Response to Reviewers

Aged streams: Time lags of nitrate, chloride and tritium assessed by Dynamic Groundwater Flow Tracking in a Lowland Landscape

https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-552

OVERALL RESPONSE: First we would like to thank the reviewers for taking the time to review our manuscript and providing us with extensive and constructive reviews. Based on the reviewer's comments, we have rewritten large parts of the text, changed the structure and added some extra analysis.

The large changes to the manuscript are:

- We have clearer articulated the innovative method that we use: this paper is one of the first to apply dynamic Travel Time Distributions to explore and interpret the processes driving observed water quality and isotopes dynamics.
- The sensitivity analysis has been renamed to an 'exploration of the model behaviour under different scenarios', which better reflects the aim of the analysis. Parts of the manuscript have been rewritten for this.
- The unique long-term dataset (1969-2018) of in-stream concentrations now has a more prominent place in the manuscript. They are now presented in a new paragraph in the Results: "3.2. Water quality measurements of surface water" and detail was be added on e.g. the time of observations, the resolution of the data and the amount of measurements. We discuss the long-term trends and seasonal variability shown in the data and calculated by the model in more detail. Likewise, the constructed input curves are now added to the Results section.
- The way that the unsaturated zone was incorporated in the method is clarified and more extensively discussed.
- The discussion has beeb extended and rewritten to focus on the hydrological and chemical processes that occur in the breakthrough of agricultural solutes and the associated time lags, especially for nitrate. For instance, an extra scenario has been added in which a distinction is made between directly-available nitrogen and organic N that is more slowly leached towards the groundwater. We better define the concept of 'time lags' to avoid confusion over this term.
- Paragraph 4.4 on 'Improving and use of the model' for the study catchment, which included Figure 10 with the 'Best model fit' has been removed. This part of the manuscript was confusing and distracted from the overall aims of the manuscript. Relevant parts from this paragraph have been added elsewhere in the paper.

We will discuss the points raised by both reviewers step-wise below.

Anonymous Referee #1 Received and published: 11 December 2019

General comments:

Still the analysis/discussion of the results could use some more work. At the moment, results are reported but not discussed in sufficient depth concerning the potentially responsible hydrologic processes. Thus far the discussion can even be condensed as it contains several repetitions.

RESPONSE: Agreed. We have critically gone through the discussion section and remove repetitions. Section 4.4, which discussed an attempt to improve the model fit, has removed from the manuscript, as it did not add to, but actually distracted from the aim of the paper. Furthermore, we added more discussion on the responsible hydrological processes that play a role. An extra scenario was added to the exploration of the model behaviour, in which a distinction has been made between nitrogen that is directly available and leaching towards the groundwater and persistent organic nitrogen that is only slowly transformed to nitrate and leached towards the groundwater (and thus creating a lag in the nitrate breakthrough). These processes are now discussed. Some of the text we added is:

Also the model lacks measures to evaluate its performance/fit.

RESPONSE: The groundwater model itself was calibrated and validated using groundwater heads and discharges (discharge NSE 0.65), as discussed in Kaandorp et al., 2018 WRR. The model was not further calibrated as it is only used as a tool to investigate it's use for the particle tracking / Travel Time method. In the analysis done in the current paper the measured chloride, nitrate and tritium function as an added evaluation of the transient TTD model.

Likewise the sensitivity analysis does not include a comprehensive evaluation of the parameter importance.

RESPONSE: Agreed. The term 'sensitivity analysis' was a bit misleading for what we tried to do. We have changed this term throughout the manuscript to an 'exploration of the model behavior under different scenarios', to better represent the actual method and goal. The effect of the different parameters is discussed in section 4.1 (The effect of processes on modelled breakthroughs) and we added a more comprehensive evaluation to this paragraph to indicate the importance of the different parameters and processes.

Addressing these issues would prevent the results and discussion to sound as vague as they currently still do. The overall conclusions are not that surprising and will benefit from a more in-depth discussion.

RESPONSE: Agreed. We extended the discussion section with further discussion on the responsible hydrological processes that play a role. We revised the conclusions to better represent the innovative parts of the manuscript. Additions to the text include:
 Revised text: *"By making this connection between dynamic groundwater travel time distributions and long-term in-stream concentration measurements, we were able to show that the seasonal and long-term fluctuations of in-stream solute concentrations were mainly caused by the dynamic contribution of different groundwater flow paths."*
"We show that for most catchments, which have a (close to) exponential TTD, a direct reaction of stream nitrate concentrations can be expected to reductions in the nitrogen inputs, even if mean travel times are high, which is contrary to what is often expected. However, we also showed the different processes that can cause a time lag."

The authors manage to write comprehensively and with a good overall structure. Just every now and then they should try to be more consistent when using short versions (Cl/NO3) or the words "chloride"/"nitrate".

RESPONSE: Thanks for the compliment regarding the comprehensiveness and structure. We now use 'chloride' and 'nitrate' consistently.
Revised text: *"chloride" and "nitrate"*

RESPONSE: We agree with the reviewer. Especially the discussion and conclusions did not capture the innovative parts of the manuscript in the right way. Following the reviewers suggestions, we have rewritten the discussion section and added more discussion on the processes and controls. It is important to mention here that this paper is one of the first to couple measurement data of water quality and isotopes to Travel Time Distributions. Even though many recent papers suggest that this method holds a lot of potential, the papers which actually attempt to do so are absent or at least very scarce.

In this modelling study we focus on the groundwater system and indeed highly simplify the unsaturated zone. The unsaturated zone is included in the method in two ways: 1) the groundwater model is coupled with an unsatured zone model (MetaSWAP, see also Kaandorp et al., 2018 WRR) to provide a realistic groundwater recharge based on e.g. land-use; 2) the input curves include part of the unsaturated zone processes: before 2000 by using a nitrate transformation factor of 0.85 and after 2000 by using the concentrations of the shallow groundwater to construct the input curves. Thus, we take into account many of the unsaturated zone processes, just not the delay.

Furthermore, the relevance of the unsaturated zone also depends on the research area and the temporal scale of interest. In this case, the research area is a lowland groundwater-driven catchment with shallow groundwater levels and the focus is on seasonal changes in flow paths and solute concentrations in the stream. This can be well simulated with a simple representation of the unsaturated zone. In a more hilly catchment, or if we would want to simulate the concentration response to individual events, a more detailed representation of unsaturated zone hydrology would be required.

We highlighted these points more in the manuscript.

Specific comments:

Abstract: Try to underline the innovative parts of your study more. Think about more precise results (like TT results, R2) Isn't it important to at least name the investigation area?

RESPONSE: We agree and we thank the reviewer for these suggestions and have rewritten the abstract to include more the innovative aspects and precise results. We added for instance:
Revised text: "This paper is one of the first to calculate in-stream concentrations of tritium, chloride and nitrate using dynamic groundwater travel time distributions (TTDs) derived from a distributed, transient 3D groundwater flow model using forward particle tracking."

"We tested our approach in the Springendalse Beek catchment, a lowland stream in the east of the Netherlands,"

p.2, 33: "through" instead of "though"?

RESPONSE: Agreed and changed accordingly

Revised text: "through"

p.2, 38: how do you mean "land-use" in this context?

RESPONSE: We agree that this is not entirely clear. We mean for instance whether or not manure/fertilizers are used, we made this more clear in the text.
Revised text: "depends on these groundwater flow paths and travel times, as well as on land-use (for instance use of manure and fertilizer)."

p.2, 41: "Land-use determines the timing and quantity of nitrate input" would be more general

RESPONSE: Agreed and changed accordingly.

Revised text: "Land-use determines the timing and quantity of nitrate input as well as its spatial distribution"

p.2, 42: ".depending on the source and timing of infiltration"

RESPONSE: Agreed and changed accordingly.

Revised text: "depending on the source and timing of infiltration,"

p.2, 52: What time is meant by "historical"?

RESPONSE: We agree that this is not clear. We changed the text into:
Revised text: "Therefore, we combine in this follow-up paper these dynamic travel time distributions with input curves for tritium, chloride and nitrate to reconstruct the concentrations in a Dutch stream from 1969 until present, while including the dynamic nature of catchments both in time and space."

p.3, 74: If 20 % of the river are not baseflow, is this not an important NO3 source due to surface runoff with high solute concentrations?

RESPONSE: A baseflow index of 0.8 does not mean that the other 20% is surface runoff. In Dutch catchments, almost all water comes from discharge of groundwater, either through tile drains, in ditches, diffuse or springs. Surface runoff has been observed in the catchment, but consists only of a small part of the discharge. Furthermore the surface runoff mostly transports phosphates, not nitrate (which is leached towards the groundwater).

p.3, 85: How big are the sub-catchments up- and downstream?

RESPONSE: Agreed that this is not clear, we added a map to Figure 1 which shows the sub-catchments, and added to the text:

Revised text: "The upstream part (2 km²) of the Springendalse Beek catchment has several spring areas and is mostly forested with some agricultural fields, while farmland is more abundant in the downstream part (2 km²) of the catchment."

p.3, 71: How can you differentiate between up- and downstream, when having only one gauging station?

RESPONSE: We agree that this is a bit unclear. Some data is available from older gauges and from field activities. However for the analysis in this paper we use the discharges calculated by the model (which were in the earlier paper (Kaandorp et al. 2018, WRR) compared with measured discharges). Surface water quality data is available for both the up- and downstream catchment.

p.3, 89: Do you know rates of drainage? How much percent of the agricultural area are artificially drained? What is the difference of these rates between up- and downstream? I think it's an important number as later on it seems to be a large factor (Fig.9).

RESPONSE: We agree that this is important information. Unfortunately, exact rates of subsurface drainage are not known, although some indication exists from the groundwater model and based on information from the catchment/water authorities. It is also important to know that in this part of the Netherlands generally all agricultural land has some form of artificial drainage (ditches or tile drains). Especially in the lower part of the catchment, which is flatter and has shallow groundwater tables,

fields are drained using tile drains and ditches. The average distance to a drainage unit (ditch, stream or known tile drain) is about 132 m for the downstream and 174 m for the upstream catchment, reflecting the difference in drainage density. The exact amount of subsurface tile drainage is however now known. Available data indicates that the total area of the downstream catchment, 3% is drained using tile drainage, while this is 1% for the upstream catchment, but this seems to be an underestimation. Overall, based on available data, the drainage density is 20 to 30% lower in the upstream part. We added some this information to the text.

Revised text: "Many of these farmlands are artificially drained by a system of tile drains and ditches, especially in the downstream part of the catchment due to the flatter topography and more shallow groundwater tables compared to the upstream part of the catchment. Available data indicates that the drainage density is around 20-30% lower in the upstream part of the catchment than in the downstream part. "

p3, 91: I cannot find groundwater data or cannot differentiate which collected data are from the surface and which are not.

RESPONSE: Agreed and clarified accordingly.

Revised text: "2.2. Collecting water quality measurements of surface water "

p3, 93: What time period is covered by "historical" data?

RESPONSE: Agreed and clarified accordingly.

Revised text: "First, historical data from 1969 and onwards of chloride and nitrate concentrations was obtained from earlier studies"

p.3, 96: Where is the first explanation of the abbreviation?

RESPONSE: We now use 'chloride' and 'nitrate' consistently.
Revised text: "chloride" and "nitrate"

p.3, 91- p.4, 101: As you join different data sources, it would be helpful to add a table consisting of the time of observation, the resolution of the data, the amount of measurements. . .

RESPONSE: Agreed. This was added to the manuscript.

p.4, 102: Can you give more information on the "dynamic TTD"?

RESPONSE: Agreed that this should be introduced better. We have added the sentences below to the explanation in Section 2.3. More detail can be found in Kaandorp et al., 2018 (WRR).
Revised text: "Travel Time Distributions describe the distribution of ages of the water that contributes to discharge in a catchment. Dynamic TTDs do this in a time-variable way and include for instance seasonality in the contribution of older and younger water. Dynamic TTDs for the Springendalse Beek catchment were calculated "

p.5, 140: What are the distances of the two stations to the corresponding measurement station?

RESPONSE: For both stations the distance is around 80 to 90 km. We added this information to the manuscript.

Revised text: "(distance from the catchment to these stations is 80 to 90 km)"

p.5, 148: "following Meinardi (1984)"

Revised text: "following Meinardi (1994)"

p.5, 154: How can you exclude land-use change?

RESPONSE: Land-use change will obviously affect the input of nitrate and we did not exclude this. Land use change is partly incorporated in the input curves. Furthermore, a large agricultural field in the upstream part of

the catchment has been in use only since approximately 1985 and an agricultural field of approximately 7.5 ha was converted to natural vegetation in 1998. This was also considered when combining the TTDs and input curves. What was not considered is that small parts of the catchment changed from nature in agriculture and vice versa. This does not have a large effect on the downstream surface water concentrations. We simply do not have enough data to take small changes into account: -we do not have knowledge on the high detail and long term land-use changes (e.g. specific crops), and -farmer specific differences will affect the result (using maximum amount of fertilizer or not, etc).

Revised text: "Land use change is partly incorporated in the input curves. Furthermore, a large agricultural field in the upstream part of the catchment has been in use only since approximately 1985 and an agricultural field of approximately 7.5 ha was converted to natural vegetation in 1998. This was also considered when combining the TTDs and input curves. What was not considered is that small parts of the catchment changed from nature in agriculture and vice versa. This does not have a large effect on the downstream surface water concentrations."

p.5, 156: How can you assume NO3 to be constant over time although atm. N-deposition changed strongly within the last decades?

RESPONSE: We agree that N-deposition also changed within the last decades. However compared with the inputs from fertilizers and manure in the Dutch agricultural catchments these are much smaller changes.

p.5, 159: What is the size and resolution of the data set? How did you manage data gaps?

RESPONSE: The size and resolution of the data set are: 1950 – 2017 with yearly values. Data gaps were filled using linear interpolation.

p.5, 160: Abbreviation of N?
Revised text: "nitrogen (N)"

p.5, 160: Later on you write about seasonal N contribution, which is highest in winter. Do you know the time of fertilizer application within the year? Are not the spring and potentially the fall also highly predestined to show N-peaks?

RESPONSE: We do not know the exact time of application of fertilizers, but it will be between spring and autumn (growing season), within the time permitted by EU legislations. In the Netherlands this is between half February until September. The timing differs per crop: grassland gets some after each grass harvest, arable land usually most in spring. However, we seldomly see these inputs causing high nitrate concentrations in streams directly (only sometimes in cold/wet conditions in February). The nutrients stay in the soil because of the precipitation deficit. Nitrate is leached to the upper groundwater during winter, and lateral transport is activated by rising groundwater levels (see e.g. Rozemeijer et al., 2009). The seasonal differences in the input will thus be averaged in the unsaturated zone and groundwater system. The contribution to stream discharge of groundwater that infiltrated on agricultural fields is higher in winter (Figure 3), but this water will no longer contain the seasonal signal of the input but instead an averaged value, as we use in the model here.

p.6, 175: Cl and NO3 concentrations or input? When did the concentration change then, at January 1st or when fertilizer application (e.g. April) would be realistic?
RESPONSE: The chloride and nitrate concentrations of the input (infiltrated water). The concentration changes at January 1st, which is a choice we made for simplicity. See also previous comment: the concentrations in upper groundwater don't change immediately after applying manure. They change when a precipitation surplus in fall/winter leaches salts down from the soil to the groundwater. It could be argued that the start of the growing season would be more realistic, but we did not focus on such short-term changes in the input (as described in the comment above).

Revised text: "The input concentrations of chloride and nitrate were assumed constant over a specific year, "

p.6, 178: What is the resolution of N input in the model? How can it be constant over the year?

RESPONSE: As described above we use yearly-average values, which are available from the different data sources. This reflects the concentration of the upper most groundwater. See also comments above.

p.6, 190-191: Could you revise this sentence? It is hard to understand.

RESPONSE: Agreed and changed accordingly.

Revised text: "The initial run of the model used the land-use map of the catchment for the year 2007 (Figure 1) where the agricultural fields received chloride and nitrate following the constructed input curves (Figure 2)."

p.7, 195-206: Does it makes sense to test for these parameters? What is the innovation?

RESPONSE: The change to the model itself is very simplistic here (adding to or multiplying the TTD). This exercise however gives understanding into the effect of such changes on the output concentrations in the receiving stream. And from that, it gives an idea of the performance of our model and which changes would improve the result of the model. It for instance indicated that we underestimate the average travel time in the catchment (due to e.g. unsaturated zone). Studying the effect of the mean TT is also interesting for comparison with other studies, which often use mean TTs.

p.8, 228: "partly by oxidation of organic C (1) or pyrite (2)". So it is easier for the reader to assign the two equations.

RESPONSE: Agreed and changed accordingly.

Revised text: "partly by oxidation of organic C (Equation 1) or pyrite (Equation 2):"

p.8, 236: It is also assumed as a first-order decay (e.g. van Meter et al., 2017) in literature. Why do you assume zero-order?

RESPONSE: Much literature exists on this matter and we considered using a first-order decay equation as well. However for simplicity, we decided to only use the zero-order decay and the complete decay at specific depth here.

p.8, 240: Do you have information about the denitrification potential assuming it as a finite process?

RESPONSE: In this scenario we assume the reactivity potential of the subsurface to be an infinite process. This complete decay at depth is in correspondence with literature from the Netherlands (Zhang et al., 2013; Visser et al., 2009) and Denmark (Jessen et al., 2017; Koch et al., 2019).

p.8, 249: Figure 3d as well? In the following sentence, I propose to add "Figure 3d".

RESPONSE: Agreed, we changed the text according to the reviewers suggestion.

p.8, 252: Highest contribution in winter although highest N inputs can be assumed in spring and are washed out until winter? And how can you see seasonal NO3 patterns assuming constant NO3 input over the year? So I think "agricultural contribution" (assumed as constant) is not the appropriate wording, perhaps NO3 transport/mobilization?

