.82.
28
29
30
31
32

33 We tested for a simple relationship between GW dynamics and topographic position in terms of the
34
35 distance from stream (Figure 6). Whilst a general significant negative relationship of increasing
36
37 median GW level and distance from stream was evident ($r = -0.66$), which differentiated the P and PG
38
39 sites from the three PP sites, there was overlap and PP3 showed a shallower depth than PP1 and
40
41 PP2. There was a strong linear correlation between both median GW levels and groundwater level
42
43 range and distance to stream: the closer to the stream the higher the mean GW levels and the lower
44
45 the variation of GW levels. Within about 80m of the stream the median GW depth was within the
46
47 upper 20cm of the soil with a standard deviation of 10cm. At distances more than 200m from the
48
49 stream the median depth was below 25cm and standard deviation greater than 30cm. The influence
50
51 of topography was much stronger in the relationship for the standard deviation in GW level and
52
53 distance to the stream, with an r of 0.83.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.2 Temporal response of groundwater relative to stream flow

The response times of GW levels, in terms of GW peak to stream flow peak lag times, were determined for 24 rainfall events during four different seasons with 6 events per season (Table 4 and Figure 7). Generally, GW tended to respond before discharge (i.e. negative lag times). Only a few sites, usually further away from the stream (notably the upslope PP wells), showed a delayed response (positive lag times) on some occasions. There was seasonality in these timings; in wetter periods in spring and winter virtually all sites showed negative lag times. In the dry summer and autumn re-wetting, some events had longer lag times, especially for sites further from the stream. Wells closer to stream had similar lag times, which remained negative meaning that GW peaks prior to discharge (typically by 1-4 hours) throughout the whole year. Table 4 also shows that a greater proportion of the events at the PP sites had non-significant correlations indicating a less clear link with the stream response, especially for smaller events.

Figures 8 and 9 show the spatially interpolated GW dynamics during two rainfall events with dry and wet antecedent conditions in July 2013 and January 2014, respectively. The first event followed an unusually dry period in June and July 2013. An initial precipitation event of 16mm on 23rd July was followed by an event of more than 40mm over 28th-30th July which caused a substantial stream storm flow response (Blumstock et al., 2015). There was initially high spatial variability in GW levels. Close to the stream, levels were generally within the upper -20cm, though they were much deeper at the upper hillslope (around -150cm). Responses close to the stream were rapid (within just few hours, 4 hours maximum), and as the event progressed, the water table rose on the steeper hillslopes. By the 29th of July, the water table depth was more uniform (-10cm) across much of the investigated area, which coincided with the maximum discharge peak. During the hydrograph recession, the GW levels began to initially fall on the upper hillslopes (where they were still around -30cm at the event peak) and later close to the stream, reaching depths of -20cm (in the valley bottom) and -50cm (on hillslopes) four days after the rainfall event stopped.

1
2
3
4
5 The January 2014 event followed a very wet period over the preceding month, and initial GW levels
6 were much higher than prior the July 2013 event. The main precipitation during the event occurred
7 on the 29th and 30th January when around 45mm of rain fell. At the start of the event GW levels were
8 within the upper 10cm of the soil profile across the catchment. GW levels rose a few centimetres
9 between the 24th and 28th of January as each day had between 2-10mm of precipitation, resulting in
10 an increase in stream flows. By the 29th of January, the day of maximum stream discharge, the water
11 table was at the ground surface in the valley bottom, and was actually above the ground surface on
12 the upper hillslopes. This apparent contradiction can be explained by extreme wetness of the
13 catchment, which resulted in a large expansion of the saturation zone and the connection of upper
14 hillslopes to the riparian area by overland flow (Birkel et al., 2011a). Because of the high antecedent
15 precipitation, there was very little storage capacity in the catchment soils with a consequent high
16 proportion of overland flow. In the flat valley bottom, saturation overland flow from the saturated
17 peat soils flowed relatively fast through well-established zero-order channels connecting the
18 peatland to the channel network. In contrast, on the steeper hillslopes, the heather vegetation
19 creates a higher degree of hydraulic roughness, slowing down water flow rates despite overland flow
20 being generated from upslope areas. The water table started falling again on 30th of January 2014
21 with the cessation of rainfall. This was most marked on the upper slopes as the soil profiles slowly
22 drained and the water table returned back below the soil surface, whilst levels remained high in the
23 valley bottom area.

4.3 Landscape controls on groundwater dynamics

24
25 To explore the integrated landscape controls on GW dynamics, in terms of range and lag times,
26 different topographic indices were used in a more formal correlation analysis (see Figure 10).
27 Strongest statistically significant correlations were between distance to stream, slope and
28 topographic wetness index (TWI) with both GWL_{Range} and $t_{R, \text{Std.Dev.}}$. The further away from the stream,
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the higher were the ranges in GW level dynamics and the more variable were the lag times. The
4
5 wetter the location (indicated by high TWI and low slope), the less variable were the lag times and
6
7 lower the variability in GW changes.
8
9

10
11 We also quantified the temporal variation in the correlation between GW levels and TWI (Figure 11)
12
13 by correlating the GW levels at each logger with its respective TWI on each day. When p was > 0.1
14
15 then data were removed from the plot. The average correlation was 0.57, however, this varied.
16
17 Highest correlations were found during driest conditions – indeed just prior to the event in July 2013
18
19 shown in Figure 8 – where water tables were high in valley bottom sites with a high TWI and low in
20
21 upslope sites with a low TWI. In contrast, the lowest correlation occurred during the wettest event in
22
23 January 2014 – shown in Figure 9 – as the extensive saturation was largely independent of
24
25 topography, but reflected the high precipitation inputs and low storage.
26
27

28
29
30
31 A hierarchical cluster analysis was also carried out for the 14 sites. This clearly differentiated the P
32
33 and PG wells (closer to stream) and the PP wells (further upslope) (Figure 12). Wells located close to
34
35 each other (e.g. P5, P6 and PG4) clustered as sub-groups. When combined in a PCA, the resulting
36
37 axes explained 83% of the variance as a combination of the characteristics of GW behaviour and
38
39 topographic characteristics (Figure 13). The water table responses of all sites were more or less
40
41 evenly distributed in PCA space. PP loggers were slightly separated based on distance to stream and
42
43 slope, P and PG wells were mixed together mainly based on TWI and a combination of t_R (median, Std. dev.)
44
45 and GW level median/mean.
46
47
48
49

