

Monitoring hillslope moisture dynamics with surface ERT for enhancing spatial significance of hydrometric point measurements

R. Hübner¹, K. Heller¹, T. Günther², and A. Kleber¹

¹Institute of Geography, Dresden University of Technology, Helmholtzstr. 10,
01069 Dresden, Germany

²Leibniz Institute for Applied Geophysics (LIAG), Stilleweg 2, 30655 Hannover, Germany

Correspondence to: R. Hübner (rico.huebner@tu-dresden.de)

Abstract. Besides floodplains, hillslopes are basic units that mainly control water movement and flow pathways within catchments of subdued mountain range. The structure of their shallow sub-surface affects water balance, e.g. infiltration, retention, and runoff. Nevertheless, there is still a gap of knowledge of the hydrological dynamics on hillslopes, notably due to the lack of generalization and transferability. This study presents a robust multi-method framework of Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT) in addition to hydrometric point measurements, transferring hydrometric data into higher spatial scales to obtain additional patterns of distribution and dynamics of soil moisture on a hillslope. A geoelectrical monitoring in a small catchment in the eastern Ore Mountains has been carried out in weekly intervals from May to December 2008 to image seasonal moisture dynamics on the hillslope scale. For linking water content and electrical resistivity, the parameters of Archie's law were determined using different core samples. To optimize inversion parameters and methods, the derived spatial and temporal water content distribution was compared to tensiometer data. The results from ERT measurements show a strong correlation to the hydrometric data. The response is congruent to the soil tension data. Water content calculated from the ERT profile shows similar variations as water content from soil moisture sensors. Consequently, soil moisture dynamics on the hillslope scale may be determined not only by expensive invasive punctual hydrometric measurements, but also by minimally invasive time-lapse ERT, provided pedo-/petrophysical relationships are known. Since ERT integrates larger spatial scales, a combination with hydrometric point measurements improves the understanding of the ongoing hydrological processes and suits better to identify heterogeneities.

1 Introduction

The knowledge of system-internal water flow pathways and the response to precipitation on different spatial and temporal scales is essential for the prediction of hydrological and hydrochemical dynamics within catchments (Uhlenbrook et al., 2008; Wenninger et al., 2004). Understanding the involved processes is of particular importance for improving precipitation-runoff and pollutant-transport models (Di Baldassarre and Uhlenbrook, 2012).

Hillslopes are important links between the atmosphere and the water input into catchments. They mainly control different runoff components and residence times (Uhlenbrook et al., 2008). Several studies have addressed hillslope hydrology (Anderson and Burt, 1990; Kirkby, 1980; Kleber and Schellenberger, 1998; McDonnell et al., 2001; Tromp-van Meerveld, 2004; Uchida et al., 2006). A major problem is that the spatial and temporal variability of the hydrological response due to different natural settings – e.g. geomorphological, pedological, lithological characteristics and the spatial heterogeneity – make it difficult to generalize and to transfer results to ungauged basins (McDonnell et al., 2007).

In catchments of Central European subdued mountain range, the shallow subsurface of hillslopes is mostly covered by Pleistocene periglacial slope deposits (Kleber and Terhorst, 2013). These slope deposits have developed in different layers. In literature normally three layers are classified (Upper Layer – LH, Intermediate Layer – LM, Basal Layer – LB: classification according to AD-hoc AG-Boden, 2005; Kleber and Terhorst, 2013). Sometimes locally a 4th layer (“Oberlage” AD-hoc AG-Boden, 2005) could be found. The occurrence of these layers can vary spatially and has different regional and local characteristics. Due to the sedimentological and substrate-specific properties, e.g. grain-size distribution, clast content, and texture, they remarkably influence near-surface water balance (e.g. infiltration, percolation) and are of particular importance for near-surface runoff, e.g. interflow (Chiffard et al., 2008; Kleber, 2004; Kleber and Schellenberger, 1998; Sauer et al., 2001; Scholten, 1999; Völkel et al., 2002a, b; Heller, 2012; Moldenhauer et al., 2013).

Most of the prior studies were based on invasive and extensive hydrometric point measurements or on tracer investigations. Punctual hydrometric measurements may modify flow pathways and are not sufficient in case of significant spatial heterogeneities in the subsurface. Tracer experiments, e.g. using isotopes, integrate much larger scales up to entire catchments but provide less direct insights into ongoing processes. Internal hydrological processes may be complex and due to the spatio-temporal interlinking of near-surface processes and groundwater dynamics, there is still a lack of knowledge regarding runoff generation in watersheds (McDonnell, 2003; Tilch et al., 2006; Uhlenbrook, 2005). For an efficient and accurate modeling of the hydrological behavior at the crucial hillslope scale, additional methods are needed especially to improve the understanding of these complex processes in order to enhance the model hypotheses. Hydrogeophysical methods are capable of closing the gap between large-scale depth-limited remote-sensing methods and invasive punctual hydrometric arrays (Robinson et al., 2008a, b; Lesmes and Friedman, 2006; Uhlenbrook et al., 2008).

Many studies show the potential of Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT) for hydrological investigation by means of synthetic case studies for aquifer transport characterization (Kemna et al., 2004; Vanderborght et al., 2005), imaging water flow on soil cores (Bechtold et al., 2012; Binley et al., 1996a, b; Garré et al., 2011, 2010; Koestel et al., 2009a, b, 2008), cross-borehole imaging of tracers (Daily et al., 1992; Oldenborger et al., 2007; Ramirez et al., 1993; Singha and Gorelick, 2005; Slater et al., 2000), or imaging of tracer-injection or irrigation with surface ERT (Cassiani et al., 2006; De Morais et al., 2008; Descloitres et al., 2008a; Michot et al., 2003; Perri et al., 2012). However, some research has been conducted under natural conditions to characterize water content change, infiltration or discharge by use of cross-borehole ERT (French and Binley, 2004), surface ERT (Brunet et al., 2010; Benderitter and Schott, 1999; Descloitres et al., 2008b; Massuel et al., 2006; Miller et al., 2008) or a combined surface cross-borehole ERT array (Beff et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2001).

Besides hydrogeophysical methods such as electromagnetics (EM) (Popp et al., 2013; Robinson et al., 2012; Tromp-van Meerveld and McDonnell, 2009), time-lapse ERT have been frequently applied to hillslope investigation in the runoff and interflow (Uhlenbrook et al., 2008; Cassiani et al., 2009) or preferential flow context (Leslie and Heinse, 2013). However, the use of ERT for monitoring hydrological dynamics on hillslopes with layered structure is still rare.

The objective of this paper is to show the potential of minimally invasive surface time-lapse ERT as a robust methodological framework for monitoring long-term changes in soil moisture and to improve the spatial resolution of punctual hydrometric measurements (e.g. tensiometer and soil moisture sensors) on a hillslope with periglacial cover beds. Furthermore, we want to show the ability of ERT for mapping spatially heterogeneous structures and water content distributions of the shallow subsurface. With a multi-method approach, we attempt to demonstrate the possibility to adequately transfer hydrometric data to higher spatial scales and to obtain additional patterns of soil water dynamics on a hillslope. These scales are fundamental for achieving a better understanding of the influence of the layered subsurface on water fluxes (e.g. infiltration, percolation or interflow) and the response to different amounts of precipitation on hillslopes.

2 Material and methods

2.1 Study site

The study area covers 6 ha of a forested spring catchment in the Eastern Ore Mountains, eastern Germany, which is located in the Freiburger Mulde catchment (Fig. 1).

Annual precipitation averages 930 mm, mean annual temperature is 6.6 °C. The altitude ranges from 521 to 575 m asl with a predominant land cover of spruce forest (*Picea abies* approx. 30 yr.). The slope angle of the catchment ranges from 0.05 to 22.5° with an average of 7°. Bedrock is gneiss overlain by periglacial cover beds with up to three layers (LH, LM, LB, with no occurrence of the




Figure 1. Study site with locations of ERT profiles and hydrometric stations (left panel) (data source: ATKIS[®]-DGM2, Landesvermessungsamt Sachsen (2008)) and profile section with installation depths of tensiometers, soil moisture sensors and suction cups (right panel).

