Interflow dynamics on a low relief forested hillslope: lots of fill, little spill

Enhao Du^{1,4*}, C. Rhett Jackson¹, Julian Klaus^{2,5}, Jeffrey J. McDonnell^{2,2a}, Natalie A. Griffiths³, Margaret F. Williamson^{1,6}, James L. Greco^{1,7}, Menberu Bitew¹

1. Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, 2. Global Institute of Water Security, University of Saskatchewan, Canada, 2a. School of Geosciences, University of Aberdeen, UK, 3. Climate Change Science Institute and Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, 4. Climate Science Department, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720 (current address), 5. Department of Environment and Agro-biotechnologies, Centre de Recherche Public Gabriel Lippmann, Belvaux, Luxembourg, 6. Peace Corps, Washington, D.C. 20526 (current address), 7. ADA Engineering, Tampa, FL 33606 (current address)

* Tel.: 805-204-7437; email: enhaodu@gmail.com

Note: This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC, under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for the United States Government purposes.

21 **Abstract**

22 We evaluated the occurrence of perching and interflow over and within a sandy clay
23 loam argillic horizon within first-order, low-relief, forested catchments at the Savannah
24 River Site (SRS) in the Upper Coastal Plain of South Carolina. We measured soil hydraulic
25 properties, depths to the argillic layer, soil moisture, shallow groundwater behavior,
26 interflow interception trench flows, and streamflow over a 4-year period to explore the
27 nature and variability of soil hydraulic characteristics, the argillic “topography”, and
28 their influence on interflow generation. Perching occurred frequently within and above
29 the restricting argillic horizons during our monitoring period, but interflow was
30 infrequent due to microtopographic relief and associated depression storage on the
31 argillic layer surface. High percolation rates through the argillic horizon, particularly
32 through soil anomalies, also reduced the importance of interflow. Interflow generation
33 was highly variable across eleven segments of a 121 m interception trench. Hillslopes
34 were largely disconnected from stream behavior during storms. Hillslope processes
35 were consistent with the fill-and-spill hypothesis and featured a sequence of distinct
36 thresholds: vertical wetting front propagation to the argillic layer; saturation of the
37 argillic followed by local perching; filling of argillic layer depressions; and finally
38 connectivity of depressions leading to interflow generation. Analysis of trench flow data
39 indicated a cumulative rainfall threshold of 60 mm to generate interflow, a value at the
40 high end of the range of thresholds reported elsewhere.

41 Keywords: interflow, argillic layer, low relief, fill-and-spill

42

1. Introduction

Subsurface stormflow or interflow (defined here as shallow slope-parallel flow over an impeding horizon) has been studied on forested hillslopes since Engler (1919) (Bachmair and Weiler, 2011; Weiler et al., 2005). Hewlett (1961) demonstrated the potential importance of interflow to watershed processes by examining interflow and drainage dynamics on re-packed hillslope troughs. Subsequently, early conceptualizations of hillslope flow processes assumed that the topography of the impeding layer was similar to that of the soil surface as in the classic schematic by Atkinson (1978) or the seminal simulations by Zaslavsky and Sinai (1981). Hewlett and Hibbert (1967) later used a multi-catchment comparison to show the overarching importance of soil depth on interflow magnitude and catchment runoff production. Since then, studies have examined the role of topographic convergence on interflow patterns (Anderson and Burt, 1978), the role of soil pipes (Mosley, 1979), and interflow mixing and displacement (Pearce et al., 1986). A continuing issue for physically-based hydrologic modeling is the need to understand how the mismatch between our knowledge of surface and subsurface topography affects our predictions of hillslope behavior.

In the past two decades, the use of geophysical techniques to study hillslopes has revealed that subsurface topography can differ substantially from surface topography (McDonnell et al., 1996). This realization led to new concepts of interflow generation via filling and spilling of depressions created by subsurface topography (Spence and Woo, 2003). Tromp van Meerveld and McDonnell (2006c) demonstrated

for the instrumented hillslope at the Panola Mountain Research Watershed, Georgia, USA that downslope flow proceeded along subsurface interfacial dendritic drainage networks that had to fill, spill, and connect as later modeled by Hopp and McDonnell (2009). Since then, others have observed fill and spill processes in other environments and found that bedrock topography more strongly controls hydraulic gradient than surface topography in flat terrain (Devito et al., 2005). Similarly, Ali et al. (2011) found that subsurface storage is a more sensitive surrogate for discharge in a steep headwater catchment than surface storage. Spatial analysis of runoff source area in moderately sloping catchments revealed that runoff production is controlled by connectivity of shallow groundwater among the hillslope, riparian zone, and stream (Jencso et al., 2009). These findings indicate subsurface topography of the impeding layers may play a more important role than surface topography on storm water partitioning and redistribution in moderately sloping catchments.

While the factors causing interflow are well studied in steep catchments, the dynamics of interflow in low-angle forested catchments are less understood. Experimental work has shown that interflow in low to moderate angle topography can occur over Bt and Bw horizons (layers of clay or iron accumulation, respectively) (Beasley, 1976; Newman et al., 1998; Wilson et al., 1990) and fragipans (McDaniel et al., 2008; Parlange et al., 1989). Modeling studies have shown that the effect of subsurface concavities is diminished as slope increases (Hopp and McDonnell, 2009) as water spills more readily over the downslope lip of each concavity. In low angle forested slopes with deep (e.g. >100 m) underlying bedrock, the subsurface topography has not been defined

by differential weathering or shallow landsliding but rather by biological processes such as windthrow (Gabet and Mudd, 2010; Ulanova, 2000) and animal burrowing (Neary et al., 2009) and also irregularities in soil weathering and illuviation of fine particles. Thus, the spill pathways connecting local concavities are likely to be random and dissimilar to fluvial pathways. If, however, subsurface pathways are dominated by macropore networks created by root systems, then subsurface topography likely becomes a control on flow networks (Tromp van Meerveld and McDonnell, 2006b). Because of these complexities, interflow influenced by the presence of an argillic clay horizon (Bt horizons) ranges from frequent and substantial (Beasley, 1976; Wilson et al., 1990) to rare and inconsequential (Buttle and McDonald, 2002; Redding and Devito, 2010). Evaluating the contrasts in flow behavior among hillslopes with different steepness and lithology allows us to understand and predict the relative balance of fill and spill (McDonnell 2013).