50 51 **5. Discussion**

52 53 **5.1 Spatial and temporal variability of groundwater dynamics**

54
55 Groundwater dynamics play an important role in runoff generation and hydrologic connectivity
56
57 between hillslopes and streams as they exert strong controls on lateral subsurface stormflow (Weiler
58
59
60

1
2
3 et al. 2005). The connectivity between riparian and upland areas is also important during low flow
4
5 periods when hillslope GW seepage often maintains high riparian water tables (Camporese et al.,
6
7 2014). In many cases, these spatial connections are time variant (McGlynn et al., 2004). Our
8
9 investigation showed that GW dynamics in different landscape units and under different
10
11 hydrogeological units exhibited contrasting characteristics. The peat (P loggers) sites had limited
12
13 GW variability, with the water table remaining high throughout the study, and responses to
14
15 precipitation being small as lateral flows were immediately initiated inhibiting deep ponding of
16
17 water on the surface. In the peaty gleys (PGs) a broadly similar response was evident apart from
18
19 during drier periods when the water table retreated into the mineral subsoil. In the PG sites the
20
21 weathered drift in the subsoil is topped by a shallow organic soil layer with macropores which can
22
23 cause rapid horizontal drainage when the water table rises towards the soil surface. For the peaty
24
25 podzols (PPs), responses were most marked, with the rising limb always much steeper than the
26
27 falling limb of the GW hydrograph. At these sites, much higher amounts of precipitation and
28
29 recharge were needed to cause the GW to rise into the soil profile and connecting the upper
30
31 hillslopes with the lower hillslopes and valley bottom. Volumetric soil moisture values VSMC in the
32
33 upper 10cm of the peat and peaty podzol were 0.83 ± 0.02 and 0.37 ± 0.14 VSMC (average values \pm
34
35 standard deviation), respectively (Geris et al., 2015). Even though vertical drainage predominates,
36
37 significant soil moisture deficits developed (0.77 VSMC in the peat and 0.23 VSMC in the peaty
38
39 podzol). Whilst such differences equated to soil moisture deficit of ~ 20 mm in the peats, they could
40
41 reach almost -100 mm in the podzols giving different rainfall thresholds for re-wetting. Groundwater
42
43 dynamics along the three contrasting landscape units are summarised conceptually in Figure 14 for
44
45 the dry (summer) and the wet (winter) period.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The findings contribute to insights from studies elsewhere that have shown the relative importance
53
54 of soils and hydrogeology in determining GW response (Gannon et al, 2014). This shows different
55
56 relative roles for hydrologically responsive soils with dominant lateral flow paths and little recharge
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to depth. In contrast, the more freely draining soils are dominated by vertical flow paths that
4
5 recharge into GW (Capell et al., 2012). Other studies have shown that in catchments with
6
7 transmissive soils, soil characteristics such as soil depth (Penna et al., 2015) and saturated hydraulic
8
9 conductivity (Bachmair & Weiler 2012) were stronger predictors for variability in GW dynamics than
10
11 topography. The spatial distribution of soils reflects landscape position amongst other pedogenic
12
13 factors and contributes to the frequency, duration, and depth of transient water table incursions
14
15 (Bailey et al., 2014). Our results here are similar to those of Haught & Meerveld (2011) who found a
16
17 lack of a persistent water table at upper slope locations and low correlation between the water table
18
19 responses at the upper and lower hillslope due to periods of connection and disconnection. The
20
21 study by Blumstock et al. (2015) supports these findings as stream water analysis right after the last
22
23 winter rain showed a highly homogenous stream chemistry, which coincided with dominant near-
24
25 surface drainage from acidic riparian peat soils. As the drought progressed stream chemistry became
26
27 increasingly enriched and highly variable along the stream with weathering-derived solutes as
28
29 dominance of diverse deep GW sources to stream flow increased.
30
31
32
33
34

35 The temporal dynamics of GW in the different landscape units showed spatial organisation that
36
37 contrasted not only at an event scale, as indicated above, but also seasonally. Whilst in times of high
38
39 antecedent wetness, water table levels were high at all sites; in drier conditions water tables were
40
41 much more variable throughout the catchment. The lower hillslopes with peat soils were connected
42
43 longer to the stream than the upslope zone which connected only after large precipitation events.
44
45 The fact that the water table remained in the upper 150cm of the drift throughout the catchment
46
47 implies slow hillslope flow paths in the deeper drift, consistent with limited bedrock infiltration.
48
49 Certainly, recent geochemical evidence suggests that GW in the drift is the main aquifer in the
50
51 catchment that contributes to stream flow generation, particularly in the lower valley bottom
52
53
54
55 (Blumstock et al., 2015).
56
57
58
59
60

5.2 Temporal dynamics in relation to stream flow: events, seasons and inter-annual variation

The lag times between GW and stream water responses exhibited seasonal patterns, being more substantial and variable in summer and autumn, while less marked and less variable in winter. This resulted from lower summer rainfall and higher evaporation which caused soil moisture deficits limiting connectivity between the upper and lower hillslopes. Even in winter, the upper hillslopes can generally contribute only limited fluxes directly to stream runoff, except during large events (Birkel et al, 2015) which was also found at other sites (e.g. von Freyberg et al., 2014). In contrast, shallow GW in the lower hillslope zone responded rapidly to precipitation, contributing most to storm runoff which was also reflected in strong correlations between GW loggers together with the small negative lag times (Soulsby et al., 2015).