“Oberlage” c.f. Heller, 2012). The upper layer (LH) with a thickness of 0.3 to 0.65 m consists of silty-loamy material with a bulk density of 1.2 g m^{-3} and many roots (cf. Table 1). In the central part of the catchment, a silty-loamy intermediate layer (LM) follows with higher bulk density and a thickness of up to 0.55 m. The ubiquitous sandy-loamy basal layer (LB) is characterized by even higher bulk density and longitudinal axes of coarse clasts oriented parallel to the slope. Down slope it may reach a thickness of at least 3 m (cf. Fig. 1).

Table 1. Properties of cover beds from the study site ($n \geq 15$ per layer). – adapted from Moldenhauer et al. (2013).

Layer	Soil horizon	Color (moist)	Soil texture			Clasts (%)	bulk density (g m^{-3})	porosity	Hydraulic conductivity (cm d^{-1})*
			Clay (%)	Silt (%)	Sand (%)				
LH	A/Bw	10YR/5/8	14	52	34	36	1.2	0.55	27
LM	2Bg	10YR/5/4	12	53	35	43	1.5	0.43	9
LB	3CBg	10YR/5/3	7	22	71	56	1.7	0.36	52

* Field-saturated hydraulic conductivity measured using the Compact Constant Head Permeameter (CCHP) method (Amoozegar, 1989).

2.2 Laboratory work

100 Quality, amount, and distribution of pore water exert a huge influence on resistivity ¹ and form the link between electrical and hydrological properties. The empirical relationship of Archie's law (Archie, 1942) describes the connection between electrical resistivity and saturation in porous media. Instead of saturation we use the volumetric water content θ with:

$$\rho_{\text{eff}} = F_{\theta} \rho_w \theta^{-n_{\theta}} \quad (1)$$

105 where ρ_{eff} is the bulk resistivity of the soil probe and ρ_w is the resistivity of the pore fluid. The formation factor F_{θ} describes the increase of resistivity due to an insulating solid matrix and constitutes an intrinsic measure of material micro-geometry (Schön, 2004; Lesmes and Friedman, 2006). The exponent n_{θ} is an empirical constant, which depends on the distribution of water within the pore space (Schön, 2004).

110 This model disregards the surface conductivity, which may occur due to interactions between pore water and soil matrix, especially with a high percentage of small grain sizes. In our study the curve fitting could be carried out very well without accounting for surface conductivity.

To investigate the pedo-/petrophysical relationship between resistivity and water content, 15 undisturbed soil core specimens (diameter = 36 mm, length = 40 mm) taken at different depths (0.3
115 to 1.4 m) were analyzed. After dehydration in a drying chamber, the samples were saturated. The saturation was done successively by stepwise injection in the middle of the soil core to achieve a better moisture distribution within the sample. Using a 4-point array, electrical resistivity was measured for different saturation conditions during the saturation process. A calibrating solution with known resistivity was used to determine the geometric factor. Particle sizes were determined by sieving
120 and the pipette method, using $\text{Na}_4\text{P}_2\text{O}_7$ as a dispersant (Klute, 1986, p. 393, 399–404, but with the sand-silt boundary at 0.063 mm).

Brunet et al. (2010) described remarkable conductivity increases of low mineralized water due to contact with the soil matrix. This may cause variation of resistivity with time. To minimize this effect we used spring water with high conductivity (approx. $\sigma_{w25} = 150 \mu\text{S cm}^{-1} / \rho_{w25} = 66 \Omega \text{ m}$
125 for $T = 25 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$). This corresponds to the mean conductivity of soil water in the study area, which is influenced by long-term contact with the subsoil.

Aside from the invariant parameters F_{θ} and n_{θ} , the resistivity of the pore water must be known to calculate the water content from resistivity values. Because it was not possible to extract pore water under dry conditions in summer, only a few measurements of pore water conductivity could
130 be carried out in late spring and early autumn. To calculate water content from resistivity obtained by field surveys, the median value over the entire time period of ρ_w for each depth was used (cf. Table 2). Interim values between the extraction depths were linearly interpolated.

¹in this context the term "resistivity" always refers to "electrical resistivity"

Table 2. Median pore water conductivity $\tilde{\sigma}_w$, resistivity $\tilde{\rho}_w$ and mean resistivity $\bar{\rho}_w$ with standard deviation (SD_w) per depth ($n \geq 11$ per sampling depth).

Depth [m]	0.3	0.6	0.85	1.05	1.65	2.3
$\tilde{\sigma}_w$ [$\mu\text{S cm}^{-1}$]	72.4	107.8	111.6	114.7	135	156.7
$\tilde{\rho}_w$ [$\Omega \text{ m}$]	138.1	92.8	89.6	87.2	74.1	63.8
$\bar{\rho}_w$ [$\Omega \text{ m}$]	135.7	92.3	88.9	86.8	75.1	63.7
SD_w [$\Omega \text{ m}$]	16.9	5.0	4.5	4.8	5.4	7.3

After reforming Eq. (1) it is possible, with known parameters F_θ and n_θ and measured variables ρ_{eff} and ρ_w , to calculate volumetric water content:

$$135 \quad \frac{\rho_{\text{eff}}}{F_\theta \rho_w} = \frac{1}{n_\theta} = \theta. \quad (2)$$

As water saturation (S) is defined as the ratio between water content and porosity (Φ), it is also possible to calculate the degree of saturation using:

$$\frac{\rho_{\text{eff}}}{F_\theta \rho_w} = \frac{1}{\Phi} = S. \quad (3)$$

The porosity (Φ) was calculated with:

$$140 \quad \Phi = 1 - \frac{\rho_{\text{bulk}}}{\rho_{\text{particle}}}. \quad (4)$$

The bulk density (ρ_{bulk}) was determined using undisturbed core sample. The particle density (ρ_{particle}) was measured with a capillary-stoppered pycnometer. The maximum sample depth for undisturbed soil cores was < 2 m. Below, the porosity had to be transferred according to grain size distribution, clasts and compaction from percussion drilling.

145 2.3 Field work

2.3.1 ERT Mapping

In addition to conventional percussion drilling, at the end of October 2008 we measured 7 ERT profiles to survey the subsurface resistivity distribution (A–G in Fig. 1). A and C are parallel to the slope inclination of approx. 9° , connecting inflection points of contour lines. B, D, E, F, and G are perpendicular to these profiles ($\angle A102.5^\circ$, $\angle C90^\circ$). This arrangement allows identifying potential 3-D-effects, which may cause inaccurate interpretation of the subsurface resistivity distribution. To improve the mapping results aided by hydrometric data, the profiles were located close to the tensiometer stations (distance < 2 m). For all resistivity measurements, the instrument “4 Point light hp” from “LGM - Lippmann Geophysical Equipment” with 50 electrodes was used. Because of the expected interferences (e.g. by roots or clasts) and the multiple layered stratification of periglacial cover beds, a Wenner array was found to be the most suitable configuration for the study area. This is

characterized by low geometric factors (K), a high vertical resolution for laterally bedded subsurface structures, and a good signal-to-noise ratio (Dahlin and Zhou, 2004). To improve the spatial resolution, a Wenner- β array was measured additionally. With an electrode spacing of 1 m, this results in
160 a combined dataset with 784 data points for each pseudo-section with a maximum depth of investigation of 9.36 m (Wenner- β : depth of investigation for radial dipole in homogeneous ground $0.195L$ with L = maximum electrode separation in m, according to Roy and Apparao, 1971; Apparao, 1991; Barker, 1989).

Horizontal resolution of a multi-electrode array is for shallow parts of the subsurface in the order
165 of electrode distances. However, vertical resolution is far better as the depth-of-investigation curves indicate (Roy and Apparao, 1971; Barker, 1989). This is further improved by measuring two electrode arrays (Wenner and Wenner- β) with different sensitivity curves so that we can expect a vertical resolution in the order of about 0.2 m in case of excellent data quality.