Here we present new work that examines the controls on perching (here defined as a subsurface water table that builds up temporarily over restricting layers) and interflow generation over and within a sandy argillic horizon on low angle slopes (less than 5%) within forested catchments in the Sandhills of the Upper Coastal Plain, South Carolina, USA. We quantified the variability of the argillic topography and saturated hydraulic conductivities of both the Bt horizon and the overlying A and E horizons, the spatial variability of interflow across a 120 m long interflow interception trench divided into 11 segments, as well as perching within and on the argillic layer using piezometers on the hillslope above the trench. The following questions guided our research: (1) Do

low angle slopes exhibit similar threshold and fill-and-spill behavior as steeper hillslopes? (2) How variable are the subsurface topography and hydraulic characteristics of the impeding argillic layer? (3) Does surface topography predict the frequency of perching and interflow production across the slope?

2. Study Site

The study was conducted in three adjacent first order catchments, with the majority of research conducted on a single catchment and most data collected from 2008 to 2011. All three catchments are tributaries to Fourmile Branch on the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Savannah River Site (SRS) within the Aiken plateau of the Upper Atlantic Coastal Plain (Fig. 1) in South Carolina, USA. The SRS site was in row-crop, agriculture, featuring terracing and shallow gullies prior to acquisition and reforestation by the Atomic Energy Commission (a predecessor to DOE) in 1950 (Kilgo and Blake, 2005). Annual precipitation at the site is approximately 1220 mm distributed evenly throughout the year, while potential evapotranspiration is approximately 1400 mm. The weather is characterized by long, hot summers with an average daily maximum temperature of 32.3 °C and high intensity thunderstorms and relatively mild winters with an average temperature of 8.6 °C (Rebel, 2005) and frontal rainfall.

The headwater catchments are characterized by gently rolling hills with average slopes of 2-3%. Upland and bottomland areas are nearly level. The steepest slopes reach 55%, but comprise only small areas on the valley margins. The primary study catchment (R) drains 45 hectares of forested area and features a 300 m long, flat,

unchanneled valley of a forested wetland above the channel head. The adjacent B and C catchments, where additional soil and groundwater measurements were made, are larger (169 and 117 hectares, respectively) and also feature long, flat, forested wetland valleys as well as Carolina Bay wetlands typical of the Upper Atlantic Coastal Plain (Fig. 1). There is field evidence of previous terracing, gully erosion, and downslope soil movement that occurred during the farming period prior to the establishment of the current timber stand.

The hillslopes and ridges are covered by longleaf pine (*Pinus palustris*), loblolly pine (*P. taeda*), and slash pine (*P. elliottii*) first established in the late 1950's, now in the second or third rotation. Mixed hardwoods dominate the riparian areas, mainly sweet gum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*). The soils are well-drained, loamy, siliceous, thermic Grossarenic Paleudults (Rasmussen and Mote, 2007), featuring a thin loamy sand A horizon overlying a deep loamy sand E horizon that grades into an argillic Bt horizon of sandy clay loam. Herein the A and E horizons will be referred to as mineral soils. The surface soils contain 80-90% sand, and clay content increases to 35% or more in the Bt horizon (Kilgo and Blake, 2005).

3. Methods

The hydrological measurements are focused in the R catchment where a 121 m interflow interception trench was excavated along the contour at mid-slope in 2009. Slopes above the trench range from about 6% to 12%. The open trench (covered by a

tarped structure to prevent precipitation input) is 1.5 -2.0 m deep and consists of eleven separate 11 m long trench drains constructed within the clay layer. Within each segment, a perforated pipe was covered with gravel and landscape cloth to intercept lateral flow moving above and within the argillic layer from an upslope contributing area of 5.7 ha (13% of the R catchment). Intercepted water from each drain was piped downhill into a v-notch weir box in which water level was measured by an Odyssey capacitance probe at 10-minute intervals (Dataflow System, New Zealand). We conducted walk-through inspections of the trench and drains during or after storm events. The walk through inspections determined whether macropore flow was exiting the trench face and where the upslope trench face was wet.

Depths to the argillic layer were characterized by two different methods: trench face inspection and tile probing. First, the argillic surface was identified by visual and tactile inspection at 0.5 m intervals at the R catchment trench face as well as in two other trenches in the B and C catchments, yielding a total survey length of 200 m (400 measurements). Depth to the argillic layer was also mapped on a 2 m by 4 m grid (838 measurements) on the hillslope above the R trench by pushing a tile probe into the soil until it reached the argillic layer. In 2011, additional tile probe testing (585 measurements) was conducted on a 2 m by 1 m grid within a 40 m by 40 m sub-domain above trench drain segments 4 through 6. Multiple people were involved in the measurements, but each did a series of calibrations with known argillic depths at the trench face to gage the resistance associated with the change in texture. When the argillic layer was encountered, much greater force was needed to advance the probe.

However, the probe could also be stopped by rocks or roots, so three measurements were taken at each point, and the deepest penetration was recorded. High-quality LiDAR data (0.877 m spatial resolution and 0.015 m root mean square error) and fine scale detection of depth to the argillic layer by tile probe allowed the creation of high-resolution maps of the surface and argillic horizon. Soil profiles were characterized for texture and color in each horizon by augering down to 2 m depths throughout the hillslopes and riparian zones. In-situ hydraulic conductivities (Ksat) in the A horizon (8 measurements), mid-layer (5 measurements), and the argillic horizon (6 measurements) were measured across the catchment using compact constant head permeameter (CCHP, or Amoozemeter). Soil moisture characteristic curves for topsoils and the argillic layer were developed on intact cores using the hanging water table method, and van Genuchten parameters α , n , and m were fitted to the resulting data (van Genuchten, 1980). The van Genuchten soil hydraulic model is defined as:

$$\theta = \theta_r + \frac{(\theta_s - \theta_r)}{[1 + (\alpha h)^n]^m}$$

where θ is volumetric soil water content, θ_r is residual water content, θ_s is saturated water content, h is the matric potential (kPa), and α , n , and m ($m=1-1/n$) are empirical parameters.

Three 1 m wide and 10 m long trenches were cut down into the argillic layer with a backhoe at the top of the R catchment and on two hillslopes in the lower B catchment. At these trenches, the argillic layer was visually inspected for areas of anomalous color, texture, and obvious root penetration (Figure 2b and 2c). The thickness of the argillic

layer was measured by augering through the argillic layer at seven locations in the hillslope above the R trench and in two other locations in the adjacent watersheds.

