

1 **High frequency monitoring of water fluxes and nutrient loads to assess the**
2 **effects of controlled drainage on water storage and nutrient transport**

3

4 *Rozemeijer, J.C.^{1*}, A. Visser², W. Borren¹, M. Winegram³, Y. van der Velde⁴, J. Klein¹, H.P,*
5 *Broers⁵*

6

7 *[1] Deltares, P.O. Box 85467, 3508 AL Utrecht, the Netherlands*

8 *[2] Lawrence Livermore National Lab, P.O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94551-0808, United States.*

9 *[3] Allseas Engineering, Poortweg 12, 2612 PA Delft, the Netherlands*

10 *[4] Department of Earth Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, Boelelaan 1085, 1081 HV*
11 *Amsterdam, The Netherlands.*

12 *[5] TNO Geological Survey of the Netherlands, P.O. Box 80015, 3508 TA Utrecht, The*
13 *Netherlands*

14

15 * Corresponding author, tel. +3162748708, email: Joachim.rozemeijer@deltares.nl

16

17 **Abstract**

18 High nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) fluxes from upstream agriculture threaten aquatic
19 ecosystems in surface waters and estuaries, especially in areas characterized by high
20 agricultural N and P inputs and densely drained catchments like the Netherlands. Controlled
21 drainage has been recognized as an effective option to optimize soil moisture conditions for
22 agriculture and to reduce unnecessary losses of fresh water and nutrients. This is achieved by
23 introducing control structures with adjustable overflow levels into subsurface tube drain systems.
24 A small scale (1 ha) field experiment was designed to investigate the hydrological and chemical
25 changes after introducing controlled drainage. Precipitation rates and the response of water
26 tables and drain fluxes were measured in the periods before the introduction of controlled
27 drainage (2007-2008) and after (2009-2011). For the N and P concentration measurements,
28 auto-analysers for continuous records were combined with passive samplers for time-average

1 concentrations at individual drain outlets. The experimental setup enabled the quantification of
2 changes in the water and solute balance after introducing controlled drainage. The results
3 showed that introducing controlled drainage reduced the drain discharge and increased the
4 groundwater storage in the field. To achieve this, the overflow levels have to be elevated in early
5 spring, before the drain discharge stops due to dryer conditions and falling groundwater levels.
6 The groundwater storage in the field would have been larger when the water levels in the
7 adjacent ditch would have been controlled as well by an adjustable weir. The N concentrations
8 and loads increased, which was largely related to elevated concentrations in one of the three
9 monitored tube drains. The P loads via the tube drains reduced due to the reduction in discharge
10 after introducing controlled drainage. However, this may be counteracted by the higher
11 groundwater levels and the larger contribution of N and P-rich shallow groundwater and overland
12 flow to the surface water.

13

14 **Keywords**

15 Controlled drainage, Water conservation, Nutrients, Agriculture

16

17 **1 Introduction**

18 High nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) fluxes from agricultural areas threaten aquatic ecosystems
19 in downstream surface waters, estuaries, and coastal zones around the world (e.g. Foley et al,
20 2005; Howarth, 2008). The effects of eutrophication, such as loss of biodiversity and toxic algal
21 blooms threaten the industrial, recreational, and ecological functions of water resources (e.g.
22 Makarewicz et al., 2007; Weijters et al., 2009; Diaz and Rosenberg, 2011). The adverse effects of
23 high nutrient inputs are most prominent in stagnant water bodies, with long residence times and
24 low vertical and horizontal mixing, such as shallow lakes, bays and harbors. Current hotspots are
25 the Gulf of Mexico, Chesapeake Bay, and the Great lakes in North America and The Baltic Sea
26 and the North Sea in Europe. In addition, eutrophication-related problems arise in developing
27 areas such as China, Southeast Asia, and South America (Seitzinger et al., 2010). Global
28 changes, such as population growth and climate change, further increase the pressures on water
29 resources and their vulnerability for eutrophication (e.g. Statham, 2012; Seitzinger et al., 2010).

1

2 Controlled drainage has been recognized as an effective option to optimize soil moisture
3 conditions for agriculture and to reduce unnecessary losses of fresh water and nutrients. The
4 strategy of controlled drainage is to stop draining as long as agricultural productivity is not
5 threatened by wet conditions. This is achieved by control structures with adjustable overflow
6 levels in subsurface tube drain systems. Several pilot studies (e.g. Evans et al., 1995; Wesstrom
7 and Messing, 2007; Jaynes, 2012, Helmers et al, 2012) reported significant reductions in
8 discharge of water via tube drains (-16% up to -89%). Although the nitrogen concentrations in the
9 drain effluent did not change in most cases, the reduced water discharge also reduced the
10 nitrogen export via tube drains (-18% up to -82%).

11

12 None of the reported studies quantified the changes of nutrient export via other flow routes, such
13 as shallow groundwater flow and overland flow. Therefore, the fate of the reduced water and
14 nutrient exports often remains unknown (Woli et al., 2011). Ideally, the conserved water and
15 nutrients enhance crop production. However, the reported effects of controlled drainage on crop
16 production vary between no significant change up to an increase of 19% at individual fields
17 (Wesstrom and Messing, 2007; Ghane et al, 2012). Considering the limited increase in water and
18 nutrient uptake by crops, the possibility comes up that water and nutrients are still exported
19 towards the surface water via enhanced overland or shallow groundwater flow.

