R80-33

OSP 87474

THE COUPLED TRANSPORT OF WATER AND HEAT IN A VERTICAL SOIL COLUMN **UNDER ATMOSPHERIC EXCITATION**

RALPH M. PARSONS LABORATORY FOR WATER RESOURCES AND HYDRODYNAMICS

Department of Civil Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Report No. 258

Prepared with the Support of **The National Science Foundation Grant No. ATM-7812327**

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

July 1980

THE **COUPLED** TRANSPORT OF WATER **AND HEAT** IN **A** VERTICAL SOIL **COLUMN UNDER** ATMOSPHERIC EXCITATION

by

P. Christopher **D.** Milly and Peter **S.** Eagleson

RALPH M. **PARSONS** LABORATORY

FOR

WATER **RESOURCES AND** HYDRODYNAMICS Department of Civil Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Report No. **258**

Prepared with the support of The National Science Foundation Grant No. **ATM-7812327**

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{d\mu}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{d\mu}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{d\mu}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{d\mu}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{d\mu}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{d\mu}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \$

 $\frac{d^2}{d\lambda} = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \frac{d\lambda}{d\lambda} = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \frac{d\lambda}{d\lambda$

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_0^1\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_0^1\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_0^1\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{$

THE COUPLED TRANSPORT OF WATER **AND HEAT** IN **A** VERTICAL

SOIL **COLUMN UNDER** ATMOSPHERIC EXCITATION

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this work is to develop a detailed, physicallybased model of the response of the land surface to atmospheric forcing.

The coupled, nonlinear partial differential equations governing mass and heat transport in the soil are derived. The theory of Philip and de Vries is re-cast in terms of the soil water matric potential, accounting for soil inhomogeneities and hysteresis of the moisture retention process. An existing model of hysteresis is modified to incorporate the effect of temperature and to facilitate numerical analysis.

The Galerkin finite element method is applied in the development of a numerical algorithm for the solution of the governing equations. The numerical procedure is coded in FORTRAN for computer solution and several examples are run in order to test the method. The various modes of mass and heat transport are simulated accurately. **A** proposed procedure for the evaluation of non-linear storage coefficients in the numerical scheme yields excellent mass and energy balances.

0739511

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This material is based upon work supported **by** the National Science Foundation under Grant No. **ATM-7812327.**

This document is essentially the Master's thesis submitted **by** Mr. P. Christopher **D.** Milly to the Department of Civil Engineering at M.I.T. Its completion was supervised **by** Dr. Peter **S.** Eagleson, Professor of Civil Engineering.

Ms. Anne Clee typed the manuscript and Mr. Pedro Restrepo provided technical assistance.

TABLE OF **CONTENTS**

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$

Page No.

LIST OF FIGURES

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\bar{\beta}$

 $\bar{\lambda}$

 $\ddot{}$

 \mathcal{L}

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

NOTATION

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

ò,

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\langle\bullet\rangle_{\rm{max}}$

L(T) latent heat of vaporization

 \sim \sim

V

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\langle \hat{N} \rangle$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \Delta \phi = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2$

12

 \sim

 $\mathcal{A}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\label{eq:2} \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) & = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \,, \end{split}$

 \sim

 $\bar{\beta}$

Chapter **1**

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation for this Study

The climate and weather at all scales on Earth is the result of the dynamic interaction of the atmosphere with the oceans, with the land surface, and with "outer space." Interest in the special role of the land surface as an atmospheric boundary is the motivation for the work described in this document, which is part of a larger study, **"A** Dynamic Land Surface Boundary Condition for Climate Models," being conducted at M.I.T. with the support of the National Science Foundation. The purpose of that study is to develop simple, physically-based parameterizations of the transport of (water) mass, heat, and momentum across the land surface for use in global numerical models of atmospheric general circulation.

The behavior of those simplified land surface models will be validated **by** comparison with a detailed mathematical model of the coupled physics of the soil, the vegetation, and the atmospheric boundary layer, driven **by** a stochastic model of the atmosphere. This physical system, which is considered to be one-dimensional (in the vertical direction), is depicted in Figure **1.1.** This report describes the detailed "primitive" equation model of the soil component of this system. The soil column may be loosely defined as a vertical section of earth extending downward from the land surface either to the water table or to a depth beyond which the water mass and heat fluxes are negligible.