RESPONSE: The text here and Figure 3c and d, refer to the origin of water, i.e. infiltrated on agricultural fields. We made this clearer in the text.

p.9, 268 I cannot associate the word "later" with the mentioned years.

RESPONSE: Agreed and changed accordingly.

Revised text: "which is about 5 to 10 years after the peak in the input (Figure 2). "

p.9, 273: What is a reasonable fit? Do you have a measure for this, like R2?

RESPONSE: We have made clear throughout the manuscript that the goal is not to create a model to fit it with the measurements. Instead, we use the model to explore and discuss the measurements and processes. The text has been changed to better reflect this.

Revised text: "The modelled chloride concentrations confirmed the observed long-term trends (Figure 4c and d), although the modelled concentrations were too low for the period between 1990 and 1995 (underestimation of 5-15 mg/L) and the chloride peak was simulated around 1985 instead of 1990."

p.10, 297: What is meant by "did not completely fit"? Think about using a measure to show the actual fit.

RESPONSE: This part of the text was rewritten, we make clear that the purpose of the paper is not to make the best 'fit' with the measurements.

p.9, 284-286: Would not denitrification cause an earlier peak/decay than Cl instead of the surprisingly later peak. Is the changing N-Cl ratio not excluded by the input data of the farmer (chapter 2.5)? Do you have any hints for potential point sources? p.9, 286: What point sources are realistic in a non-urban area?

RESPONSE: This would depend on the denitrification process, in principe only part of the nitrate will be removed but the overall trend would still exist. A later peak can occur resulting from spatial differences in denitrification. We added discussion on the effects of denitrification and the difference in the breakthrough of different solutes.

p.10, 295: Can you adjust the headings in this chapter or in the according method section so that it is easier to assign?

RESPONSE: Agreed and changed.

p.11,321: Think about adding (Figure 6, "red line") and later on (. . ., "green line"). Than it is easier to match. But this is probably a matter of taste.

RESPONSE: Agreed. We followed the suggestion by the reviewer and now mention the color of the line in the text.

p.12, 349-351: Do I need a larger area for N variations? Isn't it only caused by varying flow paths? And is "diluted" the appropriate wording? This implicates lower N concentrations in young water, which is often not the case.

RESPONSE: No, variation in N occurs in small areas due to varying flow paths, like the reviewer notes. This part of the text was not clear and was rewritten. What we meant to describe is that the effect of unsaturated zones on the lag time can be large. But when looking at larger areas, this effect can be counteracted by parts of the area with more thin unsaturated zones.

Revised text: "In catchments with thick unsaturated zones, the lag time due to unsaturated zones has been calculated to be up to decades such as for aquifers in the U.K. (Wang et al., 2012). The time lag introduced by the unsaturated zone is often averaged on a catchment scale, due to spatial variation in its thickness, although it can lead to long tails in the nitrate concentrations."

p.12, 346-352: Did you consider a combination of unsaturated zone and denitrification, so not only delay but at the same time decay?

RESPONSE: No, we did not test this scenario and it would be interesting. Some decay is already included in the input curves by using a nitrate transformation factor. We added more discussion on denitrification and chemical processes, and added a scenario with more complex unsaturated zone and nitrogen related processes by making a distinction between directly available and organic N.

p.12, 356: Is it not "decreased" instead of "increased"?

RESPONSE: No it is increased because we multiplied all travel times with a certain value. E.g. for a factor 5, a travel time of 1 month would because 5 months and a travel time of 1 year would because 5 years.

p.12, 371: ". . .when the MTT is rather long or the input decreases slowly"

RESPONSE: Agreed. We followed the reviewers suggestion and changed the text.

p.12, 377: "It is however known"

Revised text: "known"

p.13. 379: Also "temporal" (temperature dependence), not only spatial differences?

RESPONSE: Agreed. This is true and we added this to the text.

Revised text: "spatial or temporal differences in denitrification"

p.13, 408: Can you explain these non-linear reactions?

RESPONSE: Agreed that this was not clear from the text. When wetness conditions decrease, groundwater levels decrease, and drainage units fall dry. Consequently, the water that was flowing towards these drainage units suddenly stay in the aquifer and/or flows towards another drainage unit. When wetness conditions increase again, groundwater levels first have to rise to the point that they can activate these flow paths again. We added the following sentences:

Revised text: "This includes the disappearance of flow through shallow flow paths towards e.g. drainage pipes and ditches in dry periods, which leads to a non-linear reaction in of the dynamic TTD to discharge. When wetness conditions decrease, groundwater levels decrease, and drainage units fall dry. Consequently, the water that was flowing towards these drainage units suddenly stay in the aquifer and/or flows towards another drainage unit. When wetness conditions increase again, groundwater levels first have to rise to the point that they can activate these flow paths again. This also (at least partly) explains why concentration-discharge relationships vary with the wetness of catchments."

p.14, 441: So you assume transport limitation instead of source limitation, otherwise the wet period would cause dilution.

RESPONSE: Yes.

p.15, 445: Can you describe the changing discharge in Figure 3a still as "relatively stable year-round"? Are the NO3- differences caused by different Q ages (stable Q assumption, but different paths) or Q amounts (wet and dry period assumptions)?

RESPONSE: Most of the baseflow comes form the upper part of the catchment, so compared with that the discharge upstream is relatively stable. The differences in nitrate levels are caused by the activation of different flow paths (e.g. shallow flow paths fall dry during summer). Changes in the discharge through active paths is also considered, but as discussed in Kaandorp et al., 2018 (WRR) the difference in wetness between wet and dry periods seem to change the discharge through all active flow paths in a similar way, thus not affecting concentrations by such a large amount as the activation of flow paths. We made this interpretation clearer in the discussion section.

p.15, 466-473: This information could be also important earlier in the methods.

RESPONSE: As discussed in the response on the comment of p.5, 154, we do not have sufficient data to incorporate this in our model in an acceptable way. Therefore we do not consider land-use in the model, but discuss the effect of this assumption here in the Discussion using some of the results from the scenarios.

p.17, 510-511: How reliable is the model if you cannot constitute one (downstream) of two (up- and downstream) catchments?

RESPONSE: We agree with the reviewer that it is strange to present these results in this way. In rewriting, we have removed the part of the manuscript where this 'best fit' was presented. It did not add to the aims of the paper. Instead we focus on the actual processes and their effects on the variability of and breakthrough of solutes.

p.17, 522-540: Could you underline the innovative management implications?

RESPONSE: Agreed that this should be clearer. The innovative conclusions are: 1) Contrary to what is often thought, the response of measures through the groundwater system is instant in the general case that the TTD is exponential, even in areas with relative long MTT. We extended the text to specifically address how the time lags between measures and effects in the receiving stream vary under different combinations of MTT and temporal and spatial patterns of solute inputs and transformation processes such as denitrification and slow N mineralization. Some of this work was already discussed in the appendix and we extended the discussion part of the paper to address this in more detail, linking in to the results of the transient travel time modelling. 2) Location of agricultural fields has a large effect of stream concentrations and creating a (significant) riparian buffer zone lags and dampens the effect of agricultural pollution on surface water quality. Therefore, riparian buffers have a positive effect also when it is bypassed or the often assumed denitrification is low.

We made these points clearer in the text.

Revised text: "The exploration of the model behaviour indicated that removing the source of diffuse pollution leads to an immediate decrease of in-stream concentrations (Figure 6b), due to the large fraction of younger water in the TTD. Therefore, contrary to what is often thought, the response of measures through the groundwater system is instant in the general case that the TTD is (close to) exponential and thus managing the input of agricultural pollutants is a good management option with direct benefits, although the direct impact does not occur when decreases are very slow or the MTT is very large. After the immediate decrease, the legacy from older groundwater flow paths leads to a slow further decrease in time."

"Therefore, creating a (significant) riparian buffer zone lags and dampens the effect of agricultural pollution on surface water quality and riparian buffers have a positive effect even when it is bypassed or denitrification is low."

p.18, 564-565: What is new in this statement?

RESPONSE: We agree with the reviewer that the current conclusions of the paper are too general and we have rewritten them to better reflect the innovative methods and findings of the paper (innovative method of TTD+solutes, processes affecting the breakthrough of agricultural solutes and innovative management implications).

<u>Figures & Tables:</u>

p.27, Figure 1: I miss an x-axis label for the figure bottom left. Think to add also a,b,c,d to the different plots. This would also benefit the figure caption. Where is the border between up- and downstream catchments in bottom right?

RESPONSE: Agreed. We added these parts to the figure.

p.27, Figure 2: According to the caption, the tritium curve is based on measurements from Groningen and Emmerich, but isn't this the case only for values later than 1970?

RESPONSE: Yes, before that the curve is based on Vienna and Ottawa, as described in the manuscript text. We changed the caption accordingly.

Revised text: "The tritium input curve is based on precipitation measurements at stations Vienna and Ottawa (before 1970) and Groningen and Emmerich (from 1970)."

p.29, Figure 4: Think about plotting also an input curve in the same plots. This would make the in-output-comparison much easier.

RESPONSE: This is a good suggestion, and we added the input curves to the plots.

p.30, Figure 6: Is there a superfluous "the" in the end of the caption?

RESPONSE: Yes, thanks for noticing. This has been removed.

p.31, Figure 8: I am surprised that the upper RCA does not contribute any water to the GCA. And in the text overland flow is also included in the RCA. Could you revise the figure to show that?

RESPONSE: This is a good point which is not clear from the current figure. We adjusted the figure accordingly.

p.32, Figure 9: When the colors are similar to Figure 3, where does the purple come from?

RESPONSE: Agreed that this may be confusing. We added a legend to the figure.

Supplement

p.1, 24: I do not understand the "just". Do I really need combinations of TTDs and reduction rates to determine a lag between in and output? I don't think so. Perhaps in your special case, but not in general.

RESPONSE: What we attempt to illustrate in the Supplement is the importance of the reduction rate, and how that combined with the mean travel time of a catchment determines the lag time. Generally, in literature only the mean travel time (of generally an exponential TTD) is assumed. Obviously, our argumentation about the effects of temporal trends in the solutes input on the time lags should be clarified further and we included this in the Discussion part of the paper. This benefits from a better definition of groundwater induced time lags between measures and effects in receiving water which we also added to the text. We believe that the example mentioned in the Appendix represents a general finding which is not limited to our special case or study area.

p.2, Table S1: What is the definition of the delay? The peak matching? In Figure S2 you write "time to peak". This could be helpful as a column in Table S1 too.

RESPONSE: Agreed. We added 'time to peak' to the caption of the Table to make this clearer. Furthermore, we also better define the concept of 'time lags' to avoid confusion over this term.

Revised text: "Time to peak [years] of the output concentrations following a change in the input for different rates of changes and MTTs."

p.3, Figure S2: The same colors as in Figure S1 but with different meanings are confusing. Think about another color or line code.

RESPONSE: We added the supplement to the main part of the text and adapted the text accordingly.

Anonymous Referee #2 Received and published: 31 January 2020

General comments:

In terms of the question of novelty and relevance to an international audience, I was unable to determine this from the abstract and conclusions. For instance, the abstract sets out what was done but doesn't really articulate any major contribution to wider hydrological understanding in terms of enhanced model development or physical processes. The main conclusions are: [list]. None of these findings are particularly insightful – rather they demonstrate that the model produces "as expected" behaviour. Which leads to the question: how such conclusions provide a meaningful contribution to the international literature?

RESPONSE: We agree with the reviewer that the listed conclusions do not reflect the innovative work done. This paper is a first attempt to couple measurement data of water quality and isotopes to Travel Time Distributions calculated using a groundwater model. Even though many recent papers suggest that this method holds a lot of potential, but the papers which attempt to do so are absent or at least very scarce. Furthermore, much confusion exists about the effect (and importance) of the rate of change of the input (legacy nitrate) on the lag in the breakthrough. Which we demonstrate and explain in the paper. Lastly, the conclusions on the effect of location of fields and riparian zones are interesting for water managers. We have rewritten the manuscript to better reflect these points.

In terms of the model application, an existing groundwater flow model was predesigned for a different purpose (the representation of water levels and flows rather than to represent solute transport: lines 180-185) and this was then applied to the case of solute transport and subject to a sensitivity analysis to consider potential uncertainty in the resulting outputs. This seems rather odd. Surely a study of solute transport needs to rely on a model that is built and calibrated to do just that? There are many such models available and there isn't a sensible justification why this was not attempted. It would be interesting to see a comparison of the approach taken in this manuscript with a bespoke model (calibrated for the purpose) to demonstrate how sensitivity analysis may be used for the purpose described here, but that hasn't been presented.

RESPONSE: Goal of the manuscript was to explore and test the use of a groundwater flow model, particle tracking and Travel Time Distributions to calculate the breakthrough of solutes. In this groundwater driven system, a correct representation of groundwater flow paths and travel times is needed and provided by groundwater models such as the one we used. This method has been discussed in several papers, but so far, the papers which attempt to do so are absent or at least very scarce. We agree that the wording in lines 180-185 was poorly chosen and this has been modified. We agree with the reviewer that comparing this method to other models build for solute transport could be interesting, but this was not in the scope of the current paper. The focus of the current paper is on: 1) testing if the results of the TTD method are realistic by comparing them to measurements of solutes, 2) explore the important processes in the method, and 3) explore the effect of the different parameters on the breakthrough and time lags of different solutes as a way forward in a) model calibration and b) management of (ground)watersheds. We have further clarified the goals and novelty of the manuscript in the text.

A second major issue here is the function of the unsaturated zone. A large body of work in the international literature has outlined the complexity of unsaturated zone processes in some detail, and particularly their impact on solute transport. It therefore seems that a useful model linking land-based solute inputs to stream solute responses would require a detailed representation of the unsaturated zone processes in order to provide the sort of management decision-support that this manuscript purports to give. The unsaturated zone assumed in the model was of uniform thickness and did not account for any macropore flow or chemical processes. This would seem to have essential processes omitted and, therefore, automatically limits the utility of the model. I am

therefore struggling to see how this can be used as a reasonable representation of the catchment processes.

RESPONSE: In this modelling study we focus on the groundwater system and highly simplify the unsaturated zone. The unsaturated zone is included in the method in two ways: 1) the groundwater model is coupled with an unsaturated zone model (MetaSWAP, see also Kaandorp et al., 2018 WRR) to provide a realistic groundwater recharge based on e.g. land-use; 2) the input curves include part of the unsaturated zone processes: before 2000 by using a nitrate transformation factor of 0.85 and after 2000 by using the concentrations of the shallow groundwater to construct the input curves. Thus, we do take into account many of the unsaturated zone processes, just not the delay.

Furthermore, the relevance of the unsaturated zone also depends on the research area and the temporal scale of interest. In this case, the research area is a lowland groundwater-driven catchment with high groundwater levels and the focus is on seasonal changes in flow paths and solute concentrations in the stream. This can be well simulated with a simple representation of the unsaturated zone. In a more hilly catchment, or if we would want to simulate the concentration response to individual events, a more detailed representation of unsaturated zone hydrology would be needed.

We made both these points clearer in the manuscript text.

The sensitivity analysis was particularly thorough and seemed to confuse sensitivity analysis with uncertainty analysis. It is therefore unclear as to what this evaluation actually provides in terms of confidence in the model structure, parameterisation or predictive capacity.

The sensitivity analyses described seem to be very simplistic: the state of the art in model assessment for parameter, structural and data sensitivity are far more advanced than is being attempted here. Given the sensitivity analysis is being used to justify the validity of a model calibrated against water levels and flows as a way to represent solute transport, it would need to be much more comprehensive to provide confidence that the approach was appropriate and robust. I also found the framing of the sensitivity analysis rather confused (line 185). Is this a sensitivity analysis or is it an uncertainty analysis? From what is provided in the manuscript it is not at all clear how uncertainty has been accounted for.

RESPONSE: We agree with the reviewer, the term 'sensitivity analysis' was misleading for what we tried to do. We have changed this term throughout the manuscript to an 'exploration of the model behavior under different scenarios', to better represent the actual method and goal. Goal of the exploration of the model behavior under different scenarios is to demonstrate the effect of the different parameters that are included in the model. Using these results, we discuss in what way different processes are important for (the time lags in) the breakthrough curves of solutes. We have further clarifed the goal of the analyses that is done.

References:

Jessen, S., D. Postma, L. Thorling, S. Müller, J. Leskelä, P. Engesgaard ,2017. Decadal variations in groundwater quality: A legacy from nitrate leaching and denitrification by pyrite in a sandy aquifer, Water Resour. Res., 53, doi:10.1002/2016WR018995.

Kaandorp, V. P., de Louw, P. G. B., van der Velde, Y. and Broers, H. P.: Transient Groundwater Travel Time Distributions and Age-Ranked Storage-Discharge Relationships of Three Lowland Catchments, Water Resour. Res., 1–18, doi:10.1029/2017WR022461, 2018.

Koch, J., Stisen, S., Refsgaard, J.C., Ernstsen, V., Jakobsen, P.R., Højberg, A.L., 2019. Modelling depth of the redox interface at high resolution at national scale using Random Forest and residual Gaussian simulation. Water Resour. Res., https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR023939 \

Rozemeijer, J. C., Broers, H. P., Geer, F. C. van and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Weather-induced temporal variations in nitrate concentrations in shallow groundwater, J. Hydrol., 378(1–2), 119–127, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.09.011, 2009.

Visser, A., Broers, H. P., Heerdink, R. and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Trends in pollutant concentrations in relation to time of recharge and reactive transport at the groundwater body scale, J. Hydrol., 369(3–4), 427–439, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.02.008, 2009.

Zhang, Y. C., Prommer, H., Broers, H. P., Slomp, C. P., Greskowiak, J., van der Grift, B. and Van Cappellen, P.: Model-based integration and analysis of biogeochemical and isotopic dynamics in a nitrate-polluted pyritic aquifer, Environ. Sci. Technol., 47(18), 10415–10422, doi:10.1021/es4023909, 2013.