To examine groundwater dynamics, four nests of piezometers were installed on the hillslope above the trench in the R catchment with one piezometer above the argillic layer, one within the argillic layer, and one below the argillic layer in each nest. Each piezometer was equipped with an Odyssey capacitance probe to measure water depth at 15-minute intervals. In addition to the recording piezometers, 48 maximum rise piezometers in a regular grid of 12 rows by 4 rows going upslope were installed on the same hillslope. They were checked monthly to determine maximum groundwater level in the preceding month. Maximum water level was determined by measuring the height to which water washed away cork dust that was placed on a central rod in the piezometer. The cork dust was reapplied every month. Six riparian piezometers were installed near the stream gauges to a depth of 1.8 m to monitor riparian groundwater dynamics and were measured manually on monthly basis. An H-flume was installed at the R catchment outlet and water level was recorded using an ISCO 6712 automated sampler (Teledyne ISCO, Lincoln, NE) to calculate streamflow. Six nests of ECH₂O soil moisture probes, (Decagon Devices, Pullman, WA) were arranged to monitor soil volumetric water content (VWC) at both the soil surface and at the top of the argillic layer above the trench. Soil water storage accounting for interflow initiation was estimated by precipitation records from a meteorological tower at SRS (Central Tower 200F), approximately 1.6 km away from the catchments. The regional surficial groundwater table, flowing through unconsolidated sands and clays of the Upper Three

215 Runs Aquifer, was measured every 4 hours using Global Water WL16 and WL15 water
216 level loggers (Global Water Instrumentation, Inc.) that were placed in two wells on the
217 eastern ridge of the R watershed and in four wells in the lower B watershed. Well
218 depths ranged from 4.7 to 14 m as the location of the wells varied from areas close the
219 riparian zones to the ridges of the watersheds.

220 Saturated interflow travel times were calculated along flow pathlines starting
221 from the valley margins up to the ridgelines. Valley margins were defined by the extent
222 of the Pickens sand and Ogeechee sandy loam soils. Both valley soil series were mapped
223 by the Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS). At each increment along the
224 pathlines, pore-velocities were calculated based on the local slope, a porosity of 0.35,
225 and the highest and lowest bulk A and E horizon conductivities determined from
226 observed trench outflow rates (223 cm/hr and 33 cm/hr, respectively; described in
227 detail in the results). A contour map of the resulting travel times was created from the
228 resulting net of travel times.

229 **4. Results**

230 *Saturated hydraulic conductivities and soil moisture characteristic curves*

231 The loamy sand topsoils were well drained with a median hydraulic conductivity
232 (Ksat) of 10 cm/hr and a range spanning over one order of magnitude. In contrast, the
233 median Ksat in the argillic layer was 0.5 cm/hr, and varied over four orders of magnitude
234 from 0.008 cm/hr to 5 cm/hr. Six out of eight Ksat measurements in the argillic layer
235 were two orders of magnitude lower than the median value for topsoil (Figure, 2a). Soil

moisture characteristic curves contrasted sharply between the loamy sand topsoil and the sandy clay loam argillic layer (Fig. 3). As expected from the textures, topsoils lost most of the water at higher potentials and retained less than 3% of moisture at -100 cm pressure head. Clay soils, on the other hand, were able to hold significantly more water (>25%) throughout the tested pressure range. Van Genuchten's parameters were derived by fitting the core sample measurements in sand and clay (Table 1), which helped quantifying the differences in the hydraulic characteristics of the A/E and Bt horizons.

Examination of the vertical distribution of soil texture indicated that the transition from the sandy topsoil to the clayey subsoil was gradual and usually lacked a distinct boundary. In some cases, clay content increased gradually, and the soil profile included a BE transition horizon. The transitional characteristics of the argillic interface imply lateral flow can move within the argillic layer as well as above it. In fact, water regularly was observed to seep out of the trench faces below the argillic interface during storms. Visual observations of roots on the trench face and from wind-thrown trees in the forest indicated that some tree roots extended deep into or through the argillic layer. Trench excavations revealed that abnormal soil columns (anomalies) with distinctly different texture, color, and organic matter content occurred randomly in the argillic layer (Figure 2b and 2c). The anomalies were notably darker in color and had coarser particle size distributions. Ksat tests by CCHP at six locations indicated these columns had much higher Ksat (two orders of magnitude) than the surrounding clay. Possible processes that created these anomalies are the decay of tree roots, including

tap roots, and/or animal burrowing. The loamy sand topsoil lacks cohesion and tends to collapse and infill these anomalies in the underlying argillic layer.

Hillslope and subsurface topography and depths to the argillic layer

The trench hillslope had a relatively steep average gradient of 7% (compared to the flat topography of the entire catchment) and maximum slopes of around 12% with little undulation at the surface and irregular argillic topography compared to the surface (Fig. 4). Mean depth to the argillic layer within this hillslope was 0.76 m, but ranged from 0.19 m to 1.62 m. Transects of depths to the argillic layer measured at high spatial resolution (0.5 m) on the R, B, and C trench faces (Fig. 5 and Table 2) revealed an undulating argillic surface with large variation over short spatial scales. Depths to the argillic layer across both measurement approaches (depth at trench face, tile probe depth above trench at 1 m by 1 m and 2 m by 4 m scales) ranged between 0.15 m to 2.00 m, with median values of 0.50 m to 0.80 m. Standard deviations were high relative to the mean values and ranged from 0.10 m to 0.40 m. Depths to the argillic layer were usually symmetrically and near-normally distributed, except in the R catchment (Table 2) where they displayed a long right tail. Both the trench transects and the detailed soil depth map indicated that the argillic layer surface was very irregular and dimpled.

The thickness of the argillic layer varied from 1.3 to 3.0 m, with a mean and median of 2.1 and 2.0 m, respectively. Auger borings through the argillic layer also indicated variability in the texture, structure, cohesiveness, and color. For example, most of the argillic layer was friable sandy clay loam with color ranging from 2.5YR 5/6 reddish brown to 10YR 5/6 light yellowish brown yellow-orange, but we encountered

occasional layers of very hard, cemented, reddish-purple to purple (not in the Munsell soil color books) clay. Some borings revealed lenses of river-washed gravels within the sandy clay loam argillic layer.