THE COMPONENTS OF THE LAND **SURFACE** BOUNDARY OF THE ATMOSPHERE

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

1.2 Goals and Scope

The first goal of the present work is to present a general mathematical statement of the physics of water and heat transport in the soil boundary layer. Chapters 2 and **3** deal with this problem. The second goal is to outline a numerical algorithm for the solution of the governing equations and to demonstrate its validity. These issues are treated in Chapters 4 and **5.**

In formulating a general mathematical statement, the approach will be to consider all physical effects that might be important in natural environments. Hysteresis in the moisture retention curve, vapor transport, and temperature effects are therefore included. Subsequent work will address the question of simplifications of these general equations. It is precisely the purpose of this model to justify the simplification process, as the complex governing equations do not submit readily to an *a priori* scale analysis.

The role of vegetation is not treated in detail here. In order that the soil model be compatible with a mathematical model of the vegetal canopy, however, a general moisture sink (root extraction) term has been included in the derivation of the equations.

This work should have applications beyond studies of the planetary boundary layer. The theoretical presentation provides a convenient synthesis of much of the previous work. The numerical model will be a useful tool **for** the simulation of many soil physical processes, especially those involving coupled moisture and heat fields and/or vapor effects **-** situations for which general numerical codes are not readily

available.

1.3 Review of Relevant Literature

The development, during the first half of this century, of the isothermal theory of moisture flow in unsaturated soil is described **by** Swartzendruber **(1969)** and **by** Philip **(1957).** They credit Buckingham, followed **by** L. **A.** Richards, W. Gardner, **E. C.** Childs, **N.** Collis-George and others for their early contributions. The 1950's saw systematic application of the established theory to particular problems, the most well-known, perhaps, being the work of **J.** R. Philip on the infiltration process. Today, the Richards equation of liquid continuity, or a variant thereof, is probably the most widely used tool for the analysis of moisture transport in soil.

Philip and de Vries **(1957)** extended the isothermal theory of liquid water flow **by** incorporating vapor flow and clarifying the effect of temperature gradients in a synthesis of several divergent areas of research. They also presented a heat conduction equation that included the transport of latent heat **by** diffusing water vapor. Shortly thereafter, de Vries **(1958)** presented a more general heat equation, which accounted for many secondary storage and transport mechanisms and incorporated a new method for the calculation of effective thermal conductivity.

The theory of moisture transport in porous media has been complicated **by** the well-known existence of a hysteretic relationship between the moisture potential and the moisture content. **A** physical

theory explaining this phenomenon qualitatively in terms of capillarity was set forth **by** Miller and Miller **(1956).** The "independent domain" theory for hysteretic phenomena, developed **by** L. Neel and **D.** H. Everett, was first applied to soil moisture retention **by** Poulovassilis **(1962).** Subsequent developments along this line of attack are described **by** Mualem **(1973).** An important step was the suggestion of Philip (1964) that a similarity assumption be invoked. During recent years, Y. Mualem has made several contributions in this area, simplifying the formulation and maximizing the use of information to the point where the independent domain model and related models have become potentially powerful tools for the analysis of soil moisture flow problems.

Although models of hysteresis have been incorporated in several numerical simulations of soil water dynamics, a complete theoretical treatment of the applicability of the various flow equations in the presence of hysteresis has apparently not yet been given. Childs (1964) has made an important contribution, demonstrating that the commonlyemployed soil moisture diffusivity must be modified to account for hysteresis. Very little has been written on the theory of hysteresis in the presence of temperature variations.

Several analytic solutions of the non-linear moisture equations have been derived. Philip **(1957)** has presented a quasi-analytic method for analyzing infiltration into a soil of constant moisture content. Gardner **(1958),** using a particular soil parameterization, solved the problem of steady flow of water from a fixed water table to the surface, where it evaporates. Covey **(1963)** has solved a transient evaporation

problem using an exponential diffusivity function. Eagleson **(1978),** using Philip's method, has defined effective diffusivities in terms of an empirical model of the soil properties in order to solve problems of infiltration and exfiltration for constant initial conditions.

Analytic solutions typically involve idealized assumptions concerning initial conditions, homogeneity, hysteresis, etc. Nevertheless, they are very useful in generic studies of moisture transport processes and in situations where detailed computation would be prohibitive.