Seasonal variations in lag times in the saturated peat soils showed limited dependence on antecedent hydro-climatic conditions; with small negative lag times evidencing contributions to storm runoff with exceptions only during the driest antecedent conditions with small soil moisture deficits. In contrast, in upslope areas, the loggers further away from the stream generally also had negative lag times, though these were more variable and sometimes positive. More negative lag times between peak streamflow and peak GW level developed with increasing antecedent moisture conditions. This temporal variability in the piezometric response is consistent with that observed by Penna et al. (2014) in that soil depth and hillslope topography lead to consistent hysteretic behaviour in GW dynamics. Our results showed that the spatial variability of water tables was highest or lowest during dry and wet conditions, respectively.

5.3 Dominant landscape controls on groundwater contributions/dynamics

The landscape controls on GW dynamics in the Bruntland Burn catchment indicated by the PCA analysis reflect the inter-related effects of geologic and geomorphic history. Landscape evolution has set the large scale boundary conditions in terms of topography and distribution of drift materials,

1
2
3 which in turn have influenced the co-development of soils and vegetation communities. The steeper
4
5 slopes in the catchment have more freely draining soils which mostly facilitate GW recharge through
6
7 vertical drainage. On the catchment interfluvies, where the soils are shallow and fractured rock lies
8
9 beneath, the storage capacity is low and water rapidly moves downslope at depth into the steeper
10
11 hillslopes. These are dominated by the deeper peaty podzol soils which overlie drift deposits. This
12
13 change in soil depth acts as first-order control in delivering runoff to the riparian area as has been
14
15 shown elsewhere (e.g. Buttle et al., 2004; Hopp & McDonnell, 2009). In the riparian zone, the
16
17 extensive wetlands act as important mixing zones which integrate hillslope drainage both within the
18
19 surface and subsurface (Tetzlaff et al., 2014).
20
21
22
23

24
25 The use of topographic characteristics (e.g. elevation, slope, TWI) to predict GW levels at the
26
27 catchment scale is an area of interest in catchment hydrology due to the utility of its common
28
29 explicit integration into hydrological models (Nippgen et al., 2015). These indices can control matrix
30
31 potential and downslope flow (Anderson and Burt, 1978) as well as subsurface saturated areas
32
33 (Fujimoto et al., 2008). These relationships between topography and subsurface flow dynamics have
34
35 also been demonstrated theoretically (Harman and Sivapalan, 2009). GW dynamics in the Bruntland
36
37 Burn correlated quite well with many topographic measures (e.g. distance from stream etc.) though
38
39 the temporal correlation between TWI and GW levels was perhaps the most insightful. The
40
41 correlation was highest during drier periods when the water tables were lowest and showed the
42
43 biggest contrasts between the hillslope and riparian sites. However, the correlation decreased
44
45 during rainfall events becoming weakest in the largest events. This is consistent with the effects of
46
47 rainfall input, limited storage and surface flow redistribution overwhelming the normal topographic
48
49 controls (Smith et al., 2014). This is somewhat different to recent work by Rinderer et al. (2014) who
50
51 found in a pre-alpine catchment dominated by subsurface storm flow that correlations were
52
53 strongest when GW levels were high and changed slowly, e.g. when catchment was gradually
54
55 draining after events or during snowmelt in spring. At such times the TWI assumptions of steady
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 state conditions and connected upslope contributing areas with surface slope as a proxy of the
4
5 hydraulic gradient were fulfilled best. These assumptions were least appropriate during long dry
6
7 periods, when parts of the catchment drained differently and became disconnected.
8
9

10
11 Although it has been shown that bedrock topography may be more important than surface
12
13 topography in controlling the GW response (Freer et al., 2002; Graham et al., 2010; Tromp-van
14
15 Meerveld & McDonnell, 2006a, b), this influence seems to be less direct in valleys filled with glacial
16
17 drift deposits. This reflects the dominance of near-surface flow paths which in turn reflect
18
19 hydrogeological characteristics rather than the influence of deeper-bedrock flow paths. At larger
20
21 scales others have shown similar links between hillslope connectivity and shallow riparian GW. For
22
23 example, Rodgers et al. (2004) demonstrated the links between shallow GW flow systems at the
24
25 edge of a braided floodplain (that were recharged by hillslope drainage and effluent streams) and
26
27 deeper GW closer to the main channel (that was upwelling through the hyporheic zone
28
29 downstream). However, it is still an open question how GW, that becomes too deep to contribute to
30
31 headwater tributary flow, and shallower flow paths which dominate tributary discharge, are linked
32
33 together (Costelloe et al., 2014). There is also a question over the spatial scales of interactions. Some
34
35 GW flow paths only contribute to streamflow generation at large scales; thus, large catchments may
36
37 be more than simply the aggregation of hillslopes and small catchments. This is important for
38
39 modeling purposes whereas the breakpoint in such scaling relationships is usually unknown (Frisbee
40
41 et al., 2011).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Conclusion**

49
50 Montane catchments can have significant GW stores which can be highly dynamic in time and space
51
52 and are important in generating both storm flows and baseflows. Such GW stores play a crucial role
53
54 in maintaining water supplies, providing a range of ecosystem services and creating buffer capacity
55
56 against hydroclimatic variability, particularly during droughts. The present study focused on the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 effects of landscape and hydrogeological controls on the spatio-temporal GW dynamics in a
4
5 montane headwater catchment. 14 GW wells have been placed across three contrasting landscape
6
7 units in a 3.2km² experimental catchment in the Scottish Highlands. The observed water table
8
9 fluctuations were characterised via statistical analysis, peak to peak lag time analysis (between GW
10
11 and stream discharge response) and GW hysteresis response relative to streamflow.
12

13
14 Three hydrogeological units (peat, peaty gley and peaty podzol) could be differentiated through
15
16 different storage-discharge relationships with lateral flow response thresholds varying among soil
17
18 units. The steeper upslope area was characterized by shallow, freely draining podzols of limited
19
20 storage capacity and, thus, more variable GW dynamics. Here, vertical flow dominated and larger
21
22 recharge events are needed for the water table to overcome storage thresholds in order to rise into
23
24 the soil and to connect with the lower hillslope area. The valley bottom comprises hydrologically
25
26 more responsive soils with a large water storage capacity due to its highly organic content, and
27
28 nearly constant seepage all year around and little recharge to depth. The temporal variability in GW
29
30 response varied not only at an event scale, but also seasonally with much more noticeable and
31
32 variable water table dynamics during the dryer seasons (summer/fall). Again, strong dependencies
33
34 between temporal GW fluctuations and landscape characteristics (soil depth, hillslope topography,
35
36 TWI) were evident. Topographic controls on the spatial organisation of GW dynamics were strongest
37
38 during low flows (low initial GW levels) and small precipitation events. Limited storage capacity and
39
40 extensive saturation due to increased rainfall inputs during wetter conditions weakened the
41
42 topographic controls on the spatial organisation of GW dynamics.
43
44
45
46
47