Groundwater Perching, Soil Moisture, and Interflow Behavior

Piezometers above and within the argillic layer indicated that groundwater perching always began in the argillic layer and then moved upwards into the topsoil as storm size increased (see 'in argillic piezometer water level' in Fig. 6). Perching in argillic layer started 1-2 hours earlier than in top soil during the two events of June and August, 2010 (Figure 6a and 6b). Perching of water occurred frequently in the argillic horizon, e.g., four times in the dry summer months of 2010. The below-argillic piezometers did not respond to storm events and no connection was observed between the perched water and the regional groundwater table during the more than four years of monitoring. Depth to the regional water table was 35 m (74 m.a.s.l.) on the ridge tops and usually more than 18 m (68 m.a.s.l.) within a pre-1950 hand-dug well, at approximately the same elevation as the trench, in a 2010 summer survey.

Groundwater depths below the ridge showed gradual seasonal variation of up to 2 m.

Monthly maximum water level measurements in the piezometer grid showed high spatial and temporal variability in both magnitude and frequency of perching above the argillic layer (Fig.7). All piezometers responded (i.e., contained water) during at least some monthly measurements and no piezometer responded continuously across all monthly observations. The piezometer response frequency, defined as percent of month that piezometers contain water, ranged from 18% to 91% across the 3-year long

measurement period. In other words, perching occurred every 1.1 to 5.5 months in various piezometers. We observed that some piezometers contained water for extended periods between storms, but few were wet only for short amounts of time in wettest periods. Piezometer records showed some seasonality despite evenly distributed precipitation throughout the year. More piezometers responded during the winter than in other months that is likely due to lower evapotranspiration. The topography of the top of the argillic layer is more irregular than the soil surface, and piezometers in argillic depressions captured more frequent perching of infiltrated water. Because of the spatial heterogeneity of K_{sat} in the argillic layer, some piezometers were filled with water frequently, but did not hold water long because water likely percolated through the clay or moved downslope. Soil moisture responded nearly instantaneously to precipitation and dropped back to low values ($0.03\text{--}0.08\text{ vol vol}^{-1}$) within a few days following storms in both the topsoils and clays (Fig. 6).

Inspection during storms never revealed macropore flow exiting the trench face. Matrix seepage was generally observed from the BE transition layer and within the argillic layer itself. Lateral flow frequency and magnitude varied among the 11 trench flumes. During storm events, flumes 1, 4, 5, and 7 were the first to respond, while others (segment 3, 9 and 10) did not respond to small to moderate storms ($>60\text{ mm}$, Fig. 7). The variability of lateral flow generation along the trench face indicates that the undulation of argillic layer topography influences the subsurface flow distribution and can be identified by the argillic boundary line at the trench face (Fig. 5). The argillic interface at the excavation had multiple depressions that were more than 1.5 m deep at

segments 3 and 4. The perforated pipes were buried at 1.5 m to 2 m below surface and in some cases lateral flow may move below the pipes. Accordingly, segment 3 collected flow less frequently than others. Combining the responses of trench flow with the perching water level above the trench, we observed that neither perching nor interflow follows surface topography, and perching upslope does not necessarily lead to downslope interflow (Figure 7).

During some storms, outflow volumes from the trench exceeded streamflow volumes for the same period (Table 3), indicating a disconnection between the hillslopes and the stream. This mismatch between trench flows and streamflows occurred during both summer and winter storms. For example, the 61 mm storm on November 11th, 2009 produced greater flow volume from the trench (61.5 m^3) than from the stream (9.0 m^3) in the R catchment. The largest observed flow rate from individual 11 m trench segments ranged from 0.1 to 0.7 L/s. This is consistent with Darcian estimates of maximum possible flow rates. If we assume 1.0 m of interflow-carrying soils (i.e., soil depth that includes the transitional zone plus part of argillic layer) and a slope of 0.10 (at the high end of slopes in the trench hillslope), then a flow rate of 0.1 L/s suggests a lateral hydraulic conductivity of 33 cm/hr (at the very high end of the measured values). But a flow rate of 0.7 L/s suggests a lateral conductivity of 223 cm/hr, an order of magnitude higher than our topsoil measurements. The observed flow rates indicate that our CCHP measurements of topsoil conductivity may be low-biased. The bias may be due to the error of CCHP method or the lack of representation of preferential flow. Under these same assumptions, the range of Darcy velocities would be only 3.3 to 23

cm/hr, indicating the difficulty of driving a large amount of interflow on a 10% slope over the duration of a rainstorm. Analysis of interflow responses to storm precipitation input reveals that individual interflow pathways may be activated during smaller storm events, but rainfall input has to reach 60 mm in order to generate substantial interflow (Fig. 8). Estimation of downslope travel distances based on the ratio of downslope Darcy velocities to percolation velocities (Jackson et al. 2014), indicates that saturated interflow is unlikely to travel more than about 30 m on this slope due to low slopes and leakage through anomalies, similar to the leakage through fragipan cracks studied by Parlange et al. (1989). These short downslope travel distances partly explaining the mismatch between interflow behavior on this hillslope and flow observed in the stream.

5. Discussion

A perceptual model of hillslope connectivity for low-relief watersheds

The topography of the argillic layer in the 3 study catchments (R, B, C) is complex and undulating with high variation (as much as 2 m) over short distances (<10 m). This topography results in many depressions for water storage that need to be filled before perched water can connect and spill to lower elevations. The undulating subsurface topography combined with low permeability of the confining argillic layer creates a fill-and-spill process similar to that observed above bedrock in steeper catchments (Tromp van Meerveld and McDonnell, 2006c). The fill-and-spill theory was built upon the observation that bedrock depressions will hold water until the perching level in low spots rises and spills over the local high points in the bedrock microtopography; only

after saturated areas are connected will subsurface flow occur. The connectivity of saturated areas in this hillslope is very difficult to predict from gridded measures of the argillic layer topography because of the small spatial scale and randomness of the variation in the depth to the argillic. Unlike many other study areas characterized by an underlying restrictive layer (Ali et al., 2011; McDaniel et al., 2008; Redding and Devito, 2010; Tromp van Meerveld and McDonnell, 2006b), the impeding layer at SRS appears to have many areas of vertical preferred flow throughout it (Fig.9). The high variability in both the argillic topography and conductivity sets the template for near-surface hydrologic behavior in this landscape. The origin of the variability in the argillic surface is unknown, but we hypothesize that the variability originates from a combination of root penetration and subsequent rot; lifting of portions of the argillic surface when trees fall; and also animal burrowing and subsequent infill. Given that these hillslopes have been forested throughout the Pleistocene, there has been sufficient time for tree falls to create a mosaic of overlapping divots in the argillic surface. More work is needed to understand the history of soil evolution under natural and managed conditions as suggested by Tani (2013) in order to have a comprehensive understanding of interflow behavior.