Aged streams: Time lags of nitrate, chloride and tritium assessed by Dynamic Groundwater Flow Tracking in a lowland landscape

Vince P. Kaandorp[1,2], Hans Peter Broers[3], Ype van der Velde[4], Joachim Rozemeijer[1], Perry G.B. de Louw[1,54]

[1]Department of Subsurface and Groundwater Systems, Deltares, Utrecht, the Netherlands
[2]Department of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands
[3]TNO Geological Survey of the Netherlands, Utrecht, the Netherlands\
[4]Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
[54]Soil Physics and Land Management, Wageningen University, Wageningen, the Netherlands

Correspondence to: Vince P. Kaandorp (Vince.Kaandorp@deltares.nl)

Abstract. Surface waters are under pressure of diffuse pollution from agricultural activities and groundwater is known to be a connection between the agricultural fields and streams. ~~We~~ This paper is one of the first to calculate~~calculated~~ long-term in-stream concentrations ~~of~~by coupling input curves for tritium, chloride and nitrate ~~with~~using dynamic groundwater travel time distributions (TTDs) derived from a distributed, transient 3D groundwater flow model using forward particle tracking. We tested our approach in the Springendalse Beek catchment, a lowland stream in the east of the Netherlands, for which we collected long time series of chloride and nitrate (1969-2018). These measurements showed that the trend reversal in solute concentrations following legislations in the 1980s occurred after a limited time lag. By combining calculated TTDs with solute input curves, we ~~and~~ found that the variable contribution of different groundwater flow paths to stream water quality reasonably explained the majority of long-term and seasonal variation in the measured stream nitrate concentrations. An exploration of the model behaviour under different scenarios ~~sensitivity analysis~~ was done to study the time lag in the breakthrough of agricultural nitrate and it was found that this time lag mainly depends on 1) the travel time in the unsaturated zone, including slow release of organic N, 2) the combination of Mean Travel Time (MTT) and the rate of the solute input reduction, and 3) the spatial setting of agricultural fields, (bio)chemical processes and the drainage network. In absence of these processes, the effect of input reduction measures can generally be expected instantly, which is an important conclusion for water managers. ~~and it was found that an unsaturated zone, increased mean travel time and a longer distance between agricultural fields and stream cause a lag in the breakthrough of agricultural solutes. Similarly, the recovery of concentrations after input reduction measures that aim to reduce the solute inputs is determined by these parameters~~;~~, with combinations of~~both slow ~~input reduction rates and long mean travel times (MTT) tending to result in considerable lag times~~ before a concentration effect can be observed in the stream after start of the reductions. We labelled the part of the catchment area where the seepage water infiltrated that contributes to stream discharge at a certain moment in time the 'groundwater contributing area'. This groundwater contributing area was shown to increase and shrink based on wetness conditions within the catchment. Especially the location of agricultural fields in the groundwater contributing area in relation to the catchments' drainage network was~~

1

35 ~~found to be an important factor that largely governs the travel times of the agricultural pollutants. We conclude that groundwater functions as a buffer on the effect of agricultural pollution, by distributing water in time and space and making it possible for different waters to mix.~~By making the connection between dynamic groundwater travel time distributions and in-stream concentration measurements, we provide a method for validating the travel time approach and make the step towards application in water quality modelling and management.

1 Introduction

40

Diffuse pollution with nutrients is one of the main pressures on Europe's surface- and groundwaters (EEA, 2018). Intensive agricultural land-use and the accompanying use of manure and fertilizers have significantly increased the amount of nitrate in the hydrological system in the period after 1950 (Aquilina et al., 2012; Broers and van der Grift, 2004; Hansen et al., 2011; Worrall et al., 2015). Nitrate leaches to the groundwater (Boumans et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2012) from where it is transported

45 towards surface waters through fast and slow flow paths, creating a stress on surface water quality (Howden et al., 2011b; Kaandorp et al., 2018b; van der Velde et al., 2010).

Flow paths are the routes that water particles travel through the subsoil, crossing different geological formations and reaching certain depths, which takes a certain travel time from infiltration to exfiltration (Broers and van Geer, 2005; van der Velde et

50 al., 2010). The nitrate concentration in groundwater and streams depends on these groundwater flow paths and travel times, as well as on land-use (for instance use of manure and fertilizer). Both the flow route and travel time influence hydrochemical processes, as they determine which mediums are passed and the time that is allowed for (biogeo)chemical reactions. Nitrate concentrations may for instance decrease by denitrification when passing organic or pyrite-rich layers (~~refs? E.g. Yanchun Zhang, e.g. Broers 2008…~~Zhang et al., 2013).

55

Land-use determines the timing and quantity of nitrate input as well as its ~~the~~ spatial distribution ~~of the input~~ (Boumans et al., 2008). Thus, all water particles may carry different nitrate concentrations depending on their place and time~~source and timing~~ of infiltration, their flow paths and their travel times along their flow paths. For example, the input of nutrients is higher on fertilized agricultural fields than in forested areas. In catchments, groundwater flow paths provide the hydrologic connection

60 between infiltration areas and seepage zones in streams (e.g. Ali et al., 2014; Birkel et al., 2015; McGuire and McDonnell, 2010). Because groundwater flow paths are variable in time, the delivery of nitrate from groundwater to surface waters also varies in time (Rozemeijer and Broers, 2007).

In a recent paper, Kaandorp et al. (2018a) presented dynamic travel time distributions (TTDs) for lowland catchments in the

65 Netherlands. They showed how groundwater flow paths in these catchments vary in time and discussed differences in mixing processes between young and old groundwater in the streams with time. Connecting this hydrologic approach with solute

transport would enable validation of calculated travel times using stream concentration data and would highlight the potential of using TTDs for non-point source transport modelling. Therefore, we combine in this follow-up ~~In this~~ paper ~~we combine~~ these dynamic travel time distributions with input curves for tritium, chloride and nitrate to reconstruct ~~and forecast~~ the

70 ~~historical and present~~ concentrations in a Dutch stream from 1969 until present, while including the dynamic nature of catchments both in time and space. Our aims are twofold: first to ~~Our a~~validate the results of the TTD method by comparing them to measurements of solutes, and second to explore the effect of different processes and parameters on the breakthrough patterns and time lags of groundwater derived solutes as a way forward in a) model calibration and b) management of (ground)watersheds. ~~im was to test whether the use of dynamic travel time distributions as derived from a distributed, transient~~

75 ~~3D groundwater flow model adds value to the understanding of the breakthrough pattern of groundwater derived solutes in a lowland stream.~~ This work extends on recent advances in research on~~of~~ the groundwater contribution to streams (e.g. Engdahl et al., 2016; McDonnell et al., 2010; Morgenstern et al., 2010; Solomon et al., 2015; van der Velde et al., 2012), and is one of the first to couple measurement data of water quality and isotopes to dynamic TTDs calculated using ~~by combining transient TTDs from~~ a forward particle tracking model ~~with historical records of tritium, chloride and nitrate inputs~~. Even though many

80 recent papers suggest that this method holds a lot of potential (e.g. Hrachowitz et al., 2016), the papers which have attempted to do so are still scarce due to a lack of long-term solute input in the range of 5-50 years and discharge concentration data. The data availability within our study catchment provides a unique opportunity to explore the application of dynamic TTD's for solute transport calculation.

85 In our study, t~~T~~ritium and chloride were included as water tracers. ~~, where t~~Tritium is part of the actual water molecule, while~~and~~ chloride was considered to be a conservative tracer of manure and fertilizers when it ~~while~~ pass~~ing~~es through the aquifer, and nitrate reactive. Convolutions of the solute input curves with the modelled TTDs were compared with observed stream concentrations of tritium, chloride and nitrate, which opens the possibility of validation of the model-derived TTDs. We used the model to assess whether the fluctuation in flow paths and contributing areas explain the variability of stream water quality,

90 as has been found in other studies (Musolff et al., 2016; Rozemeijer and Broers, 2007), and ran a~~n~~ exploration of the model behaviour under different scenarios to~~sensitivity~~ analyse~~is of~~ the parameters that determine lag times between recharge of the solutes and discharge in the stream, such as unsaturated zone delay, the distance between fields and the stream and the mean travel time of the system. Lastly, we explored the effects of input scenarios on the breakthrough of agricultural nitrate.

2. Methods

95 **2.1. Study area**

A lowland stream in the east of the Netherlands, the Springendalse Beek (Figure 1), was selected for this study because of its high nitrate concentrations and ~~interesting~~ differences in land-use and discharge characteristics between upstream and downstream parts of the catchment (Kaandorp et al., 2018b). The catchment has a temperate marine climate with a mean

temperature of 9.6 °C and mean annual precipitation and evaporation of around 850 and 560 mm respectively. The size of the catchment is 4 km2 and the average discharge downstream is 0.043 m3/s with a baseflow index of 0.8 (Gustard et al., 1992).

The catchment is located on the flank of an ice-pushed ridge that was formed during the Saalien glaciation and has a maximum elevation of 75 m above sea level. Recent hydrogeological inventories ~~strongly~~ suggest a ~~very~~ complex ice-pushed structure, composed of a series of tilted slabs of Tertiary clays (Formation of Breda and older) intercalated with Pleistocene moderately coarse, organic poor sands and some gravel that were deposited by a braided river (Formation of Appelscha). These slabs roughly have a N-S strike direction, perpendicular to the receiving Springendalse Beek stream (pers. comm. Harting and Bakker, TNO Geological Survey of the Netherlands) and can hardly be passed by groundwater flow, leading to relatively high groundwater tables compared to more sandy ice-pushed ridges in the Netherlands. In general, the average depth of the water table is around 0.5 m below the surface in the downstream part of the catchment and up to about 3.0 meter below the surface in the highest parts of the upstream ~~of the~~ catchment, presumably concentrated at outcrops of the Pleistocene sands. The streambed of the stream is sandy with some occasional gravel, which represents material from the tilted Appelscha Formation.

The upstream part (2 km^2) of the Springendalse Beek catchment has several spring areas and is mostly forested with some agricultural fields, while farmland is more abundant in the downstream part (2 km^2) of the catchment. Many of t~~T~~hese farmlands are ~~often~~ artificially drained by a system of tile drains and ditches, especially in the downstream part of the catchment due to the flatter topography and more shallow groundwater tables compared to the upstream part of the catchment. Available data indicates that the drainage density is around 20-30% lower in the upstream part of the catchment than in the downstream part. Due to its constant flow and permanent springs, the stream is known to have a high ecological value (e.g. Nijboer et al., 2003; Verdonschot et al., 2002).

2.2. Collecting water quality measurements of ~~ground- and~~ surface water

Surface water quality measurements were collected from various sources (Table 1), with a focus on the availability of data on chloride and nitrate. First, historical data from 1969 ~~and~~ onwards of chloride and nitrate concentrations was obtained from earlier studies (Dam et al., 1993; Higler et al., 1981; Hoek, 1992; ~~Nijboer et al., 2003;~~ van der Aa et al., 1999; Verdonschot and Loeb, 2008~~; Visser, 2001~~). This dataset was complemented with a 1985-present time series of C~~c~~hloride and nitrate~~NO₃~~ that was collected by the monitoring program of the local Waterboard Vechtstromen. In addition, w~~We further extended this dataset with our own field data of the period 2015-2018, determining NO₃ using a DR1900 HACH field spectrophotometer and laboratory analysis of NO₃ and Cl. For this, samples were filtered (0.45 µm) and stored cool in glass tubes and ion analysis was done within 48 hours using a Dionex ICS-1500.~~ We started sampling for 3H in 2016 because we anticipated that tritium could give an independent validation of our transient TTD model. ~~For tritium~~In total, 10 samples were taken over the period

4

2016 to 2018. These were stored in 1L plastic containers and measured at the Bremen mass spectrometric facility by degassing followed by analysis of ^{3}He with a Sectorfield mass-spectrometer (MAP 215-50) (Sültenfuß et al., 2009).

2.3. Groundwater Model and TTDs

135   Travel Time Distributions describe the distribution of ages of the water that contributes to discharge in a catchment. Dynamic TTDs do this in a time-variable way and include for instance seasonality in the contribution of older and younger water. The dDynamic TTDs for the Springendalse Beek catchment were calculated using forward particle tracking on a high-resolution spatially distributed groundwater flow model following the method described by Kaandorp et al. (2018a). A concise description of the method is given here and more details are found in Kaandorp et al. (2018a). Groundwater flow was calculated using an

140   existing finite-difference groundwater flow model (MODFLOW, Harbaugh, 2005) created and calibrated on groundwater heads and validated with both groundwater heads and river discharge in earlier studies (Hendriks et al., 2014; Kuijper et al., 2012). Groundwater flow was simulated with a monthly time step on a regional scale (total modelled area 58 by 45 km) with cells of 25*25 m. The top of the model followed the surface elevation and the model consisted of seven layers of variable thickness, based on the Dutch Geohydrological Information System (REGIS II, 2005). Figure 1 gives a 2D cross-section

145   through the model's hydrogeological schematization of the subsurface, which is a gross simplification typical in regional groundwater flow models. Mean aquifer thickness in the model was approximately 18 m, but varied between 0.5 and 30 m. Transmissivity in the aquifers was approximately 40 m^2/day, porosity was assumed to be 0.3 and some anisotropy was added in the ice pushed ridges (Kuijper et al., 2012). The entire drainage system in the catchment was modelled using the DRN and RIV MODFLOW packages (Harbaugh, 2005). Flow through the unsaturated zone was modelled using the MetaSWAP model

150   for a seasonal representation of the groundwater recharge based on land-use (De Lange et al., 2014; van Walsum and Groenendijk, 2008; van Walsum and Veldhuizen, 2011). To allow for the calculation of long groundwater flow paths the model was run for the period of 1700-2017, repeating climate data from the period 1965-2017 (see Kaandorp et al., 2018a).

Backward groundwater travel times (TTs), that represent the age of the water that contributes to streamflow (Benettin et al.,

155   2015; Harman, 2015; van der Velde et al., 2012), were calculated using a combination of forward particle tracking and volume "book keeping" (Kaandorp et al., 2018a). Using the flow velocities calculated by the groundwater flow model, particle tracking software MODPATH version 3 (Pollock, 1994) was used to calculate transient flow paths and TTs. Particles were released monthly at the water table at the center of each model cell and represented the volume equal to the total groundwater recharge of that month. Particles were released for the total model period spanning 317 years yielding a total of 3,804 particle tracking

160   runs, with which each had around 14 thousand particles each. Particles were stopped at strong sinks or at weak sinks if the fraction of discharge to the sink was larger than 50% of the total inflow to the cell (Kaandorp et al., 2018a). To construct monthly TTDs, particles were collected on a monthly time scale at their end points in an area of interest (whole catchment or part of catchment). As we started the particles at the water table, we effectively neglected the travel time through the

unsaturated zone (e.g. Green et al., 2018; Sprenger et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2012), but this layer was generally thin in the study area (mostly <1 m) and is partly bypassed by preferential flow. Also, ~~and~~ our focus was on the groundwater TTs and time scales. Chemical processes in the unsaturated zone concerning ~~Leaching of~~ nitrate ~~through the unsaturated zone was~~were included in constructing the solute input curves. By adding input curves of tritium, chloride and nitrate to the calculated flow paths it is possible to calculate the water quality of the catchment's streams.

2.4. Tritium input curve

Principally, a series of tritium measurements in streams can be used to derive (ground)water age distributions~~, assuming a certain lumped model~~ (Broers and van Vliet, 2018a; Cartwright and Morgenstern, 2015; Duvert et al., 2016; Gusyev et al., 2014; Morgenstern et al., 2010; Solomon et al., 2015; Stewart et al., 2016). Here, we intend to use ^{3}H in an opposite approach; validating our dynamic groundwater model TTDs using a short series of ^{3}H measurements in the gaining stream (as e.g. Rodriguez et al., 2020). For the ^{3}H input into our model, we combined the monthly measurements of tritium in precipitation of the closest measurement stations Groningen (1970-2010) and Emmerich (1978-2016) (distance from the catchment to these stations is 80 to 90 km), taken from the GNIP Database of tritium activity in precipitation (IAEA/WMO, 2018). For months that both stations had measurements, we used the average concentration, as our study area is located approximately halfway between these two measurement stations. For months that measurements from both stations were not available, we adjusted the available data using a factor based on the average difference between the stations, following an approach similar to Meinardi (1994). Because the relation between the values measured at the two stations seemed to differ before and after 1997, we use two factors: before 1997, we used Emmerich = Groningen * 1.49. From 1997 onwards, we used Emmerich = Groningen * 1.03. For the period before 1970 we used adjusted measurements from Vienna and Ottawa, roughly following ~~(~~Meinardi~~,~~ (1994). ~~Figure 2 shows the constructed input curve. Tritium in precipitation increased in the 1950s and 1960s following hydrogen bomb testing and has been returning to natural values since the 1980s (Figure 2). The monthly ^{3}H concentration in precipitation was fed directly into the modelled groundwater recharge, as tritium is part of the actual water molecule.~~

2.5. Land-use and chemical input curve

Two types of land-use were distinguished: farmlands and natural vegetation, which includes forests and heather (Figure 1). Concentrations of solutes reaching the water table below natural areas were assumed to be constant in time: 15 mg/L for chloride and 5 mg/L for nitrate, which are conservative estimates based on Kros et al. (2004) and Van Beek et al. (1994). Although these concentrations of solutes have not been constant during the last decades (e.g. Boumans et al., 2013), we feel this assumption is acceptable as the concentration changes due to atmospheric deposition are much smaller than those due to agricultural inputs. For agricultural fields, a ~~chemical~~ solute input curve was constructed on an annual basis. For the period 2000 to 2017, we used the data f~~o~~rom the Dutch sandy areas of the Dutch Minerals Policy Monitoring Programme (LMM),

which includes monitored concentrations in the uppermost first meter below the water table at agricultural fields since 1991 (see e.g. Boumans et al., 2005; Fraters et al., 2015). For the period 1950 to 2000, we used the nitrogen (N) and chloride~~Cl~~ surplus that was derived from historical bookkeeping records of minerals applied to farmlands and corrected for crop uptake (Broers and van der Grift, 2004; van den Brink et al., 2008; Visser et al., 2007). We combined this data with the 2000-2017 LMM data by fitting the overlap between 1991-2000 by adjusting the older data to correspond to a groundwater recharge of 0.35 m/year and a nitrate transformation factor of 0.85 in the unsaturated zone, which corresponds with Dutch data for soils with average water tables around 1 m depth (Steenvoorden et al., 1997; van den Brink et al., 2008). ~~Chloride and nitrate increased from the 1950s until around 1985 due to intensification of agriculture (Figure 2). From 1985 concentrations from agricultural fields decreased as a result of national and European legislations (Dutch Manure Law, 1986; EU Nitrates Directive, 1991), that contain rules for the reduction of N applications in farming. Figure 1 shows the areas where the constructed agricultural input curve was used as input for the model, the other parts of the catchments were given the constant concentration of natural vegetation.~~ Land use change was considered for two agricultural fields: a large field in the upstream part of the catchment which has been in use only since approximately 1985, and an agricultural field of approximately 7.5 ha that was converted to natural vegetation in 1998. What was not considered is that small parts of the catchment changed from nature in agriculture and vice versa. This does not have a large effect on the downstream surface water concentrations.