2.3.2 Joint Hydrometric and ERT Monitoring

170 Since November 2007 soil water tension has been measured using 76 recording tensiometers (UMS – T8) arranged in 14 survey points along the slope at 5 to 7 different depths (cf. Fig. 1). Additionally, at the survey point H3a five soil moisture sensors (ThetaProbes, Delta T devices – ML2x) were installed to measure volumetric water content. A V-notch weir with a pressure meter was used to quantify spring discharge. Rainfall was recorded by 4 precipitation gauges with tipping bucket (Fa. R.M. Young Co., 200 cm² - resolution: 0.1 mm with max. 7 mm min⁻¹). For determination of pore water
175 conductivity and resistivity, soil water was extracted with suction cups (VS-pro Vacuum System Co. UMS) at four depths at three locations (S1, S2, S3; Fig. 1) and cumulated as a weekly mixed sample.

Time lapse ERT measurements were performed with the same equipment, electrode array and spacing used for the mapping. The two time lapse profiles are congruent with profile A and B (cf.
180 Fig. 1). From May to December 2008, twenty seven time lapse measurements were carried out within almost weekly intervals. Contact resistance was checked before each measurement and was the range of 0.2 k Ω to max. 1 k Ω over the whole measuring period. This range is very favorable and does not influence the measurements as numerical studies show (Rücker and Günther, 2011).

To compare time lapse measurements and to apply sophisticated inversion routines, the location
185 of electrodes needs to remain constant. For current injection we used stainless steel electrodes (diameter = 6 mm, length = 150 mm), completely plunged into the ground, thus avoiding shifting of electrodes, except for natural soil creep. In the numerical computations, electrodes are considered points, which is not the case for the present ratio of length to distance. However, numerical computations with real electrode lengths show that the deviations are negligible, particularly if the points
190 are placed at about the half electrode length (Rücker and Günther, 2011).

Subsoil temperature, especially in the upper layers, is characterized by distinct annual and daily variations. Therefore, temperature dependence of resistivity must be considered when comparing

different time steps. The installed tensiometers are able to measure soil temperature simultaneously. These data have been used to correct resistivity measurements to a standard temperature. Comparing several existing models for the correction of soil electrical conductivity measurements, Ma et al. (2011) conclude that the model (Eq. 5) proposed by Keller and Frischknecht (1966) is practicable within the temperature range of environmental monitoring.

$$\rho_{25} = \rho_t (1 + \delta (T - 25^\circ\text{C})) \quad (5)$$

With this equation the inverted resistivity (ρ_t) at the temperature (T) was corrected to a resistivity at a soil temperature of 25°C (ρ_{25}). The empirical parameter δ is the temperature slope compensation, with $\delta = 0.025^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$ being commonly used for geophysical applications (Keller and Frischknecht, 1966; Hayashi, 2004; Ma et al., 2011).

2.3.3 ERT data inversion

For inversion of the ERT data, we used the BERT Code (Günther et al., 2006). In order to account for the present topography, we used an unstructured triangular discretization of the subsurface and applied finite element forward calculations. For static inversion, a smoothness-constraint objective function is minimized that consists of the error-weighted misfit between measured data \mathbf{d} and model response $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{m})$, and a model roughness:

$$\Phi = \|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{m}))\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{C}\mathbf{m}\|_2^2 \rightarrow \min \quad (6)$$

The regularization parameter λ defines the strength of regularization imposed by the smoothness matrix \mathbf{C} and needs to be chosen such that the data are fitted within expected accuracy, which is incorporated in the data weighting matrix \mathbf{D} . In our case, values of $\lambda=30$ provided sufficient data fit. See Günther et al. (2006) for details of the minimization procedure, Beff et al. (2013) or Bechtold et al. (2012) for specific modifications in hydrological applications.

For time-lapse inversion, i.e. calculating the temporal changes in resistivity, there are three different methodical approaches: (i) either inverting the models for each point in time separately, (ii) to use the initial model as reference model for the time step, (iii) or inverting the differences of the two data sets (Miller et al., 2008). With our data, each method generates insufficient results with unsubstantiated artifacts. An increase on the surface was always followed by a decrease below and vice versa. These systematic changes cannot be explained or related to any natural process. Descloitres et al. (2003, 2008b) showed with synthetic data that time lapse inversion may produce artifacts due to the smoothness constraints especially with changes caused by shallow infiltration (decrease of resistivity), as mostly expected in our case.

As smoothness constraints are the main reason of these problems, we avoid the smoothness operator in the time-lapse inversion and minimize a different objective function for the subsequent time-steps:

$$\Phi = \|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{d}^n - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{m}^n))\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{m}^n - \mathbf{m}^{n-1}\|_2^2 \rightarrow \min \quad (7)$$




Figure 2. Exponent n_θ in dependence of different grain sizes.

Beginning from the static inversion, the subsequent models are found by reference model inversion. Only the total difference between the models of subsequent time steps $n - 1$ and n is used for regularization (minimum-length constraints). A higher regularization parameter of $\lambda=100$ proved optimal for time lapse inversion concerning both data fit and in comparison to the hydrometric results.

In order to find representative resistivity values as a function of depth, which are independent on small-scale heterogeneities, we subdivide the model down to a depth of 3 m into seven layers according to the boundaries of the described layering (cf. Table 1) and installation depth of hydro-metric devices (cf. Fig. 1) (0–0.2, 0.2–0.4, 0.4–0.9, 0.9–1.2, 1.2–1.5, 1.5–2.0 and 2.0–3.0 m). The representative values are median resistivities in the layers from the stations H1a to H4a and H4b to H4a for profiles A and B, respectively.

3 Results

3.1 Laboratory

Within the separately analyzed samples, non-linear curve fitting was carried out. Using the method of least squares, the data could be fitted using a power function in the form of Archie’s law (Eq. 1, $0.973 < r < 0.999$).

The exponent n_θ shows a positive correlation to small grain sizes, primarily medium silt (6.3–20 μm , $r = 0.909$), but in the same case a negative correlation to grain sizes $> 630 \mu\text{m}$ including clast content ($r = -0.852$) (cf. Fig. 2).

The amount of silt as well as the clast content are important distinctive attributes to differentiate the basal layer from the overlying intermediate or upper layer (Table 1). Two different “electrical” layers may be identified. This is due to the fact that the exponent is strongly influenced by grain

250 size, which shows a remarkable change at the upper boundary of LB. On the other hand, grain size distribution and clast content are very similar between LH and LM, so that these may not be differentiated using ERT. Figure 3 shows the aggregation of the 14 single samples into two regions with different depth ranges.

The first depth range comprises the upper and the intermediate layer. These two periglacial layers 255 are characterized by a high amount of silt (mostly medium silt) and comparatively low clast content. The exponent n_θ ranges from 1.8 to 2.3. The second depth range is represented by the basal layer. This is characterized by a higher amount of coarse material at the expense of fine grain sizes. In this depth range n_θ ranges from 0.7 to 1.8. Within each of these two depth ranges, we assume, analog to the properties of the substrate, similar electrical properties with a threshold at 0.9 m. The threshold 260 depth of 0.9 m is not developed as an exact, continuous boundary. Rather it is a short transition zone, because the samples right from this depth may have properties of the shallow or the deeper region, similar to the geomorphological differentiation between the basal and intermediate layer, whose boundary varies between depths of 0.8 to 1 m. By combining samples from different depths into two regions, it was possible to derive the parameter for Eqs. (1)–(3) for each region (Table 3).

Table 3. Fitted water content formation factor (F_θ), water content exponent (n_θ) and mean squared error for ρ_{eff}/ρ_w (MSE) for Eqs. (1)–(3) of the two different depth ranges.

Depth range	F_θ	n_θ	r	MSE
< 0.9 m	0.577	1.83	0.895*	2.8
≥ 0.9 m	0.587	1.34	0.888*	1.4

* $p < 0.01$

265 This relationship between water content and resistivity, shown in Fig. 3 and Table 3, is only a mean value for each depth range. In the first depth range (0–0.9 m), especially close to the surface, the differences in soil or electrical properties between the samples even at the same depth may vary. This higher variation may be explained by intense biotic activity near the surface, enhancing small-scale heterogeneity compared to deeper parts of the soil.