The limitations inherent in the analytic solutions, together with the rapid growth of the capabilities of the digital computer, have led many investigators to seek numerical solutions of the flow equations. An early numerical solution was Klute's **(1952)** treatment of non-linear unidirectional moisture diffusion, neglecting gravity. **A** more general approach to infiltration, which allows for layered soils, was presented **by** Hanks and Bowers **(1962).** Hysteresis was incorporated into an analysis of redistribution after infiltration **by** Rubin **(1967),** and later **by** many others. Freeze **(1969)** presents a review of various solutions obtained during the 1960's.

Two- and three-dimensional numerical models have been developed to study the areal response of the coupled saturated zone-unsaturated zone system **by** Rubin **(1968),** Freeze **(1971),** Neuman, et al. **(1975),** Narasimhan and Witherspoon **(1977),** and others.

Sasamori **(1970)** used the theory of Philip and de Vries **(1957)** to model the coupled transport of heat and moisture in the soil for his landmark study of the interaction of the earth and atmosphere surface boundary layers. The numerical model was used to simulate a (precipitation-free) period of evaporation from the soil, and did not include the hysteresis effect. Furthermore, it employed the somewhat limited θ -based formulation of the conservation equations. Vauclin, et al. **(1977)** have used the (isothermal) Richards equation for liquid flow, and a simple heat diffusion equation, in order to study evaporation. Thermal properties were dependent upon moisture content, providing one coupling mechanism.

Sophocleous **(1979)** has attempted to convert the Philip and de Vries theory to a matric head-based formulation and has presented the results of some simulation experiments. It appears, however, that his new system of equations is incorrectly formulated (Milly, **1979).** In particular, the expression for moisture flow due to temperature gradients is in error. Hysteresis was not considered.

Chapter 2

THE PHYSICS OF WATER **AND HEAT** TRANSPORT IN **POROUS** MEDIA

2.1 Introduction

A physically-based analysis of water and heat transport processes in the soil must begin with derivation of the governing equations and accompanying boundary and initial conditions from established principles. This is the objective of this chapter. The development is presented for heterogeneous, non-deforming, isotropic media exhibiting hysteresis. The coupled partial differential equations governing the distributions of temperature and water mass in the porous medium are derived **by** application of the conservation principle to water and heat at macroscopic scale. This gives

$$
\frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial t} = - \nabla \cdot \underline{q} \tag{2.1}
$$

where **E** is the amount of "substance" (e.g., water or enthalpy) per unit volume $\begin{bmatrix} \text{XL}^{-3} \end{bmatrix}$, and q is the local average flux of substance $\begin{bmatrix} \text{XL}^{-2} \text{T}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$. X represents the units of the substance.

Expressions are given for the storage and flux terms as functions of the relevant dependent variables. Substitution into the general conservation equation (2.1) then yields the mass and heat conservation equations. Various mathematical manipulations are then investigated in an attempt to express the equations in diffusion forms, which are potentially more useful. Two pairs of dependent variables are

considered (ψ, T) and (θ, T) .

This chapter draws heavily on the works of Philip and de Vries **(1957)** and of de Vries **(1958),** although several extensions and modifications of these works are proposed. In particular, a system based on the dependent variables ψ and T is presented, along with one employing θ and T as proposed **by** Philip and de Vries **(1957).** The proposed systems of equations are valid for inhomogeneous and hysteretic soils when applied with care. The possibility of water uptake **by** a plant root system is included. Combination of the basic heat equation and the mass equation yields two other forms of the heat equation, one of which is equivalent to that given **by** de Vries **(1958). A** physically-small mathematical error in his equation is noted.

Following the derivation of the governing equations, the proper boundary and initial conditions for a one-dimensional (vertical) soil system are presented. **All** of the processes possible at the land surface (infiltration with or without ponding, evaporation and the accompanying heat transfers) are considered. The saturated zone is modeled dynamical**ly** as a linear storage reservoir. The conditions necessary to allow modeling of domain discontinuities are given.

The chapter closes with a discussion of the differences between ψ -based and θ -based forms of the conservation equations.