Notwithstanding our lack of detailed slope evolution history, our work suggests the following sequence for subsurface redistribution of rainfall as storm size increases: 1) rainfall infiltrates rapidly, and the wetting front propagates vertically until it reaches the argillic layer; 2) the argillic layer saturates from within, and subsequently localized patches of perched water tables develop; 3) depressions in the argillic horizon surface

389 are filled and connect locally as lateral flows are initiated at limited locations; 4) most
390 depressions are filled and widespread hillslope connectivity is formed. At the third
391 stage, we saw interflow entering a few trench sections, and as the last stage was
392 reached, we saw interflow entering most trench sections. However, on the hillslopes,
393 much of the storm water percolates through anomalies in the argillic layers. This
394 sequencing is consistent with the general sequencing of runoff of all slopes as outlined
395 recently by McDonnell (2013).

396 Relatively high forest evapotranspiration demand in this climate means that the
397 soils rapidly dry out and reset the interflow thresholds between storms. The high
398 amounts of subsurface storage in the low points of the argillic surface may act to
399 improve tree growth and productivity in this landscape by acting as reservoirs to supply
400 transpiration demand as measured by Tromp van Meerveld and McDonnell (2006a) at
401 the nearby Panola hillslope.

402 When the topography above a trench segment is comprised of deep or multiple
403 depressions as suggested by the argillic boundary at the trench face (Fig. 5) and the
404 depth-to-clay survey above segment 3 and 4 (Fig. 4), some water is dammed and
405 confined in the depressions. The corresponding downslope segments will be less
406 responsive than those with relatively flat contributing argillic topography. Alternatively,
407 if there are anomalies (which have much higher permeability compared to surrounding
408 argillic layers) on the route of lateral flow, the high percolation through the argillic layer
409 may decrease the portion that reaches downslope areas (Fig. 9, segment I). If fewer
410 argillic anomalies occur along the route, more lateral flow may appear (Fig. 9, segment II

and III). The results suggest that predicting hillslope flowpaths requires not only information about surface topography and topsoil characteristics, but also information about subsurface topography and leakage rates. The high spatial variability of interflow and depressional storage also means that interflow contributions to valley water are an ensemble of substantially varying signals. One of the distinct characteristics of this hillslope compared to earlier interflow studies is the interspersed “holes” (anomalies) that filled with highly permeable sand. The anomalies not only increase subsurface storage, but also create large variation of interflow at the space of the hillslope.

The mismatch between interflow generation amounts and streamflow runoff response ratio (~ 0.02) suggests that while hillslopes “turn on” in certain places (like the measured trench section), the hillslopes are not connected to the streams at the space scale of the entire catchment and at the time scales of storm events. Thus the majority of rainfall on the catchment hillslopes results in a broad patchwork of transient saturation that percolates through argillic layer to recharge deep groundwater. This deep groundwater bypasses the first order streams and appears far down valley as evidenced by a runoff ratio of 0.20 at the first downstream USGS gage on Fourmile Creek (#02197334, draining 15.6 km^2) and a runoff ratio of 0.39 at the lower USGS gage on Fourmile Creek (#02197344, draining 58 km^2). The high measured interflow initiation threshold for the trench and the low streamflow volume relative to trench flow strongly implies that steeper hillslope segments directly adjacent to the riparian zones likely to contribute to channel stormflow in the stream (Fig. 6), a finding supported by water isotope analysis by (Klaus et al., 2015) and downslope travel distance analysis by Jackson

et al. (2014). This is largely attributed to low hydraulic gradient (flat terrain) and low conductivity contrast between top soil and impeding layer (high permeability in argillic layer induced by anomalies). Over most of the hillslope, interflow acts only to transfer water downslope before it percolates to groundwater (Jackson et al. 2014). Interflow producing events on site last hours to a few days (up to a week), and only the hillslopes on the riparian margins can contribute interflow to the valleys on the time scale of an interflow event (Fig. 10). Potential interflow travel times from the majority of the watershed area exceed 50 days even at the highest conductivity estimate of 223 cm/hr.

Storm size threshold for lateral flow initiation

The A/E horizon thickness averages 0.8 m, which is comparable to soil depths at other well-studied hillslopes, such as the Maimai (New Zealand) (Graham et al., 2010) and Panola catchments (Tromp van Meerveld and McDonnell, 2006b), and thinner than the mineral soil at the Watershed 10 hillslope, HJ Andrews experimental forest, Oregon (McGuire and McDonnell, 2010). The loamy sand mineral soil at SRS drains quickly and holds only a few percent of water by volume at field capacity. Excavation of tree roots and diurnal variation of soil moisture in the argillic layer suggests the pines may utilize the argillic layer as a water resource. In the growing season, the upper part of the argillic layer can become very dry with soil volumetric water content (VWC) dropping from 30-40% in wet conditions to 5% in dry conditions. Our piezometer observations indicate that perching begins within the argillic layer itself, and when the argillic layer is very dry, more water is needed to wet up the argillic layer before perching occurs. Because of the wetting needs and greater water holding capacity of the argillic layer compared to the

mineral soil, the threshold for initiating perching in the argillic layer is dependent on the moisture condition of both the argillic layer and the mineral soil above.

