

Interactive comment on “Where does streamwater come from in low relief forested watersheds? A dual isotope approach” by J. Klaus et al.

J. Klaus et al.

klaus@lippmann.lu

Received and published: 27 May 2014

The authors take a novel approach to estimate sources of water to stream flow in low relief sub-humid ($P < ET$) catchments using established dual isotope methods. This study makes a significant contribution both in terms of the techniques to interpret and the conceptual understanding of runoff (or lack thereof) from low gradient catchment in drier regions, which are, arguably, under represented in the published literature. I believe this paper should be published in HESSD. I propose some changes, mostly to provide more information on physiographic setting and some suggestions in aid of interpretation of the conceptual model. The paper is well written. The main assumptions of the techniques are addressed, and with respect to the conceptual model the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

distinction between speculation and actual data is reasonably clear. However, in using isotopic techniques equifinality (Buttle 1994) can make it difficult to make inferences about sources and especially flow path of water in complex systems, were complementary sources and process may contribute water. The paper also compares isotopes of N, and in conjunction with the dual isotopes provides a convincing argument. However, the interpretation and conceptual model also relies heavily on hydrometric data that was largely not presented and currently not accessible to the reader (Du et al in review). I echo the editor's comments about needing a little more quantification. At times, I am left asking how much water and when does it move.

Response: We would like to thank Kevin Devito for his comprehensive review of our manuscript. We agree with Kevin that we need to add more of the hydrometric data in this manuscript. We will do that in the revised manuscript.

1) There are potentially several conceptual models that could be applied to direct field sampling, interpret isotopic data and water cycling and sources to stream flow. Conceptualizing the x-section slope to the stream is often applied to steep systems with a confining layer where the contribution from hill slopes is contiguous along the stream reach. The x-section provided in Fig7 for the conceptual model seems reasonable, given the location of the depth of the argillic horizon presented in Figure 7. However, fig 7 is the only place in the paper were the reader receives information or can conceptualize the potential layering and depth of soils in the catchments. Only physical properties, not depth, are provided in study sites description. Providing general information on distribution of the thickness of the surface sandy layer (and depth to argillic horizon) in the hillslopes and draws, and a relative scale on the conceptual diagram would help the reader conceive and infer how much storage there is between the hillslope and the stream, and how often this storage is potential filled and thus makes it to the stream? Also, providing the timing of flow from the plot study relative to the streams would provide some information on the time lags or threshold in storage.

Response: This is a very important point. We measured the depth to the argillic horizon

on approx. 40 x 40 m above the R hillslope trench with a 2 x 1 m grid. Mean depth to the argillic layer within this hillslope was 0.76 m, ranging from 0.19m to 1.62m. Additional depths to clay measurements were carried out at three trenches and in the R catchment, close to 2000 measurements were taken. We will give a short summary of this in the revised version (details will be in the Du et al. paper, under review). We also will try to enhance the conceptual diagram. We will also think of how to better present the (dis-)connectivity between the hillslope and the catchment response in the current paper.

2) The authors present two alternative models for flow in the catchment: the conceptual model in fig7 and that of saturation excess flow from the valleys. It appears that contributions from saturation excess surface flow are not a major mechanism, at least during the study period. In drier system where the hillslope is disconnected, there may be other alternate conceptualizations of water flow to exclude. The interpretation of the stream isotope data seems to be focused on the x-section right behind the weir. In fact it appears that the weir appears to be illustrated in the conceptual model (Fig 7). Understanding the distribution of the riparian zone and the stream-riparian-hillslope interaction is integral to conceptualizing the water cycling and interpreting the data. In low gradient systems with wide valleys, the riparian areas are not often narrow strips near a stream channel. Currently no information on the riparian zone, i.e the distribution or soil characteristics, has been provided. Providing these may allow the reader to better visualize the potential catchment scale process presented and would address many of the questions presented above. A formal definition of what constitutes a riparian zone would help in extrapolating the conceptual model. Is the riparian zone defined to be adjacent to a well-developed stream channel eroded into the forest floor and mineral soils, or does it extend up into the ephemeral streams with no stream channel? Do the ephemeral streams have a defined channel? Do the riparian zones include the extensive valley wetlands, or are they defined as between the valley wetlands and the hillslope? Clearly define the wetlands (over and above CB) and what the riparian zone is in fig 1. In the study site description there appears to be distinct forest wetland veg-