2.2 Derivation of the Governing Equations

2.2.1 Mass Conservation

Let S_m be defined as the total (liquid plus vapor) water

storage per unit volume of the porous medium. The units of S_m are equivalent volume of liquid water per unit bulk volume of the medium. We then have

$$
\rho_{\hat{\chi}} S_m = [\rho_{\hat{\chi}} \theta + \rho_{\hat{\chi}} \theta_a + \rho_{\hat{\chi}} T] = \frac{\text{total mass of water}}{\text{unit bulk volume}} \qquad [g \text{ cm}^{-3}]
$$

or

$$
S_{m} = \theta + \frac{\rho_{v}}{\rho_{\ell}} \theta_{a} + T \qquad (2.2)
$$

where

$$
\rho_{\mathbf{v}} = \text{vapor density} = \frac{\text{mass of water vapor}}{\text{unit volume of air}} \qquad \text{[g cm}^{-3}]
$$
\n
$$
\rho_{\mathbf{g}} = \text{liquid density} = \frac{\text{mass of liquid water}}{\text{unit volume of liquid water}} \qquad \text{[g cm}^{-3}]
$$
\n
$$
\theta = \frac{\text{volume of liquid water in the soil}}{\text{unit bulk volume}}
$$
\n
$$
\theta_{\mathbf{a}} = \frac{\text{volume of air in the soil}}{\text{unit bulk volume}}
$$
\n
$$
T = \frac{\text{volume of liquid water stored in roots}}{\text{unit bulk volume}}
$$

The first term in (2.2) is thus storage in the liquid phase, the second is water vapor storage in the air-filled portion of the medium, and the third is root storage. In this work, θ refers to total soil liquid content, including the portion that is sometimes referred to as "residual" moisture content. The liquid water is assumed incompressible.

The flux of liquid in an unsaturated porous medium is described **by** the Buckingham-Darcy equation (Swartzendruber, **1969).** This relation, for isotropic media, is

$$
\underline{\mathbf{q}}_{\theta}/\rho_{\theta} = - \mathbf{K} \nabla \Phi \tag{2.3}
$$

$$
24
$$

in which

$$
\underline{q}_{\ell} = \frac{\text{liquid mass flow rate in soil}}{\text{unit bulk cross-sectional area}} \qquad [\text{g cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
K = \text{hydraulic conductivity} \qquad [\text{cm s}^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
\Phi = \text{total potential} \qquad [\text{cm}]
$$

The total potential Φ is a measure of the local energy level of the water. It is conveniently resolved into a gravity term and a matric, or "pressure," term,

$$
\Phi = \psi + z \tag{2.4}
$$

where the z-coordinate is the elevation relative to an arbitrary fixed datum (positive upward). When the presence of solutes is important, there is another component, the osmotic potential, on the right-hand side of **Eq.** (2.4).

The quantity, ψ , the matric head, is fully determined by the liquid moisture content, the temperature, the soil properties, and (in the general case of hysteretic soils) the wetting history of the particular point in the medium. This dependence is discussed in Chapter **3.** Keeping in mind the possibility of hysteresis, as well as the possible spatial variability (heterogeneity) of the soil, we shall write

$$
\psi = \psi(\theta, T; \underline{R}; \underline{s}) \tag{2.5}
$$

where T is temperature and \underline{R} and \underline{s} are vectors providing all the requisite information about wetting history and soil properties, respectively. Their physical significance is dealt with in Chapter **3.**

Substitution of Equation (2.4) into **(2.3)** yields

$$
q_{\rho}/\rho_{\rho} = - K \nabla \psi - K \underline{k} \qquad (2.6)
$$

where **k** is the unit vector in the z direction. Since K is ordinarily. discontinuous where s is discontinuous, the use of Equations (2.3) and **(2.6)** will be restricted to media in which the properties are either constant or continuously varying in space.

The "simple theory" of vapor flow in porous media is an intuitive extension of Fick's law to the macroscopic scale of a porous material. It is written (Philip and de Vries, **1957)**

$$
\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{v}} = - \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{a}} \vee \alpha \mathbf{\theta}_{\mathbf{a}} \nabla \rho_{\mathbf{v}} \tag{2.7}
$$

where

$$
\frac{q}{v} = \frac{vapor \text{ mass flow rate in soil}}{\text{unit bulk cross-sectional area}} \qquad [g \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
D_a = \text{molecular diffusion coefficient of water vapor in}
$$
\n
$$
\text{air} \qquad [\text{cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
v = \text{mass flow factor, a correction for the difference in}
$$
\n
$$
\text{boundary conditions governing air and vapor}
$$

 α = tortuosity of the air-filled pore space

The mass flow factor, which is normally very close to unity, will be neglected here. The tortuosity, which is less than unity, accounts for the effect of the increased path length that results from the irregular geometry of the pore space. The proportion of the bulk cross-section available for flow is assumed to be identical to **0** a