The rainfall threshold for interflow generation at the trenched slope derived from field measurements is approximately 60 mm (Fig. 8). This value is nearly identical to the value noted by Tromp van Meerveld and McDonnell (2006a) for Panola and higher than values for steeper slopes in New Zealand (Graham et al., 2010; Mosley, 1979; Woods and Rowe, 1996) and Japan (Tani, 1997; Tani, 2013; Uchida and Asano, 2010). The high value at SRS is likely due to the low angle terrain and leakage through anomalies in the argillic layers. Impeding layer permeability is a first order controlling factor for generating a perched water table and connectivity at the hillslope (Hopp and McDonnell, 2009). CCHP test results suggest that the median vertical Ksat of the argillic layer at SRS is approximately 0.5 cm/hr, slightly higher than the bedrock Ksat of 0.1-0.3 cm/hr in Maimai (Graham et al., 2010) and other study areas. The relatively high permeability of the argillic layer partially accounts for the greater threshold value because more water input is needed to compensate for percolation through the argillic layer.

6. Conclusions

The highly variable topography and conductivities of the sandy clay loam argillic layer create a hillslope system in which shallow groundwater perches frequently within and above the argillic layer, but lateral flow occurs much less frequently and does not appear to contribute substantially to streamflow during most storms. Depths to the

argillic layer were highly variable over short distances, indicating large areas of subsurface detention storage. Lateral flow occurred largely as matrix flow (lateral macropore flow was not observed) moving through the BE transition layers and was highly spatially variable, with very different frequencies and volumes of lateral flow among the eleven trench sections. Streamflow pulses showed little relationship to lateral flow pulses during most storm events except a few major events (Table 3), indicating a hillslope-stream disconnect except during large events with high antecedent moisture conditions. Essentially, there are four steps in the process of interflow generation: 1) infiltrated water brings the A and E horizons to field capacity, 2) the active portion of the argillic layer saturates and perching begins, 3) depressional storage in the argillic layer surface is filled, and 4) the depressions connect across the slope as infiltration continues. What is unique here compared to original fill-and-spill theory is step 2 when the argillic layer has to be wetted up in order to start perching, while bedrock should require no such wetting process. Also filling and connecting processes in last two steps have to compete with vertical loss through argillic anomalies that are highly permeable, reducing the likelihood of exceeding the spill threshold. There are spectra of each threshold across the hillslope, and these spectra contribute to the large lateral flow response variability along the trench segments. Spatial variation in the argillic microtopography and permeability also contribute to the variation in interflow generation across the slope.

Hydrologic behavior on these hillslopes reflected a variation of the fill-and-spill process model. Tromp van Meerveld and McDonnell (2006c) exhibiting a fill-dominated

regime as suggested by Hopp and McDonnell (2009). The high frequency of concavities in the undulating argillic surface, combined with the occurrence of high conductivity anomalies within the argillic layer, created a high threshold for connecting low spots in the argillic layer and transmitting interflow downslope. Combined with the low slopes, these slope characteristics also result in short downslope travel distances for interflow, such that most of the hillslopes are disconnected from stormflow generation in streams. Only the steeper slopes adjacent to the stream valleys are likely to contribute interflow to streams on the timescale of a storm. This geological setting is common in lowland and coastal plain catchments and may imply a longer transit time of water and solutes from most of the hillslope to streams. Therefore, nonpoint source water quality issues caused by intensive silvicultural or agricultural practices (i.e., via excess fertilization) are likely delayed in these low-relief watersheds.

Acknowledgments

Support was provided by the Department of Energy – Bioenergy Technologies Office and Savannah River Operations Office through the U.S. Forest Service Savannah River under Interagency Agreement DE-A109-00SR22188. SRS is a National Environmental Research Park. John Blake of the USDA Forest Service was instrumental in project coordination. Benjamin Morris managed the field data collection. Bob Bahn, Shelly Robertson, Erin Harris, Damion Drover, Louise Jacques and several undergraduates from the University of Georgia assisted with fieldwork. Kellie Vache of Oregon State University and Luisa Hopp of the University of Bayreuth provided valuable advice and discussions of the data.

520 Support to Natalie Griffiths was provided by U.S. DOE Bioenergy Technologies Office.
521 Oak Ridge National Laboratory is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC for the U.S. Department
522 of Energy under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725.

523 References

- 524 Ali, G.A., L'Heureux, C., Roy, A.G., Turmel, M., Courchesne, F., 2011. Linking spatial patterns of
525 perched groundwater storage and stormflow generation processes in a headwater
526 forested catchment. *Hydrological Processes*, 25: 3843-3857.
- 527 Anderson, M.G., Burt, T.P., 1978. The role of topography in controlling throughflow generation.
528 *Earth Surface Processes*, 3: 331-344.
- 529 Atkinson, T.C., 1978. Techniques for measuring subsurface flow on hillslopes. In: Kirkby, M.J.
530 (Ed.), *Hillslope Hydrology (Landscape Systems: A Series in Geomorphology)*. John Wiley
531 and Sons, pp. 70-120.
- 532 Bachmair, S., Weiler, M., 2011. New dimensions of hillslope hydrology. In: Levia, D.F., Carlyle-
533 Moses, D., Tanaka, T. (Eds.), *Forest hydrology and biogeochemistry*. Springer
534 Netherlands, Amsterdam, pp. 455-481.
- 535 Beasley, R.S., 1976. Contribution of subsurface flow from the upper slopes of forested
536 watersheds to channel flow. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 40: 995-957.
- 537 Buttle, J.M., McDonald, D.J., 2002. Coupled vertical and lateral preferential flow on a forested
538 slope. *Water Resources Research*, 38(5).
- 539 Devito, K. et al., 2005. A framework for broad-scale classification of hydrologic response units on
540 the Boreal Plain: is topography the last thing to consider? *Hydrological Processes*, 19:
541 1705-1714.
- 542 Engler, A., 1919. *Untersuchungen über den einfluss des Waldes auf den Stand der Gewässer*.
543 Kommissionsverlag von Beer & Cie: Zurich, 12.
- 544 Gabet, E.J., Mudd, S.M., 2010. Bedrock erosion by root fracture and tree throw: A coupled
545 biogeomorphic model to explore the humped soil production function and the
546 persistence of hillslope soils. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 115.
- 547 Graham, C.B., Woods, R.A., McDonnell, J.J., 2010. Hillslope threshold response to rainfall: (1) A
548 field based forensic approach. *Journal of Hydrology*, 393: 65-76.
- 549 Hewlett, J.D., 1961. *Soil moisture as a source of baseflow from steep mountain watersheds*,
550 Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, USDA Forest Service, Asheville, NC.
- 551 Hewlett, J.D., Hibbert, A.R., 1967. Factors affecting the response of small watersheds to
552 precipitation in humid areas. In: W. E. Sopper, Lull, H.W. (Eds.), *International Symposium*
553 *on Forest Hydrology*, Pergamon, Oxford, pp. 275-290.
- 554 Hopp, L., McDonnell, J.J., 2009. Connectivity at the hillslope scale: Identifying interactions
555 between storm size, bedrock permeability, slope angle and soil depth. *Journal of*
556 *Hydrology*, 376: 378-391.
- 557 Jackson, C.R., Bitew, M., Du, E., 2014. When interflow also percolates: downslope travel
558 distances and hillslope process zones. *Hydrological Processes*, 28(7): 3195-3200.
- 559 Jencso, K.G. et al., 2009. Hydrologic connectivity between landscapes and streams: Transferring
560 reach- and plot-scale understanding to the catchment scale. *Water Resources Research*,
561 45.