48 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

49
50 Funding was provided by the Leibniz Association (SAW- 2012-IGB 4167) within the International
51
52 Leibniz Graduate School: Aquatic boundaries and linkages- Aqualink. We would like to thank the NRI
53
54 staff for their help during field work.
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Aishlin, P., & McNamara, J. P. (2011). Bedrock infiltration and mountain block recharge accounting
7 using chloride mass balance. *Hydrological Processes*, 25: 1934–1948. doi: 10.1002/hyp.7950
8
9 Ambroise, B. (2004). Variable “active” versus “contributing” areas or periods: a necessary
10 distinction. *Hydrological Processes*, 18, 1149–1155. doi:10.1002/hyp. 5536
11
12 Anderson, M. G., & Burt, T. P. (1978). The role of topography in controlling throughflow generation,
13 *Earth Surf. Processes Landforms*, 3, 331–334. doi:10.1002/esp.3290030402
14
15 Asano, Y., Uchida, T., & Ohte, N. (2002). Residence times and flow paths of water in steep
16 unchannelled catchments, Tanakami, Japan, *Journal of Hydrology*, 261(1–4), 173–192,
17 doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(02)00005-7
18
19 Bachmair, S., & Weiler, M. (2012). Hillslope characteristics as controls of subsurface flow variability,
20 *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 16(10), 3699– 3715, doi:10.5194/hess-16-3699-2012.
21
22 Bailey, S.W., Brousseau, P.A., McGuire, K.J., & Ross, D.S. (2014). Influence of hillslope position and
23 transient water table on soil development and carbon distribution in a steep, headwater
24 catchment. *Geoderma*, 226-227:279–289. doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2014.02.017
25
26 Batlle-Aguilar, J., Harrington, G. A., Leblanc, M., Welch, C. & Cook, P. G. (2014). Chemistry of
27 groundwater discharge inferred from longitudinal river sampling, *Water Resource Research*, 50,
28 1550–1568, doi:10.1002/ 2013WR013591
29
30 Birkel, C., Tetzlaff, D., Dunn, S.M., Soulsby, C. (2010). Towards simple dynamic process
31 conceptualization in rainfall–runoff models using multi-criteria calibration and tracers in
32 temperate, upland catchments. *Hydrological Processes*, 24: 260–275. doi: 10.1002/hyp.7478
33
34 Birkel, C., Tetzlaff, D., Dunn, S.M., Soulsby, C. (2011a). Using time domain and geographic source
35 tracers to conceptualise streamflow generation processes in lumped rainfall–runoff models.
36 *Water Resources Research*, 47: W02515. doi: 10.1029/2010WR009547
37
38 Birkel, C., Soulsby, C., & Tetzlaff, D. (2011b). Modelling catchment-scale water storage dynamics:
39 reconciling dynamic storage with tracer-inferred passive storage. *Hydrological Processes*,
40 25:3924–3936. doi: 10.1002/hyp.8201
41
42 Birkel, C., Soulsby, C., & Tetzlaff, D. (2014). Developing a consistent process-based conceptualization
43 of catchment functioning using measurements of internal state variables, *Water Resources*
44 *Research*, 50, 3481– 3501, doi:10.1002/2013WR014925
45
46 Birkel, C., Soulsby, C., & Tetzlaff, D. (2015). Conceptual modelling to assess how the interplay of
47 hydrological connectivity, catchment storage and tracer dynamics controls nonstationary water
48 age estimates. *Hydrological Processes*, 29, 2956–2969. doi: 10.1002/hyp.10414
49
50 Blumstock, M., Tetzlaff, D., Malcolm, I.A., Nuetzmann, G., Soulsby, C. (2015). Baseflow dynamics:
51 Multi-tracer surveys to assess variable groundwater contributions to montane streams under
52 low flows. *Journal of Hydrology*, 527, 1021–1033. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.05.019
53
54 Buttle, J.M., Dillon, P.J., & Eerkes, G.R. (2004). Hydrologic coupling of slopes, riparian zones and
55 streams: an example from the Canadian Shield. *Journal of Hydrology*, 287, 161–177.
56 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.09.022
57
58 Camporese, M., Penna, D., Borga, M., & C. Paniconi (2014). A field and modeling study of nonlinear
59 storage- discharge dynamics for an Alpine headwater catchment, *Water Resources Research*,
60 50, 806–822. doi:10.1002/ 2013WR013604