20

21 This study aimed to quantify the effects of controlled drainage on water and nutrient exports from
22 an agricultural field to the surface water system. A small scale (1 ha) field experiment was
23 designed to investigate the changes in flow route contributions towards surface water after
24 introducing controlled drainage. Precipitation rates and the response of water tables and drain
25 fluxes were measured in the period before the introduction of controlled drainage (2007-2008)
26 and after (2009-2011). For the N and P concentration measurements, auto-analysers for
27 continuous records were combined with passive samplers for time-average concentrations at
28 individual drain outlets. This setup enabled us to quantify the changes in the field water and
29 solute balance after introducing controlled drainage.

1 **2 Methods**

2 **2.1 Study area**

3 The experimental setup was installed in the Hupsel catchment (6.64 km²) in the eastern part of
4 The Netherlands (Figure 1) (52°04'01.5" N 6°39'29.0" E). The surface elevations in the
5 catchment range from 22-36 m above sea level (MSL) and the land use is predominantly
6 agricultural with maize and grassland. At depths ranging from 0.5 to 20 m a 20-30 m thick
7 impermeable marine clay layer of Miocene age is found of which the top is carved by glacial
8 erosion. This clay layer forms a natural lower boundary for the unconfined groundwater flow (Van
9 Ommen et al., 1989; Van der Velde et al., (2010a, 2010b). The unconfined aquifer consists of
10 Pleistocene aeolian sands with occasional layers of clay, peat and gravel. Wösten et al. (1985)
11 classified the main soil type of the catchment as sandy, siliceous, mesic Typic Haplaquads. The
12 catchment is drained by a dense network of artificial ditches and subsurface tube drains. The
13 spacing between the ditches averages 300 m and tube drainage is installed in more than 50% of
14 the area. See Van der Velde et al., (2010a) for a more detailed description of the Hupsel
15 catchment.

16
17 For the field scale evaluation of controlled drainage, a 0.9 ha grass field in the northern part of
18 the catchment was selected. Within this field, surface elevations range between 27.5 and 28.5 m
19 +MSL. The subsurface consists of a 3-4 m thick unconfined sandy aquifer of Pleistocene aeolian
20 sands. Below this, a 20-30 m thick impermeable marine clay layer of Miocene age forms the
21 natural lower boundary for the unconfined groundwater flow (Van Ommen et al., 1989).
22 Subsurface drain tubes of 5 cm in diameter are present with spaces of 14.5 m between individual
23 drains. The drains discharge into the ditch at 90 cm below the field surface level. Over their 200
24 m length the tubes slope upward by 20 to 60 cm away from the ditch, depending on the local
25 topography (Rozemeijer et al., 2010b). Rozemeijer et al. (2010a) quantified that the tube drains
26 contributed 80% of the total yearly water discharge to the surface water and 90% of the total
27 yearly NO₃-N and P export.

28 29 **2.2 Experimental setup reference period**

1 The water and nutrient fluxes at the experimental field were monitored for the reference situation
2 with conventional drainage from May 2007 to December 2008. During the summer of 2009, the
3 setup was extended and controlled drainage was introduced. This approach enabled us to study
4 the hydrological and chemical changes after introducing controlled drainage. A reference field
5 without controlled drainage was not included in the experimental setup. The large spatial
6 variability in hydrology and nutrient concentrations (see also Rozemeijer et al., 2010c) would not
7 allow for an appropriate comparison between a pilot and a reference field. This was also
8 concluded by Heinen et al. (2012) who studied the field scale effects of buffer strips at a nearby
9 experimental field.

10

11 The monitoring for the controlled drainage period was from November 2009 until September
12 2011. The farmer's land management did not change during this period. During both periods, the
13 field was used for grass harvesting and cattle grazing. Manure was applied at the experimental
14 field up to the maximum allowed 170 kg N per hectare per year during both the reference and the
15 controlled drainage period.

16

17 The experimental setup for the reference period is described in detail by Van der Velde et al.
18 (2010a). The tube drain effluent was physically separated from the groundwater and overland
19 flow routes towards a 43.5 m long section of the ditch (Figure 1). To separate the fluxes toward
20 the ditch via different routes, three adjacent sheet pile reservoirs were built (Figure 2). These in-
21 stream reservoirs were constructed around the outlets of drains 1, 2, and 3 and captured
22 overland flow, interflow, direct precipitation, and groundwater inflow from the thin aquifer above
23 the Miocene clay. Excess water was pumped from the in-stream reservoirs into the ditch and the
24 pumped volumes were recorded with digital flux meters with an accuracy of 2%.

25

26 The effluent from the tube drains was separated from the other flow routes by connecting each
27 drain outlet to a 500 L vessel using a flexible tube (Figure 2). In an undisturbed situation, the
28 surface water pressure would affect the tube drain flow rates when the drain outlets are
29 submerged. To imitate this effect, floaters were attached to the flexible tubes that connected the

1 drains to the collection vessels. Thus, water leaving the drain had to flow up to the ditch water
2 level before being discharged into the vessel (Van der Velde, 2010a). After reaching a maximum
3 water level in the vessel, the water was pumped into the ditch and the flux was measured with
4 digital water flux meters. On an average day during the drainage season, the vessels filled and
5 emptied every two hours.

6

7 In addition to the discharge measurements, phreatic groundwater levels were measured weekly
8 on 14 locations in transects at 5 m from the ditch and at 80 m from the ditch (Figure 1). The
9 meteorological data were derived from the Royal Dutch Meteorological Institute (KNMI) weather
10 station adjacent to the experimental field (Figure 1).

