Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, C3145–C3151, 2010
www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/6/C3145/2010/

Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions

Interactive comment on "Plot and field scale soil moisture dynamics and subsurface wetness control on runoff generation in a headwater in the Ore Mountains" *by* E. Zehe et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 18 January 2010

Overview

The study investigates the innovative Spatial TDR (STDR) technology to assess the spatial-temporal soil moisture behaviour in two (grassland and forested) experimental sites located in the German eastern Ore mountains. Moreover, the relationship between soil moisture and runoff for the headwater catchment (16 km2) including the experimental areas was analyzed.

General Comments

The paper is well written and structured and the topic is relevant for the HESS reader.

Full Screen / Esc
Printer-friendly Version
Interactive Discussion
Discussion Paper

The paper presents a novel technology and the language is fluent and precise. However, in my opinion, several aspects should be better discussed before its publication.

1) The first one concerns the selection of an appropriate strategy to set up a soil moisture monitoring network to be used for improving the understanding of the rainfall-runoff behaviour at the catchment scale. The authors, in the introduction, stated that " Soil moisture at the headwater scale exhibits huge spatial variability and single or even distributed TDR measurements yield non-representative data". However, several studies reported that a few number of soil moisture measurements can be conveniently used for the estimation of the wetness conditions at the catchment scale, and, hence, to improve rainfall-runoff modelling (Aubert et al., 2003; Pfister et al., 2003; Anctil et al., 2008; Brocca et al., 2009; Tramblay et al., 2009). On the other hand, many studies analyzing the temporal stability of soil moisture spatial pattern revealed that, also for large areas, the temporal behaviour of spatial mean soil moisture can be derived from a small number of point measurements (see e.g. Grayson and Western, 1998; De Rosnay et al., 2009; Brocca et al., 2010). In this study (see P7516L24-26) soil moisture measurements carried out in an area of 400 m2 were found correlated with the runoff response of the catchment having a drainage area of 16 km2 (five order of magnitude larger!). This result agrees well with those mentioned above and confirms the possibility to monitor soil moisture in few locations, also for "large" catchments. Therefore, I suggest to reformulate the introduction and the discussion sections considering these comments. I agree with the authors that the STDR technology represents a clear improvement for soil moisture monitoring at the catchment scale (mainly because the soil moisture profile can be derived) but it was demonstrated that also a network of ground soil moisture sensors (and also satellite derived soil moisture estimates) can furnish useful information for rainfall-runoff modelling and even for flood warning purposes.

2) As mentioned by the authors in the conclusions section, the geostatistical analysis carried out for a small area has little sense. In this case, in my opinion, the analysis of the relationship between other statistical quantities as mean, standard deviation

HESSD

6, C3145–C3151, 2010

and coefficient of variation can be more valuable (see e.g. De Lannoy et al., 2006; Famiglietti et al., 2008).

3) In the regression analysis I suggest to use not only the runoff coefficient as indicator of the runoff response at catchment scale. Several authors suggested to compute the soil potential maximum retention parameter, S, of the Soil Conservation Service - Curve Number method (Huang et al., 2007; Brocca et al., 2009; Tramblay et al., 2009) that reproduces at best the runoff volume and to use this value as benchmark for the comparison with in-situ soil moisture observations. Otherwise, the initial soil moisture conditions derived by a physically based approach (as the CATFLOW model used in this study) can be more conveniently used for this purpose. Due to the strong non linearity of the relation between soil moisture and runoff a comparison with these indicators can be more meaningful for the assessment of the representativeness of the TDR cluster at catchment scale. Moreover, why antecedent precipitation indices were not tested? Why a multiple regression analysis was not performed? I suggest to investigate also these two aspects.

4) The application of the CATFLOW model for soil moisture simulation is very poorly described. I do not understand if the model parameters are calibrated or estimated through specific measurements. For instance, in the study area and field instrumentation section the authors reported that C2 site is characterized by a higher infiltrability (beyond the measurement range) than C1 site. However, looking at Table 2 the ks values for the two sites are quite similar. If the model parameters are calibrated it is not surprising the good accordance between model simulation and observations (see P7518L13-14). When the parameters are calibrated, even with more simple models similar results can be obtained. Moreover, it is not amazing that for long term soil moisture simulations the more significant process is the evapotranspiration (see e.g. Brocca et al., 2008). Finally, mainly if model parameters are calibrated, I suggest to use also the 2008 period (that should be available) for model validation to give a more clear picture of the model performance.

HESSD

6, C3145–C3151, 2010

On this basis, the paper can be recommended for publication in HESS journal, provided the comments and suggestions given above are addressed.

Specific Comments/ Technical Corrections

P7505L15: see also Aubert et al. (2003); Anctil et al. (2008); Brocca et al. (2009) and Tramblay et al. (2009) for studies relating soil moisture observations and runoff.

P7506L16-18: Other authors found opposite results. For instance, a direct relationship between mean and standard deviation was frequently observed analyzing soil moisture spatial patterns (see e.g Figure 1 in Brocca et al., 2007). In general, the relationship type depends on the climatic and soil characteristics of the study area (Teuling and Troch, 2005). The same occurs for the mean-correlation length relationship.