270 The fitted curves of both regions are quite similar, except for n_θ . The adapted values for F_θ are almost identical (0.577 vs. 0.587, Table 3). With high saturation, the difference of resistivity between the depth ranges is small and primarily influenced by the conductivity of the pore fluid, but increases with decreasing water content. As a result of the higher exponent, LH and LM react more sensitively to water content changes than LB, especially at low presaturations. Related to this, small water 275 content changes cause larger changes in resistivity than in the deeper region.




Figure 3. Volumetric water content in dependence of resistivity ratio (ρ_{eff}/ρ_w) for two different depth ranges.




Figure 4. Resistivity results from ERT mapping (October 2008) of the study area: pseudo 3-D view of the profiles A to G.

3.2 ERT Mapping

At our study site the resistivity of the subsoil ranges from nearly 100 Ωm up to more than 4000 Ωm . The distribution may be divided in two main areas, the “inner” area between the depression lines and the “outer” area at the hillsides which differ in their depth profiles. (cf. Fig. 4)




Figure 5. ERT section of profile A with plotted layer boundaries. (date: 21.10.08)

280 At the intersection between the longitudinal and diagonal profiles, a good match of the calculated resistivity models can be found at shallow depth. With increasing depth, the differences become more notable (e.g. A×B: depth <1 m: average deviation 8% ($\sigma = 5.4\%$), depth 1–7 m: average deviation 20% ($\sigma = 10\%$) and depth >7 m: average deviation 43% ($\sigma = 6.6\%$)). To exclude potential errors (e.g. electrode positioning errors), the data quality may be evaluated by comparing normal and reciprocal measurements, i.e. interchanging potential and current electrodes (LaBrecque et al., 285 1996; Zhou and Dahlin, 2003). For profile A and B repeated measurements with reciprocal electrode configuration were conducted. Thereby, no large errors (max $\pm 1.2\%$) could be found between normal and reciprocal measurements. Because of the absence of large potential errors, the increasing deviation with depth may be only explained by the inversion process, decreasing sensitivity, less spatial resolution or potential 3-D-effects.

290

The resistivity distribution of the subsurface is characterized by large-scale and small-scale heterogeneities, but also distinct patterns may be identified. At shallow depth up to 0.9 m, the study area is characterized by high resistivity. This comprises the upper and the intermediate layer.

Since the laboratory results indicate similar electrical properties, remarkable differences between upper and intermediate layers only occur, if water content deviates. There are areas, where the intermediate layer has higher resistivity, suggesting lower water content (cf. Fig. 5).

295

The hydrometric data show the driest conditions in 0.55–0.65 m (cf. Fig. 8) which is consistent with the high median resistivity of the intermediate layer at the time of data acquisition (cf. Fig. 6).

Resistivity decreases in greater depths (starting at 1 m). Thus, the basal layer is characterized by lower resistivity compared to the overlying layers. However, this is not constant in lateral direction. Two different patterns are found. In the “inner” area between the two depression lines (approx. between profile A and C), the resistivity of the basal layer is lower than in the “outer” area (the hillsides) (cf. Fig. 6). Between the depression lines LB is characterized as a connected zone of low resistivity. A calculation of saturation using Eq. (3) and the porosity from Table 1 indicates that this may be interpreted as a connected saturated zone (Figs. 6).

300

305




Figure 6. Median resistivity (left panel) and median water saturation (right panel) per depth for the inner region (between the depression lines) and outer region (hillslopes). (date: 21.10.08)

Due to the slope gradient, water from the hillsides and upper parts of the catchment flows into the direction of the depression lines, where it concentrates and forms a local slope groundwater reservoir. This results in a maximum decrease of resistivity in this zone as observed in all measured profiles at depths of 1.5 to 4.5 m (cf. Fig. 4 and 6). Percussion drilling confirmed that the thickness of LB downslope exceeds 3.5 m. Therefore, we assume that the entire saturated zone is located within the basal layer and since it is connected to the spring, it is also the source of the base flow. According to this, the shape of the surface may be partially transferred to the subsurface to identify regions of different hydrogeological conditions. Convex areas indicate dryer conditions in the basal layer in comparison to the concave or elongate parts of the hillslope, which may act as local aquifers.

It is not feasible to relate a resistivity to the underlying gneiss or its regolith. Percussion drilling was only realized down to 4 m depth where bedrock could not be reached. If the maximum thickness of the basal layer is equal to the saturated zone, as obtained by resistivity data, the change from basal layer to underlying gneiss may be set at a depth around 4.5 m.

ERT mapping of the spatial distribution of periglacial cover beds is associated with several restrictions. In our study area, stratification is concealed by the influence of pore water, the main factor driving resistivity. On the other hand this fact may be used to improve the understanding of the moisture conditions of the subsurface.

To check the equations obtained in the lab and also to compare directly with hydrometric data, we used the water contents from the soil moisture sensors at H3a. Figure 7 compares water content, calculated with temperature-corrected resistivity ($\theta_{\rho_{H3a}}$ profile A close to H3a), with water content from the ThetaProbes (θ_{Theta}) at time of mapping.

The values of $\theta_{\rho_{H3a}}$ and θ_{Theta} show depth profiles of similar shape, but the values differ slightly. The resistivity depth profile shows a shift of $-4.5 \text{ Vol}\%$ in comparison to the ThetaProbes. The




Figure 7. Volumetric water content calculated from resistivity data close to H3a in comparison with soil moisture sensors. (date: 21.10.08)

different positions of the two probe locations could be one reason for this mismatch. Other reasons
 330 could be the inversion process of the resistivity data or differing pore water resistivity from the used
 median value (Table 2).

Because the data of the resistivity measurements and also the ThetaProbes may contain biased
 errors (e.g. caused by clast content or by the installation procedure), it is difficult to make reliable
 conclusions, which depth profile is more accurate.

335 3.3 Joint Hydrometric and ERT Monitoring

During the period May to December 2008 the spring discharge varied between 0.07 and 1.67 L s^{-1} .
 Median soil water tension of the study area, related to depth and time (cf. Fig. 8), indicates the
 impact of soil moisture on spring discharge. During summer increasing evapotranspiration causes
 the drying-out of soil. The spring showed only a slight reaction to precipitation events. Rainfall
 340 could only balance the soil water deficit and caused no runoff. Therefore, there is almost no runoff
 generation in the summer season. Primarily base flow dominates and decreasing discharge is mainly
 caused by saturation excess overland flow from the area surrounding the spring.

In contrast, during winter season (starting in November) at all depths lower tensions ($< 90 \text{ hPa}$)
 were measured. Less evapotranspiration results in a replenishment of the storage water reservoirs
 345 in the subsurface. Due to the moist conditions, high presaturations predominate and cause a rapid
 runoff response with rain and the high discharges within the winter season.

Furthermore, there is an influence of the layered subsurface on soil moisture and runoff response.
 Until the beginning of May and again from December the low tensions of the upper parts of LB
 indicate saturated conditions, in contrast to the deeper LB with higher tensions (cf. Fig. 8). Due to




Figure 8. Spring discharge in comparison with daily precipitation (top panel), image of median soil water tension of the shallow subsurface (middle panel) and median soil water tension for different depths (bottom panel) – adapted from Heller (2012).

350 the anisotropic hydraulic properties (low vertical compared to horizontal hydraulic conductivity) the percolation into deeper parts of LB decreases. The seepage water is concentrated as backwater in the LM and the upper parts of LB. Because of the high lateral hydraulic conductivity this saturated depth range is mainly involved in runoff and causes strong interflow.

As the hydrometric data show, the first period from May to October was mainly characterized by
 355 drying of the subsurface. After that, humid conditions began to dominate (cf. Fig. 8). Major changes occur at shallow depth and proceed to depth, though remarkably attenuated. Each depth has its own characteristics, its own variation in time and shows different hydrological and electrical response. To better distinguish the results and to deal with the subsurface layered structure, a depth- or layer-based analysis is appropriate.




Figure 9. Trend of median resistivity for different depth ranges for (a) profile A and (b) profile B in comparison with daily precipitation (Grey and white shaded regions for visualization of ERT time intervals).

360 Figure 9 shows the trend of median resistivity for each depth range for the entire time series of profile A between H1a and H4a and profile B between H4b and H4a, in comparison with daily accumulated precipitation.