11

12 During the reference period, water quality samples were taken weekly from the three in-stream
13 reservoirs and from the three drain effluent vessels. The samples were taken using a peristaltic
14 pump and filtered in situ (0.45 μm). Electrical conductivity and the pH of the samples were
15 measured directly in the field. Sub-samples for ICP analysis were directly acidified with HNO_3 .
16 All samples were transported and stored at 4°C. The samples were analyzed within 48 hours
17 using IC ($\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$, SO_4 , Cl), ICP-AES (Na, K, Ca, Fe, Mg, Si), ICP-MS (P, Al, Ni, Cu, Zn, Cd, Pb),
18 AA (NH_4). HCO_3 was measured by titration. Samples with deviating results for ions measured by
19 more than one analytical method as well as samples with an ionic unbalance larger than 10%
20 were reanalyzed.

21

22 In addition to the grab sampling, SorbiCell-samplers (De Jonge and Rothenberg, 2005) were
23 used for monthly time-average $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentration measurements of tube drain effluent. The
24 SorbiCell-samplers were applied to measure average $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations for individual drains.
25 An evaluation of SorbiCells based on duplicate analyses and comparison to conventional grab
26 sampling and continuous measurements was published by Rozemeijer et al. (2010c). The
27 SorbiCells proved to be capable of reproducing the NO_3 concentration levels and the seasonal
28 patterns that were observed with weekly conventional grab sampling and continuous water
29 quality measurements.

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

2.3 Experimental setup controlled drainage period

For studying the effects of controlled drainage, the monitoring setup for the second period (2009-2011) was changed to focus more on the tube drains. The monitoring of the groundwater and overland flow contributions towards the in-stream reservoirs was stopped. The overflow levels of the drains were controlled by attaching the flexible connection tubes between the drain outlets and the collection vessels at the desired level (Figure 3a). In the reference setup, the connection tubes were kept just below the water table in the reservoir using floaters. The excess water from the three drainage effluent vessels was collected in a combined reservoir (Figure 3b). This enabled continuous registration of NO₃-N and total-P concentrations of the combined drain effluent, for which a Nitratax-UV sensor and a Phosphax auto-analyser were used (both Hach, Germany, Figure 3c). More details on these technologies are provided by Van der Grift et al. (2015). Phreatic groundwater levels were monitored continuously using pressure sensors in all 14 piezometers in transects B and D. The high resolution measurements enabled us to measure the direct responses of groundwater levels, drain discharges, and drain effluent nutrient concentrations after changing the overflow levels of the drains.

The overflow levels of the drains were adjusted following the scheme in Figure 4. The exact adjustment moments are shown in the results section. To conserve as much water as possible, the overflow levels were elevated during most of the year. However, the field had to be dry enough for manure spreading after the end of the winter ban on manure spreading on February 15th. Like many farmers, the land owner has a limited storage capacity for manure, which forces him to apply manure as early as possible after February 15th. To enable manure spreading, the overflow levels were lowered to the original drain outlet levels during February and March. In case of wet conditions at the end of the summer (grass harvest, manure spreading) the overflow levels were also lowered in consultation with the land owner.

1 **3 Results**

2 **3.1 Water levels, flows, and water balances**

3 The most important quantitative hydrological monitoring results are summarized in Figure 5. The
4 overflow levels of the drain outlets were elevated for the first time in November 2009. Initially, the
5 overflow level was raised up to 20 cm above the drain outlet levels. Starting in mid-December
6 2009, the overflow levels were raised up to +50 cm. In early spring 2010, the overflow levels
7 were lowered to +35 cm to enable the first manure application. In the wet autumn 2010 period,
8 and in early spring 2011, the overflow levels were lowered down to the original drain outlet level.
9 During the second drainage season with controlled drainage (2010-2011) we elevated and
10 lowered the overflow levels with 50cm on each occasion in order to bring about more distinct
11 changes in groundwater levels, drain discharges and nutrient losses compared to the first season
12 (2009-2010).

13

14 The groundwater levels were above the tube drain level during the winter drainage period (Figure
15 5). The differences between the individual piezometers in each transect were low, which
16 indicates a minor groundwater level curvature between the drains. The winter groundwater levels
17 were higher during the controlled drainage period compared to the reference period, especially in
18 piezometers of transect D at 80 m from the ditch. The total amount of precipitation was higher in
19 the reference drainage season compared to the controlled drainage period (see also Table 1).
20 This indicates that the higher groundwater levels during the controlled drainage period cannot
21 have been caused by weather conditions, but by the elevated overflow level of the drains.

22

23 During the controlled drainage period, the groundwater levels were above the land surface more
24 frequently and for longer periods, which indicates that ponding and overland flow became more
25 important. Ponding and overland flow at the experimental field, as well as its relation with the
26 groundwater levels, have been observed and reported by Van der Velde et al. (2010a).

27

28 The groundwater levels at 5 m from the ditch in transect B were less affected by controlled
29 drainage than the groundwater levels at 80 m from the ditch in transect D. The most evident

1 difference between the responses of transects B and D was in November 2010, when the
2 overflow levels were raised to +50 cm. Before this, the groundwater level difference between
3 transects B and D averaged 15 cm. After elevating the overflow levels, the difference increased
4 up to ca. 50 cm.