- 1
2
3 Capell, R., Tetzlaff, D., Hartley, A. J., & Soulsby, C. (2012). Linking metrics of hydrological function and
4 transit times to landscape controls in a heterogeneous mesoscale catchment. *Hydrological*
5 *Processes*, 26: 405–420. doi: 10.1002/hyp.8139
6
- 7 Caulfield, J., Chelliaha, M., Comte, J.C., Cassidy, R., & Flynn, R. (2014). Integrating petrography,
8 mineralogy and hydrochemistry to constrain the influence and distribution of groundwater
9 contributions to baseflow in poorly productive aquifers: Insights from Gortinlieve catchment,
10 Co. Donegal, NW Ireland. *Science of The Total Environment*, 500–501: 224–234.
11 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.08.105
12
- 13 Costelloe, J. F., Peterson, T. J., Halbert, K., Western, A. W., & McDonnell, J. J. (2015). Groundwater
14 surface mapping informs sources of catchment baseflow, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*,
15 19, 1599-1613, doi:10.5194/hess-19-1599-2015
16
- 17 Detty, J. M., & McGuire, K. J. (2010). Threshold changes in storm runoff generation at a till-mantled
18 headwater catchment, *Water Resources Research*, 46, W07525, doi:10.1029/2009WR008102
19
- 20 Freer, J., McDonnell, J.J., Beven, K.J., Peters, N.E., Burns, D.A., Hooper, R.P., & Aulenbach, B. (2002).
21 The role of bedrock topography on sub- surface storm flow. *Water Resources Research*, 38,
22 1269, doi: 10.1029/2001WR000872
23
- 24 Frisbee, M. D., F. M. Phillips, A. R. Campbell, F. Liu, & S. A. Sanchez (2011). Streamflow generation in
25 a large, alpine watershed in the southern Rocky Mountains of Colorado: Is streamflow
26 generation simply the aggregation of hillslope runoff responses? *Water Resources Research*,
27 47, W06512, doi:10.1029/2010WR009391
28
- 29 Fujimoto, M., Ohte, N., & Tani, M. (2008). Effects of hillslope topography on hydrological responses
30 in a weathered granite mountain, Japan: comparison of the runoff response between the
31 valley-head and the side slope. *Hydrological Processes*, 22: 2581–2594. doi: 10.1002/hyp.6857
32
- 33 Gabrielli, C. P., McDonnell, J. J., & Jarvis, W. T. (2012). The role of bedrock groundwater in rainfall-
34 runoff response at hillslope and catchment scales, *Journal of Hydrology*, 450, 117–133.
35 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.05.023
36
- 37 Gannon, J. P., S. W. Bailey, & K. J. McGuire (2014). Organizing groundwater regimes and response
38 thresholds by soils: A framework for understanding runoff generation in a headwater
39 catchment, *Water Resources Research*, 50, 8403–8419. doi:10.1002/ 2014WR015498
40
- 41 Geris, J., Tetzlaff, D., McDonnell, J. & Soulsby, C. (2015). The relative role of soil type and tree cover
42 on water storage and transmission in northern headwater catchments. *Hydrol. Process.*, 29:
43 1844–1860. doi: 10.1002/hyp.10289.
44
- 45 Graham, C. B., Woods, R. A., & McDonnell, J. J. (2010). Hillslope threshold response to rainfall: (1) A
46 field based forensic approach, *Journal of Hydrology*, 393(1), 65–76,
47 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.12.015
48
- 49 Hannah, D.M., I. A., Malcolm, C.S., & Youngson, A.F. (2008). A Comparison of Forest and Moorland
50 Stream Microclimate, Heat Exchanges and Thermal Dynamics. *Hydrological Processes*, 22 (7):
51 919–40. doi:10.1002/hyp.7003
52
- 53 Haria, A. H., & Shand, P. (2004). Evidence for deep sub-surface flow routing in forested upland
54 Wales: implications for contaminant transport and stream flow generation. *Hydrology and*
55 *Earth System Sciences*, 8, 334-344. doi:10.5194/hess-8-334-2004
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Haria, A. H., Shand, P., Soulsby, C., & Noorduijn, S. (2013). Spatial delineation of groundwater–
4 surface water interactions through intensive in-stream profiling. *Hydrological Processes*, 27:
5 628–634. doi: 10.1002/hyp.9551
6
7 Harman, C., & Sivapalan, M. (2009). A similarity framework to assess controls on shallow
8 subsurface flow dynamics in hillslopes, *Water Resources Research*, 45, W01417,
9 doi:10.1029/2008wr007067
10
11 Haught, D. R. W., & van Meerveld, H. J. (2011). Spatial variation in transient water table responses:
12 differences between an upper and lower hillslope zone. *Hydrological Processes*, 25: 3866–3877.
13 doi: 10.1002/hyp.8354
14
15 Heggenes, J., Bremset, G. & Brabrand, Å. (2011). Groundwater, critical habitats, and behaviour of
16 Atlantic salmon, brown trout and Arctic char in streams. – NINA Report 654, 28 pp.
17
18 Hopp, L., & McDonnell, J. J. (2009). Connectivity at the hillslope scale: Identifying interactions
19 between storm size, bedrock permeability, slope angle and soil depth, *Journal of Hydrology*,
20 376(3–4), 378–391, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.07.047.
21
22 Johnson, R. H., (2009). The Influence of Shallow and Deep Ground-Water Discharge on Stream-
23 Water Quality in a Watershed with Historical Mining, Prospect Gulch, Colorado, USA. Presented
24 at Securing the Future and 8th ICARD, June 23-26, Skelleftea, Sweden.
25
26 Katsuyama, M., Fukushima, K., & Tokuchi, N. (2008). Comparison of Rainfall-Runoff Characteristics in
27 Forested Catchments Underlain by Granitic and Sedimentary Rock with Various Forest Age.
28 *Hydrological Research Letters*, Vol. 2, pp.14-17. doi: 10.3178/HRL.2.14
29
30 Kay, A.L., Crooks, S.M., Davies, H.N., Reynard, N.S., 2014. Probabilistic impacts of climate change on
31 flood frequency using response surfaces II: Scotland. *Regional Environmental Change*. 14 (3),
32 1243–1255. doi:10.1007/s10113-013-0564-x.
33
34 Koch, K., Wenninger, J., Uhlenbrook, S., & Bonell, M. (2009). Joint interpretation of hydrological and
35 geophysical data: electrical resistivity tomography results from a process hydrological research
36 site in the Black Forest Mountains, Germany. *Hydrological Processes*, 23: 1501–1513. doi:
37 10.1002/hyp.7275
38
39 Laudon, H., Sjöblom, V., Buffam, I., Seibert, J., Morth, M. (2007). The role of catchment scale and
40 landscape characteristics for runoff generation of boreal streams. *Journal of Hydrology*, 344,
41 pp. 198–209. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.07.010
42
43 Malcolm, I. A., Soulsby, C., Youngson, A. F., Hannah, D. M., McLaren, I. S., & Thorne, A. (2004).
44 Hydrological influences on hyporheic water quality: implications for salmonid survival.
45 *Hydrological Processes*, 18, 1543–1560. doi: 10.1002/hyp.1405
46
47 Malcolm, I.A, Soulsby, C., & Youngson, A.F. (2006). High frequency logging technologies reveal state
48 dependence of hyporheic process dynamics: implications for hydroecology. *Hydrological*
49 *Processes*, 20: 615–622. doi: 10.1002/hyp.6107
50
51 McGlynn, B.L., McDonnell, J.J., Seibert, J., & Kendall, C. (2004). Scale effects on headwater
52 catchment runoff timing, flow sources, and groundwater- streamflow relations. *Water*
53 *Resources Research*, 40, W07504. doi:10.1029/ 2003WR002494
54
55 McGuire, K. J., & McDonnell, J. J. (2010). Hydrological connectivity of hillslopes and streams:
56 Characteristic time scales and nonlinearities, *Water Resources Research*, 46, W10543.
57 doi:10.1029/2010WR009341
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 McMillan, H. K., & Srinivasan, M. S. (2015). Characteristics and controls of variability in soil moisture
4 and groundwater in a headwater catchment, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19, 1767-
5 1786, doi:10.5194/hess-19-1767-2015, 2015
6
7 Neal, C., Hill, T., Hill, S., & Reynolds, B. (1997). Acid neutralizing capacity measurements in surface
8 waters and groundwaters in the upper Severn, Plynlimon: from hydrograph splitting to water
9 flow pathways. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 3: 687–696. doi:10.5194/hess-1-687-
10 1997
11
12 Nippgen, F., McGlynn, B. L., & Emanuel, R. E. (2015). The spatial and temporal evolution of
13 contributing areas, *Water Resources Research*, 51, doi:10.1002/2014WR016719
14
15 Orr, H.G., Carling, P.A., (2006). Hydro-climatic and land use changes in the River Lune catchment,
16 North West England, implications for catchment management. *River Research and*
17 *Applications*. 22 (2), 239–255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/rra.908>.
18
19 Penna, D., Mantese, N., Hopp, L., Dalla Fontana, G., & Borga, M. (2015). Spatio-temporal variability
20 of piezometric response on two steep alpine hillslopes, *Hydrological Processes*, 29, 198–211,
21 doi: 10.1002/hyp.10140
22
23 Price, M. F., & Egan, P. A. (2014) Policy Brief: Our global water towers: ensuring ecosystem services
24 from mountains under climate change. UNESCO
25
26 R Development Core Team, 2009. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R
27 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3- 900051-07-0. <[http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org)
28 [project.org](http://www.R-project.org)>.
29
30 Rinderer, M., van Meerveld, H. J., & Seibert, J. (2014). Topographic controls on shallow groundwater
31 levels in a steep, prealpine catchment: When are the TWI assumptions valid? *Water Resources*
32 *Research*, 50, 6067–6080, doi:10.1002/2013WR015009
33
34 Rodgers, P., Soulsby, C., Petry, J., Malcolm, I., Gibbins, C., & Dunn, S. (2004). Groundwater–surface-
35 water interactions in a braided river: a tracer-based assessment. *Hydrological Processes*, 18:
36 1315–32. doi: 10.1002/hyp.1404
37
38 Seibert, J., Bishop, K., Rodhe, A., & McDonnell, J. J. (2003). Groundwater dynamics along a hillslope:
39 A test of the steady state hypothesis, *Water Resources Research*, 39(1), 1014.
40 doi:10.1029/2002WR001404
41
42 Shaw, G. D., Conklin, M. H., Nimz, G. J., & Liu, F., (2014). Ground water and surface water flow to the
43 Merced River, Yosemite Valley, California: 36Cl and Cl2 evidence, *Water Resources Research*,
44 50, 1943–1959, doi:10.1002/ 2013WR014222.
45
46 Smith, R. S., Moore, R. D., Weiler, M., & Jost, G. (2014). Spatial controls on groundwater response
47 dynamics in a snowmelt-dominated montane catchment, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*,
48 18, 1835-1856, doi:10.5194/hess-18-1835-2014
49
50 Soulsby, C., Chen, M., Ferrier, R. C., Helliwell, R. C., Jenkins, A. & Harriman, R. (1998).
51 Hydrogeochemistry of shallow groundwater in an upland Scottish catchment. *Hydrological*
52 *Processes*, 12: 1111–1127. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1085(19980615)12:7<1111::AID-
53 HYP633>3.0.CO;2-2
54
55 Soulsby, C., Malcolm, R., Helliwell, R., Ferrier, R. C., & Jenkins, A. (2000). Isotope hydrology of the Allt
56 a' Mharcaidh catchment, Cairngorms, Scotland: implications for hydrological pathways and
57 residence times. *Hydrological Processes*, 14: 747–762. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-
58 1085(200003)14:4<747::AID-HYP970>3.0.CO;2-0
59
60