562 Kilgo, J.C., Blake, J.I. (Eds.), 2005. Ecology and Management of a forested landscape. IslandPress,
 563 Washington.
 564 Klaus, J., McDonnell, J.J., Jackson, C.R., Du, E., Griffiths, N.A., 2015. Where does streamwater
 565 come from in low relief forested watershed? A dual isotope approach. *Hydrologic and*
 566 *Earth System Sciences*, 19: 125-135.
 567 McDaniel, P.A. et al., 2008. Linking fragipans, perched water tables, and catchment-scale
 568 hydrological processes. *Catena*, 73: 166-173.
 569 McDonnell, J.J., 2013. Are all runoff processes the same? *Hydrological Processes*, 27(26): 4103-
 570 4111.
 571 McDonnell, J.J. et al., 1996. A new method for studying flow on steep humid hillslopes. *EOS*,
 572 77(47): 465-472.
 573 McGuire, K.J., McDonnell, J.J., 2010. Hydrological connectivity of hillslopes and streams:
 574 Characteristic time scales and nonlinearities. *Water Resources Research*, 46: W10543.
 575 Mosley, M.P., 1979. Streamflow generation in a forested watershed, New Zealand. *Water*
 576 *Resources Research*, 154: 795–806.
 577 Neary, D.G., Ice, G.G., Jackson, C.R., 2009. Linkages between forest soils and water quality and
 578 quantity. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 258: 2269-2281.
 579 Newman, B.D., Campbell, A.R., Wilcox, B.P., 1998. Lateral subsurface flow pathways in a
 580 semiarid ponderosa pine hillslope. *Water Resources Research*, 34(12).
 581 Parlange, M.B., Steenhuis, T.S., Timlin, D.J., Stagnitti, F., Bryant, R.B., 1989. Subsurface flow
 582 above a fragipan horizon. *Soil Science*, 148(2): 77-86.
 583 Pearce, A.J., Stewart, M.K., Sklash, M.G., 1986. Storm runoff generation in humid headwater
 584 catchments 1. where does the water come from? *Water Resources Research*, 22(8):
 585 1263-1277.
 586 Rasmussen, T.C., Mote, T.L., 2007. Monitoring surface and subsurface water storage using
 587 confined aquifer water levels at the Savannah River Site, USA. *Vadose Zone Journal*, 6:
 588 327-335.
 589 Rebel, K.T., 2005. Using trees to remediate tritium contaminated groundwater: a modeling and
 590 tracer study, Cornell University, 173 pp.
 591 Redding, T., Devito, K., 2010. Mechanisms and pathways of lateral flow on aspen-forested,
 592 Luvisolic soils, Western Boreal Plains, Alberta, Canada. *Hydrological Processes*, 24: 2995-
 593 3010.
 594 Spence, C., Woo, M.K., 2003. Hydrology of subarctic Canadian Shield: Soil filled valleys. *Journal*
 595 *of Hydrology*, 279: 151-166.
 596 Tani, M., 1997. Runoff generation processes estimated from hydrological observations on a
 597 steep forested hillslope with a thin soil layer. *Journal of Hydrology*, 200: 84-109.
 598 Tani, M., 2013. A paradigm shift in stormflow predictions for active tectonic regions with large-
 599 magnitude storms: generalisation of catchment observations by hydraulic sensitivity
 600 analysis and insight into soil-layer evolution. *Hydrologic and Earth System Sciences*, 17:
 601 4453-4470.
 602 Tromp van Meerveld, H.J., McDonnell, J.J., 2006a. On the interactions between the spatial
 603 patterns of topography, soil moisture, transpiration and species distribution at the
 604 hillslope scale. *Advances in Water Resources*, 29: 293-310.
 605 Tromp van Meerveld, H.J., McDonnell, J.J., 2006b. Threshold relations in subsurface stormflow:
 606 1. A 147-storm analysis of the Panola hillslope. *Water Resources Research*, 42: W02410.
 607 Tromp van Meerveld, H.J., McDonnell, J.J., 2006c. Threshold relations in subsurface stormflow:
 608 2. The fill and spill hypothesis. *Water Resources Research*, 42: W02411.

609 Uchida, T., Asano, Y., 2010. Spatial variability in the flowpath of hillslope runoff and streamflow
 610 in a meso-scale catchment. *Hydrological Processes*, 24: 2277-2286.
 611 Ulanova, N.G., 2000. The effects of windthrow on forests at different spatial scales: a review.
 612 *Forest Ecology and Management*, 135: 155-167.
 613 van Genuchten, M.T., 1980. A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of
 614 unsaturated soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 44: 892-898.
 615 Weiler, M., McDonnell, J.J., Meerveld, I., Uchida, T., 2005. Subsurface stormflow. In: Anderson,
 616 M.G. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Hydrological Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK,
 617 pp. 1719-1732.
 618 Wilson, G.V., Jardine, P.M., Luxmoore, R.J., Jones, J.R., 1990. Hydrology of a forested hillslope
 619 during storm events. *Geoderma*, 46(1-3): 119-138.
 620 Woods, R., Rowe, L., 1996. The changing spatial variability of subsurface flow across a hillside.
 621 *Journal of Hydrology*, 35(1): 49-84.
 622 Zaslavsky, D., Sinai, G., 1981. Surface hydrology IV-Flow in sloping, layered soil. *Journal of*
 623 *Hydraulics Division, ASCE*, 107(No.HY1): 53-64.

624

625

626 Table 1. Van Genuchten's parameters derived by fitting the soil moisture release curve of argillic
 627 and sand layers of the catchment soils.