5

6 The tube drain fluxes were clearly affected by the changes in overflow levels during the
7 controlled drainage period. During the reference period, the drains were active for several
8 periods during the summer period of 2009. In the controlled drainage period, the tube drainage
9 flow stopped after raising the overflow levels in spring 2010 and 2011. No drainage flow was
10 registered during the subsequent summer periods. However, the drainage flow was immediately
11 re-activated after lowering the overflow levels. This effect was most prominent in the 2010-2011
12 drainage period, when the overflow levels were lowered by 50 cm on two occasions, resulting in
13 an immediate re-activation of the tube drain discharge.

14

15 Table 1 enables the comparison of the field water balances of the drainage seasons during the
16 reference and the controlled drainage periods. The water balances of Table 1 focus on the winter
17 drainage periods when the differences between conventional and controlled drainage were most
18 pronounced. The precipitation and evapotranspiration data in the water balances were derived
19 from the weather station next to the field. The drain discharge was directly measured during the
20 reference and controlled drainage period. The groundwater and overland/biopore discharge
21 towards the 45 meter ditch transect were directly measured during the reference period (Van der
22 Velde et al., 2010a). Winegram (2012) used the measured groundwater discharges and
23 groundwater level gradients to estimate the average saturated conductivity (k). This conductivity,
24 together with the groundwater level gradients measured during the reference period, was used to
25 estimate the groundwater discharge during the controlled drainage period. A similar approach
26 was used to estimate the overland and biopore flow volumes during the controlled drainage
27 period. In this case Winegram (2012) related the measured overland and biopore flow during the
28 reference period to the amount of precipitation that fell on ponded parts of the field. The storage
29 change in the water balance was derived from the difference in groundwater levels between the

1 start and the end of the water balance periods. The net influx (or outflux) from the surrounding
2 fields via regional groundwater flow cannot be measured, but was likely to occur and was needed
3 to close the water balance for which the other fluxes were accurately measured (Van der Velde
4 et al., 2010a). More details on the water balance for the reference period were reported in Van
5 der Velde et al. (2010a) and for the controlled drainage period in Winegram (2012) and
6 Rozemeijer et al. (2012).

7

8 When comparing the water balances for the reference period with the controlled drainage period,
9 the differences in precipitation input and the groundwater storage change should be considered.

10 The reference period was wetter than both controlled drainage periods, which may explain part of
11 the differences in the discharges via groundwater, tube drains and overland flow in the water
12 balances. In addition, the groundwater levels rose during the reference water balance period.
13 This change in groundwater storage during the reference period is compensated with a negative
14 water volume (-108 mm), indicated as 'compensation groundwater storage change' in the water
15 balances in Table 1. During the first controlled drainage period, a smaller rise in groundwater
16 levels was measured. During the second controlled drainage period the groundwater levels
17 dropped slightly, which is compensated for in the water balance with a positive volume (+26mm).

18

19 The discharge via the tube drains was significantly lower in the controlled drainage periods
20 compared to the reference period; -46% in 2009-2010 and -58% in 2010-2011. The discharge via
21 groundwater increased slightly. Overland flow was slightly less in 2009-2010 and more in 2010-
22 2011. However, these small changes in groundwater discharge and overland flow cannot
23 compensate for the large reduction in discharge via drains. This compensation mainly comes
24 from the net inflow of water from the surrounding fields. During the reference period, the field
25 received a substantial influx of water from the surroundings (+154 mm). This influx was almost
26 absent (+ 8 mm) during the first controlled drainage period. During the second controlled
27 drainage period, a net outflux (-47 mm) from the field towards the surroundings was found. The
28 change from a net influx to a net outflux is related to the elevated groundwater levels at the
29 experimental field in the controlled drainage period.

1

2 **3.2 Nutrient concentrations and loads**

3 The measured nutrient concentrations ($\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$, P-tot, PO_4) in tube drain effluent for the reference
4 period and the controlled drainage period are shown in Figure 6. During the reference period, the
5 $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations varied between ca. 6 mgN/l in winter and 3 mgN/l in summer. During the
6 controlled drainage period, higher $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations of 8-10 mgN/l were recorded. The
7 concentrations were well above the surface water quality standard of 2.3 mgN/l (Van der Molen
8 et al., 2012). The $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations did not directly respond to changes in the overflow
9 levels of the drains. However, the $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations increased upon the rewetting of the field
10 and the increase of groundwater levels during November and December 2008. Although this
11 increase in groundwater levels and $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations is a common seasonal pattern,
12 elevating the overflow levels of the tube drains further increased both the groundwater levels and
13 $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations. The increase of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations is related to the activation of near
14 surface $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ rich groundwater flow routes towards the tube drains. The described autumn
15 rewetting pattern is less clear in 2010, when a large precipitation event in August caused an
16 immediate rewetting of the field and activation of NO_3 -rich tube drainage.

17

18 For P, low concentrations were measured, both before and after the introduction of controlled
19 drainage. Unlike $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$, the P concentrations did not increase during rewetting in autumn. The
20 low P-tot concentrations are related to the P-immobilisation in the tube drains due to adsorption
21 to iron-oxides (Van der Grift et al., 2014). During the 2010-2011 drainage season, the P-tot
22 concentrations did increase after lowering the overflow levels with 50 cm and thereby increasing
23 the drain effluent flow velocities. This caused uptake and transport of the P-rich iron oxides and
24 higher P concentrations in the tube drain effluent.