- 1
2
3 Soulsby, C., Malcolm, I.A., Youngson, A.F., Tetzlaff, D., Gibbins, C.N. & Hannah, D.M. (2005).
4 Groundwater - surface water interactions in upland Scottish rivers: hydrological, hydrochemical
5 and ecological implications. *Scottish Journal of Geology*, 41-1, 39-49. doi: 10.1144/sjg41010039
6
7 Soulsby, C., Tetzlaff, D., van den Bedem, N., Malcolm, I. A., Bacon, P. J., & Youngson, A. F. (2007).
8 Inferring groundwater influences on surface water in montane catchments from hydrochemical
9 surveys of springs and streamwaters, *J. Hydrol.*, 333, 199–213.
10 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2006.08.016, 2007
11
12 Soulsby, C., Neal, C., Laudon, H., Burns, D.A., Merot, P., Bonell, M., Dunn, S.M., & Tetzlaff, D. (2008)
13 Catchment data for process conceptualization: simply not enough? *Hydrological Processes* 22,
14 2057–2061.
15
16 Soulsby, C., Birkel, C., Geris, J., Dick, J., Tunaley, C., & Tetzlaff D. (2015). Stream water age
17 distributions controlled by storage dynamics and nonlinear hydrologic connectivity: Modelling
18 with high-resolution isotope data, *Water Resour. Res.*, 51, 7759–7776,
19 doi:10.1002/2015WR017888.
20
21 Soulsby, C., Bradford, J., Dick, J., McNamara, J., Geris, J., Lessels, J., Blumstock, M., & Tetzlaff, D. (in
22 review). Using geophysical surveys to test tracer-based storage estimates in headwater
23 catchments. *Hydrological Processes*.
24
25 Tetzlaff, D., Soulsby, C., Waldron, S., Malcolm, I.A., Bacon, P.J., Dunn, S.M., Lilly, A., & Youngson, A.F.,
26 (2007). Conceptualization of Runoff Processes Using a Geographical Information System and
27 Tracers in a Nested Mesoscale Catchment. *Hydrological Processes*, 21 (10): 1289–1307. doi:
28 10.1002/hyp.6309
29
30 Tetzlaff, D., & Soulsby, C. (2008). Sources of baseflow in larger catchments -Using tracers to develop a
31 holistic understanding of runoff generation. *Journal of Hydrology*, 359: 287–302. doi:
32 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.07.008.
33
34 Tetzlaff, D., Birkel, C., Dick, J., Geris, J., & Soulsby, C. (2014). Storage dynamics in hydrogeological
35 units control hillslope connectivity, runoff generation, and the evolution of catchment transit
36 time distributions, *Water Resources Research*, 50, 969–985, doi: 10.1002/2013WR014147
37
38 Tromp-van Meerveld, H.J., & McDonnell, J.J. (2006a). Threshold relations in subsurface stormflow: 1.
39 A 147-storm analysis of the Panola hillslope. *Water Resources Research*, 42: 11. doi:
40 10.1029/2004wr003778
41
42 Tromp-van Meerveld, H.J., & McDonnell, J.J. (2006b). Threshold relations in subsurface stormflow: 2.
43 The fill and spill hypothesis. *Water Resources Research*, 42: W02411. doi: 10.1029/WR003800
44
45 Uhlenbrook, S., Frey, M., Leibundgut, C., & Maloszewski, P. (2002). Hydrograph separations in a
46 mesoscale mountainous basin at event and seasonal timescales, *Water Resources Research*,
47 38(6), doi:10.1029/2001WR000938, 2002
48
49 UKCP09. 2009. "UK Climate Projections."
50
51 von Freyberg, J., Radny, D., Gall, H.E., & Schirmer, M. (2014). Implications of hydrologic connectivity
52 between hillslopes and riparian zones on streamflow composition. *Journal of Contaminant*
53 *Hydrology*, 169, pp. 62–74, doi:10.1016/j.jconhyd.2014.07.005
54
55 Weiler, M., McDonnell, J.J., Tromp-van Meerveld, H.J., & Uchida, T. (2005). Subsurface stormflow.
56 *Encyclopedia of Hydrological Sciences*, vol. 3, Anderson M(ed). John Wiley&Sons,Ltd.:Hoboken,
57 NJ, USA; 1719–1732.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Winter, Thomas C., (2007). The Role of Ground Water in Generating Streamflow in Headwater Areas
4 and in Maintaining Base Flow. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association (JAWRA)*,
5 43(1):15-25. DOI: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00003.x
6
7 Vidon, P.G.F., & Hill. A.R. (2004). Landscape controls on the hydrology of stream riparian zones.
8 *Journal of Hydrology*. 292, pp. 210–228. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.01.005
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review