2.6. Water quality modeling

The dynamic TTD was combined with the solute input curves by assigning tritium, chloride and nitrate ~~(Figure 2)~~ to the particles based on their starting time and location (natural/agricultural). Figure 1 shows the areas where the constructed agricultural input curve was used as input for the model, the other parts of the catchments were given the constant concentration of natural vegetation. For each month the particles that contributed to stream discharge were combined, and their concentrations weighted based on their volumes to simulate the concentrations in the stream. The input concentrations of ch~~C~~loride and nitrate~~NO₃~~ were assumed constant over a specific year, whereas monthly ^{3}H measurements were directly assigned to the particles in the start month. The model keeps trace of particles that are lost through evapotranspiration within the months after their initial start, thus effectively removing water and ^{3}H in periods of a precipitation deficit. For chloride~~Cl~~ and nitrate~~NO₃~~ the solute input is constant over the year and based on concentrations in the uppermost groundwater, thus there is no need to further account for evaporation for these solutes.

2.7. Exploration of the model behaviour under different scenarios~~Sensitivity analysis~~

The initial run of the water quality model was based on the calibrated groundwater flow model and constructed solute input curves, and is not further~~that was made for other purposes, related to the quantification of water levels and flow of water, not solutes. Therefore, it had not been~~ calibrated for solute transport~~of solutes~~. We did not intend to ~~calibrate~~ add further local

7

details to improve the model performance; instead we aimed at understanding the catchment mechanisms relevant for solute transport which is also useful outside our study catchment. Therefore, ~~this model for this new purpose, instead~~ we ~~carried out a sensitivity analysis~~explored the model behaviour under different scenarios~~in order to increase understanding of the transport, and effectively revealing the uncertainties that are involved and the parameters that determine the outcomes~~. In ~~the sensitivity analysis~~this model exercise, we explored the effect of the following processes on the breakthrough of solutes in the upstream part of the catchment: 1a) unsaturated zone hydrological delay, 1b) unsaturated zone N species delay, 2) increased saturated zone travel times, 3) different temporal input of solutes~~input curves~~, 4) spatial differences in ~~the~~ solute input, and 5) denitrification in the saturated zone (Table 2~~1~~).

~~Base case:~~
The initial run of the model used~~was based on~~ the land-use maps of the catchment of the year 2007 (Figure 1) ~~and~~where the agricultural fields received chloride and nitrate following the constructed solute input curves ~~(Figure 2)~~and the TTDs remain unchanged~~were used for the agricultural fields, with no further changes to the model~~. Nitrate transformation processes in the unsaturated zone are (partly) captured in the solute input curves, by using a nitrate transformation factor of 0.85 (Steenvoorden et al., 1997; van den Brink et al., 2008). ~~The model therefore did not consider an unsaturated zone or reactive processes such as denitrification.~~

Set 1a, unsaturated zone hydrological delay

~~Set 1, unsaturated zone:~~

The initial model neglected hydrological transport time in the unsaturated zone, while it takes time for water to flow from the surface to the groundwater table. This creates a time delay in the order of months to multiple years (Green et al., 2018; Sprenger et al., 2016) and even decades (Wang et al., 2012), depending on the depth of the water table and soil characteristics. In our model exploration~~sensitivity analysis~~ we applied a time delay of 5 years for all particles in our model, assuming that piston flow occurs through an unsaturated zone with an equal thickness everywhere in the catchment area. In reality, flow through the unsaturated zone is much more complicated due to e.g. macropores, ~~and chemical processes,~~ but this was outside of the scope of the current study.

Set 1b, unsaturated zone N species delay
N added to agricultural fields as organic manure consist of directly available N and persistent N. Whereas the directly available N is quickly taken up by crops or leached towards the groundwater, the mineralization of organic N takes more time (e.g. Ehrhardt et al., 2019). We explore the effect of this distinction by creating a time delay of 10 years in 50% of the nitrate that is added to the TTD model.

Set 2, increased saturated zone travel times

Next, we explored the effect of saturated zone different travel time uncertaintys by applying a multiplication factor of 5 on all the calculated travel times of all flow paths. Increasing the ages of groundwater implies an increase in mean travel time (MTT),
265   which could result from a different aquifer thickness, porosity, groundwater recharge or a change in drainage density (Broers, 2004; Duffy and Lee, 1992; Raats, 1978; van Ommen, 1986).

Set 3, different temporal input of solutes

270   The solute input curve for chlorideCl and nitrateNO3 was created on a regional scale and has been successfully used at a local scale in earlier studies (van den Brink et al., 2008; Visser et al., 2007). However, wWe explored the effect of a more delayed decrease in the solute input curve after 1985, which could for instance be caused by slightly different local farming practices compared to the regional input curves. In addition, we explored the effect of a sharp decrease in the input by removing all agricultural application of N after the year 1985. In both scenarios the peak of the agricultural input curve for chloride and
275   nitrate was kept at 1985, as this timing of the peak has been found all over the Netherlands (e.g. van den Brink et al., 2008; Visser et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2013). This input trend reversal and results from the EU milk quota legislations in 1984 and EU and Dutch manure laws (Dutch Manure Law, 1986; EU Nitrates Directive, 1991).

Set 4, spatial differences in solute input

280

We explored the effect of different land-use configurations by moving the agricultural fields either away from the stream (towards longer travel times) or towards the stream (shorter travel times). A buffer zone of 200 m around the stream was used and two scenarios were tested. First the buffer zone was turned into an agricultural area, while all fields outside the buffer zone were turned into natural areas. Second, the reverse was done: the buffer zone was turned into natural areas with agricultural
285   fields outside of the buffer zone. A ratio of 50% agriculture and 50% natural vegetation was used for the agricultural areas in these scenarios to prevent excessive nitrate concentrations and to keep the total input in the system approximately equal as based on the land-use maps.

Set 5, denitrification in the saturated zone

In the Netherlands, Ddenitrification is known to remove nitrate from the groundwater, partly by oxidation of organic C (Equation 1) or pyrite (Equation 2):

$$5C\ (s) + 4NO_3^- + 2H_2O\ \rightarrow\ 4HCO_3^- + CO_2(g) + 2N_2(g) \tag{1}$$

$$5FeS_2\ (s) + 14NO_3^- + 4H^+ \rightarrow 5Fe^{2+} + \ 10SO_4^{2-} + 7N_2\ (g) + 2H_2O \tag{2}$$

Oxidation of pyrite has been found to be the main nitrate reducing process in several studies (e.g. Broers and van der Grift, 2004; Postma et al., 1991; Prommer and Stuyfzand, 2005; Tesoriero et al., 2000; Visser et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2009). To see the possible effects of different conceptualizations, denitrification and nitrate time lags werewas modelled in different two ways. First, it was simulated as a kinetic zero order reaction following $\div NO_3[output] = NO_3[input] - rate * travel\ time$.

$$NO_3 = NO_3 - rate * travel\ time \tag{3}$$

We used 10 mg NO3/L/year as the rate of denitrification, which is in the range of values reported by Van Beek et al. (1994) for the Netherlands. Second, denitrification was based on the occurrence of a pyrite layer at a certain depth, similar to the model of Zhang et al. (2013). Oxidation of pyrite has been found to be the main nitrate reducing process in several studies (e.g. Broers and van der Grift, 2004; Postma et al., 1991; Prommer and Stuyfzand, 2005; Tesoriero et al., 2000; Visser et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2009). In this model scenario, aAll nitrate passing through the denitrifying pyrite layers was instantaneously removed.

3. Results

3.1 Input curves of Chloride, nitrate and tritium

Figure 2 shows the constructed solute input curve that indicates the historic input of tritium, nitrate and chloride towards the groundwater. Tritium in precipitation increased in the 1950s and 1960s following hydrogen bomb testing and has been returning to natural values since the 1980s (Figure 2). The monthly ^{3}H concentration in precipitation was fed directly into the modelled groundwater recharge, as tritium is part of the actual water molecule. Chloride and nitrate increased from the 1950s until around 1985 due to intensification of agriculture (Figure 2). From 1985 concentrations from agricultural fields decreased as a result of national and European legislations (Dutch Manure Law, 1986; EU Nitrates Directive, 1991), that contain rules for the reduction of N applications in farming.

3.2. Water quality measurements of surface water

Tritium concentrations measured in the upstream catchment in 2016 and 2017 were between 4.8 and 6.0 TU with no clear seasonality (Figure 4a). For chloride and nitrate the measurements show some seasonality, with higher concentrations in winter than in summer. This variability seems larger for the total catchment than for the upstream part of the catchment (Figure 4). The long-term chloride concentrations varied between 20 and 40 mg/L with slightly lower values in the upstream than in the downstream catchment. Nitrate concentrations varied between approximately 30 and 50 mg/L during the last few decades. Tritium concentrations were found to be around 5 TU (Figure 4a). Both the chloride and nitrate measurements show a clear trend reversal in the 1990s (Figure 4c-f) that resembles the trend reversal in the solute input curves (Figure 2) due to legislations. Chloride concentrations in the upstream part of the catchment increase from about 20 mg/L in the 1970s to up to 30 mg/L between 1990 and 1994 (Figure 4c), which is about 5 to 10 years after the peak in the input (Figure 2). In the same period, the chloride concentrations measured at the outlet of the total catchment peak at a concentration up to about 42 mg/L (Figure 4d). After 1994, the chloride concentrations decrease both up- and downstream and have been approximately stable between 20 and 25 mg/L since the year 2000, similar to the trend in the chloride concentrations in the uppermost groundwater. The measured timing of nitrate at the outlet of the catchment (Figure 4f) is similar to chloride (figure 4d) with an increase up to 1994 when the maximum of 50 mg/L is reached. After that, nitrate concentrations have decreased but at a slower rate than chloride. What is especially noticeable is that for the upstream part of the catchment, the timing of the chloride and nitrate peaks in the measurements do not coincide. While chloride peaks around 1990 and quickly drops after that, nitrate concentrations only start decreasing after approximately 2000.

3.13. Groundwater TTDs modelling result

The model indicated that about 20% of discharge in the Springendalse Beek is water with a travel time less than 1 year, while about 15% of discharge has a travel time of more than 25 years (Figure 3a and b). The discharge in the Springendalse Beek thus consists mainly of medium aged water (1 – 25 years) and the mean travel time is approximately 11 years and median travel time around 4 years. Part of the discharge in the catchment originates from agricultural fields and part from natural areas. Based on the land-use map (Figure 1) and the particle tracking, we found that in the upstream part of the catchment between 15 and 25% of discharge infiltrated under agricultural fields (Figure 3c and d). For the total catchment this increases is slightly higher atto about 25 to 35% (Figure 3d), because a slightly larger part of the streams capture zone in the downstream part of the catchment is used for agriculture.

In the modelling results, tThe discharge contribution from agricultural fields shows a seasonal pattern especially for the total catchment (Figure 3d), with a higher agricultural contributions to discharge of water that was infiltrated under agricultural

11

fields during the wet winter. ~~A larger fraction of discharge is young in winter compared to summer, especially in the downstream part of the catchment (Figure 3b). During this period, the activation of flow to tile drains and towards adjacent ditches promotes the shallow flow paths resulting in a young water component (Rozemeijer and Broers, 2007; van der Velde et al., 2009).~~

3.~~4~~2. ~~Stream measurements and initial m~~Water quality modelling ~~results~~

~~We started sampling for 3H in 2016 because we anticipated that tritium could give an independent validation of our transient TTD model. Tritium concentrations were found to be around 5 TU (Figure 4a). Although the time series is relatively short, the model captures the variability of the actual 3H measurements well, though the modelled concentrations overestimate the measured concentrations by approximately 0.5 TU (Figure 4a). Based on experience in other catchments (Broers and van Vliet, 2018a; Morgenstern et al., 2010; Stolp et al., 2010) this might be caused by the model underestimating the mean age of water in our catchment.~~

~~The chloride and nitrate measurements show a clear trend reversal (Figure 4c-f) that resembles the trend reversal in the input curves (Figure 2). Chloride concentrations in the upstream part of the catchment increase from about 20 mg/L in the 1970s to up to 30 mg/L between 1990 and 1994 (Figure 4c), which is later than the peak in the input curve in 1985 (Figure 2). In the same period, the chloride concentrations measured at the outlet of the total catchment peak at a concentration up to about 42 mg/L (Figure 4d). After 1994, the chloride concentrations decrease both up- and downstream and have been approximately stable between 20 and 25 mg/L since the year 2000, similar to the trend in the chloride concentrations in the uppermost groundwater.~~ The initial combination of the TTD results and solute input curves ~~model run~~ was based on the land-use and solute input curves described in paragraph 2.5 and included no further processes or changes to the original flow model. The initial model run showed higher chloride and nitrate concentrations in winter than in summer, and this seasonal variation was larger for the total catchment than the upstream catchment. This agrees with the measurements and conclusion of Kaandorp et al. (2018a) that the contribution of different flow paths differ between the two parts of the catchment.

The modelled chloride concentrations confirmed ~~gave a reasonable fit~~ the observed long-term trends (Figure 4c and d), although the modelled concentrations were too low for the period between 1990 and 1995 (underestimation of 5-15 mg/L) and the chloride peak was simulated around 1985 instead of 1990.
For tritium, the model overestimates the measured concentrations by approximately 0.5 TU (Figure 4a), which could indicate either an underestimation of the mean age of water in the catchment (allowing for more decay) or an underestimation of the amount of younger water (contributing water with low tritium concentrations).

~~The measured timing of nitrate at the outlet of the catchment (Figure 4f) is similar to chloride (figure 4d) with an increase up~~
~~to 1994 when the maximum of 50 mg/L is reached. After that, nitrate concentrations have decreased but at a slower rate than~~
~~chloride.~~ While the measurements showed the nitrate peak around 1994 and 1997 for the total catchment and upstream respectively, the initial model run showed the nitrate peak around 1987 for both the total and upstream catchment. This may suggest that travel times were underestimated in the model, ~~in correspondence~~which is supported by ~~with~~ the ~~results from tritium measurements~~^{3}H.

~~What is especially noticeable is that for the upstream part of the catchment, the timing of the chloride and nitrate peaks in the~~
~~measurements do not coincide. This could be caused by processes that only affect nitrate and not the more conservative~~
~~chloride, such as denitrification. The difference could also indicate that the ratio between chloride and nitrate have changed in~~
~~the fertilizers used or suggest point source pollution disturbing the agricultural signal.~~

~~The measured chloride and nitrate measurements nicely reflect the seasonality in the contribution of water infiltrated below~~
~~agricultural fields (Figure 3) by showing more variation in the downstream than in the upstream part of the catchment (Figure~~
~~4). Like the measurements, the initial model run showed higher chloride and nitrate concentrations in winter than in summer,~~
~~and this seasonal variation was larger for the total catchment than the upstream catchment. This agrees with the measurements~~
~~and conclusion of Kaandorp et al. (2018a) that the contribution of different flow paths differ between the two parts of the~~
~~catchment.~~

3.5~~3~~. Exploration of model behaviour~~Sensitivity analysis~~: Effects on the breakthrough of tritium, chloride and nitrate

Overall, the simulated tritium, chloride and nitrate concentrations in the stream did not completely match ~~fit~~ the measurements, both in concentration and in the arrival in time of the agricultural peak (Figure 4). Instead of attempting to further adapt and calibrate the groundwater flow model, we explored the model behavior under different scenarios~~ran a sensitivity analysis~~, exploring the parameters that might determine the apparent mismatch with the measured concentrations; thereby increasing our understanding of the flow and transport system in catchments in general.

~~3.3.1. Scenarios affecting the travel time distribution~~

Set 1a, ~~U~~unsaturated zone hydrological delay
An unsaturated zone was added to the upstream catchment model with a travel time of 5 years, as a separate piston flow component superposed on the groundwater system that was modelled.

415 This <u>delay</u> shifted the tritium peak in time and led to a decrease in the tritium concentrations because decay takes place while travelling through the unsaturated zone (Figure 5a). Because chloride and nitrate were not reactive, the unsaturated zone merely added a certain amount of time to the whole travel time distribution, simply shifting the chloride and nitrate output curves in time (Figure 5b and c).

420 *Set 1b, unsaturated zone N species delay*

<u>The lag time created in the unsaturated zone by the slower release of persistent N was simulated by putting a delay of 10 years on 50% of the nitrate input. Because the input of nitrate is spread out over a longer period, this resulted in a lower peak value but extended the period with high nitrate levels (Figure 5c).</u>

425 *Set 2, increased saturated zone ~~Mean~~ travel time<u>s</u>*

The application of a factor 5 on the mean travel times decreased the overall tritium concentrations due to the extra time for decay (Figure 5a). The<u>-</u> input ~~curves~~ <u>of solutes</u> was<u>were</u> distributed more in time ~~and therefore~~<u>which</u> lowered the chloride and nitrate peak and increased the tail of the peak (Figure 5b and c). <u>This scenario thus has a similar effect on the shape of the breakthrough curve of nitrate as scenario 1b (Figure 5c).</u> When <u>all</u> travel times were increased a 5-fold the chloride and nitrate

430 peaks shifted approximately 10 years.