	A	n	m
Sand	-0.035	3.180	0.686
Clay	-0.033	1.207	0.171

628

629 Table 2. Depth to the argillic layer (m) in interflow interception trenches and the maximum rise
 630 piezometer grid in the hillslope above the R watershed trench.

	median	mean	min	max	St. Dev.	Number of measurements
R trench	0.51	0.63	0.15	2.08	0.40	221
B trench	0.69	0.69	0.30	1.30	0.16	65
C trench	0.57	0.57	0.30	0.78	0.10	65
Detailed mapped region of R hillslope by tile probe	0.76	0.76	0.19	1.62	0.23	838
Large scale tile probe grid (2m x 4 m)	0.76	0.77	0.56	1.50*	0.32	585

631 *Length of tile probe used in large scale measurements was 150cm. The finer scale
 632 measurements used a 200 cm probe at the deeper locations.

633 Table 3. Trench flow and streamflow responses of all trench flow events during the period of
 634 June 2009 to June 2011 (italicized numbers indicate that trench flow was greater than
 635 streamflow).

	Trench flow (m³)	Streamflow (m³)
6/19/2009	0.15	9.31
7/6/2009	22.26	1.31
11/11/2009	61.51	8.96
12/3/2009	2.85	1.86
12/19/2009	29.33	96.05
2/25/2009	545.27	2047.50
1/22/2010	39.70	365.36
2/7/2010	7.39	130.64
3/13/2010	14.89	2.76
5/31/2010	7.92	1048.50
6/16/2010	0.34	69.09
6/25/2010	25.18	76.16
7/21/2010	0.63	3.20
7/28/2010	1.94	14.54
8/7/2010	165.61	104.69
2/5/2011	131.16	1374.30

Figure. 1 Map of three study catchments (R, B, and C) in Upper Coastal Plain of South Carolina showing the locations of stream segments, the interflow interception trench in R, groundwater monitoring wells, stream flumes, piezometers nests, the argillic horizon survey domain assessed by tile probe, and soil moisture sensors. Catchment R is where the majority of the research was conducted. The black square box indicates the area where depth-to-argillic layer surveys were conducted and max-rise piezometers were located. Readers should refer Figure 7 for details in the area. The 1 m contour line is surface elevation.

Figure 2. a. Saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ksat) by depth for the surface, mid, and argillic layers. Ksat measurements were determined using the compact constant head permeameter (CCHP); b. vertical soil profile at trench excavation (~1 m high); c. bottom of an excavation with an anomaly (as arrow pointed, ~0.1 m in diameter)

651

652 Figure 3. Moisture release curves of the surface (sand) and argillic (clay) layers were fitted with
 653 van Genuchten curves. Data were obtained from soil columns that maintained a constant
 654 negative pressure head on each soil core.

Figure 4. Surface and argillic layer topography mapped using LiDAR and a tile-probe survey, respectively, show variation of the surface and argillic layers of an approximately 40 by 40 m area above trench segments 3 to 6 in the R catchment. A few augering tests indicated that the thickness of argillic layer ranged from 1.3 to 3.0 m. Note: the elevation of the surface layer has been lifted to better illustrate the variability in the argillic layer. Note: blue indicates high elevation and green indicates low elevation.

Figure 5. Argillic boundary along the face of the R, B, and C trenches. Depths to the argillic layer ranged from 0.15 to 2.00 m, with median values in the range of 0.50 to 0.80 m. The larger numbers in the R trench figure show the 11 trench segments and corresponding drains. The argillic surface is irregular, and creating subsurface depression storage contributing to large fill-and-spill thresholds.

Figure 6. Hydrological responses (from top to bottom) to precipitation in the summer of 2010 (5/15/2010 to 8/15/2010): a piezometer nest at three depths, soil moisture above and in the argillic layer, lateral flow intercepted by the R trench, and streamflow at the outlet of the R catchment. Perching was observed more frequently in the argillic layer than below the argillic layer. Subplot 6a and 6b are enlarged view of two events when both piezometers above and in the argillic layer responded. The occurrence of trench interflow and streamflow in the R catchment corresponded to perching (e.g., the response of the in-argillic piezometer and trench flow were similar). The trench contributing area only represented approximately 13% of the entire catchment, but interflow volume was comparable to streamflow except during the late May and early August events, suggesting that the contribution of upslope shallow subsurface water to stream flow is rather small.

Figure 7. The response of the maximum rise piezometers and the trenches to storms from 2009-2011. Grey dots indicated median level of water of all detectable events in the piezometers above R catchment trench (segmented line). Blue circles indicated frequency of water occurrence in piezometers in all months over 3-year period. Blue bars were frequency of flow occurrence of total months and ranged from 9-27%, grey bars represented maximum trench flows. The frequency of trench flows was counted only after flows were > 0.05 L/s. Underlying was a 1-m contour lines.

Figure 8. The response of interflow to rainfall events. Interflow was initiated when rainfall exceeded 60 mm. Only storm events greater than 10 mm were included in this figure.

Figure 9. Conceptual connectivity model at the hillslope scale indicates that the storm water flowpath follows a series of progressive steps as storm size increases: 1) the input necessary to bring the mineral soil profile up to field capacity near the soil base, 2) to then bring the upper part of the argillic layer to saturation, 3) then to fill the depressional storage in the argillic layer surface and, 4) then to connect the depressions across the slope. The incoming water is partitioned into interflow and deep percolation (neglecting ET and storage change) and segments I, II, and III have different volumes of outflow at the argillic interface and groundwater influenced by upslope Ksat discrepancies. Segment I has the lowest outflow because of the most percolation was lost via anomalies, while segment II has the greatest outflow due to the lack of anomalies.

Figure 10. Cumulative saturated interflow travel times calculated along flow paths from the riparian boundary to the ridgetops based on local slope at each point along the flowpath, a porosity of 0.35, and saturated conductivities of a) 223 cm/hr or b) 33 cm/hr (see methods for more detailed description of travel time calculations). Travel times from hillslope segments on the margin of the riparian zones to the stream are within the duration of interflow events. Saturated interflow travel times from the majority of the watershed exceeded 50 days even at the higher conductivity of 223 cm/hr. At the low end of the estimated conductivities, saturated interflow travel times exceeded 200 days across most of the catchments.