Figure 1: Bruntland Burn catchment (a) topography, showing location of the weather station, flow recorder and groundwater logger locations located in P= Peat, PP= Peaty Podzol and PG= Peaty Gley soil; (b) LIDAR based topographic Wetness Index (TWI); (c) bedrock geology and superficial geology classification and (d) distribution of main soil classes.
635x476mm (72 x 72 DPI)

view

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2: Ranges in groundwater levels between 1st of June 2013 and 31st of May 2014. The boxes determine the 25th and 75th percentile, the whiskers indicate the 10th and 90th percentile and the horizontal line within the box indicates the median.
300x164mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Peer Review




Figure 3: (a) Precipitation and discharge; and groundwater level dynamics for a site in (b) Peat, (c) Peaty Gley and (d) Peaty Podzol between 1st of June 2013 and 31st of May 2014.
214x169mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 4: Empirical cumulative density functions for three groundwater level dynamics for a site in (a) Peat, (b) Peaty Gley and (c) Peaty Podzol between 1st of June 2013 and 31st of May 2014 with soil horizons shown to the right. Dashed line represents the soil-drift interface.
458x165mm (72 x 72 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 5: Normalized groundwater table responses in (a)-(b) Peat, (c)-(d) Peaty Gley and (e)-(f) Peaty Podzol versus discharge between 1st of June 2013 and 31st of May 2014.
183x205mm (72 x 72 DPI)




Figure 6: (a) Median and (b) standard deviation of groundwater table depth versus distance to stream. 328x167mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 7: Peak-to-peak lag time analysis between groundwater table peak and discharge peak for all loggers with changing distance to stream occurring in (a) Spring, (b) Summer, (c) Fall and (d) Winter. Negative lag times indicate a GW level response to precipitation prior discharge.
379x234mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Review




Figure 8: GW level dynamics during a rainfall event after dry antecedent conditions: Rainfall event starts at the 23rd of July '13 and peaks at the 28th of July '13 while discharge peaks at the 29th of July '13. a) shows the area used for interpolation, b) is precipitation and discharge for the considered time period and c) are the spatially distributed GW level dynamics.
564x599mm (72 x 72 DPI)




Figure 9: GW level dynamics during a rainfall event after wet antecedent conditions. Rainfall event starts at the 24th of Jan. '13 and peaks at the 28th of Jan. '14 while discharge peaks at the 29th of Jan. '14. a) shows the area used for interpolation, b) is precipitation and discharge for the considered time period and c) are the spatially distributed GW level dynamics.
564x599mm (72 x 72 DPI)




Figure 10: Groundwater dynamic variables (GWL range and lag time) against landscape characteristics. Correlations were not statistically significant between distance to stream with both GWLRange and tR, Std.Dev. and between elevation and GWLRange.
440x176mm (72 x 72 DPI)




Figure 11: Precipitation, discharge and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient between groundwater level (GWL) at 14 locations and the topographic Wetness Index (WI). Correlation coefficients are significant with $p < 0.1$.