The water vapor density in the air phase is found **by** Edlefson and Anderson (1943, **p.** 145) to be

$$
\rho_{\mathbf{v}} = \rho_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{h} = \rho_{\mathbf{0}}(\mathbf{T}) \exp(\psi g / \mathbf{R} \mathbf{T}) \tag{2.8}
$$

in which

$$
\rho_0(T)
$$
 is the saturation vapor density over a free, flat
water surface
[g cm⁻³]
h is the relative humidity of air
g is the acceleration of gravity
R is the water vapor gas constant
[erg g⁻¹ K⁻¹]

Equation **(2.8)** is a direct consequence of the assumption of thermodynamic equilibrium between the liquid and vapor phases, and is valid for practically all natural soil systems.

The continuity of $\rho_{\mathbf{v}}(\psi, \mathbf{T})$ allows us to expand the gradient in Equation (2.7) to obtain (setting $v = 1$)

$$
\underline{q}_{\mathbf{v}} = - D_{\mathbf{a}} \alpha \theta_{\mathbf{a}} \left[\frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial \psi} \Big|_{\mathbf{T}} \nabla \psi + \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}} \Big|_{\psi} \nabla \mathbf{T} \right]
$$
 (2.9)

in which the vertical bar indicates which variable is to be held constant in the differentiation. Philip and de Vries **(1957)** use 6 and T in this expansion and assume that h is a function only of θ , obtaining

$$
\nabla \rho_{\mathbf{v}} = h \frac{d\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{dT} \nabla T + \rho_{\mathbf{v}} \frac{dh}{d\theta} \nabla \theta
$$

In fact, the temperature dependence of h may be significant. We shall retain the more general Equation **(2.9),** but follow the same subsequent steps proposed **by** Philip and de Vries **(1957).**

Consider now the case of a discontinuous liquid phase, i.e., $\theta \leq \theta_k$, where θ_k is the highest value of θ for which K = 0. Philip and de Vries **(1957)** argue that the isolated liquid islands act as shortcircuits for the thermally-induced vapor flux, effectively increasing the cross-section available for transport to include the liquid phase. (They rejected a similar correction for the flux due to matric head gradients, apparently because the necessary head gradients across the liquid islands would be too large.) The increased cross-section is incorporated by replacing θ_a in the VT term of Equation (2.9) by $(\theta_a + \theta)$. Note that this change is rather small, since $\theta < \theta_k$.

A second correction to Equation **(2.9)** is made **by** Philip and de Vries **(1957)** to account for the fact that the average magnitude of the temperature gradient in the air-filled pores exceeds the magnitude of the macroscopic gradient, due to the difference in thermal conductivity among the various phases. They introduce

$$
\zeta = \frac{(\nabla T)}{\nabla T} \tag{2.10}
$$

as the necessary correction, (TT) _a being the average temperature gradient in the air phase, the effect of tortuosity included.

The modified version of Equation **(2.9)** is

$$
\underline{q}_{v} = - D_{a} \alpha \theta_{a} \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial \psi} \Big|_{T} \nabla \psi - D_{a} (\theta_{a} + \theta) \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi} \zeta \nabla T \qquad (2.11)
$$

which is valid for $\theta < \theta_k$.

Finally, Philip and de Vries **(1957)** propose a generalization of Equation (2.11) for the range of **0** where the liquid phase is continuous. In this situation, the quantity $(\theta_a + \theta)$ in Equation (2.11) is replaced by $(\theta_a + f' \theta)$, where f' goes to zero as θ_a goes to zero. The proposed form of f' is linear with θ_a in this regime. The final expression for vapor flux is

$$
\underline{\mathbf{q}}_{\mathbf{y}} = - D_{\mathbf{a}} \alpha \theta_{\mathbf{a}} \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{y}}}{\partial \psi} \Big|_{\mathbf{T}} \nabla \psi - D_{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{f} \zeta \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{y}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}} \Big|_{\psi} \nabla \mathbf{T}
$$
(2.12)

in which

$$
f = \begin{cases} n & \theta \le \theta_k \\ \theta_a + \frac{a}{n - \theta_k} \theta & \theta_k < \theta \end{cases}
$$
 (2.13)

$$
D_{\psi v} = \frac{D_a}{\rho_\ell} \alpha \theta_a \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial \psi} \Big|_T = \text{matric head diffusivity of vapor}_{\text{cm s}^{-1}} \text{ [cm s}^{-1}]
$$

$$
D_{\text{TV}}^{\psi} = \frac{D_{\text{a}}}{\rho_{\ell}} f \zeta \frac{\partial \rho_{\text{v}}}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi} = \text{temperature diffusivity of vapor in}
$$
\n
$$
\psi - T \text{ system} \qquad [\text{cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ s} \text{K}^{-1}]
$$