P7507L1: "km" to modify as "km2"

P7507L29: Graeff et al., 2009 is reported 2 times in the reference section. Use 2009a and 2009b to distinguish the 2 papers. Moreover, the acceptance of the paper Graeff et al. (2009) submitted to HESSD is needed for this study because it reports the description of the STDR technology. Likely, a brief description should be included in this paper.

P7509L18-19: A more detailed description of the two grids where soil moisture measurements were carried out is needed. For instance, what is the location of the two sites within the catchment? Which is the distance between C1 and C2 sites? Which is the area covered by the two grids? Which is the average spacing between measurement points?

P7512L17: "...and the separated..." to modify as "...and then separated..."

P7512L23-24: I suppose that the recession coefficients are computed for the recession limb of the hydrograph but it should be better specified.

P7512L27: Why was only the grassland site used for the comparison with the catch-

HESSD

6, C3145–C3151, 2010

ment runoff response? Were the results for the forested site not good? If so please specify because it is relevant to know which are the better locations for soil moisture monitoring.

P7513L11: Please specify the SVAT acronym.

P7514L2-4: I suggest to include a figure showing the employed numerical scheme. It helps the reader to better understand the CATFLOW model application.

P7514L6: "...26 October 2008." to modify as "26 October 2007.".

P7515L8-10: Please reformulate the sentence because it is not clear.

P7515L20-21: What does one order of magnitude smaller mean? Please specify better this part where the spatial and temporal variability of soil moisture patterns is compared because it is confusing for me. I do not understand if the spatial variability is more significant than the temporal variability or viceversa.

P7515L24-25: Likely, the low correlation length is due to the small area investigated.

P7516L8-10: The sill to nugget ratio equal to $\sim$1 means that, for the forested site, the spatial soil moisture patterns are not organized (see also Figure 4 on the right). Therefore, the correlation length obtained for this site has a very low sense.

P7517L28: Show the first guess line of Mauer in Figure 9.

P7519L20: "...total runoff production is stronger in, ..." to modify as "...total runoff production is stronger in autumn (?), ...".

P7520L3: This is true for long term soil moisture dynamic simulation. For short term analysis the infiltration parameters are more significant. Please specify.

Figure 1: The figure showing the catchment (in the middle) is too small. Please enlarge it and include the hydrometeorological network location.

Figure 3: For the lower panel the y label is missing

HESSD

6, C3145–C3151, 2010

References

Anctil, F., Lauzon, L., Filion, M. (2008). Added gains of soil moisture content observations for streamflow predictions using neural networks. Journal of Hydrology, 359(3-4), 225-234.

Aubert, D., Loumagne, C., Oudin, L. (2003). Sequential assimilation of soil moisture and streamflow data in a conceptual rainfall runoff model. Journal of Hydrology, 280, 145-161. Brocca, L., Morbidelli, R., Melone, F., Moramarco, T. (2007). Soil moisture spatial variability in experimental areas of central Italy. Journal of Hydrology, 333 (2-4), 356-373.

Brocca, L., Melone, F., Moramarco, T., Singh, V.P. (2009): Assimilation of observed soil moisture data in storm rainfall runoff modelling. Journal of Hydrologic Engineering ASCE, 14(2), 153-165.

Brocca, L., Melone, F., Moramarco, T., Morbidelli, R. (2010). The spatial-temporal variability of soil moisture and its estimation across scales. Water Resources Research, in press, doi:10.1029/2009WR008016.

De Lannoy G.J.M., Verhoest N.E.C., Houser P.R., Gish T.J., Van Meirvenne M. (2006) Spatial and temporal characteristics of soil moisture in an intensively monitored agricultural field (OPE3), Journal of Hydrology, 331(3-4), 719-730.

De Rosnay, P., C. Gruhier, F. Timouk, F. Baup, E. Mougin, P. Hiernaux, L. Kergoat, V. LeDantec (2009). Multiscale soil moisture measurements at the Gourma meso-scale site in Mali, Journal of Hydrology, 375(1-2), 241-252.

Famiglietti, J. S., D. Ryu, A. A. Berg, M. Rodell, T. J. Jackson (2008). Field observations of soil moisture variability across scales, Water Resources Research, 44, W01423.

Grayson, R. B., Western, A. W. (1998), Towards areal estimation of soil water content from point measurements: time and space stability of mean response, Journal of Hydrology, 207, 68-82.

Huang, M., Gallichand, J., Dong, C., Wang, Z., Shao, M. (2007). Use of soil moisture data and curve number method for estimating runoff in the Loess Plateau of China. Hydrol. Processes, 21(11), 1471-1481.

Pfister, L., Drogue, G., El Idrissi, A., Humbert, J., Iffly, J.F., Matgen, P., Hoffmann, L. (2003). Predicting peak discharge through empirical relationships between rainfall, groundwater level and basin humidity in the Alzette river basin (Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg). Journal of Hydrology and Hydromechanics, 51, 210-220.

Teuling, A.J., Troch, P.A. (2005) Improved understanding of soil moisture variability dynamics, Geophysical Research Letters, 32, L05404.

Tramblay, Y., Bouvier, C., Martin, C., Didon-Lescot, J.F. (2009). Assessment of soil moisture to set the initial conditions of a event-based rainfall-runoff model. Plinius Conference Abstracts, 11, Plinius11-35-2.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 7503, 2009.