The resistivity of profile A clearly correlates with profile B (Table 4). This correlation is more pronounced at shallow depths. The absolute values are similar, except for the near-surface part of LH (0–0.2 m) and parts of LB (1.5–2.0 m). These two depth ranges have higher resistivity values at profile B than A at all points in time, due to the different positions. Profile A is completely situated in one of the depression lines, in which higher soil water contents can be expected in general.

365 During the measuring period, the upper layer (0–0.2 and 0.2–0.4 m) reacts with similar resistivity variations as the intermediate layer (0.4–0.9 m). Resistivity of the intermediate layer may temporarily exceed the upper layer (e.g. profile A October–December).

370

Table 4. Correlation between median resistivity of profiles A ($\rho_{\text{profile A}}$) and B ($\rho_{\text{profile B}}$) and between subsequent resistivity ratio of profile A ($\rho_{\text{timestep}}/\rho_{\text{initial}}$) and cumulative precipitation during the time step (ppt).

Depth [m]	$r(\rho_{\text{profile A}}, \rho_{\text{profile B}})$	$r(\frac{\rho_{\text{timestep}}}{\rho_{\text{initial}}}, \text{ppt})$
0–0.2	0.977 ^a	–0.773 ^a
0.2–0.4	0.988 ^a	–0.770 ^a
0.4–0.9	0.987 ^a	–0.804 ^a
0.9–1.2	0.987 ^a	–0.586 ^a
1.2–1.5	0.852 ^a	–0.378 ^b
1.5–2.0	0.831 ^a	–0.078 ^b
2.0–3.0	0.878 ^a	0.173 ^b

^a $p < 0.01$

^b $p > 0.01$

The temporal changes in resistivity decrease with depth. Short time variations are limited down to 2 m. Below, the differences are marginal with only a continuous slight increase during the investigated period.

The variation of resistivity is significant influenced by rainfall. As shown in Table 4, the upper and intermediate layers (< 0.9 m) show a strong negative correlation with the cumulated amount of precipitation (ppt). This correlation decreases with depth. Upper parts of the basal layer (0.9–1.5 m) respond slightly and delayed to intense rain events or enduring dry periods. Depths > 1.5 m show no direct correlation with rainfall. Water cannot infiltrate straight to greater depths because of decreasing hydraulic conductivity, evaporation, storage, or consumption of water by roots.

One problem is the temporal resolution. Because of the time intervals (usually ≥ 1 week), we are not able to resolve the entire temporal heterogeneity of the subsurface, which may lead to misinterpretation. For example, during the period from 3 to 16 September, the amount of 33 mm rain seems not to affect the resistivity of profile A. However, 32 of these 33 mm had already been fallen until 7 September. At profile B with an additional measurement on 9 September, resistivity at shallow depth decreases first and after that increases back to the initial level of 3 September (cf. Fig. 9b). Due to the missing time step, this alteration is not traced in profile A (cf. Fig. 9a).

This issue is also evident when comparing the resistivity with the soil suction data. With the higher temporal resolution of the tensiometer it is possible to resolve short time events e.g. single rain events (Fig. 8), which cannot be rendered with the resistivity survey (cf. Fig. 9).

During the investigation period, different trends could be identified. The initial conditions in April and early May are characterized by a highly saturated subsurface. This is indicated by low soil water tension, high spring discharge, and high water content. Due to the humid conditions at the beginning of the measurements, the conductivity of the shallow subsurface is high and the observed resistivity is low relative to the seasonal variations.




Figure 10. Ratio between subsequent resistivity (first column), median resistivity as a function of depth (second column) and median soil water tension (third column) for three exemplary precipitation responses: (1) small amount, (2) medium amount and (3) high amount.

395 The first period between May and October is mainly characterized by increasing resistivity. The accumulated precipitation from 9 May to 21 October is only 337 mm. In combination with increasing evapotranspiration, this causes a drying of the subsurface (cf. Fig. 8). As a result of drying, at shallow depths (< 0.9 m) resistivity quickly increases until July. Below, the increase proceeds slightly, but continuously until October.

400 As mentioned above, resistivity, especially of LH and LM (up to 0.9 m), shows a high short time variability and is strongly associated with the amount of precipitation (ppt) (Table 4). During the investigated period three different response types could be identified that are exemplarily illustrated in Fig. 10 and compared to soil water tension.

1. A small amount of precipitation (cf. 23 September–7 October, ppt = 23 mm) causes a short
 405 deferment of increasing resistivity of LH and LM during the summer period. The values of

initial state and time step are in the same order of magnitude. Within the temporal resolution, only a slight decrease could be recorded. Deeper parts are not affected and dry continuously. Constant discharge indicates that there is no runoff generation during this period. This amount of rain is only able to balance the deficit caused by evaporation at shallow depths, at least within the temporal resolution of measurements.

410

2. A medium amount of precipitation (cf. 1 July–15 July, ppt = 51.1 mm) causes a distinctive reaction at shallow depth. Resistivity at these depths shows a sharp decrease by comparatively the same ratio (~ 0.7). However, the signal is not traced into the deeper ground (> 1.2 m), which remains completely unaffected. So vertical seepage dominates in LH and LM, which leads to recharge of soil water. The water is predominantly fixed by capillary force; hence it does not percolate into deeper layers. The short rise of discharge is caused by saturation overland flow in the spring bog.

415

3. A high amount of precipitation (cf. 22 October–4 November, ppt = 102.1 mm) results in a strong response down to 2.0 m and affects LH, LM as well as parts of LB. Such a heavy rain period does not induce larger resistivity changes in LH and LM than the medium rain period, but influence deeper regions in the same order of magnitude as above. The water infiltrates to the upper, but does not reach the deeper parts of the basal layer (2–3 m). The vertical seepage is limited and therefore, the increasing spring discharge may only be caused by lateral subsurface flow, such as interflow in the unsaturated subsoil.

420

425 After the major rain event at the end of October, resistivity values remain constant until the next time step. Due to precipitation of 102.1 mm during the period from 19 November to 16 December, resistivity drops below the initial state and shows highly saturated conditions.

A comparison of water content obtained by soil moisture sensors (θ_{Theta}) and water content calculated from resistivity data for different depths over time at profile A close to the hydrometric station

430 H3a ($\theta_{\rho\text{H3a}}$) using Eq. (2), is shown in Fig. 11

At shallow depth (≤ 0.85 m), $\theta_{\rho\text{H3a}}$ correlates closely with θ_{Theta} (Table 5). However, there is a shift of the curves during the whole period. The volumetric water content from resistivity data is consequently smaller than from the soil moisture sensors. In dry periods (e.g. July–October), the difference is less than under humid conditions (e.g. May).

435 In deeper parts the variations are attenuated. At a depth of 1.2 m there is almost no response over the year, until the heavy rain period at the end of October.

In 1.5 m depth the response of the soil moisture sensor is marginal until December, but thereafter they show an increase. In contrast, $\theta_{\rho\text{H3a}}$ shows already in late October a reaction to the heavy rain event, which is not reproducible with the ThetaProbe.




Figure 11. Trend of volumetric water content, obtained by resistivity data and soil moisture sensors (ThetaProbes) with daily precipitation for different depths.

Table 5. Correlation of volumetric water content calculated from resistivity values ($\theta_{\rho_{H3a}}$) and water content from soil moisture sensors (θ_{Theta}) and correlation of resistivity at H3a (ρ_{H3a}) and soil suction at H3a (Ψ_{H3a}).

Depth [m]	$r(\theta_{\rho_{H3a}}, \theta_{\text{Theta}})$	$r(\rho_{H3a}, \Psi_{H3a})$
0.30	0.863 ^a	0.993 ^a
0.55	0.957 ^a	0.904 ^a
0.85	0.885 ^a	0.905 ^a
1.20	0.136 ^a	0.120 ^b
1.50	0.619 ^a	0.566 ^a

^a $p < 0.01$

^b $p > 0.01$

440 The same holds true for the correlation between resistivity (ρ_{H3a}) and soil suction at H3a (Ψ_{H3a}) (cf. Table 5). The resistivity of LH and LM fits well to the tensiometer data at the same depth, but in deeper parts it deviates.