25

26 The results of the SorbiCell average concentration measurements for the individual drains are
27 shown in Figure 7. The data show that the largest increase in $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations occurred in
28 drain 3. During the reference period, the effluent from this drain showed $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations

1 close to zero. In the controlled drainage period however, the $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations were
2 between the concentrations measured in drain 1 and 2.

3

4 Cumulative plots of the nutrient loads from the three drains are shown in Figure 8, together with
5 the cumulative precipitation and drain discharge. The $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ and P loads for distinct periods are
6 given in Table 2. The first three periods in Table 2 give the loads for periods of a total year.
7 Comparing both controlled drainage years (periods 2 and 3) with the reference (period 1) shows
8 that the P loads were reduced after introducing controlled drainage. The P load/precipitation
9 ratios were also lower for the controlled drainage periods 2 and 3 than for the reference period.
10 For $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$, however, the yearly $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ loads were higher in the controlled drainage periods. This
11 is related to the higher $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentrations in drain effluent after the introduction of controlled
12 drainage, especially in period 2.

13

14 The impact of adjusting the overflow levels on nutrient loads is most clear in the 2010-2011
15 drainage period, when large adjustments of the overflow levels were made. Elevating the
16 overflow levels reduced the drainage flux and loads, as indicated by the leveling of the
17 cumulative graphs in Figure 8 and by the lower loads and load/precipitation ratios during period 9
18 in Table 2. Lowering the overflow levels however, induced higher drainage flow and higher loads.
19 For example, the nutrient loads were relatively high during a controlled drainage period with
20 lowered overflow levels (period 7). In figure 8, the cumulative discharge and load rates of change
21 become steeper after lowering the overflow levels.

22

1 **4 Discussion**

2 The monitoring results produced valuable insights in the hydrological and hydrochemical effects
3 of controlled drainage and in some practical issues for implementing controlled drainage and
4 optimizing its effects in agricultural practice. First, the groundwater level monitoring revealed that
5 on the pilot field (1) the groundwater levels were well above the drain levels during the winter
6 drainage periods and (2) the groundwater curvature between the individual drains was limited (2-
7 3 cm). In figure 9, the common drainage concept (e.g. De Vos et al., 2000) is compared with the
8 situation at the experimental field. It is suggested that the groundwater discharge through the
9 drains is limited due to an increased entrance resistance caused by the clogging of iron oxide
10 around the drains. The formation of iron oxides around the water table and in tube drains is a
11 known problem among farmers in the area and is related to reduced, iron rich groundwater that is
12 mixed with nitrate- and oxygen-containing infiltrating water. The kinetics of this iron oxidation
13 process and its effect on P immobilization were studied for the same pilot site by Van der Grift et
14 al., (2014).

15
16 From the groundwater level monitoring, a large difference was observed in the effect of
17 controlled drainage between the piezometer transect at 5 m and at 80 m from the ditch. The less
18 significant response of transect B is related to the dominant effect of direct drainage towards the
19 ditch at 5 m distance. For the area further away from the ditch, drainage via tube drains is
20 dominant and the effects of elevating the overflow levels are more significant. This concept,
21 where most extra groundwater storage is realized further away from the ditch, is sketched in
22 Figure 10. Controlling the discharge and water levels in the ditch using a flexible weir would
23 enhance the utilization of the groundwater storage capacity close to the ditch. Especially in areas
24 with a dense network of open ditches, a combination of controlling both tube drain and open ditch
25 discharges and water levels should be considered to increase the effectiveness of controlled
26 drainage systems.

27
28 For the reduction of drought damage in summer, the groundwater storage during the spring
29 period is crucial. To conserve water for the growing season, the overflow levels should be

1 elevated as early as possible after the first manure application in February. After the first
2 controlled drainage season, the overflow levels were not elevated until 15 April 2010. After this, a
3 dry period started and increasing temperatures and grass growth enhanced evapotranspiration.
4 No extra water was conserved for the summer period. At the end of the second drainage season,
5 the overflow levels were elevated on 15 March 2011. This prevented the discharge of circa 160
6 m³ (ca. 18 mm) of groundwater. The two scenarios are visualized in Figure 11. The green line
7 represents the groundwater levels when drain discharge was prevented and water was
8 conserved by elevating the drain outlets on time. The purple line represents the groundwater
9 levels when the overflow levels were not elevated before the drains became inactive and no
10 discharge was prevented. Although elevating the overflow levels of the drains in early spring
11 reduces drought in summer, the reduced discharge may hinder farm practices in early spring. At
12 the end of the winter ban on manure spreading on February 15th, many livestock farmers are at
13 or close to the maximum of their manure storage capacity. This forces them to apply manure in
14 February and March, which may still be hampered by wet conditions, especially when the
15 drainage is reduced by elevated overflow levels. A larger manure storage capacity could reduce
16 the pressure for early manure applications and improve the effective use of controlled drainage
17 systems to conserve water.

18

19 The introduction of controlled drainage did not reduce the NO₃-N and P concentrations in the
20 drain effluent. The NO₃-N concentrations even increased, although this was largely caused by
21 elevated concentrations in one of the drains which may or may not be related to controlled
22 drainage. Due to the increased concentrations, the NO₃-N loads increased after introducing
23 controlled drainage. The P loads reduced, which is related to the reduced drain discharge.
24 However, the comparison of water balances indicated that the reduced drain discharge is
25 compensated by more overland flow and shallow groundwater flow, both to the surrounding fields
26 and directly to the ditch. The increased contribution of these flow routes may increase the NO₃-N
27 and P loads to surface water. For P, an average concentration of 0.65 mg/l was observed in
28 overland flow in the Hupsel catchment (Rozemeijer & Van der Velde, 2014).

