



HAL
open science

Use of distributed water level and soil moisture data in the evaluation of the PUMMA periurban distributed hydrological model: application to the Mercier catchment, France

Isabelle Braud, M. Fuamba, F. Branger, E. Batchabani, P. Sanzana, B. Sarrazin, S. Jankowsky

► To cite this version:

Isabelle Braud, M. Fuamba, F. Branger, E. Batchabani, P. Sanzana, et al.. Use of distributed water level and soil moisture data in the evaluation of the PUMMA periurban distributed hydrological model: application to the Mercier catchment, France. EGU General Assembly 2016, Apr 2016, Vienna, Austria. pp.1, 2016. hal-02605019

HAL Id: hal-02605019

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02605019v1>

Submitted on 16 May 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Use of distributed water level and soil moisture data in the evaluation of the PUMMA hydrological model

Application to the Mercier catchment 6.6 km², France



I. Braud (1), M. Fuamba (2), F. Branger (1), E. Batchabani (2), P. Sanzana (3), B. Sarrazin (4), S. Jankowsky (5)

(1) Irstea, UR HHLY, Villeurbanne, France; (2) Polytechnique Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada; (3) Departamento de Ingeniería Hidráulica y Ambiental, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile; (4) ISARA-LYON, Lyon, France; (5) RMS, San Francisco Bay Area USA

HS2.1.3
Spatial patterns evaluation and process-physics understanding in distributed hydrologic modeling
Poster A.55

1. CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

Context:

- Use of distributed hydrological models in a hypothesis testing framework (Clark et al., 2011)
- Evaluation of models using distributed data

Objectives:

- Assessment of the value of distributed networks of surface soil moisture and water level sensors to identify problems with models parameters and representations
- Application to the PUMMA (Peri-Urban Model for landscape Management, Jankowsky et al., 2014) distributed model in the Mercier catchment (6.6 km², France)

2. STUDY AREA AND DATA

Study catchment:

- Mercier catchment, south-east France, close to Lyon city
- Gneiss geology and soils with a low retention capacity.
- Three dominant land uses used as a basis for the PUMMA model mesh

Available data (Fig. 1)

- Two rain gauges with a variable time step
- Discharge at the outlet with a variable time step
- Network of water level in streams (18 locations), 2 to 5 min time step, 2007-2010, (Sarrazin, 2012)
- Surface soil moisture network (7 locations), 2 min time step, 2010-2011 (Dehotin et al., 2015)




Figure 2: a) soil moisture and (b) water level sensors in the field

Figure 1: Location and land use of the study catchment. Location of the various sensors

3. THE PUMMA MODEL

- Model mesh made of irregular polygons corresponding to land-use patterns
- Modular structure with specific modules according to land-use
- Main hydrological processes accounted for:
 - Evapotranspiration and infiltration in soil
 - Saturation excess surface runoff on forest/agriculture surfaces
 - Subsurface flow
 - Flow routing in the natural and artificial hydrographic network




Figure 3: PUMMA model and coupling between process modules (from Jankowsky et al., 2014)

4. MODEL SET UP AND EVALUATION

Model set up:

- Simulation with a variable time step for rainfall and hourly ET0 over the 2007-2010 period using 2006 as warm-up period
- Parameters specification from observations and Jankowsky et al. (2014) previous study on a neighboring catchment
- No calibration to relate mismatch between observation and model to model parameters and process representations

Stepwise evaluation methodology:

- Simple consistency checks (water balance and flow components)
- **Comparison (NSE, bias) between observed/simulated discharge at the annual and event time scales**
- **Analysis of soil water storage dynamics** using a normalized moisture index $X_{norm} = \frac{X - X_{min}}{X_{max} - X_{min}}$
- **Simulation of stream intermittency:** 1cm water level threshold on observations to define the flow/no flow patterns by fortnight, test of 0.5, 0.7, 1 cm threshold for modelled values
- **Simulation of response and reaction times**
- Reproduction of observed controls on hydrological response (antecedent moisture, rainfall volume/intensity)

6. CONCLUSIONS

- Surface soil moisture and distributed water level data useful to provide a diagnostic on the model dynamics, but not on runoff quantity
- Quantitative information on catchment soil water storage (Vannier et al., 2014) and distributed discharge would be required to improve model parameters
- **Main component to improve: soil water storage and topology**

5. RESULTS

Evaluation on discharge

Annual:

- Low Nash on Q, better on \sqrt{Q}
- Low bias
- Variable performance from one year to the other. Better results in wet conditions

Hourly	2007-2008	2008 (wet)	2009 (dry)
NSE_Q	0.01	0.41	-0.33
NSE_vQ	0.27	0.39	0.45
PBIAS (%)	-8	9.3	1.3

Events:

- Good dynamics
- Volume overestimation
- Better results in wet conditions

6min time step	All events (20)	Wet (12)	Dry (8)
NSE_Q	-3.5	-2.4	-6.5
R ²	0.6	0.7	0.4
PBIAS (%)	62.7	46.7	86.9
Peak flow lag (h)	-0.4	-0.4	-0.4
Peak flow error(-)	1.4	0.9	6.9

Stream intermittency

Model underestimation of no flow and continuous flow periods




Figure 5: Comparison of Simulated (Top and Bottom Left) and Observed (Bottom Right) stream intermittency patterns for year 2009 divided into 24 fortnight periods for water level sensors @1 to @16.

Soil water storage dynamics

- Correlation normalized observed surface soil moisture / normalized simulated soil water storage: $R^2 = 0.42$ [0.04, 0.79] and $\tau_{Kendall} = 048$ [0.01, .71] (average of 7 stations)
- Ability of the model to capture the autumn dry/wet change in soil moisture




Figure 4: Normalized observed surface soil moisture and simulated soil water storage

Reaction/response times

Model underestimation of response/reaction times, overestimation of response amplitude




Figure 6: Observed and simulated reaction (a) and response (b) times (see definition in (d)) and response amplitude $H_{max} - H_{beg}$ (c). Points colored by land use. (d) Scheme for the extraction of reaction and response times, and the response amplitude

References: Clark, Met et al., 2011. Hydrol. Process. 25, 523-543; Dehotin, J. et al., 2015., J. Hydrol. 525, 113-129; Fuamba et al., 2016. Value of distributed water level and soil moisture data in the evaluation of a distributed hydrological model: application to the PUMMA model in the semi-rural Mercier catchment in France, J. Hydrology, submitted; Jankowsky et al., 2014., J. Hydrol., 517, 1056-1071; Sarrazin, B., 2012. MNT et observations multi-locales du réseau hydrographique d'un petit bassin versant rural dans une perspective d'aide à la modélisation hydrologique. PhD thesis, Grenoble University, 269 pp (in French); Vannier et al., 2014, Hyd. Proc., 28, 6276-6291, .

Acknowledgements:

The second author thanks Polytechnique Montréal for providing the funding allowing its 6-month stay at Irstea Lyon. Most of the data used in this study were collected during the AVuPUR (Assessing the Vulnerability of PeriUrban Rivers) project funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR) under contract ANR-07-VULN-01, the IRIP project funded by Région Rhône-Alpes and Agence de l'Eau, and in the framework of OTHU (Observatoire de Terrain en Hydrologie Urbaine). We thank Judicaël Dehotin for providing the soil moisture data.