445 These deviations between resistivity data and hydrometric measurements may have different causes. Both methods contain measuring errors, just as the laboratory and other hydrometric (e.g. soil–water resistivity) measurements. Furthermore, the soil moisture sensors and tensiometers measure punctual values. Heller (2012) demonstrated with dye infiltration experiments that preferential flow is an important process in our study area. Hence, hydrometric point measurements may over- or underestimate soil moisture, depending on whether they are inside or outside a preferential pathway.

Therefore the data are very limited, with restricted validity for the entire depth range or layer. In contrast, ERT has the advantage to integrate over a larger measuring volume, which makes it more suitable for extensive depth-related interpretations.

4 Conclusions

In drainage basins, hillslopes link precipitation to river runoff. Runoff components, different flow pathways, and residence times are mainly influenced by the properties of the hillslope, especially the shallow subsurface. The knowledge of these properties is one of the keys to characterize the runoff dynamics in catchments. According to this, we used ERT for mapping the spatial heterogeneity of the subsurface structure on a hillslope with particular focus on mid-latitude slope deposits (cover beds).

ERT allows to differentiate between LH and LM as one unit and LB as another. Like the intrinsic properties (e.g. sedimentological), LH and LM have very similar electrical characteristics. Therefore, they may only being distinguished with ERT, if water contents are different or change differently with time.

On the contrary, the sediments within LB have their own electrical characteristics. The pedo-/petrophysical relationship, with neglecting surface conductivity, shows equal formation factors to LH and LM, but different exponents. With the lower exponent, LB is characterized by lower resistivity at the same water content. Therefore, the resistivity of LB is lower in the entire study area, which is further reinforced by the increasing mineralization of pore water with depth.

Moreover, from the results of field measurements and pedo-/petrophysical parameter determination in the laboratory we are able to monitor seasonal changes in subsurface resistivity and its relationship to precipitation and soil moisture on the hillslope scale with a minimally invasive method directly. In combination with commonly used hydrometric approaches, we improved our understanding of the allocation, distribution, and movement of water in the subsurface. Different amounts of precipitation affect the subsurface moisture conditions differently and accordingly different depths take part in runoff generation.

Because pore water (saturation and conductivity) is the main driver for resistivity, we arrive at some comprehensive interpretations of the subsurface moisture conditions. The high resistivities of LH and LM indicate low water contents, whereas LB is divided into two different moisture zones. On the hillsides water saturation of LB is less than between the depression lines, where low resistivity shows high water saturation and implies a local slope groundwater reservoir.

During investigation time, temperature-corrected resistivity showed distinct seasonal variations due to changes in moisture conditions, primarily influenced by precipitation and evapotranspiration. Close to the surface, these variations are very evident and decline with increasing depth, mainly limited to a depth of 2 m. This primarily affects LH, LM, and the upper parts of LB, since it may

be assumed that deeper parts are already saturated and changes are only possible due to changes in
485 water conductivity.

In summer the subsurface continuously dries, starting at the surface and proceeding to depth. This
drying is temporarily interrupted by precipitation. Penetration depth and intensity of the response
strongly depend on the amount of precipitation. During periods with a small amount of precipita-
tion, infiltration is limited to LH. There is no runoff generation, and greater depths remain unaffected
490 which leads after repeated occurrence to drier conditions within LM compared to LH. In contrast
to this, a response caused by a medium amount of precipitation includes LM and a small increase
in spring discharge. The main source of this runoff is saturated overland flow from the surface sur-
rounding the spring. With a high amount of precipitation, changes in resistivity point to vertical
seepage down to 2 m. Due to lateral subsurface flow within LH, LM and the upper parts of LB, the
495 discharge of the spring strongly increases.

The results from ERT measurements show a strong correlation to the hydrometric data. The aver-
age resistivity response is congruent to the average soil tension data. Water content obtained with soil
moisture sensors shows similar variations as calculated from the closest ERT profile. Consequently,
soil moisture on the hillslope scale may be determined not only by punctual hydrometric measure-
500 ments, but also by minimally invasive ERT monitoring, provided pedo-/petrophysical relationships
are known. By the use of ERT, expansive invasive hydrometric measurements may be reduced or par-
tially substituted without losing information, but rather enhancing the spatial significance of these
conventional point measurements. A combination improves the spatial understanding of the ongoing
hydrological processes and is better suitable to identify heterogeneities.

505 Cassiani et al. (2009) pointed out that a combination of geophysical and hydrometric data may be
used for quantitative estimation of hillslope moisture conditions. Our study has shown that this may
also be applied to mid-latitude hillslopes covered by periglacial slope deposits. Nevertheless, there
are some restrictions requiring further improvements.

One shortcoming is the temporal resolution. Some hydrological responses especially at hillslopes
510 may proceed very quickly. The major goal for further research should be to increase the temporal
resolution of ERT measurements to at least trace single rain events. This could be realized with
automated data acquisitions as described in Kuras et al. (2009).

Another aim should be to improve the spatial resolution. A high-resolution ERT in combination
with additional cross-borehole measurements would be more suitable to deal with small-scale het-
515 erogeneities and to overcome the problem of decreasing sensitivity with depth.

Acknowledgements. We acknowledge support by the German Research Foundation and the Open Access Pub-
lication Funds of the TU Dresden. We would also like to thank three anonymous reviewer and J. Boaga for their
helpful comments and suggestions that improved the quality of the manuscript.

References

- 520 AD-hoc AG-Boden: Bodenkundliche Kartieranleitung, 5th Edn., Bundesanst. für Geowiss. und Rohstoffe in
Zusammenarb. mit den Staatl. Geol. Diensten, Hannover, 2005.
- Amoozegar, A.: A compact constant-head permeameter for measuring saturated hydraulic conductivity of the
Vadose Zone, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 53, 1356–1361, 1989.
- Anderson, M. G. and Burt, T. P. (Eds.): *Process studies in hillslope hydrology*, Wiley, Chichester, West Sussex,
525 England, New York, 1990.
- Apparao, A.: Geoelectric profiling, *Geoexploration*, 27, 351–389, 1991.
- Archie, G.: The electrical resistivity log as an aid in determining some reservoir characteristics, *T. Am. I. Min.
Met. Eng.*, 146, 54–61, 1942.
- ATKIS®-DGM2, Landesvermessungsamt Sachsen - Amtliches Topographisch-Kartographische Information-
530 ssystem - Digital elevation model, resolution: 2m, 2008
- Barker, R.: Depth of investigation of collinear symmetrical four-electrode arrays, *Geophysics*, 54, 1031–1037,
1989.
- Bechtold, M., Vanderborght, J., Weihermueller, L., Herbst, M., Günther, T., Ippisch, O., Kasteel, R., and
Vereecken, H.: Upward transport in a three-dimensional heterogeneous laboratory soil under evaporation
535 conditions, *Vadose Zone J.*, 11, doi:10.2136/vzj2011.0066, 2012.
- Beff, L., Günther, T., Vandoorne, B., Couvreur, V., and Javaux, M.: Three-dimensional monitoring of soil water
content in a maize field using Electrical Resistivity Tomography, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 17, 595–609,
doi:10.5194/hess-17-595-2013, 2013.
- Benderitter, Y. and Schott, J. J.: Short time variation of the resistivity in an unsaturated soil: the relationship
540 with rainfall, *Eur. J. Environ. Eng. Geophys.*, 4, 37–49, 1999.
- Binley, A., Henry-Poulter, S., and Shaw, B.: Examination of solute transport in an undisturbed soil column
using electrical resistance tomography, *Water Resour. Res.*, 32, 763–769, 1996a.
- Binley, A., Shaw, B., and Henry-Poulter, S.: Flow pathways in porous media: electrical resistance tomography
and dye staining image verification, *Meas. Sci. Technol.*, 7, 384–390, 1996b.
- 545 Brunet, P., Clément, R., and Bouvier, C.: Monitoring soil water content and deficit using Electrical Resistivity
Tomography (ERT) a case study in the Cevennes area, France, *J. Hydrol.*, 48, 146–153, 2010.
- Cassiani, G., Bruno, V., Villa, A., Fusi, N., and Binley, A.: A saline trace test monitored via time-lapse surface
electrical resistivity tomography, *J. Appl. Geophys.*, 59, 244–259, 2006.
- Cassiani, G., Godio, A., Stocco, S., Villa, A., Deiana, R., Frattini, P., and Rossi, M.: Monitoring the hydrologic
550 behaviour of a mountain slope via time-lapse electrical resistivity tomography, *Near Surf. Geophys.*, 7, 475–
486, 2009.
- Chiffard, P., Didszun, J., and Zepp, H.: Skalenübergreifende Prozess-Studien zur Abflussbildung in Gebieten
mit periglazialen Deckschichten (Sauerland, Deutschland), *Grundwasser*, 13, 27–41, 2008.
- Dahlin, T. and Zhou, B.: A numerical comparison of 2-D resistivity imaging with 10 electrode arrays, *Geophys.
555 Prospect.*, 52, 379–398, 2004.
- Daily, W., Ramirez, A., LaBrecque, D. J., and Nitao, J.: Electrical resistivity tomography of vadose water
movement, *Water Resour. Res.*, 28, 1429–1442, 1992.