29

1 At the experimental field, the tube drains contributed 80% of the total yearly water discharge to
2 the surface water and 90% of the total yearly NO₃-N and P export (Rozemeijer et al., 2010a).
3 This relatively large contribution is related to poor natural drainage through the relatively thin
4 unconfined aquifer. The relative importance of the tube drain discharge for water and nutrient
5 transport also results in a relatively large impact of the introduction of controlled drainage. In
6 areas with lower contributions of tube drain discharge, the effects of controlled drainage on water
7 and nutrient transport may be less.

8

9 In the monitoring setup, continuous nutrient monitoring was successfully combined with passive
10 samplers for average nutrient concentration monitoring. The equipment for continuous monitoring
11 was applied for the registration of concentrations in the combined effluent of the three studied
12 tube drains. Together with the continuous registration of discharge, the high resolution nutrient
13 concentration measurements enabled us to report detailed tube drain load patterns that could not
14 have been measured by low-frequency grab sampling (see also Rozemeijer et al., 2010d). In
15 addition, the direct responses of discharge and nutrient concentrations to the changes in
16 overflow levels of the drains were measured. These responses would not have been captured by
17 conventional grab sampling. The SorbiCell-samplers were applied to measure average NO₃-N
18 concentrations for individual drains. This information became important to understand the
19 increase of the combined effluent NO₃-N concentrations after introducing controlled drainage.
20 This increase could largely be explained by the increased concentrations of effluent from one of
21 the three drains and is not necessarily related to the introduction of controlled drainage. The
22 strategy of combining continuous water quality monitoring and passive samplers for individual
23 sources is applicable for other monitoring studies as well.

24

1 **5 Conclusions**

2 The experimental setup produced valuable insights in the hydrological and hydrochemical effects
3 of controlled drainage and in options to optimize the effects in agricultural practice. The
4 introduction of controlled drainage effectively reduced the drain discharge and increased the
5 groundwater storage in the studied field-site. To achieve this, the overflow levels have to be
6 elevated in early spring, before the drain discharge stops due to dryer conditions. The
7 groundwater storage in the field would have been larger when the water levels in the adjacent
8 ditch would have been controlled as well. The comparison of water balances before and after the
9 introduction showed that the reduced drain discharge was partly compensated by more overland
10 flow and shallow groundwater flow, both to the surrounding fields and directly to the ditch.
11 Controlled drainage did not have clear positive effects for nutrient losses to surface water. The
12 tube drains NO₃-N concentrations and loads increased after introducing controlled drainage,
13 which was largely related to elevated concentrations in one of the three monitored tube drains.
14 The P loads via tube drainage decreased due to the lower drain discharge. However, this may be
15 compensated by more P-rich overland flow and shallow groundwater flow. In areas with dense
16 networks of open ditches, the effectiveness of controlled drainage for water conservation may be
17 increased by also controlling the ditch water levels and discharges using flexible weirs. The
18 pressure on manure application on dry fields directly after the end of the winter ban on manure
19 spreading limits the optimal use of controlled drainage systems to conserve water in early spring.

20

21 **Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank Water Authority Rijn en IJssel for partially
22 funding this study and especially Laurens Gerner, Annemarie Kramer and Bob van IJzendoorn
23 are acknowledged for their cooperation. We also thank land owner Wim Kimmels for allowing our
24 experiments on his farmland.

25

1 **References**

2
3 De Jonge, H., and Rothenberg, G.: New device and method for flux-proportional sampling of
4 mobile solutes in soil and groundwater. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 39, 274-282, 2005.

5
6 De Vos, J.A., D. Hesterberg, and P.A.C. Raats: Nitrate leaching in a tile-drained silt loam soil,
7 *Soil Sci. Soc. of Am.J.* 64,517-527,2000.

8
9 Díaz, R.J., and Rosenberg, R.: Introduction to environmental and economic consequences of
10 hypoxia. *Int. J. Water Resour. D.*,27, 71-82, 2011.

11
12 Evans, R.O., Skaggs, R.W., and Gilliam, J.W.: Controlled versus conventional drainage effects
13 on water quality. *J. Irrig. Drain. E.-ASCE*, 121(4), 271-276, 1995.

14
15 Foley, J.A., DeFries, R., Asner, G.P., Barford, C., Bonan, G., Carpenter, S.R., Chapin, F.S., Coe,
16 M.T., Daily, G.C., Gibbs, H.K., Helkowski, J.H., Holloway, T., Howard, E.A., Kucharik, C.J.,
17 Monfreda, C., Patz, J.A., Prentice, I.C., Ramankutty, N., and Snyder, P.K.: Global consequences
18 of land use, *Science*, 309, 570-574, 2005.

19
20 Ghane, E., Fausey, N.R., Shedekar, V.S., Piepho, H.P., Shang, Y., and Brown, L.C.: Crop yield
21 evaluation under controlled drainage in Ohio, United States. *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, 67, 465-473,
22 2012.

23
24 Heinen, M., Noij, I.G. A. M., Heesmans, H. I. M., Van Groenigen, J.W., Groenendijk, P., and
25 Thissen J. T. N. M. A Novel Method to Determine Buffer Strip Effectiveness on Deep Soils. *J.*
26 *Environ. Qual.*, 41, 334–347, 2012.