The validity of this model of vapor transport has not been exhaustively demonstrated, although Philip and de Vries **(1957)** cite several experiments that support it. The interaction of the ψ - and T-fields on the microscopic (pore-scale) level is deserving of further theoretical work, in conjunction with careful analyses of the existing experimental data. Most likely, further experiments will be required.

Rather than open this Pandora's box of micro-scale physics, we shall accept the present theory as the proper formulation of the process dynamics.

At this point, we can define the total mass flux in the medium, using **(2.6)** and (2.12), to be

$$
\underline{q}_{m}/\rho_{\ell} = \underline{q}_{\ell}/\rho_{\ell} + \underline{q}_{v}/\rho_{\ell} + \underline{q}_{r}/\rho_{\ell}
$$

= -(K + D_{ψv}) $\nabla \psi - D_{\text{TV}}^{\psi} \nabla T - K\underline{k} + \underline{q}_{r}/\rho_{\ell}$ (2.14)

where

$$
q_r = \frac{\text{water mass flow rate in plant root system}}{\text{unit bulk cross-sectional area}} \qquad [g \text{ cm}^{-S} \text{ s}^{-1}]
$$

Substitution of (2.2) and (2.14) into (2.1) yields the continuity equation of water mass,

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\theta + \frac{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\rho_{\ell}} \theta_{\mathbf{a}} + T \right) = \nabla \cdot \left[\left(\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{D}_{\psi \mathbf{v}} \right) \nabla \psi + \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{T} \mathbf{v}}^{\psi} \nabla T + \mathbf{K} \underline{\mathbf{k}} - \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{r}} / \rho_{\ell} \right]
$$
\n(2.15)

Considering mass conservation in the root system, we also have

$$
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (q_r / \rho_g) + S \qquad (2.16)
$$

where **S** is the volumetric uptake of water from the soil **by** the plant roots, i.e.,

S = volume of liquid extracted from soil per unit time unit bulk volume

Combination of **(2.15)** and **(2.16)** yields

$$
\left(1 - \frac{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}\right) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}} \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left[\left(K + D_{\psi \mathbf{v}}\right) \nabla \psi + D_{\mathbf{TV}}^{\psi} \nabla T + K \underline{k} \right] - S \quad (2.17)
$$

where use has been made of the fact that

$$
\frac{\partial \theta_{a}}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}
$$

2.2.2 Heat Conservation

Let S_h denote the total heat content per unit volume of porous medium. Then the expression of de Vries **(1958),** generalized for a hysteretic soil, is

$$
S_h = (C_d + c_p \rho_v \theta_a + c_g \rho_g \theta) (T - T_o)
$$

+
$$
L_o \rho_v \theta_a - \rho_g \int_{t_o} W \frac{d\theta}{d\tau} d\tau
$$
 (2.18)

in which

$$
C_d
$$
 is the heat capacity of dry soil plus roots, bulk volume basis [cal cm⁻³°K⁻¹]
\nc_p is the specific heat of water vapor at constant pressure [cal g⁻¹°K⁻¹]
\n C_{ℓ} is the specific heat of liquid water [cal g⁻¹°K⁻¹]
\n T_0 is the arbitrary reference temperature [°K]
\n L_0 is the latent heat of vaporization, L, evaluated at T = T_0 [cal g⁻¹]
\n T_0

where

 $\ddot{}$

L is the latent heat of vaporization [cal g^{-1}]

W is the differential heat of wetting
$$
[cal g^{-1}]
$$

The differential heat of wetting, W, is the amount of heat released when a small amount of free water is added to the soil matrix (Edlefson and Anderson, 1943). Note that C_d is taken to include all organic material, living roots in particular. The heat capacity of air is neglected.