- De Morais, F., De Almeida Prado Bacellar, L., and Aranha, P. R. A.: Study of flow in vadose zone from electrical resistivity surveys, *Rev. Bras. Geofis.*, 26, 115–122, 2008.
- 560 Descloitres, M., Ribolzi, O., and Le Troquer, Y.: Study of infiltration in a Sahelian gully erosion area using time-lapse resistivity mapping, *Catena*, 53, 229–253, 2003.
- Descloitres, M., Ribolzi, O., Troquer, Y. L., and Thiébaux, J. P.: Study of water tension differences in heterogeneous sandy soils using surface ERT, *J. Appl. Geophys.*, 64, 83–98, 2008a.
- Descloitres, M., Ruiz, L., Sekhar, M., Legchenko, A., Braun, J., Mohan Kumar, M. S., and Subramanian, S.:
565 Characterization of seasonal local recharge using electrical resistivity tomography and magnetic resonance sounding, *Hydrol. Process.*, 22, 384–394, 2008b.
- Di Baldassarre, G. and Uhlenbrook, S.: Is the current flood of data enough? A treatise on research needs for the improvement of flood modelling, *Hydrol. Process.*, 26, 153–158, 2012.
- French, H. and Binley, A.: Snowmelt infiltration: monitoring temporal and spatial variability using time-lapse
570 electrical resistivity, *J. Hydrol.*, 297, 174–186, 2004.
- Garré, S., Koestel, J., Günther, T., Javaux, M., Vanderborght, J., and Vereecken, H.: Comparison of heterogeneous transport processes observed with electrical resistivity tomography in two soils, *Vadose Zone J.*, 9, 336–349, 2010.
- Garré, S., Javaux, M., Vanderborght, J., Pages, L., and Vereecken, H.: Three-dimensional electrical resistivity
575 tomography to monitor root zone water dynamics, *Vadose Zone J.*, 10, 412–424, 2011.
- Günther, T., Rücker, C., and Spitzer, K.: Three-dimensional modelling and inversion of dc resistivity data incorporating topography – II. Inversion, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 166, 506–517, 2006.
- Hayashi, M.: Temperature-electrical conductivity relation of water for environmental monitoring and geophysical data inversion, *Environ. Monit. Assess.*, 96, 119–128, 2004.
- 580 Heller, K.: Einfluss periglazialer Deckschichten auf die oberflächennahen Fließwege am Hang – eine Prozessstudie im Osterzgebirge, Sachsen, Ph.D. thesis, Faculty of Environmental Sciences, TU Dresden, available at: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:14-qucosa-98437> (last access: 30 April 2014), 2012.
- Keller, G. V. and Frischknecht, F. C.: *Electrical Methods in Geophysical Prospecting*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1966.
- 585 Kemna, A., Vanderborght, J., Hardelauf, H., and Vereecken, H.: Quantitative imaging of 3-D solute transport using 2-D time-lapse ERT: a synthetic feasibility study, in: *17th EEGS Symposium on the Application of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental Problems*, Colorado, USA, 342–353, 2004.
- Kirkby, M. J. (Ed.): *Hillslope Hydrology*, Wiley, Chichester, 1980.
- Kleber, A.: Lateraler Wasserfluss in Hangsedimenten unter Wald, in: *Stoff- und Wasserhaushalt in Einzugsgebieten, Beiträge zur EU-Wasserrahmenrichtlinie*, edited by: Lorz, C. and Haase, D., Springer Verlag, Heidelberg,
590 7–22, 2004.
- Kleber, A. and Schellenberger, A.: Slope hydrology triggered by cover-beds, With an example from the Frankenwald Mountains, northeastern Bavaria, *Z. Geomorphol.*, 42, 469–482, 1998.
- Kleber, A. and Terhorst, B. (Eds.): *Mid-Latitude Slope Deposits (Cover Beds)*, vol. 66 of *Developments in sedimentology*, 1st Edn., Elsevier, Amsterdam, Boston, Heidelberg, London, New York, Oxford, Paris, San
595 Diego, San Francisco, Singapore, Sydney, Tokyo, 2013.

- Klute, A. (Ed.): *Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 1: Physical and Mineralogical Methods*, 2nd Edn., ASA, SSA, Madison, Wisconsin, 1986.
- 600 Koestel, J., Kemna, A., Javaux, M., Binley, A., and Vereecken, H.: Quantitative imaging of solute transport in an unsaturated and undisturbed soil monolith with 3-D ERT and TDR, *Water Resour. Res.*, 44, W12411, doi:10.1029/2007WR006755, 2008.
- Koestel, J., Vanderborght, J., Javaux, M., Kemna, A., Binley, A., and Vereecken, H.: Noninvasive 3-D transport characterization in a sandy soil using ERT: 1. Investigating the validity of ERT-derived transport parameters, *Vadose Zone J.*, 8, 711–722, 2009a.
- 605 Koestel, J., Vanderborght, J., Javaux, M., Kemna, A., Binley, A., and Vereecken, H.: Noninvasive 3-D transport characterization in a sandy soil using ERT: 2. Transport process inference, *Vadose Zone J.*, 8, 723–734, 2009b.
- Kuras, O., Pritchard, J. D., Meldrum, P. I., Chambers, J. E., Wilkinson, P. B., Ogilvy, R. D., and Wealthall, G. P.: Monitoring hydraulic processes with automated time-lapse electrical resistivity tomography (ALERT), *CR Geosci.*, 341, 868–885, 2009.
- 610 LaBrecque, D. J., Miletto, M., Daily, W., Ramirez, A., and Owen, E.: The effects of noise on Occam's inversion of resistivity tomography data, *Geophysics*, 61, 538–548, 1996.
- Leslie, I. N. and Heinse, R.: Characterizing soil-pipe networks with pseudo-three-dimensional resistivity tomography on forested hillslopes with restrictive horizons, *Vadose Zone J.*, 12, doi:10.2136/vzj2012.0200, 2013.
- 615 Lesmes, D. P. and Friedman, S. P.: Relationships between the electrical and hydrogeological properties of rocks and soils, in: *Hydrogeophysics*, edited by: Rubin, Y. and Hubbard, S. S., Springer, Dordrecht, 87–128, 2006.
- Ma, R., McBratney, A., Whelan, B., Minasny, B., and Short, M.: Comparing temperature correction models for soil electrical conductivity measurement, *Precis. Agric.*, 12, 55–66, 2011.
- 620 Massuel, S., Favreau, G., Descloitres, M., Le Troquer, Y., Albouy, Y., and Cappelaere, B.: Deep infiltration through a sandy alluvial fan in semiarid Niger inferred from electrical conductivity survey, vadose zone chemistry and hydrological modelling, *Catena*, 67, 105–118, 2006.
- McDonnell, J. J.: Where does water go when it rains? Moving beyond the variable source area concept of rainfall–runoff response, *Hydrol. Process.*, 17, 1869–1875, 2003.
- 625 McDonnell, J. J., Tanaka, T., Mitchell, M. J., and Ohte, N.: Hydrology and biogeochemistry of forested catchments, *Hydrol. Process.*, 15, 1673–1674, 2001.
- McDonnell, J. J., Sivapalan, M., Vaché, K., Dunn, S., Grant, G., Haggerty, R., Hinz, C., Hooper, R., Kirchner, J., Roderick, M. L., Selker, J., and Weiler, M.: Moving beyond heterogeneity and process complexity: a new vision for watershed hydrology, *Water Resour. Res.*, 43, W07301, doi:10.1029/2006WR005467, 2007.
- 630 Michot, D., Benderitter, Y., Dorigny, A., Nicoullaud, B., King, D., and Tabbagh, A.: Spatial and temporal monitoring of soil water content with an irrigated corn crop cover using surface electrical resistivity tomography, *Water Resour. Res.*, 39, SBH 14-1–SBH 14-20, 2003.
- Miller, C. R., Routh, P. S., Brosten, T. R., and McNamara, J. P.: Application of time-lapse ERT imaging to watershed characterization, *Geophysics*, 73, G7–G17, 2008.