~~3.3.2. Scenarios affecting the input of solutes and the land-use specific TTD's~~

Set 3, different temporal input of solutes~~Time~~

We modelled two alternative <u>solute</u> input curves of agricultural fields. First, we used a<u>-</u><u>solute</u><u>n</u> input curve <u>in which the-</u>~~that~~

435 ~~has a slower~~ <u>rate of the</u> decrease of nitrate ~~in time~~ after the 1985 peak <u>is lowered</u> (Figure 6a<u>, red line</u>). This slower decrease <u>in the agricultural input</u> resulted in an ~~longer~~ increase <u>in</u><u>of</u> nitrate <u>during a longer period, remarkably also</u> extending also into the period when the input is already decreasing, followed by a slower decrease after that (Figure 6b<u>, red line</u>). <u>In the s</u>S<u>econd scenario,</u> we removed all agricultur<u>al input</u>e after the 1985 nitrate peak (Figure 6a<u>, green line</u>). This instantly lowered the stream nitrate concentrations <u>from 1986 onwards,</u> as the stream consists of a large amount of young water and after removal

440 of agriculture is only affected by nitrate from older flow paths that started before 1986 (Figure 6b<u>, green line</u>).

Set 4, spatial differences in solute input~~Space~~

The effect of spatial changes of the input was modelled in two scenarios: one scenario where <u>only the</u> ~~a-~~zone of 200 m around the stream was used for agriculture, and one scenario where agricultur<u>al input only</u>e took place outside of the same 200 m

445 zone. With the agricultural fields directly around the stream (Buffer scenario 1)~~,~~ the nitrate peak shifted to 1985 (Figure 6c), which is the year of maximum input (Figure 2). With ~~a natural buffer strip and~~ the agricultural fields in the more upstream parts of the catchment (Buffer scenario 2), <u>representing e.g. a natural buffer strip,</u> the nitrate peak shifted towards later in time

14

and became flatter with a much slower decrease over time (Figure 6d). This results from the fact that the fields further away are connected with the stream by longer flow paths with longer travel times. In addition, the shape of the curve was changed based on the location of the fields: wWhen fields are further away, the agricultural input is distributed more over time resulting in a lower peak but a longer tail with higher concentrations.

3.3.3. Scenarios affecting the transformation processes in the subsurface

Set 5, dDenitrification in the saturated zone

Two denitrification scenarios were modelled, using different conceptualizations. Zero order denitrification with a rate of 10 mg/L per year resulted in continuously lower nitrate concentrations without a shift in time (Figure 7). In the other scenario, denitrification was modelled based on the depth that the particles flowed through, for which nitrate was removed from all particles travelling through deeper layers (> model layer 2, >0.5-15 m below surface). This also resulted in decreased nitrate concentrations, but with higher values in the concentration tail than in the zero order scenario (Figure 7).

4. Discussion

Aim of this study is to test whether the use of dynamic TTDs as derived from a groundwater flow model helps us to understand the observed breakthrough pattern of solutes in a lowland stream. We collected long time series of chloride and nitrate which showed a clear trend reversal in the 1990 following national and European legislations restricting the use of manure and fertilizers. By combining the TTDs with input curves for solutes, we were able to calculate stream concentrations which we could compare with the long time series of chloride and nitrate. This base model, which did not include time delays due to the unsaturated zone or chemical processes (except a simple correction for nitrate in the unsaturated zone), was able to reasonably capture the long-term trends of chloride and nitrate. In addition to the trend reversal in the 1990s, both the measurements and model indicated seasonality in the in-stream concentrations, with higher concentrations in winter and lower concentrations in summer.

Interestingly, a time lag seems to exist between the reduction of the solute input and the following trend reversal observed in the long time series. This time lag, defined as the time between the peak in solute application and the observed peak in the stream, was further studied using the model. For this, we did an exploration of the model behaviour under different scenarios, to get more understanding of the effect of different processes on the long-term breakthrough of the solutes.

In the discussion we will first focus on the effect of different processes on the breakthrough of solutes, based on the exploration of the model behaviour under different scenarios. We will evaluate how unsaturated zone processes, advective saturated flow,

15

the spatial source zones and temporal patterns of solute inputs and transformation processes such as denitrification will influence time lags in the receiving water body. Using our dynamic TTD model, we will then introduce 'contributing areas' to discuss the spatial and temporal effects of land-use and groundwater flow paths. We will subsequently discuss the measurements and model results of the study area and take another look at the observed breakthroughs and time lags of the different solutes. Lastly, we will discuss the implications of our findings for catchment management.

4.1. The effect of processes on modelled breakthroughs

Unsaturated zones led to a shift in time of the breakthrough of the nitrate curve while not affecting the concentration of nitrate (Figure 5; Table 2).

In catchments with thick unsaturated zones, the lag time due to unsaturated zones has been calculated to be up to decades such as for aquifers in the U.K. (Wang et al., 2012). Storage of N in an area with a thick unsaturated zone can thus be large, but in a larger area with variations in the water table the outflow of N is often diluted by shallow flow paths contributing young water in downstream areas with shallow water tables or artificial drainage. In such an area the part of the catchment with thick unsaturated zones will create a longer tail in the nitrate concentrations.

Multiplication of the MTTTTD lowered the nitrate peak because the larger age of the discharging groundwater resulteds in a larger contribution of pre-1950 water, which has been less influenced by agricultural activities. Because the ages of the younger flow paths weare increased, the agricultural peak from the 80s is distributed over a larger amount of time, resulting in a shift in arrival of the peak and a slower decrease of concentrations after the maximum stream concentration has been reached (Figure 5; Table 32). The factor 5 we multiplied the MTT with in our results clearly shows the effect on the breakthrough, but is a very extreme case, as. It would it represents a system with an aquifer that is also 5 times as thick (or has with an unrealistic porosity 5 times higher) given the same groundwater recharge rate (van Ommen, 1986; Vogel, 1967).

Changing the shape of the solute input curve led to a similar change in stream concentrations similar to that applied to the input. In the case we presented, this was a slower decrease in concentrations after the concentration peak (Figure 6a). There was noWe did not shift of the time of the peak in the input peak because the peak in the input was kept at the same moment in time as we have strong indications that the peak in Dutch agriculture occurred during the same year in all of the Netherlands, due to the strict measures taken around 1985 (van den Brink et al., 2008; Visser et al., 2007). It seems obvious that the solute input curve and its uncertainty have a large effect on the stream concentrations (Howden et al., 2011a). In athe scenario where all agriculture was removed from the year 1986, an instant decrease of nitrate concentrations in the stream instantly decreased in the stream following the removal of inputwas found. This follows from the relatively large amount of young water in ourdischarges by our catchment and is in line with the quick response observed for other catchments in the Netherlands (e.g. Rozemeijer et al., 2014). Van Ommen (1986) used a conceptual case to illustrate the same fast reaction: in catchments with an

16

exponential TTD (or in our case close to exponential TTD; Kaandorp et al., 2018a), a change in the input directly affects stream concentrations for all MTTs. This is however not always the case ~~The response differs with MTT~~ when the reduction in inputs is more gradual: the scenario where the solute input curve was changed to have a slower decrease of NO3 resulted in a time lag of the peak observed in the surface water. Thus, the time for a change in input to show in stream concentrations. ~~A delay of the arrival of the peak is possible when the MTT is rather long and the input decreases slowly or a combination of those (see Supplement).~~

~~Zero-order denitrification removed nitrate from the model and thus lowered nitrate concentrations while not changing the timing of the peak (Table 2). Zhang et al. (2013) and more recently Kolbe et al. (2019) showed that varying denitrification with depth has a major influence on nitrate delivered to streams via groundwater. Our scenarios were relatively simple with equal denitrification rates and depths throughout the catchment. It is however know that there is a large variability in the reactivity of for instance organic matters (e.g. Hartog et al., 2004; Middelburg, 1989; Postma et al., 1991), which could lead to spatial differences in denitrification and therefore a change in the nitrate breakthrough similar to the scenarios where the spatial input was changed.~~ ~~As older flow paths generally originate from a larger distance from the stream (e.g. Modica et al., 1998), there is a difference in the travel time of water from different parts of the groundwater contributing area. Because of this, the location of agricultural fields in the groundwater contributing area affects the breakthrough of tritium, chloride and nitrate.~~
 seems to depend also on the reduction rates of the input.

To further study this observation, we combined exponential TTDs with varying MTTs with different conceptual input scenarios and no other processes. Results show that a time lag in the arrival of the peak is possible when the MTT is rather long or the input decreases slowly or a combination of those (Table 4). Figure 8 illustrates three input scenarios for a conceptual catchment with an exponential Travel Time distribution with a Mean Travel Time (MTT) of 5. The three input scenarios are a direct stop, a slow decrease of the input and a fast decrease of the input, all following a block input of '100' between time=0 and time=10. The direct stop leads to a direct decrease in output concentrations, showing an 'inverse' exponential distribution which represents the new unpolluted front travelling through the groundwater system. The other two scenarios on the contrary do not show a direct decrease: the scenario with the fast decrease of the input shows a concentration increase for one extra time step (1 month) before decreasing, and this decrease is much slower than the scenario with the direct input stop as a result from the extra input after t=10. The scenario with a slowly decreasing input shows the same behaviour but more extreme: an increase in output concentration until t=16, even with a decreasing input in that period.

The time lag until peak output concentration following a decrease in the input is thus controlled by both the MTT of the exponential travel time distribution and the speed of the input change (Table 4). Figure 9 shows the time to peak for different MTTs and input decreases. The time lag increases with increasing MTTs and with slower input decreases. This behaviour is

17

only the result of the hydrology of the groundwater system and is related to the net result of mass loading through groundwater recharge and mass removal at the outflow point. Concentrations at the outflow only start decreasing once the net input is smaller than the net output (Broers and van Geer, 2005). This analysis shows that in the general case of a catchment with an exponential TTD the effect of measures on the solute input can be expected to show directly, but that a lag time can be introduced by certain combinations of MTTs and solute input reduction rates.

The unsaturated zone was considered in a simplified way in the model by 1) coupling the groundwater model with an unsaturated zone model (MetaSWAP, see also Kaandorp et al., 2018a) to provide a realistic groundwater recharge based on e.g. recharge and by 2) including part of the unsaturated zone processes in the solute input curves by using a nitrate transformation factor of 0.85 on the data before 2000 and using the concentrations of shallow groundwater from 2000 onwards. Although in this way many unsaturated zone processes were accounted for, it did not include potential delays caused on the breakthrough of solutes. The model exploration showed that unsaturated zones lead to a shift in time of the breakthrough of the nitrate curve due to the time it takes for water to percolate from the surface towards the groundwater (Figure 5; Table 3). This is purely a hydrological effect (Set 1a). In catchments with thick unsaturated zones, the lag time due to unsaturated zones has been calculated to be up to decades such as for aquifers in the U.K. (Wang et al., 2012). The time lag introduced by the unsaturated zone is often averaged on a catchment scale, due to spatial variation in its thickness, although it can lead to long tails in the nitrate concentrations. On the other hand, longer residence times in the unsaturated zone will promote the uptake efficiency by crops and potential denitrification in saturated parts of the unsaturated zone. Other biochemical processes in the unsaturated zone can also create time lags in the breakthrough of nitrate (Set 1b). N applied on agricultural fields comes partly in the form of directly available N and partly in the form of persistent organic N. While the directly available N is rapidly leached towards the groundwater, persistent N is only slowly transformed into nitrate and leaches towards the groundwater over a time scale of decades (e.g. Ehrhardt et al., 2019). This not only lowers the height of the nitrate peak, but also leads to a time lag in the output with elevated nitrate levels over a longer period of time.

Denitrification removes (part of) the nitrate and thus lowers concentrations. When applied as zero order denitrification this does not change the timing of the peak (Table 3), as the denitrification takes place equally along all flow paths. When this is not the case denitrification does affect the shape and timing of the breakthrough of nitrate, for instance when denitrification takes place only at certain depths (Figure 7). Zhang et al. (2013) and more recently Kolbe et al. (2019) showed that varying denitrification with depth has a major influence on nitrate delivered to streams via groundwater. Our scenarios were relatively simple with equal denitrification rates and depths throughout the catchment. It is however known that there is a large variability in the reactivity of for instance organic matters (e.g. Hartog et al., 2004; Middelburg, 1989; Postma et al., 1991), which could lead to spatial or temporal differences in denitrification and therefore a change in the nitrate breakthrough. If denitrification for instance occurs predominantly in the stream valley close to the stream, where conditions are wet and organic matter is abundant, denitrification removes nitrate mostly from younger flow paths, thus shifting the nitrate peak due to the delivery of

580 nitrate mostly by older flow paths, which generally originate from a larger distance from the stream (e.g. Modica et al., 1998). This effect was shown by the model scenario in which a buffer without agriculture was introduced around surface waters (Figure 6c and d) and is a result of the difference in travel time of the flow paths from the fields close to the stream and the fields more upstream (e.g. Musolff et al., 2017).

585 The location of agricultural fields in relation to the catchments' drainage network, and more precisely the location of high loading is thus an important factor that largely governs the travel times of the agricultural solutes. Both seasonal and long-term concentration-discharge relationships strongly depend on spatial source patterns (e.g. Musolff et al., 2017) and spatial differences in reactivity (e.g. Kolbe et al., 2019) can further cause spatial variability between solute concentrations of water in different flow paths. It can therefore be argued that in modelling not only the location of fields must be known but also more

590 information about leaching towards the groundwater at every field, as there can be a significant difference in the use of manure and fertilizers due to for instance differences in crops. However, for our catchment, national and EU regulations put strong constraints on the application of nitrogen, thus levelling differences in inputs to farmlands (e.g. Oenema et al., 1998; Schroder et al., 2007). Effectively, soil properties and groundwater levels determine the areas with strongest leaching towards the groundwater as those factors determine the potential for unsaturated zone denitrification.

595

Summarizing the observations from the model exploration, a time lag of the breakthrough of a trend reversal can be caused by: 1) travel time of the unsaturated zone, including slow release of (part of the) N, 2) the combination of MTT and solutes input reduction, 3) spatial setting between solute input, (bio)chemical processes and the drainage network (e.g. locations of agricultural fields and denitrification).

600

4.2. Contributing area of streams

In the previous paragraph, we have seen that the spatial distribution of inputs and processes is an important factor in the breakthrough of agricultural solutes. Recently Barlow et al. (2018) restated the definition of the 'contributing area' as "the

605 two-dimensional areal extent of that portion of a capture zone that intersects the water table and surface-water features where water entering the groundwater-flow system is discharged". They did this for groundwater wells, but streams also have a contributing area, which is variable in time and not the same as the catchment. The catchment of a stream is the area in which all discharging water finally ends up in the stream.

It The contributing area of streams is also not to be confused by the 'contributing area' or 'upslope area' used in many

610 distributed hydrologic modes by catchment scientists, which is the runoff-generating area, i.e. the parts of the catchment where seepage and overland discharge towards the surface waterflow occur (e.g. Ambroise, 2004; Beven and Wood, 1983; Beven and Kirkby, 1979; Mcglynn and Seibert, 2003; Yang et al., 2018). To avoid further confusion, we introduce the terms

'groundwater contributing area' and 'runoff contributing area'. The groundwater contributing area (GCA) is defined as the area where the water that is actively contributing to streamflow at a certain moment of time through active flow paths entered the coupled groundwater-surface water system as precipitation (recharge area). The runoff contributing area (RCA) is defined as the area where at a certain moment in time water is discharged from the catchment storage as seepage or overland flow, and thus is the area where runoff is generated (Figure 8igure 10). Areas that are neither groundwater- or runoff contributing areas are inactive and do not actively influence contribute to streamflow at that specific moment in time. In our particle tracking method, the GCA is the starting point and the RCA is the ending point of a particle (Figure 9igure 11).

As older flow paths generally originate from a larger distance from the stream (e.g. Modica et al., 1998), there is a difference in the travel time of water from different parts of the groundwater contributing area. Because of this, the location of agricultural fields in the groundwater contributing area affects the breakthrough of tritium, chloride and nitrate. The buffer scenarios showed that the arrival of the nitrate peak shifts in time and changes shape if the fields are further away from the stream (Figure 6c and d), which is a result of the difference in travel time of the flow paths from the fields around the stream and the fields more upstream (e.g. Musolff et al., 2017).

Because flow paths change based on wetness conditions (e.g. Kaandorp et al., 2018a; Rozemeijer and Broers, 2007; Yang et al., 2018) the groundwater contributing area also shifts through the seasons. This includes the disappearance inactivation of flow through shallow flow paths towards e.g. drainage pipes and ditches in dry periods, which leads to the a non-linear reaction in of the dynamic TTD to discharge. When wetness conditions decrease, groundwater levels decrease, and drainage units fall dry. Consequently, the water that was flowing towards these drainage units suddenly stays in the aquifer and/or flows towards another drainage unit. When wetness conditions increase again, groundwater levels first have to rise to the point that they can activate these flow paths again. This also (at least partly) explains why concentration-discharge relationships vary with the wetness of catchments. In our results, the discharge originating from agricultural fields changes in time as a result of this variation in the GCAcontributing area (Figure 3 and 9), and . Because of this, the seasonal variation in flow paths and thus the groundwater contributing area also leads to fluctuations in the concentrations of nitrate in the stream (e.g. Figure 4). Figure 8igure 10 illustrates how the groundwater contributing area may shift based on wetness conditions: in the wet period all flow paths are active while during the dry period only the older flow paths are active, and flow through shallow short flow paths has ceased. Therefore, in this example the groundwater contribution of the field close to the stream stops in the dry period and removing this field thus only affects stream nitrate concentrations during the wet period. This concept extents on the ideas presented by Rozemeijer and Broers (2007), by adding the spatial dimension and groundwater contributing area to their concept of variation in the contribution of flow paths with depth. Similarly, Musolff et al. (2017) showed that both seasonal and long-term concentration-discharge relationships strongly depend on spatial source patterns. Spatial differences in reactivity (e.g. Kolbe et al., 2019) can further cause spatial variability between solute concentrations of water in different flow paths.