Following the general approach of de Vries **(1958),** we tentatively express the heat flux as

$$
\underline{q}_{h} = -\lambda_{*}\nabla T + L_{0}\underline{q}_{v} + c_{p}(T - T_{0})\underline{q}_{v} + c_{l}(T - T_{0})\underline{q}_{l} + c_{l}(T - T_{0})\underline{q}_{r}
$$
\n(2.19)

in which

and

$$
\frac{q}{m} \text{ is the heat flux in the medium} \qquad \text{[cal cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}\text{]}
$$
\n
$$
\lambda_{\star} \text{ is the thermal conductivity of bulk medium [cal cm}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1}\text{)}
$$

The first term in **(2.19)** is simple conduction in all phases of the medium, the second is latent heat transport (convection) in the vapor phase,while the remaining terms represent the sensible heat convected **by** vapor, soil liquid, and root water. Convection of air, as well as radiative transfer, is considered negligible.

The basic thermodynamic relation

$$
L_o + c_p (T - T_o) = L + c_g (T - T_o)
$$
 (2.20)

may be used to convert Equation **(2.19)** to

$$
\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{h}} = -\lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \nabla \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{L} \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{v}} + \mathbf{c}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} (\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{o}}) \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{m}}
$$
 (2.21)

where q_m has been defined in Equation (2.14). Let us substitute for q_V using (2.12). This yields

$$
\underline{q}_{h} = - (\lambda_{\star} + \rho_{\ell} L D_{T\mathbf{v}}^{\psi}) \nabla T - \rho_{\ell} L D_{\psi\mathbf{v}} \nabla \psi + c_{\ell} (T - T_{o}) \underline{q}_{m} \quad (2.22)
$$

The two terms multiplying VT are not strictly additive (de Vries, **1958),** as was assumed in the statement of Equation **(2.19).** The two effects interact, resulting in an effective thermal conductivity, λ^{ψ} , which depends strongly on 0, as discussed in Chapter **3.** We therefore replace Equation (2.22) with the following:

$$
\underline{q}_{h} = -\lambda^{\psi} \nabla T - \rho_{\psi} L D_{\psi v} \nabla \psi + c_{\psi} (T - T_{o}) \underline{q}_{m}
$$
 (2.23)

The substitution of Equations **(2.18)** and **(2.23)** into (2.1) yields the heat conservation equation,

$$
C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + [L_0 + c_p (T - T_0)] \theta_a \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial t}
$$

+
$$
[c_g \rho_g (T - T_0) - \rho_g W - c_p \rho_v (T - T_0) - L_0 \rho_v] \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}
$$

=
$$
\nabla \cdot [\lambda^{\psi} \nabla T + \rho_g L D_{\psi v} \nabla \psi - c_g (T - T_0) \underline{q}_m]
$$
(2.24)

in which

$$
C = C_d + c_p \rho_v \theta_a + c_g \rho_g \theta
$$

= bulk heat capacity [cal cm⁻³°K⁻¹]

Two more equivalent forms of the heat equation may be generated **by** application of the mass conservation equation **(2.17).** Let us first assume that the temporal variations in the amount of water stored in the root system are negligible. Then, from Equation **(2.16),**

$$
S = \nabla \cdot (\underline{q}_r / \rho_0) \tag{2.25}
$$

This may be used to eliminate **S** from Equation **(2.17)** for use in the development below.

Multiplying Equation **(2.17) by** the quantity

$$
\rho_{\hat{\chi}}[L_o + c_p(T - T_o)]
$$

and subtracting the result from Equation (2.24), we obtain

$$
C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - (\rho_{\ell} L + \rho_{\ell} W) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}
$$

= $\nabla \cdot [\lambda^{\psi} \nabla T + \rho_{\ell} L D_{\psi V} \nabla \psi] - c_{\ell} \underline{q}_{m} \cdot \nabla T + L \nabla \cdot \underline{q}_{m}$ (2.26)

Multiplying Equation (2.17) instead by $\rho_{\ell} c_{\ell} (T - T_o)$ and subtracting from Equation (2.24), we find a third variant of the heat equation, which is

$$
C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + L\theta_a \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial t} - (\rho_v L + \rho_g W) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [\lambda^{\psi} \nabla T + \rho_g L D_{\psi v} \nabla \psi] - c_g \mathbf{q}_m \cdot \nabla T
$$
\n(2.27)