27
28 Helmers, M., Christianson, R., Brenneman, G., Lockett, D. and Pederson, C.: Water table,
29 drainage, and yield response to drainage water management in southeast Iowa. *J. Soil Water*
30 *Conserv.*, 67, 495-501, 2012.

31
32 Howarth, R.W.: Coastal nitrogen pollution: A review of sources and trends globally and
33 regionally. *Harmful Algae* 8, 14–20, 2008.

34
35 Jaynes, D.B.: Changes in yield and nitrate losses from using drainage water management in
36 central Iowa, United States. *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, 67, 485-494., 2012.

1 Makarewicz, J.C., D'Aiuto, P.E., and Bosch, I.: Elevated Nutrient Levels from Agriculturally
2 Dominated Watersheds Stimulate Metaphyton Growth. *J. Great Lakes Res.*, 33, 437–448., 2007.
3

4 Rozemeijer J.C., Van der Velde, Y., Van Geer, F.C., Bierkens, M.F.P., and Broers, H.P.: Direct
5 measurements of the tile drain and groundwater flow route contributions to surface water
6 contamination: From field-scale concentration patterns in groundwater to catchment-scale
7 surface water quality, *Environ. Pollut.*, 158, 3571-3579., 2010a.
8

9 Rozemeijer, J.C., Van Der Velde, Y., McLaren, R.G., Van Geer, F.C., Broers, H.P., and Bierkens,
10 M.F.P.: Integrated modeling of groundwater-surface water interactions in a tile-drained
11 agricultural field: The importance of directly measured flow route contributions directly measured
12 flow route contributions, *Water Resour. Res.*, 46, 2010b
13

14 Rozemeijer, J.C., Van der Velde, Y., De Jonge, H., Van Geer, F.C., Broers, H.P., and Bierkens,
15 M.F.P.: Application and evaluation of a new passive sampler for measuring average solute
16 concentrations in a catchment-scale water quality monitoring study, *Env. Sci. Technol.*, 44,
17 1353–1359, 2010c.
18

19 Rozemeijer J.C., Van der Velde, Y., Van Geer, F.C., De Rooij, G.H., Torfs, P., and Broers, H.P.:
20 Improving load estimates for NO₃ and P in surface waters by characterizing the concentration
21 response to rainfall events, *Env. Sci. Technol.* 44: 6305-6312, 2010d.
22

23 Rozemeijer, J.C., Broers, H.P., Visser, A., Winegram, M., Borren, W., Gerner, L., Van
24 IJzendoorn, B., and Kramer, A.: Veldonderzoek naar de effecten van peilgestuurde drainage op
25 grondwaterstanden, drainafvoeren en waterkwaliteit op het Oost-Nederlands Plateau, Deltares-
26 report 1201979-000-BGS-0001, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 2012 (in Dutch).
27

28 Rozemeijer, J.C., and Van der Velde, Y.: Temporal variability in groundwater and surface water
29 quality in humid agricultural catchments; driving processes and consequences for regional water
30 quality monitoring, *Fundam. Appl. Limnol.*, 184, 195–209, 2014.
31

32 Statham, P.J.: Nutrients in estuaries - An overview and the potential impacts of climate change,
33 *Sci. Tot. Environ.*, 434, 213-227, 2012.
34

35 Seitzinger, S.P., Mayorga, E., Bouwman, A.F., Kroeze, C., Beusen, A.H.W., Billen, G., Van
36 Drecht, G., Dumont, E., Fekete, B.M., Garnier, J., and Harrison, J.A: Global river nutrient export:
37 A scenario analysis of past and future trends, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 24, Article number
38 GB0A08, 2010.

1
2 Van der Grift, B., Rozemeijer, J.C., Griffioen, J., and Van der Velde, Y: Iron oxidation kinetics and
3 phosphate immobilization along the flow-path from groundwater into surface water, *Hydrol. Earth*
4 *Syst. Sci.*, 18, 4687-4702, 2014.
5
6 Van der Grift, B., Broers, H. P., Berendrecht, W. L., Rozemeijer, J. C., Osté, L.A., and Griffioen,
7 J.: High-frequency monitoring reveals nutrient sources and transport processes in an agriculture-
8 dominated lowland water system, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 12, 8337–8380, 2015.
9
10 Van der Molen, D.T., Pot, R., Evers, C.H.M., and Van Nieuwerburgh, L.L.J.: Referenties en
11 maatlatten voor natuurlijke watertypen voor de Kaderrichtlijn Water 2015-2021, STOWA
12 rapportnummer 2012-31, 2012 (in Dutch).
13
14 Van der Velde, Y., Rozemeijer, J.C., De Rooij, G.H., Van Geer, F.C., and Broers, H.P: Field
15 scale measurements for separation of catchment discharge into flow route contributions, *Vadose*
16 *Zone J.*, 9, 25-35, 2010a.
17
18 Van der Velde, Y., Rozemeijer, J.C., De Rooij, G.H., Van Geer, F.C., Torfs, P.J.J.F., and De
19 Louw, P.G.B.: Improving catchment discharge predictions by inferring flow route contributions
20 from a nested-scale monitoring and model setup, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 15, 913-930, 2010b.
21 .
22 Van Ommen, H.C., Dijkema, R., Hendrickx, J.M.H., Dekker, L.W., Hulshof, J., and Van Den
23 Heuvel, M.: Experimental assessment of preferential flow paths in a field soil, *J. Hydrol.* 105,
24 253-262, 1989.
25
26 Weijters, M.J., Janse, J.H., Alkemade, R.,and Verhoeven, J.T.A.: Quantifying the effect of
27 catchment land use and water nutrient concentrations on freshwater river and stream
28 biodiversity. *Aquat. Conserv.*, 19, 104–112, 2009.
29
30 Wesström, I, and Messing, I.: Effects of controlled drainage on N and P losses and N dynamics
31 in a loamy sand with spring crops, *Agricultural Water Management*, 87, 229–240, 2007.
32
33 Winegram, M.: Effects of controlled drainage in an agricultural watershed on water storage and
34 nutrient transport by using time series analysis, MSc-thesis VU Amsterdam, 2012.
35

1 **Tables**

2

3 Table 1: Water balances for a reference drainage season (2007-2008) and two controlled
4 drainage seasons (2009-2010 and 2010-2011).