The location of agricultural fields in relation to the catchments' drainage network, and more precisely the location of high loading is thus an important factor that largely governs the travel times of the agricultural solutes. This means that in modelling not only the location of fields must be known but also more information of leaching towards the groundwater at every field, as there can be significant difference in the use of manure and fertilizers due to for instance differences in crops. However, for our catchment national and EU regulations put strong constraints on the application of nitrogen, thus levelling differences in inputs to farmlands (e.g. Oenema et al., 1998; Schroder et al., 2007). Effectively, soil properties and groundwater levels determine the areas with strongest leaching towards the groundwater as those factors determine the potential for unsaturated zone denitrification.

4.3. Understanding nitrate in the Springendalse Beek catchment

The previous paragraphs discussed more generally the important processes that affect the breakthrough of agricultural solutes, which we will use in this paragraph to discuss the observations from both the measurements and TTD model in the study area. Overall the model was able to describe the trend reversal that was observed in the measurements of the Springendalse Beek catchment. The time series of discharge and solutes showed that The increase in relative old water contribution during dry periods has been found in several studies and is called the 'inverse storage effect' (e.g. Benettin et al., 2017; Harman, 2015). Seasonally, the upstream catchment area shows has less seasonal variation in discharge than the downstream catchment, as well as less variation in the contribution from agricultural fields and in the stream concentrations of chloride and nitrate (Figures 3 and 4). The fact that oOur groundwater-based model was able to simulate this difference between up- and downstream which indicates that e seasonal variation in chloride and nitrate concentrations shows that this variation can largely be explained by variations in the contribution of different groundwater flow paths originating from different locations in the catchment, as was also concluded by e.g. Martin et al. (2004),; Musolff et al. (2016),; Rozemeijer and Broers (2007) and van der Velde et al. (2010a). High chloride and nitrate concentrations from agricultural activities are mostly present in the shallower layers (0-5m below surface) (e.g. Bohlke and Denver, 1995; Broers and van der Grift, 2004; Rozemeijer and Broers, 2007; van der Velde et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2013) and. E especially in the downstream part of the catchment, with its larger drainage density from the many (shallow) agricultural tile drains and ditches, these shallow flow paths contribute more water of a young agehave a larger contribution in the wet period with high groundwater tables than in the dry period (Kaandorp et al., 2018a). Thise increase in relative old water contribution during dry periods has been found in several studies and is called the 'inverse storage effect' (e.g. Benettin et al., 2017; Harman, 2015). Similar to our model, van der Velde et al. (2010) and Wriedt et al. (2007) were able to model seasonality of in-stream nitrate concentrations using only groundwater dynamics, and concluded it to be an important process that is further superposed by denitrification and variability in loading. We conclude that the upstream part of the Springendalse Beek catchment with its relatively stable year-round discharge compared to the

downstream part of the catchment, provides the lower limit of the nitrateNO3 concentrations in the catchment, while the drained downstream part of the catchment mainly causes the seasonalyearly variation in stream concentrations.

The fact that most of the discharge has travel times larger than one year might explain that no seasonality was observed in the tritium measurements. The model overestimated all observed tritium concentrations in the initial model run, by approximately 0.5 TU on average (Figure 4a). This could indicate the uncertainty in the measured concentrations but based on experience in other catchments (Broers and van Vliet, 2018a; Morgenstern et al., 2010; Stolp et al., 2010) this might be caused by the model underestimating the mean age of water in our catchment, for instance due to an overestimation of the recharge. On the other hand, an overestimation of the mean water age by the model could also cause higher modelled tritium concentrations, as more recently infiltrated water has lower tritium concentrations (Figure 2). Unfortunately, no earlier measurements of tritium are available for the Springendalse Beek to draw further conclusions using tritium.

Denitrification does not seem to occur substantially in the upstream part of the study area as the modelled nitrate concentrations are generally already lower than the measurements. This is confirmed by the oxic nature of the sandy sediments that the groundwater discharges from (Kaandorp et al., 2019), the presence of oxygen and lack of iron in the discharge water (data not shown). Although the upstream part of the catchment contains less agriculture than the downstream part (Figure 3), the nitrate concentrations in the stream are comparable. This may be an indication of denitrification in the downstream part of the catchment where water levels are close to the root zone, promoting shallow denitrification, which could be a reason for the overestimation of nitrate as well as the fact that the model overestimates the seasonal variation in the downstream catchment (Figure 4f). Another important aspect is uptake of nitrate and denitrification within the surface water system. This is currently not accounted for and probably limited in winter (high flow velocities and low temperatures), but may be causing lower nitrate concentrations in summer.

Measurements of chloride and nitrate showed a time lag between the trend reversal in the solute input and in the discharge. Tritium concentrations were overestimated by approximately 0.5 TU in the initial model run (Figure 4a). Because the tritium concentrations can only be lowered by increasing the TTD, both an unsaturated zone or an increase of MTT could improve the fit of tritium. We cannot derive from the tritium measurements whether the catchment should have an unsaturated zone time delay or increased MTT, because no earlier measurements of tritium are available for the Springendalse Beek. In our the lowland groundwater-driven study catchment, unsaturated zones are relatively thin in the downstream part of the catchment (maximum a few meters, but mostly <1 m) and slightly thicker in the upstream part (up to 3 meters), and thus only a maximum shift time lag of a few years would be realistic. Due to the complex hydrogeology of the ice pushed ridge, especially in the upstream part of the catchment, there is quite some uncertainty in the exact depths and volumes of the aquifers that are present within the ice-pushed ridge. In the regional groundwater flow model, this complex geology was highly simplified based on the version of the hydrogeological schematization of REGIS (REGIS II, 2005) that was available when building the flow model.

22

The complex geological structure of the ice-pushed ridge makes it difficult to exactly pinpoint the position of the tilted Pleistocene sand layers that probably form the main pathways to the stream, as the tilted slabs of Tertiary clays form hydraulic
715 barriers for groundwater flow (pers. comm. Harting, TNO Geological Survey of the Netherlands). Given the approximate N-S strike direction of the sandy intercalations, this may have influence on the distinct farmlands that contribute to the nitrate concentrations in the stream, that may be positioned further away than the modelled schematization might allow in the regional groundwater flow model. It might also affect the mean travel times in the groundwater system as a larger aquifer volume would result in overall longer travel times (Vogel, 1967; van Ommen, 1986). ~~Moreover, thicker than average unsaturated zones within~~
720 ~~the sandy outcrops may also delay the propagation of nitrate and chloride peaks towards the stream, following the conceptualization presented.~~ The observation that the time lag is larger for nitrate than for chloride, especially in the downstream catchment, can be explained by processes that only affect nitrate and not the more conservative chloride, such as a difference in residence time of different N species or spatial differences in denitrification. The difference could also indicate that the ratio between chloride and nitrate has changed in the fertilizers used.

725

Although a time lag was observed, the measurements showed that legislations in the 1980s were effective in lowering the concentrations of agricultural solutes in the stream. The model was reasonably able to simulate the long-term trends, but could be improved by adding more detail based on the lessons learned from the model exploration. However, these lessons on the breakthrough of solutes are already applicable in other catchments and will be further discussed in the next paragraph.
730 ~~Land use changes have occurred in the study area over the past few decades. For instance, a large agricultural field in the upstream part of the catchment has been in use only since approximately 1985 and an agricultural field of approximately 7.5 ha was converted to natural vegetation in 1998. On top of this, more manure may have been imported from areas with a manure surplus towards the study area since 2000, which has been found to be the case for other catchments in the region (Roelsma et al., 2011). Obviously, this complexity in the input curves in time and space was too detailed for our model and beyond the~~
735 ~~scope of our analysis. However, the scenarios in which we shifted the location of agricultural fields and changed the input curves were an attempt to infer the effect of such land-use changes.~~

~~Denitrification does not seem to occur substantially in the upstream part of the study area as the~~ ~~modelled~~ ~~nitrate concentrations are generally already lower than the measurements. This is confirmed by the oxic nature of the sandy sediments that the~~
740 ~~groundwater discharges from (Kaandorp et al., under revision for publication in JoH), the presence of oxygen and lack of iron in the discharge water (data not shown). Although the upstream part of the catchment contains less agriculture than the downstream part (Figure 3), the nitrate concentrations in the stream are comparable. This may be an indication of denitrification in the downstream part of the catchment where water levels are close to the root zone, promoting shallow denitrification, which could be a reason for the overestimation of nitrate (Figure 4f).~~

745

23

4.4. Improving and use of the model

The groundwater flow model that we used was calibrated on groundwater heads and validated using stream discharge (Kaandorp et al., 2018a), which is common practise for groundwater models. By combining TTDs with input curves for solutes, we were able to further validate the model using water quality measurements. This way, the model is not only validated on celerities, but also on water velocities (Beven, 1981; McDonnell and Beven, 2014). Although our model performed well on celerities (groundwater heads and stream discharge), it showed considerable mismatch for water velocities (solutes) even considered that it did not include reactive processes. Instead of completely adapting the model, we chose to run a sensitivity analysis to understand the reasons for the apparent mismatch, thus elucidating important transport factors in our study catchment, that are of general use in transport modelling studies for non-point sources in catchments worldwide.

To illustrate whether it is possible to match the model to the measured concentrations, we adapted some of the parameters that are most sensitive and somewhat most realistic. This is by no means a calibration effort, because that would require a significant change to the complete set up of both the hydrogeological part of the model, the unsaturated zone conceptualization and/or the introduction of time changing position of agricultural fields. The result depicted in Figure 10 is meant to show that a different parameterization is possible, adapting part of the uncertain parameters.

For the improved model run, we mainly focussed on the upstream part of the catchment, as the concentrations there also influence the stream concentrations in the downstream part. Especially the late arrival of the nitrate peak in the upstream area is exceptional for the Netherlands. To improve the model, we needed to delay the arrival of the chloride and nitrate peaks and provoke a slower decrease after the arrival of the peaks. For this, the spatial layout of agricultural fields was changed by removing the (few) fields close to the stream and increasing the amount of agriculture outside of a 200 m buffer. Considering that land use has changed in the past decades and that the geology on the ice pushed ridge is known to be much more complicated than the conceptualization in the model, the change made to the spatial input for this model run was deemed realistic. Additionally, based on the mismatch with tritium, we added an unsaturated zone with a travel time of 3 years. Note that an unsaturated zone of 3 years is not realistic for most of the downstream area as that part of the catchment has shallow groundwater levels. However, it is currently not possible in our method to add an unsaturated zone in the upstream area and not in the downstream at the same time. These two changes together resulted in a better fit with the tritium, chloride and nitrate measurements (Figure 10), especially for nitrate in the upstream area. For the measurements made downstream between 1985 and 1990 a better fit was not possible with realistic model changes.

Further calibration of the model, to use it for e.g. the calculation of the effects of certain management measures, would require much more changes to the model. It would be required to conceptually change the way the unsaturated zone is accounted for at this moment, it requires much more detail in the hydrogeology of especially the upstream part of the catchment on the ice-

4.~~5~~. Management implications

The exploration of the model behaviour indicated that r~~R~~emoving the source of diffuse pollution le~~a~~ds to an immediate decrease of in-~~stream~~ concentrations ~~in the studied stream~~ (Figure 6b), due to the large fraction of younger water in the TTD. ~~Thus~~Therefore, contrary to what is often thought, the response of measures through the groundwater system is instant in the general case that the TTD is (close to) exponential and thus managing the input of agricultural pollutants is a good management option with direct benefits. We showed however that ~~,~~ this direct impact does not occur ~~except~~ when decreases are very slow or the MTT is very large. ~~Also, a~~After ~~an~~ the immediate decrease, the legacy from older groundwater flow paths leads to a slow further decrease in time.

According to scenarios modelled by Tufford et al. (1998) the management of stream water quality is most effectively done at riparian and adjacent lands. ~~Johnes and Heathwaite (1997) suggested to move agricultural fields to the locations with the highest potential for nutrient retention.~~ Our results show that the location of agricultural fields indeed has a large effect on stream concentrations. ~~We saw that the location of agricultural fields in a catchment is indeed an important factor in the effect of agricultural pollution.~~ Not only does the location of the fields affect the time lag and shape of the breakthrough curve of stream concentrations, longer flow paths from the fields further away from the stream also have more time for processes such as denitrification. ~~In fact, t~~The scenario with the 200 m agricultural-free zone around the stream can be compared with a (natural) riparian zone, on which much research has been done (e.g. Anderson et al., 2014; Feld et al., 2018; Hefting and Klein, 1998; Hill, 1996; Ranalli and Macalady, 2010). These studies show that riparian zones positively affect stream water quality because of their high rate of denitrification. Johnes and Heathwaite (1997) even suggested to move agricultural fields to the locations with the highest potential for nutrient retention.

Our results show that in addition to ~~this~~the denitrification potential of a riparian buffer zone, the longer length of the groundwater flow paths lags the arrival of and dampens the nitrate peak. In fact, as denitrification rates are highly variable (e.g. Tesoriero and Puckett, 2011; Van Beek et al., 1994) and riparian zones can be by-passed by deeper groundwater flows (Bohlke and Denver, 1995; Flewelling et al., 2012; Hill, 1996; O'Toole et al., 2018; Ranalli and Macalady, 2010), the longer distance and thus distribution of solutes in ~~through~~ time is at some locations and/or moments arguable the more important effect of riparian buffer zones. Therefore, creating a (significant) riparian buffer zone lags and dampens the effect of agricultural pollution on surface water quality and riparian buffers have a positive effect even when it is bypassed or when

denitrification is low. Although overall positively affecting water quality of the stream by decreasing concentrations, the longer travel times of agricultural solutes will also lead to a longer tail and thus invoke a longer lasting effect of agricultural solutes ~~with lower concentrations of polluting stressors~~on stream concentrations.

The modelling approach using Travel Time Distributions is a valuable approach for water quality management. While often (ground)water models focus on representing groundwater heads and discharges, a better representation of travel times and flow paths is essential to correctly simulate non-point source solute transport. Using TTDs therefore delivers more realistic scenario's predicting future concentration trends and/or the effects of mitigation options.

5. Conclusions

This paper is among the first to attempt to couple decades long time series of water quality to ~~D~~dynamic travel time distributions based on a high-resolution spatially distributed groundwater flow ~~model~~model. We collected a unique dataset of solute measurements for the period 1969-2018 for the Springendalse Beek, a Dutch lowland stream. We ~~were~~combined calculated TTDs with input curves for tritium, chloride and nitrate spanning the period 1950 to 2018. This way, we~~to~~ calculate ~~their~~solute concentrations in the Springendalse Beek between 1969 and 2018~~a Dutch lowland stream~~. By making this connection between dynamic groundwater travel time distributions and long-term in-stream concentration measurements, we were able to~~The groundwater dynamics were shown to largely cause~~ show that the seasonal and long-term fluctuations ~~of~~ in-stream solute concentrations were mainly caused by ~~, indicating the importance of~~ the dynamic contribution of different groundwater flow paths.

Both the measurements and model showed a trend reversal in concentrations which followed legislations on the solute input in the 1980s. Because we observed a time lag between the time of the peak solute input and the peak concentrations in the stream, w

~~The model was calibrated on celerities (pressure wave propagation) in earlier research and it was therefore not surprising that a mismatch existed for the results that we obtained for solutes, which depend on velocities. Instead of completely adapting the model, w~~e ran a~~n~~ exploration of the model behaviour under different ~~sensitivity analysis and~~ scenarios to understand ~~the reasons for the mismatch and clarifying~~ the important transport factors. ~~The location of agricultural fields in relation to the catchments' drainage network was found to be an important factor that largely governs the travel times of the agricultural leachate.~~ We found that ~~the~~a time lag in the ~~of~~arrival of the trend reversal of nitrate ~~peak shifted due~~can be caused by~~to~~: 1) travel times in the unsaturated zone, both due to slow percolation as (bio)chemical processes such as the slow mineralisation of organic N; 2) the combination of MTT and input reduction, caused by combination of a slow decrease of the input with a

relatively long MTT; and 3) the spatial setting between input, (bio)chemical processes and the drainage network (e.g. locations of agricultural fields and denitrification). To describe the spatial effect of processes and land-use on the breakthrough of solutes, we introduced addition of an unsaturated zone, multiplication of the MTT and spatial changes of the input, as well as a slow decrease of the input combined with a relatively long MTT. The location of agricultural fields in relation to the catchments' drainage network was found to be an important factor that largely governs the travel times of the agricultural leachate. It was also shown that the 'groundwater contributing area' of a stream, that which is the catchment area where the discharging water infiltrated, increases and shrinks based on wetness conditions.

The model for the presented case was improved by shifting the location of agricultural fields and adding the time delay of an unsaturated zone. Further improvements would require much more detail on the complex hydrogeology and historical land-use changes. A limited amount of stream tritium measurements proved to be a valuable indication of an unsaturated zone time delay and/or higher MTT. The method presented in this paper can be used to validate calculated TTDs and provides an opportunity to validate groundwater models not only on celerities, but also on water velocities.

Overall it was found that groundwater distributes water in time and space and makes it possible for water from different sources to mix and consequently groundwater functions as a buffer on the effect of (diffuse) pollution. The results of this study are interesting for water managers of catchments with diffuse pollution from agriculture, as it gives provides an insight into the possible parameters to steer on. We show that for mFor instance, iostn catchments, which have with a (close to) exponential TTD, and a limited unsaturated zone, a direct reaction of stream nitrate concentrations can be expected to reductions in the nitrogen inputs, even if mean travel times are high, which is contrary to what is often expected can often be expected. However, we also showed the different processes that can cause a time lag. Furthermore, we show that creating riparian buffer zones is a good management option, due to the importance of the spatial distribution (distance) of agricultural fields and the reactivity of the subsurface on the breakthrough patterns of diffuse pollutants.