- 635 Moldenhauer, K.-M., Heller, K., Chiffard, P., Hübner, R., and Kleber, A.: Influence of cover beds on slope hydrology, in: *Mid-Latitude Slope Deposits (Cover Beds)*, edited by: Kleber, A. and Terhorst, B., vol. 66 of *Developments in Sedimentology*, Elsevier, Amsterdam etc., 127–152, 2013.
- Oldenborger, G. A., Knoll, M. D., Routh, P. S., and LaBrecque, D. J.: Time-lapse ERT monitoring of an injection/withdrawal experiment in a shallow unconfined aquifer, *Geophysics*, 72, F177–F188, 2007.
- 640 Perri, M. T., Cassiani, G., Gervasio, I., Deiana, R., and Binley, A.: A saline tracer test monitored via both surface and cross-borehole electrical resistivity tomography: comparison of time-lapse results, *J. Appl. Geophys.*, 79, 6–16, 2012.
- Popp, S., Altdorff, D., and Dietrich, P.: Assessment of shallow subsurface characterisation with non-invasive geophysical methods at the intermediate hill-slope scale, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 17, 1297–1307, doi:10.5194/hess-17-1297-2013, 2013.
- 645 Ramirez, A., Daily, W., LaBrecque, D. J., Owen, E., and Chesnut, D.: Monitoring an underground steam injection process using electrical resistance tomography, *Water Resour. Res.*, 29, 73–87, 1993.
- Robinson, D. A., Binley, A., Crook, N., Day-Lewis, F. D., Ferré, T. P. A., Grauch, V. J. S., Knight, R., Knoll, M. D., Lakshmi, V., Miller, R., Nyquist, J., Pellerin, L., Singha, K., and Slater, L.: Advancing process-based watershed hydrological research using near-surface geophysics: a vision for, and review of, electrical and magnetic geophysical methods, *Hydrol. Process.*, 22, 3604–3635, 2008a.
- 650 Robinson, D. A., Campbell, C. S., Hopmans, J. W., Hornbuckle, B. K., Jones, S. B., Knight, R., Ogden, F., Selker, J., and Wendroth, O.: Soil moisture measurement for ecological and hydrological watershed-scale observatories: a review, *Vadose Zone J.*, 7, 358–389, 2008b.
- 655 Robinson, D. A., Abdu, H., Lebron, I., and Jones, S. B.: Imaging of hill-slope soil moisture wetting patterns in a semi-arid oak savanna catchment using time-lapse electromagnetic induction, *J. Hydrol.*, 416, 39–49, 2012.
- Roy, A. and Apparao, A.: Depth of investigation in direct current methods, *Geophysics*, 36, 943–959, 1971.
- Rücker, C. and Günther, T.: The simulation of Finite ERT electrodes using the complete electrode model, *Geophysics*, 76(4), F227–238, 2011.
- 660 Sauer, D., Scholten, T., and Felix-Henningsen, P.: Verbreitung und Eigenschaften periglaziärer Lagen im östlichen Westerwald in Abhängigkeit von Gestein, Exposition und Relief, *Mitt. Dtsch. Bodenkdl. Ges.*, 96, 551–552, 2001.
- Scholten, T.: Periglaziäre Lagen in Mittelgebirgslandschaften – Verbreitungssystematik, Eigenschaften und Bedeutung für den Landschaftswasser- und stoffhaushalt, in: *Tagungsbeiträge IFZ-Workshop Ressourcensicherung in der Kulturlandschaft*, Selbstverlag, Justus-Liebig-Universität, Gießen, 11–15, 1999.
- Schön, J. H.: *Physical Properties of Rocks: Fundamentals and Principles of Petrophysics*, vol. 18 of *Handbook of Geophysical Exploration: Seismic Exploration*, Elsevier, Oxford, 2004.
- Singha, K. and Gorelick, S. M.: Saline tracer visualized with three-dimensional electrical resistivity tomography: field-scale spatial moment analysis, *Water Resour. Res.*, 41, W05023, doi:10.1029/2004WR003460, 2005.
- 670 Slater, L., Binley, A., Daily, W., and Johnson, R.: Cross-hole electrical imaging of a controlled saline tracer injection, *J. Appl. Geophys.*, 44, 85–102, 2000.

- 675 Tilch, N., Uhlenbrook, S., Didszun, J., Wenninger, J., Kirnbauer, R., Zillgens, B., and Leibundgut, C.: Hydrologische Prozessforschung zur Hochwasserentstehung im Löhnersbach-Einzugsgebiet (Kitzbüheler Alpen, Österreich), *Hydrol. Wasserbewirts.*, 50, 67–78, 2006.
- Tromp-van Meerveld, H. J.: Hillslope hydrology: from patterns to processes, Ph.D. thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, 2004.
- 680 Tromp-van Meerveld, H. J. and McDonnell, J. J.: Assessment of multi-frequency electromagnetic induction for determining soil moisture patterns at the hillslope scale, *J. Hydrol.*, 368, 56–67, 2009.
- Uchida, T., McDonnell, J. J., and Asano, Y.: Functional intercomparison of hillslopes and small catchments by examining water source, flowpath and mean residence time, *J. Hydrol.*, 327, 627–642, 2006.
- Uhlenbrook, S.: Von der Abflussbildungsforschung zur prozessorientierten Modellierung – ein Review, *Hydrol. Wasserbewirts.*, 49, 13–24, 2005.
- 685 Uhlenbrook, S., Didszun, J., and Wenninger, J.: Source areas and mixing of runoff components at the hillslope scale – a multi-technical approach, *Hydrolog. Sci. J.*, 53, 741–753, 2008.
- Vanderborght, J., Kemna, A., Hardelauf, H., and Vereecken, H.: Potential of electrical resistivity tomography to infer aquifer transport characteristics from tracer studies: a synthetic case study, *Water Resour. Res.*, 41, W06013, doi:10.1029/2004WR003774, 2005.
- 690 Völkel, J., Leopold, M., Mahr, A., and Raab, T.: Zur Bedeutung kaltzeitlicher Hangsedimente in zentraleuropäischen Mittelgebirgslandschaften und zu Fragen ihrer Terminologie, *Petermann. Geogr. Mitt.*, 146, 50–59, 2002a.
- Völkel, J., Zepp, H., and Kleber, A.: Periglaziale Deckschichten in Mittelgebirgen – ein offenes Forschungsfeld, *Ber. deuts. Landesg.*, 76, 101–114, 2002b.
- 695 Wenninger, J., Uhlenbrook, S., Tilch, N., and Leibundgut, C.: Experimental evidence of fast groundwater responses in a hillslope/floodplain area in the Black Forest Mountains, Germany, *Hydrol. Process.*, 18, 3305–3322, 2004.
- Zhou, B. and Dahlin, T.: Properties and effects of measurement errors on 2-D resistivity imaging surveying, *Near Surf. Geophys.*, 1, 105–117, 2003.
- 700 Zhou, Q. Y., Shimada, J., and Sato, A.: Three-dimensional spatial and temporal monitoring of soil water content using electrical resistivity tomography, *Water Resour. Res.*, 37, 273–285, 2001.