261x123mm (72 x 72 DPI)




Figure 12: Dendrogram of the hierarchical cluster analysis based on wetness index, distance to stream and to outlet, elevation, slope, GW level median, GW level standard deviation, range of the GW level, median and standard deviation of the lag times of each logger.
186x87mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Peer Review




Figure 13: PCA of catchment and groundwater dynamic characteristics at 14 groundwater logger locations as biplot. The first two principal components explain 83% of the total variance.
192x192mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 14: Conceptual scheme showing groundwater flowpaths along a hillslope transect in the Bruntland Burn during wet (a) and dry (b) conditions. Red arrows indicate groundwater flowpaths into the stream. 151x63mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Table 1: Catchment characteristics for the Bruntland Burn catchment (*land that has been drained and possibly fertilized for agricultural purposes)

Area [km ²]		3.2
Soil type [%]	Brown Ranker	30.7
	Peaty Podzol	35.6
	Peat	9.6
	Peaty Gley	11.9
	Peaty Ranker	12.2
Geology type [%]	Granite	45.3
	Psammite & semipelite	46.9
	Biotite Granite	0.6
	Quartzite and psammite	4.0
	Calcsilicate-rock & psammite	2.6
	Metalimestone	0.02
	Porphyritic Microgranite	0.6
Vegetation type [%]	Moorland	59.7
	Rock/Scree	22.7
	Blanket Bog	5.9
	Woodland	11.1
	Improved Land*	0.5
	Grassland	0.2

Table 2: Landscape and shallow groundwater characteristics for each logger in the Bruntland Burn catchment

Logger Name	Elevation [m.a.s.l.]	Distance to Stream [m]	Distance to Outlet [m]	Slope [°]	$t_{R, \text{Median}} [\text{h}]^1$	$t_{R, \text{Std.Dev}} [\text{h}]^1$	GW level _{Mean} [cm] ²	GW level _{Median} [cm] ²	GW level _{Std.Dev.} [cm] ²	GW level _{Range} [cm] ²	TWI [-] ³	Soil type	Geology
P1	258	21	686	0.0	-4.25	1.0	-5.5	-5.3	2.1	8.8	16.2	Peat	Granite
P2	263	9	1015	2.0	-4.0	0.5	-16.6	-16.4	2.5	15.3	8.3	Peat	Granite
P3	271	92	1389	5.3	-1.0	2.6	-30.5	-32.9	10.1	64.2	10.0	Peat	Granite
P4	273	30	1788	1.3	-1.1	1.0	-8.5	-8.8	6.8	42.1	15.3	Peat	Granite
P5	269	1	1360	1.6	-1.5	0.9	2.0	1.3	4.8	34.9	14.6	Peat	Granite
P6	274	3	1753	4.7	-3.5	1.2	0.5	2.3	4.5	30.0	11.1	Peat	Granite
PG1	259	121	775	0.9	-1.5	1.9	-20.8	-15.1	14.9	65.2	11.0	Peaty Gley	Granite
PG2	259	125	779	0.9	-1.3	1.7	-31.7	-26.0	13.7	66.1	10.3	Peaty Gley	Granite
PG3	261	41	1064	2.7	-1.8	1.5	2.9	2.4	1.9	12.9	11.1	Peaty Gley	Granite
PG4	267	14	1230	2.9	-1.8	1.3	-4.0	-3.3	5.2	28.4	10.9	Peaty Gley	Granite
PG5	319	48	2060	10.8	-3.0	1.9	3.5	8.1	9.4	54.9	9.8	Peaty Gley	Metasediments
PP1	283	352	1006	10.7	0.3	2.5	-54.8	-46.8	38.6	153.4	5.0	Peaty Podzol	Granite
PP2	275	230	1199	7.8	-0.6	2.4	-51.9	-48.4	28.3	142.9	7.4	Peaty Podzol	Granite
PP3	344	544	1793	12.6	0.0	2.7	-33.4	-23.3	20.4	96.5	7.7	Peaty Podzol	Metasediments

¹ t_R lag time² 1st of June 2013-31st of May 2014 data³ Topographic Wetness Index

Table 3: Fraction of time GW level at specific soil depths between 1.6.2013-31.5.2014 [%]*

Fraction of time water table is in upper	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	PG1	PG2	PG4	PG5	PP1	PP2	PP3
0cm	0	0	0	13	62	78	0	0	26	74	14	0	0
20cm	100	94	19	95	100	99	71	8	100	97	18	7	0
40cm	100	100	86	100	100	100	88	76	100	99	30	34	80
60cm	100	100	100	100	100	100	96	94	100	100	66	75	89

*PG3 excluded as not enough data were available

For Peer Review

Table 4: Number of precipitation events used for lag time analysis at the different groundwater loggers

GWL	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	PG1	PG2	PG3	PG4	PG5	PP1	PP2	PP3
No. of P events where GW data were available ^{*1}	24	23	16	20	24	24	15	24	12	19	16	24	24	16
No. of P events where correlation between Q and GW data was ≥ 0.5 ^{*2}	19	22	11	20	21	23	14	23	11	17	16	14	17	8

^{*1} 24 precipitation events analysed in total

^{*2} Lag times having statistical significant correlation ≥ 0.5 are plotted in Figure 7

For Peer Review

Table 5: Main properties of the selected rainfall-runoff events

	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter
Number of events	6	6	6	6
Minimum P (mm)	8.33	3.7	4.74	5.5
Maximum P (mm)	74.1	27.0	74.1	27.1
Mean P (mm)	40.1	11.9	32.6	16.3
Maximum streamflow peak (mm)	0.55	0.12	0.32	0.34
% of active wells (upper20cm)	92	72	70	82

For Peer Review