A limited amount of stream tritium measurements proved to be a valuable indication of the performance of the model. The method presented in this paper can be used to validate calculated TTDs and provides an opportunity to validate groundwater models not only on celerities, but also on water velocities. when agricultural fields are close to the streams. Further research could be aimed on application of the same method in other catchments and focus on gathering further knowledge on dynamic contributing areas in other hydrogeochemical and topographical settings.

27

885 **References**

van der Aa, N. G. F. M., Goes, B. J. M., de Louw, P. G. B., den Otter, C., Reckman, J. W. T. M. and Stuurman, R. J.: Ecohydrologische Systeemanalyse Springendalse Beek, Delft., 1999.

Ali, G., Birkel, C., Tetzlaff, D., Soulsby, C., McDonnell, J. J. and Tarolli, P.: A comparison of wetness indices for the prediction of observed connected saturated areas under contrasting conditions, Earth Surf. Process. Landforms, 39(3), 399–413,

890 doi:10.1002/esp.3506, 2014.

Ambroise, B.: Variable '-active-' versus '-contributing-' areas or periods-: a necessary distinction, Hydrol. Process., 18, 1149–1155, doi:10.1002/hyp.5536, 2004.

Anderson, T. R., Groffman, P. M., Kaushal, S. S. and Walter, M. T.: Shallow Groundwater Denitrification in Riparian Zones of a Headwater Agricultural Landscape, J. Environ. Qual., 43(March), 732–744, doi:10.2134/jeq2013.07.0303, 2014.

895 Aquilina, L., Vergnaud-Ayraud, V., Labasque, T., Bour, O., Molénat, J., Ruiz, L., de Montety, V., De Ridder, J., Roques, C. and Longuevergne, L.: Nitrate dynamics in agricultural catchments deduced from groundwater dating and long-term nitrate monitoring in surface- and groundwaters., Sci. Total Environ., 435–436, 167–78, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.06.028, 2012.

Barlow, P. M., Leake, S. A. and Fienen, M. N.: Capture Versus Capture Zones-: Clarifying Wells, Groundwater, 56(5), 694–704, doi:10.1111/gwat.12661, 2018.

900 Van Beek, C. G. E. M., Laeven, M. P. and Vogelaar, A. J.: Modellering denitrificatie in grondwater onder invloed van organisch materiaal, H2O, 27(7), 1994.

Benettin, P., Rinaldo, A. and Botter, G.: Tracking residence times in hydrological systems: Forward and backward formulations, Hydrol. Process., 29(25), 5203–5213, doi:10.1002/hyp.10513, 2015.

Benettin, P., Soulsby, C., Birkel, C., Tetzlaff, D., Botter, G. and Rinaldo, A.: Using SAS functions and high-resolution isotope data to unravel travel time distributions in headwater catchments, Water Resour. Res., 53(3), 1864–1878, doi:10.1002/2016WR020117, 2017.

Beven, K. and Wood, E. F.: Catchment Geomorphology and the Dynamics of Runoff Contributing Areas, J. Hydrol., 65, 139–158, 1983.

~~Beven, K. J.: Kinematic Subsurface Stormflow, Water Resour. Res., 17(5), 1419–1424, 1981.~~

Beven, K. J. and Kirkby, M. J.: A physically based~~-~~, variable contributing area model of basin hydrology / Un modèle à base physique de zone d~~—'—~~appel variable de l~~—'—~~hydrologie du bassin versant, Hydrol. Sci. J., 24(1), 43–69, doi:10.1080/02626667909491834, 1979.

Birkel, C., Soulsby, C. and Tetzlaff, D.: Conceptual modelling to assess how the interplay of hydrological connectivity, catchment storage and tracer dynamics controls nonstationary water age estimates, Hydrol. Process., 29(January 2015), 2956–2969, doi:10.1002/hyp.10414, 2015.

Bohlke, J. K. and Denver, J. M.: Combined use of ground- water dating, chemical, and isotopic analyses to resolve the history and fate of nitrate contamination in two agricultural watersheds, atlantic coastal Plain, Maryland, Water Resour. Res., 31(9), 2319–2339, doi:10.1029/95WR01584, 1995.

Boumans, L. J. M., Fraters, D. and Van Drecht, G.: Nitrate leaching in agriculture to upper groundwater in the sandy regions of the Netherlands during the 1992-1995 period, Environ. Monit. Assess., 102(1–3), 225–241, doi:10.1007/s10661-005-6023-5, 2005.

Boumans, L. J. M., Fraters, D. and Drecht, G.: Mapping nitrate leaching to upper groundwater in the sandy regions of The Netherlands, using conceptual knowledge, Environ. Monit. Assess., 137(1–3), 243–249, doi:10.1007/s10661-007-9756-5, 2008.

Boumans, L. J. M., Wattel-Koekkoek, E. J. W. and van der Swaluw, E.: Veranderingen in regen- en grondwaterkwaliteit als gevolg van atmosferische emissiereducties. RIVM Rapport 680720005/2012 , 2013.

van den Brink, C., Jan, W., van der Grift, B., de Ruiter, P. C. and Griffioen, J.: Using a groundwater quality negotiation support system to change land-use management near a drinking-water abstraction in the Netherlands, J. Hydrol., 350, 339–356, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.10.046, 2008.

Broers, H. P.: The spatial distribution of groundwater age for different geohydrological situations in the Netherlands: implications for groundwater quality monitoring at the regional scale, J. Hydrol., 299(1–2), 84–106, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.04.023, 2004.

Broers, H. P. and van Geer, F. C.: Monitoring strategies at phreatic wellfields: a 3D travel time approach., Ground Water, 43(6), 850–62, doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2005.00043.x, 2005.

Broers, H. P. and van der Grift, B.: Regional monitoring of temporal changes in groundwater quality, J. Hydrol., 296(1–4), 192–220, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.03.022, 2004.

Broers, H.P., van Vliet, M.E.: Age-dating springs and spring-streams in South-Limburg (Dateringsonderzoek bronnen en bronbeken Zuid-Limburg), TNO-rapport TNO 2018 R10421, 21 p, In Dutch, 2018a.

Cartwright, I. and Morgenstern, U.: Transit times from rainfall to baseflow in headwater catchments estimated using tritium: The Ovens River, Australia, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19(9), 3771–3785, doi:10.5194/hess-19-3771-2015, 2015.

Dam, H. Van, Mertens, A. and Janmaat, L. M.: De invloed van atmosferische depositie op diatomeeën en chemische samenstelling van het water in sprengen, beken en bronnen, Wageningen., 1993.

Duffy, C. J. and Lee, D.-H.: Base Flow Response From Nonpoint Source Contamination' Simulated Spatial Variability in Source, Structure, and Initial Condition, Water Resour. Res., 28(3), 905–914, 1992.

Duvert, C., Stewart, M. K., Cendón, D. I. and Raiber, M.: Time series of tritium, stable isotopes and chloride reveal short-term variations in groundwater contribution to a stream, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 20(1), 257–277, doi:10.5194/hess-20-257-2016, 2016.

EU Nitrates Directive, EC, Directive of the Council of 12 December 1991, concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates form agricultural sources, 91/676/ EEC, Brussels: European Community, 1991.

EEA: European waters - Assessment of status and pressures 2018., 2018.

Engdahl, N. B., McCallum, J. L. and Massoudieh, A.: Transient age distributions in subsurface hydrologic systems, J. Hydrol., (April), doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.04.066, 2016.

Ehrhardt, S., Kumar, R., Fleckenstein, J. H., Attinger, S., and Musolff, A.: Trajectories of nitrate input and output in three nested catchments along a land use gradient, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 23, 3503–3524, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-23-3503-2019, 2019.

Feld, C. K., Fernandes, M. R., Ferreira, M. T., Hering, D., Ormerod, S. J., Venohr, M. and Gutiérrez-Cánovas, C.: Evaluating riparian solutions to multiple stressor problems in river ecosystems — A conceptual study, Water Res., 139, 381–394, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.04.014, 2018.

Flewelling, S. A., Herman, J. S., Hornberger, G. M. and Mills, A. L.: Travel time controls the magnitude of nitrate discharge in groundwater bypassing the riparian zone to a stream on Virginia's coastal plain, Hydrol. Process., 26(8), 1242–1253, doi:10.1002/hyp.8219, 2012.

Fraters, D., van Leeuwen, T., Boumans, L. J. M. and Reijs, J.: Use of long-term monitoring data to derive a relationship between nitrogen surplus and nitrate leaching for grassland and arable land on well-drained sandy soils in the Netherlands, Acta Agric. Scand. Sect. B Soil Plant Sci., 65(0), 144–154, doi:10.1080/09064710.2014.956789, 2015.

Green, C. T., Liao, L., Nolan, B. T., Juckem, P. F., Shope, C. L., Tesoriero, A. J. and Jurgens, B. C.: Regional Variability of Nitrate Fluxes in the Unsaturated Zone and Groundwater, Wisconsin, USA, Water Resour. Res., 54(1), 301–322, doi:10.1002/2017WR022012, 2018.

Gustard, A., Bullock, A. and Dixon, J. M.: Low flow estimation in the United Kingdom, , (108), 88 [online] Available from: http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/6050/, 1992.

970 Gusyev, M. a., Abrams, D., Toews, M. W., Morgenstern, U. and Stewart, M.: Simulated tritium concentrations in river waters of the western Lake Taupo catchment, New Zealand with MODPATH particle tracking, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 11(3), 3083–3109, doi:10.5194/hessd-11-3083-2014, 2014.

Hansen, B., Thorling, L., Dalgaard, T. and Erlandsen, M.: Trend reversal of nitrate in Danish groundwater - A reflection of agricultural practices and nitrogen surpluses since 1950, Environ. Sci. Technol., 45(1), 228–234, doi:10.1021/es102334u,
975 2011.

Harbaugh, A. W.: MODFLOW-2005, The U. S. Geological Survey Modular Ground-Water Model — the Ground-Water Flow Process, U.S. Geol. Surv. Tech. Methods, 253, doi:U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods 6-A16, 2005.

Harman, C. J.: Time-variable transit time distributions and transport: Theory and application to storage-dependent transport of chloride in a watershed, 1–30, doi:10.1002/2014WR015707.Received, 2015.

980 Hartog, N., van Bergen, P. F., de Leeuw, J. W. and Griffioen, J.: Reactivity of organic matter in aquifer sediments: Geological and geochemical controls, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta, 68(6), 1281–1292, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2003.09.004, 2004.

Hefting, M. M. and Klein, J.: Nitrogen removal in buffer strips along a lowland stream in the Netherlands : a pilot study, , 521–526, 1998.

Hendriks, D. M. D., Kuijper, M. J. M., Ek, R. Van and van Ek, R.: Groundwater impact on environmental flow needs of
985 streams in sandy catchments in the Netherlands, Hydrol. Sci. J., 59(3–4), 1–16, doi:10.1080/02626667.2014.892601, 2014.

Higler, L. W. ., Repko, F. F. and Sinkeldam, J. A.: Hydrobiologische Waarnemingen in Springendal, 1981.

Hill, A. R.: Nitrate Removal in Stream Riparian Zones, J. Environ. Qual., 25, 743–755, 1996.

Hoek, D.: Nutriëntenbelasting in de bovenloop van de Springendalse beek : een onderzoek naar de waterkwaliteit van een Twentse bronbeek in bestuurskundig alsmede civieltechnisch perpectief, Universiteit Twente. [online] Available from:
990 http://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/hydrotheek/2196989, 1992.

Howden, N. J. K., Burt, T. P., Mathias, S. A., Worrall, F. and Whelan, M. J.: Modelling long-term diffuse nitrate pollution at the catchment-scale: Data, parameter and epistemic uncertainty, J. Hydrol., 403(3–4), 337–351, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.04.012, 2011a.

Howden, N. J. K., Burt, T. P., Worrall, F., Mathias, S. and Whelan, M. J.: Nitrate pollution in intensively farmed regions: What
995 are the prospects for sustaining high-quality groundwater?, Water Resour. Res., 47(11), 0–13, doi:10.1029/2011WR010843, 2011b.

Hrachowitz, M., Benettin, P., Breukelen, B. M., Fovet, O., Howden, N. J. K., Ruiz, L., van der Velde, Y. and Wade, A. J.: Transit times - the link between hydrology and water quality at the catchment scale, WIREs Water, 3, 629–657, doi:10.1002/wat2.1155, 2016.

1000 IAEA/WMO: Global Network of Isotopes in Precipitation, The GNIP Database, available at: http://www.iaea.org/water (last access: November 2018), 2018.

Johnes, P. J. and Heathwaite, A. L.: Modelling the Impact of Land Use Change on Water Quality in Agricultural Catchments, Hydrol. Process., 11(November 1995), 269–286, 1997.

Kaandorp, V. P., de Louw, P. G. B., van der Velde, Y. and Broers, H. P.: Transient Groundwater Travel Time Distributions and Age-Ranked Storage-Discharge Relationships of Three Lowland Catchments, Water Resour. Res., 1–18, doi:10.1029/2017WR022461, 2018a.

Kaandorp, V. P., Molina-Navarro, E., Andersen, H. E., Bloomfield, J. P., Kuijper, M. J. M. and de Louw, P. G. B.: A conceptual model for the analysis of multi-stressors in linked groundwater–surface water systems, Sci. Total Environ., 627, 880–895, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.259, 2018ab.

Kaandorp, V. P., Doornenbal, P. J., Kooi, H., Broers, H. P. and de Louw, P. G. B.: Temperature buffering by groundwater in ecologically valuable lowland streams under current and future climate conditions, J. Hydrol. X, 3, 100031, doi:10.1016/j.hydroa.2019.100031, 2019.

Kaandorp, V. P., de Louw, P. G. B., van der Velde, Y. and Broers, H. P.: Transient Groundwater Travel Time Distributions and Age-Ranked Storage-Discharge Relationships of Three Lowland Catchments, Water Resour. Res., 1–18, doi:10.1029/2017WR022461, 2018b.

Kolbe, T., Dreuzy, J. De, Abbott, B. W., Aquilina, L. and Babey, T.: Stratification of reactivity determines nitrate removal in groundwater, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 116(7), 2494–2499, doi:10.1073/pnas.1816892116, 2019.

Kros, J., Tietema, A., Mol-Dijkstra, J. P. and Vries, W. De: Quantification of nitrate leaching from forest soils on a national scale in The Netherlands, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 8(4), 813–822, 2004.

Kuijper, M. J. M., Goorden, N. and Vermeulen, P. T. M.: Update Grondwatermodel Waterschap Regge en Dinkel, 2012.

De Lange, W. J., Prinsen, G. F., Hoogewoud, J. C., Veldhuizen, A. A., Verkaik, J., Oude Essink, G. H. P., van Walsum, P. E. V., Delsman, J. R., Hunink, J. C., Massop, H. T. L. L. and Kroon, T.: An operational, multi-scale, multi-model system for consensus-based, integrated water management and policy analysis: The Netherlands Hydrological Instrument, Environ. Model. Softw., 59, 98–108, doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.05.009, 2014.

Martin, C., Aquilina, L., Gascuel-Odoux, C., Molénat, J., Faucheux, M. and Ruiz, L.: Seasonal and interannual variations of nitrate and chloride in stream waters related to spatial and temporal patterns of groundwater concentrations in agricultural catchments, Hydrol. Process., 18(7), 1237–1254, doi:10.1002/hyp.1395, 2004.

McDonnell, J. J. and Beven, K. J.: Debates — The future of hydrological sciences: A (common) path forward? A call to action aimed at understanding velocities, celerities and residence time distributions of the headwater hydrograph, Water Resour. Res., 50, 5342–5350, doi:10.1002/2013WR015141.Received, 2014.

McDonnell, J. J., McGuire, K. J., Aggarwal, P., Beven, K. J., Biondi, D., Destouni, G., Dunn, S. M., James, a., Kirchner, J. W., Kraft, P., Lyon, S., Maloszewski, P., Newman, B., Pfister, L., Rinaldo, A., Rodhe, A., Sayama, T., Seibert, J., Solomon, D. K., Soulsby, C., Stewart, M. K., Tetzlaff, D., Tobin, C., Troch, P., Weiler, M., Western, a., Wörman, a. and Wrede, S.: How old is streamwater? Open questions in catchment transit time conceptualization, modelling and analysis, Hydrol. Process., 24(12), 1745–1754, doi:10.1002/hyp.7796, 2010.

Mcglynn, B. L. and Seibert, J.: Distributed assessment of contributing area and riparian buffering along stream networks, Water Resour. Res., 39(4), 1–7, doi:10.1029/2002WR001521, 2003.

McGuire, K. J. and McDonnell, J. J.: Hydrological connectivity of hillslopes and streams: Characteristic time scales and nonlinearities, Water Resour. Res., 46(10), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2010WR009341, 2010.

1040 Meinardi, C. R.: Groundwater recharge and travel times in the sandy regions of the Netherlands, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. [online] Available from: http://dare.ubvu.vu.nl//handle/1871/12739, 1994.

Meststoffenwet (Manure law), Staatsblad 133, The Hague, The Netherlands, 1986.

Middelburg, J. J.: A simple rate model for organic matter decomposition in marine sediments, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta, 53, 1577–1581, 1989.

1045 Modica, E., Buxton, H. T. and Plummer, L. N.: Evaluating the source and residence times of groundwater seepage to streams, New Jersey Coastal Plain, Water Resour. Res., 34(11), 2797–2810, 1998.

Morgenstern, U., Stewart, M. K. and Stenger, R.: Dating of streamwater using tritium in a post nuclear bomb pulse world: continuous variation of mean transit time with streamflow, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 14(11), 2289–2301, doi:10.5194/hess-14-2289-2010, 2010.