5

Water balance period	Reference	Controlled drainage	
	2 Nov 2007 - 2 Apr 2008	2 Nov 2009 - 2 Apr 2010	2 Nov 2010 - 2 Apr 2011
Precipitation (mm)	+387	+331	+300
Evapotranspiration(mm)	-51	-47	-50
Discharge via drains (mm)	-303	-163	-127
Discharge via groundwater (mm)	-51	-63	-68
Discharge via overland and biopore flow (mm)	-28	-20	-34
Compensation groundwater storage change (mm)	-108	-46	+26
Net inflow from surroundings (mm)	+154	+8	-47

6

7

8

9 Table 2: Comparison of NO₃-N and P loads in the combined discharge of three drains between
10 distinct periods. Precipitation and the ratios between loads and precipitation are also shown. The
11 first 3 periods cover total years; the others compare shorter periods within the drainage season.

12

Period	Drainage level	Start	End	Precipitation [mm]	NO ₃ -N load [kg]	NO ₃ -N load / Precipitation (kg/mm)	P load [g]	P load / Precipitation (g/mm)
1	Reference	02-Nov-07	02- Nov -08	812	17.6	0.022	284	0.35
2	Controlled (+0-50cm)	02- Nov -09	02- Nov -10	896	24.3	0.027	134	0.15
3	Controlled (+0-50cm)	21-Apr-10	21-Apr-11	861	18.2	0.021	127	0.15
4	Reference	03-Dec-07	12-Feb-08	175	15.1	0.086	240	1.37
5	Controlled (+0-50cm)	02- Dec -09	12- Feb -10	161	26.7	0.166	147	0.91
6	Reference	03-Sep-08	19-Nov-08	122	1.2	0.010	19	0.16
7	Controlled (+0 cm)	03-Sep-10	17-Nov-10	228	11.3	0.050	88	0.39
8	Reference	19-Nov-07	01-Feb-08	191	8.9	0.047	129	0.68
9	Controlled (+50 cm)	19-Nov-10	02-Feb-11	131	3.0	0.023	13	0.10

13


14

15

16

1 **Figures**

2




3

4

5 Figure 1: Location of the Hupsel Catchment and the experimental field. The field sketch shows
6 the three measured tube drains, the location of the in-stream reservoirs, and the locations of the
7 continuous groundwater level recording in transects at 5 m from the ditch (B1-B7) and at 80 m
8 from the ditch (D1-D7).

9

10




1
2
3
4
5

Figure 2: Picture of the complete setup with collector vessels for drain discharge, pumps and water flux meters. The shed in the back houses the data acquisition and control equipment.




1
 2 Figure 3: Pictures of the controlled drainage period setup, (a) the drainage overflow levels were
 3 adjusted by attaching the flexible connection tube (with a SorbiCell socket between the black
 4 fasteners) at the desired level, (b) the tube drain effluent was pumped to a collection vessel to
 5 enable continuous monitoring of NO₃-N and total-P concentrations using a Nitratax-sensor and a
 6 Phosphax autoanalyser (c).
 7



8
 9
 10 Figure 4: Drainage overflow level management schedule. The overflow levels were elevated
 11 most of the time, but were lowered in early spring and, if needed, in autumn to accommodate
 12 manure application and harvest.
 13


1




2

3 Figure 5: Combined results of hydrological measurements. The time series shown are (1) the
 4 overflow level of the drains (fixed at 27.5 in reference period, variable in controlled drainage
 5 period) in black, (2) the groundwater levels of the two transects B and D, (3) in the lower part the
 6 drainage flux (grey) and precipitation (blue). The surface elevations at the lowest and highest
 7 groundwater monitoring locations of transects B and D are shown in coloured horizontal lines.

8



9




10

11 Figure 6: Measured nutrient concentrations in drain effluent. Precipitation (blue), drain discharge
 12 (grey), and the overflow levels are also plotted.



13

1





2

3 Figure 7: Results of the SorbiCell average NO₃-N concentration measurements for the individual
4 drains.
5




6

7 Figure 8: Cumulative precipitation, drain discharge, and drain NO₃-N and P-tot loads.
8
9
10




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Figure 9: Comparison of (A) the common drainage concept with groundwater tables at the drain elevations and a large groundwater curvature between individual drains and (B) the situation at the experimental field with groundwater tables above the drains and a small groundwater curvature between the drains.



9
10
11
12
13
14

Figure 10: Transect-sketch of the effects of controlled drainage on groundwater levels in the experimental field.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Figure 11: The crucial timing of elevating the overflow levels of controlled drainage at the end of the drainage season. Water can be conserved when the drain outlets are elevated before the groundwater levels are below the drains and the discharge has stopped.