C1569

HESSD

11, C1567–C1572, 2014

[Interactive
Comment](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



etation that could be used to map out or infer the riparian area. Is there major changes in soil organic depth or other characteristics (ie holding capacity) or is it mostly slope that defines the riparian zone?

Response: We completely agree with the reviewer that we need to improve this description since it allows a better understanding of our system. We will supply additional information in the revised version, and an updated figure 1.

5) A glance at the hydro-geology literature indicates that the long-term vertical recharge through the argillic horizon could be provided for this site. This helps in visualizing the water balance. Also, in these low relief systems, there can be interactions of different scales of groundwater flow. From the “deeper well” data (locations on fig 1) presumably the general location and gradient of the water table relative to the three catchments can be presented (at least in the text). Do the valley bottoms of any of the catchments intersect the WT of the larger groundwater systems, and are the hill slopes perched when delivering flow? One or two lines can be inserted so the reader can make some assessment of the potential interactions and exclude a number of potential conceptual models of catchment-stream interaction.

Response: We will improve the description of this in the revised version, the better explain the role of different groundwater flow systems and their impact on the investigated system.

6) The wells are located on figure 1. The location of the riparian piezometers (relative to the distribution of the wetland/riparian area) should be indicated on the map (Fig 1). Also, the completion depth, length of screen, ad the soil layer they sample from should be presented.

Response: We agree. We will improve figure 1 in this perspective and the related information in the methods description.

7) page 9, In 19. The EWLs for groundwater include 14 wells. It is not clear if these

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



include riparian or stream areas, or they are all exclusively from the confined aquifer. Listing completion depths would clarify this.

Response: Yes, this needs clarification. These 14 wells do not include the riparian wells. We will provide more detail in the revised manuscript (e.g. adding a table).

8) page 10, ln20-25. The authors indicate that hillslopes can generate considerably more peak flow than the catchment outlet. It is implied that the water is evaporated/transpired. Could this go into deeper storage, and eventually recharged to groundwater?

Response: We would argue that this water is largely recharged to deeper groundwater on the scale of a precipitation event, since potential recharge through the argillic horizon can be significant. Nevertheless, it also can go to soil storage and thus feed evaporation and transpiration. We will think of how to clarify/discuss this in the revised manuscript.

11) p11, ln 14-16. Could the valley wetlands above the weir also provide a mixed source of water?

Response: We think the morphology of the catchment allows the interpolation of the simple model of an x-direction all along the stream network. The mixing processes along the valley wetland should be similar. We will think of how to include this in the revised version.

12) Citations not in the reference list: Page 3 ln 3: Sidle et al. 2000 – is not in the references, p3 ln5: Jensco et al. 2009 –is not in the references

Response: Thank you. We will correct this.

13) Figure 1; Note. Map out the riparian areas, location of piezometers. It could be my printer, but it seems that the contours and the intervals would not reproduce very well. Also, I have trouble distinguishing between the perennial and ephemeral streams.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



Response: As mentioned above, we will supply an updated version of figure 1 including the suggestions. We will do some test prints of figure 1 to re-check the quality of contours and the difference between perennial and ephemeral streams.

14) Figure 3. There are periods of zero flow and periods with no data. It is difficult to tell which is which. If not already done, could zero flows be denoted with a symbol, and blank for no flow (some manipulation because of the log scale). Presenting the flow from the trench data and comparing with stream flow would provide information on the timing of potential storage and connectivity.

Response: This is a very good idea about a better visualization in the log scale. We will also think of how to include the trench flow in this figure.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 11, 2613, 2014.

HESSD

11, C1567–C1572, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