1050 Musolff, A., Schmidt, C., Rode, M., Lischeid, G., Weise, S. M. and Fleckenstein, J. H.: Groundwater head controls nitrate export from an agricultural lowland catchment, Adv. Water Resour., 96, 95–107, doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2016.07.003, 2016.

Musolff, A., Fleckenstein, J. H., Rao, P. S. C. and Jawitz, J. W.: Emergent archetype patterns of coupled hydrologic and biogeochemical responses in catchments, Geophys. Res. Lett., 44, 4143–4151, doi:10.1002/2017GL072630, 2017.

Nijboer, R. C., Wiggers, R., van den Hoek, T. H. and van Rhenen-Kersten, C. H.: Herstel van een brongebied in natuurreservaat 1055 het Springendal, Wageningen., 2003.

O'Toole, P., Chambers, J. M. and Bell, R. W.: Understanding the characteristics of riparian zones in low relief, sandy catchments that affect their nutrient removal potential, Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., 258(February), 182–196, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2018.02.020, 2018.

Oenema, O., Boers, P. C. M., van Eerdt, M. M., Fraters, B., van der Meer, H. G., Roest, C. W. J., Schroder, J. J. and Willems, 1060 W. J.: Leaching of nitrate from agriculture to groundwater-: the effect of policies and measures in the Netherlands, Environ. Pollut., 102(S1), 471–478, 1998.

van Ommen, H. C.: Influence of diffuse sources of contamination on the quality of outflowing groundwater including non-equilibrium adsorption and decomposition, J. J, 88, 79–95, 1986.

Pollock, D. W.: User's guide for MODPATH: A particle tracking post-processing package for MODFLOW., 1994.

1065 Postma, D., Boesen, C., Kristiansen, H. and Larsen, F.: Nitrate Reduction in an Unconfined Sandy Aquifer: Water Chemistry, Reduction Processes, and Geochemical Modeling, Water Resour. Res., 27(8), 2027–2045, 1991.

Prommer, H. and Stuyfzand, P. J.: Identification of temperature-dependent water quality changes during a deep well injection experiment in a pyritic aquifer, Environ. Sci. Technol., 39(7), 2200–2209, doi:10.1021/es0486768, 2005.

Raats, P. A. C.: Convective Transport of Solutes by Steady State Flows I. General Theory, Agric. Water Manag., 1, 201–218, 1070 1978.

Ranalli, A. J. and Macalady, D. L.: The importance of the riparian zone and in-stream processes in nitrate attenuation in undisturbed and agricultural watersheds - A review of the scientific literature, J. Hydrol., 389(3–4), 406–415, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.05.045, 2010.

1075   REGIS II, Hydrogeological model of The Netherlands, Report: Vernes, R.W., Van Doorn, Th.H.M. From Guide layer to Hydrogeological Unit, Explanation of the construction of the data set, TNO report NITG 05–038-B. (in Dutch), retrieved from www.dinoloket.nl, 2005.

Rodriguez, N. B., Benettin, P. and Klaus, J.: Multimodal water age distributions and the challenge of complex hydrological landscapes, Hydrol. Process., (March), 1–18, doi:10.1002/hyp.13770, 2020.

Roelsma, J., Grift, B. Van Der, Mulder, H. M. and van Tol Leenders, T. P.: Nutriëntenhuishouding in de bodem en het

1080   oppervlaktewater van de Drentse Aa, Wageningen., 2011.

Rozemeijer, J. C. and Broers, H. P.: The groundwater contribution to surface water contamination in a region with intensive agricultural land use (Noord-Brabant, The Netherlands)., Environ. Pollut., 148(3), 695–706, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2007.01.028, 2007.

Rozemeijer, J. C., Klein, J., Broers, H. P., van Tol-Leenders, T. P. and van der Grift, B.: Water quality status and trends in

1085   agriculture-dominated headwaters; a national monitoring network for assessing the effectiveness of national and European manure legislation in The Netherlands. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 186(12), 8981-8995. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-014-4059-0, 2014.

Schroder, J. J., Aarts, H. F. M., Middelkoop, J. C. Van, Schils, R. L. M., Velthof, G. L., Fraters, B. and Willems, W. J.: Permissible manure and fertilizer use in dairy farming systems on sandy soils in The Netherlands to comply with the Nitrates

1090   Directive target, Eur. J. Agron., 27, 102–114, doi:10.1016/j.eja.2007.02.008, 2007.

Solomon, D. K., Gilmore, T. E., Solder, J. E., Kimball, B. and Genereux, D. P.: Evaluating an unconfined aquifer by analysis of age-dating tracers in streamwater, Water Resour. Res., 51, 8883–8899, doi:10.1002/2014WR016259, 2015.

Sprenger, M., Seeger, S., Blume, T. and Weiler, M.: Travel times in the vadose zone: Variability in space and time, Water Resour. Res., 52, 1–20, doi:10.1002/2014WR015716, 2016.

1095   Steenvoorden, J.H.A.M., Roest, C.W.J., and Boers, P.C.M., 1997. Simulation of nutrient losses to groundwaters and surface waters in The Netherlands. Freshwater Contamination (Proceedings of Rabat Symposium S4, April–May 1997). IAHS Publ. No. 243, Wallingford, Oxfordshire, UK, 392 pp.

Stewart, M. K., Morgenstern, U., Gusyev, M. a. and Maloszewski, P.: Aggregation effects on tritium-based mean transit times and young water fractions in spatially heterogeneous catchments and groundwater systems, and implications for past and future

1100   applications of tritium, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., (October), 1–26, doi:10.5194/hess-2016-532, 2016.

Stolp, B. J., Solomon, D. K., Suckow, Aa., Vitvar, T., Rank, D., Aggarwal, P. and Han, L. F.: Age dating base flow at springs and gaining streams using helium-3 and tritium: Fischa-Dagnitz system, southern Vienna Basin, Austria, Water Resour. Res., 46(7), 1–13, doi:10.1029/2009WR008006, 2010.

34

Sültenfuß, J., Roether, W. and Rhein, M.: The Bremen mass spectrometric facility for the measurement of helium isotopes-, neon , and tritium in water of helium isotopes , neon , and tritium in water †, , 6016, doi:10.1080/10256010902871929, 2009.

Tesoriero, A. J. and Puckett, L. J.: O 2 reduction and denitrification rates in shallow aquifers, Water Resour. Res., 47(12), 1–17, doi:10.1029/2011WR010471, 2011.

Tesoriero, A. J., Liebscher, H. and Cox, S. E.: Mechanism and rate of denitrification in an agricultural watershed: Electron and mass balance along groundwater flow paths, Water Resour. Res., 36(6), 1545–1559, 2000.

Tufford, D. L., McKellar, H. N. and Hussey, J. R.: In-Stream Nonpoint Source Nutrient Prediction with Land-Use Proximity and Seasonality, J. Environ. Qual., 27, 100–111, doi:10.2134/jeq1998.00472425002700010015x, 1998.

van der Velde, Y., Rooij, G. H. De and Torfs, P. J. J. F.: Catchment-scale non-linear groundwater-surface water interactions in densely drained lowland catchments, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 13, 1867–1885, 2009.

van der Velde, Y., de Rooij, G. H., Rozemeijer, J. C., van Geer, F. C. and Broers, H. P.: Nitrate response of a lowland catchment: On the relation between stream concentration and travel time distribution dynamics, Water Resour. Res., 46(11), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2010WR009105, 2010.

van der Velde, Y., Torfs, P. J. J. F., van der Zee, S. E. A. T. M. and Uijlenhoet, R.: Quantifying catchment-scale mixing and its effect on time-varying travel time distributions, Water Resour. Res., 48(6), W06536, doi:10.1029/2011WR011310, 2012.

Verdonschot, P. F. M. and Loeb, R.: Effecten van grondwatertoevoer op oppervlaktewaterkwaliteit: Een casestudie in twee natuurgebieden, Wageningen., 2008.

Verdonschot, P. F. M., van den Hoek, T. H. and van den Hoorn, M. W.: De effecten van bodemverhoging op het beekecosysteem van de Springendalse beek, Wageningen., 2002.

Visser, A., Broers, H. P., van der Grift, B. and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Demonstrating trend reversal of groundwater quality in relation to time of recharge determined by 3H/3He., Environ. Pollut., 148(3), 797–807, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2007.01.027, 2007.

~~Visser, H.: Bronnen in Het Springendal: De relatie tussen de temporele variatie in abiotische omstandigheden en de kolonisatie door macro evertebraten in de helocrene bronnen van Het Springendal, Wageningen UR. [online] Available from: http://edepot.wur.nl/407108, 2001.~~

Vogel, J.C., 1967. Investigation of groundwater flow with radiocarbon. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA): IAEA.

van Walsum, P. E. V. and Groenendijk, P.: Quasi Steady-State Simulation of the Unsaturated Zone in Groundwater Modeling of Lowland Regions, Vadose Zo. J., 7(2), 769, doi:10.2136/vzj2007.0146, 2008.

van Walsum, P. E. V. and Veldhuizen, A. A.: Integration of models using shared state variables: Implementation in the regional hydrologic modelling system SIMGRO, J. Hydrol., 409(1–2), 363–370, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.08.036, 2011.

Wang, L., Stuart, M. E., Bloomfield, J. P., Butcher, A. S., Gooddy, D. C., Mckenzie, A. A., Lewis, M. A. and Williams, A. T.: Prediction of the arrival of peak nitrate concentrations at the water table at the regional scale in Great Britain, Hydrol. Process., 26(2), 226–239, doi:10.1002/hyp.8164, 2012.

Worrall, F., Howden, N. J. K. and Burt, T. P.: Time series analysis of the world's longest fluvial nitrate record: Evidence for changing states of catchment saturation, Hydrol. Process., 29(3), 434–444, doi:10.1002/hyp.10164, 2015.

Wriedt, G., Spindler, J., Neef, T., Meißner, R. and Rode, M.: Groundwater dynamics and channel activity as major controls of

1140   in-stream   nitrate   concentrations   in   a   lowland   catchment   system?,   J.   Hydrol.,   343(3–4),   154–168, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.06.010, 2007.

Yang, J., Heidbüchel, I., Musolff, A., Reinstorf, F. and Fleckenstein, J. H.: Exploring the Dynamics of Transit Times and Subsurface Mixing in a Small Agricultural Catchment, Water Resour. Res., 54(3), 2317–2335, doi:10.1002/2017WR021896, 2018.

1145   Zhang, Y. C., Slomp, C. P., Broers, H. P., Passier, H. F. and Cappellen, P. Van: Denitrification coupled to pyrite oxidation and changes   in   groundwater   quality   in   a   shallow   sandy   aquifer,   Geochim.   Cosmochim.   Acta,   73(22),   6716–6726, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2009.08.026, 2009.

Zhang, Y. C., Prommer, H., Broers, H. P., Slomp, C. P., Greskowiak, J., van der Grift, B. and Van Cappellen, P.: Model-based integration and analysis of biogeochemical and isotopic dynamics in a nitrate-polluted pyritic aquifer, Environ. Sci. Technol.,

1150   47(18), 10415–10422, doi:10.1021/es4023909, 2013.

Figure 1: Location of the study area (a, b), model conceptualization (c), and the location of agricultural fields in the year 20~~07~~19 (d). *Background maps and DEM from PDOK (PDOK.nl/datasets).*

Figure 2. Input curves for tritium (left axis) and the estimated concentrations of nitrate and chloride under farmland (right axis). The tritium input curve is based on precipitation measurements at stations Vienna and Ottawa (before 1970) and Groningen and Emmerich (from 1970). The 1985 peak in ~~Cl~~chloride and ~~NO₃~~nitrate coincides with the start of the legislations from the Dutch Manure Law that placed restrictions on the applications of N in agriculture.

Figure 3. Three age classes of the travel time distributions of the discharge in the Springendalse Beek for the upstream part of the catchment (a) and the total catchment (b). The lower panels show the percentage of discharge originating from agricultural fields for the upstream part of the catchment (c) and the total catchment (d).

Upstream catchment   Total catchment

Initial run   • Measurements

1165

Figure 4. Measurements, agricultural input curves and initial model results based on the TTDs from Kaandorp, et al. (2018) and the solute input curves in Figure 2. No further processes were added yet. Note that tritium samples were only available for the upstream part of the catchment (panel a).

1170

40

Figure 5. The effect on tritium (a), chloride (b) and nitrate (c) of a scenario with a 5-year delay due to an unsaturated zone and a scenario where all travel times where increased by a factor 5.

1175

Figure 6. Panel a and b show the effect of two scenarios with changes in the nitrate input curve. Note the difference in scale of the x-axis between the left and right panels. Panels c and d show the effect of spatial changes in land-use on both chloride (c) and nitrate (d): only agriculture inside of a 200 m strip around the stream (Buffer scenario 1), and only agriculture outside of the same buffer strip (Buffer scenario 2). In both scenarios agricultural parts have 50% agriculture and 50% nature, so that the total amount of fields is approximately equal to ~~the~~ that in the real catchment.

Figure 7. Effect of denitrification for the upstream part of the catchment using different conceptualizations: zero order denitrification and denitrification in deep layers.

Figure 8. Output concentrations for a hypothetical catchment with an exponential TTD with a MTT of 5, following three input scenarios: a direct stop of the input, a slow decrease in the input and a fast decrease of the input.

1190

Figure 9. Graphical representation of Table 4 showing the time lag in output concentration (time to peak) on changes in the input for an exponential TTD. The time lag is based on both the MTT and the speed of decrease of the input, a direct stop in the input always results in a direct response in the output. Figure 8 shows some of the scenarios used to construct this Figure.

1195

Figure 8igure 10. Contributing areas fluctuate with wetness conditions due to changing flow paths. GCA is the Groundwater Contributing Area which is where discharge was infiltrated and RCA is the Runoff Contributing Area which is where discharge is generated. Areas between the two different contributing areas are 'inactive' and do not actively influence stream discharge.

Figure 9igure 11. Contributing area in the model for a dry (top; summer 2006) and a wet (bottom; winter 2006/2007) period. Colors represent the travel time towards the stream with blue TT >25 year and red TT < 1 year (similar to Figure 3). Notice the large increase in the runoff contributing area in the downstream part of the catchment during wet periods which results from the extensive agricultural drainage system. *Background map ESRI_StreetMap_World_2D, Sources: Esri, DeLorme, NAVTEQ, USGS, NRCAN, METI, iPC, TomTom, http://services.arcgisonline.com/ArcGIS/rest/services/ESRI_StreetMap_World_2D/MapServer.*

45

Figure 10. Best model fit using changed agricultural fields and an unsaturated zone of 3 years.

1215

46

Table 1. Overview of the collected chloride and nitrate measurements.

Location	Parameters	Period	Source	Total amount of samples
Upstream	Cl, NO$_3$	1969 - 1981	Higler et al., 1981	15
Upstream	Cl, NO$_3$	1992	Hoek, 1992	1
Upstream	NO$_3$	1980 - 1990	Dam et al., 1993	2
Upstream	Cl, NO$_3$	1998	Van der Aa et al., 1999	1
Upstream	Cl, NO$_3$	2004 - 2005	Verdonschot en Loeb, 2008	2
Upstream	Cl, NO$_3$	1985 - 2018	Waterboard Vechtstromen	245
Downstream	Cl, NO$_3$	1992	Hoek, 1992	1
Downstream	Cl, NO$_3$	1985 - 2018	Waterboard Vechtstromen	282

1220

Table 2~~1~~. ~~Sensitivity~~ Exploration of the model behaviour under different scenarios~~analysis~~.

Set		Parameter
-	Base case. Variable input, no denitrification	
1a	Unsaturated zone hydrological delay	Travel Time ~~delay~~
1b	Unsaturated zone N species delay	Travel Time only part of N
2	Increased saturated zone travel times	Mean Travel Time
3	Different temporal ~~ces in the~~ input ~~curve in time~~of solutes	Input
4	Spatial d~~D~~ifferences in ~~the~~solute input ~~curve in space~~	Input
5	Denitrification in the saturated zone	Travel Time, depth

Table ~~2~~3. Summarized results of the _exploration of the model behaviour_ ~~sensitivity analysis~~.

Set	Peak concentration change [mg/L]		Time to peak change [years]		Conc. in 2016 change [TU] Tritium
	Cl	NO$_3$	Cl	NO$_3$	
1_a_	Unsaturated zone, _delay_ 5 years	0	0	+5	+5	-0.29
1b	_Unsaturated zone, delay 10 years on 50% of N_	_0_	_-11_	_0_	_+10_	_0_
2	Increased _sat. zone_ travel times, factor 5	-5	-20	+10	+10	-0.63
3	Differen_t temporal_~~ces in the~~ _input_ 1~~curve in tim~~_: direct stop N_~~e~~	0*	0*	0*	0*	0
	Different temporal input 2: slower reduction N	_0_	_+2_	_0_	_+10_	_0_
4	_Spatial D_~~d~~ifferences in _solute_~~the~~ input ~~curve in space~~ 1	+1	+5	-1	-1	0
	Spatial d~~D~~ifferences in ~~the~~ _solute_ input ~~curve in space~~ 2	0	-1	+7	+4	0
5	Denitrification _saturated zone_ zero order	0	-15	0	0	0
	Denitrification _saturated zone_ deep layers	0	-15	0	0	0

~~*No changes because the peak was not changed.~~

Table 4. Time to peak [years] of the output concentrations following a change in the input for different rates of changes and MTTs.

Slope of decrease [fraction of max / step]	_Young_		Mean Travel Time (MTT)			_Old_
	_1_	_5_	_10_	_20_	_50_	_100_
Slower decrease 0.2	0	12	29	40	55	90
0.5	0	8	20	38	51	76
1	0	6	15	27	44	58
2	0	4	10	18	29	37
5	0	1	5	9	14	16
10	0	1	3	5	7	8
20	0	0	1	2	3	4
30	0	0	1	1	2	2
Faster 40	0	0	0	1	1	2
decrease 50	0	0	0	1	1	1