On the interior of a suitable space-time domain **D,** Equation **(2.17)** and either (2.24) or one of its variants, together with the
appropriate diagnostic equations, constitute a mathematical model of the coupled distributions of the soil state variables. **A** problem arises in the flux relations (2.14) and **(2.23)** when either a diffusivity or K is discontinuous in space, or in Equation (2.24), for instance, when some of the storage coefficients may be discontinuous. Assuming that the boundary conditions, the initial conditions, and the extraction term, **S,** are smooth functions, the only sources of discontinuities in the equations already derived are spatial discontinuities in **0** resulting from the juxtaposition of different soil types. For convenience in dealing with this problem, we shall restrict **D** to be a domain on whose interior the soil properties are continuous. Such sub-domains may then be linked through the appropriate boundary conditions to describe an overall system.

$2.2.3$ The ψ -T System

It is standard practice to express moisture and heat flow equations in diffusion form. The equation usually used to describe water flow in a porous medium, which neglects temperature and vapor effects, is ordinarily written in terms of a single dependent variable, either ψ (e.g., Whisler and Klute, 1965) or θ (e.g., Klute, 1952). The classical heat equation is naturally expressed in terms of T. Philip and de Vries **(1957),** and then de Vries **(1958),** proposed coupled heat and mass conservation equations with θ and T as the dependent variables.

In this section, the conservation equations derived in the previous sections will be written with ψ and T as dependent variables.

In the following section, we will present the equations in terms of θ and T.

In the storage terms of Equation (2.17), both $\frac{80}{11}$ and $\frac{1}{11}$ are to be expressed in terms of $\frac{94}{94}$ and $\frac{94}{94}$. Expansion of $-\frac{4}{94}$, using Equation **(2.8),** yields

$$
\frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial \psi} \bigg|_{T} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial T} \bigg|_{\psi} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$
(2.28)

Now consider the other time derivative, $\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}$. We assume that θ may be expressed as

$$
\theta = \theta(\psi, T; \underline{R}; \underline{s}) \qquad (2.29)
$$

which is simply an inverse of Equation **(2.5).** Formal differentiation of **(2.29)** yields

$$
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi}\bigg|_{T} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T}\bigg|_{\psi} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial R_{i}} \frac{\partial R_{i}}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial s_{i}} \frac{\partial s_{i}}{\partial t}
$$
(2.30)

(The variables to be held constant in a partial differentiation will be indicated only when they may be ambiguous due to the use of different sets of dependent variables.) In this study, the porous medium is assumed to be non-deforming, so the last summation is dropped. It is quite reasonable to assume the differentiability of **(2.29)** with respect to its arguments, so the first two terms in **(2.30)** are valid. The nature of R , the wetting history, is one of the subjects of Chapter **3.** Here, it is sufficient to note that R is constant as long

as a wetting reversal does not occur. When there is a reversal, \underline{R} has a discontinuity. We must therefore restrict the use of **(2.30)** to time periods during which no reversal occurs. This summation is thus zero.

We now substitute the expansion

$$
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi}\bigg|_{T} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T}\bigg|_{\psi} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$
(2.31)

and Equation **(2.28)** into the basic mass conservation equation **(2.17)** to obtain

$$
\left[\left(1 - \frac{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\rho_{\ell}}\right) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi}\Big|_{T} + \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial \psi}\Big|_{T}\right] \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \left[\left(1 - \frac{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\rho_{\ell}}\right) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T}\Big|_{\psi} + \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial T}\Big|_{\psi}\right] \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$

= $\nabla \cdot \left[(K + D_{\psi \mathbf{v}}) \nabla \psi + D_{\mathbf{Tv}}^{\psi} \nabla T + K \underline{k} \right] - S$ (2.32)

This is a non-linear second-order partial differential equation relating the time derivatives and gradients of the two dependent variables, ψ and T, in an expression of the principle of mass conservation.

The same approach may be used on the various heat equations. They become (from 2.24)

$$
\left\{ C + [L_0 + c_p(T - T_0)] \theta_a \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi} + [c_g \rho_{\ell} (T - T_0) - \rho_{\ell} W - c_p \rho_v (T - T_0) - L_0 \rho_v] \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi} \right\} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \left\{ [L_0 + c_p(T - T_0)] \theta_a \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial \psi} \Big|_{T} + [c_g \rho_{\ell} (T - T_0) - \rho_{\ell} W - c_p \rho_v (T - T_0) - L_0 \rho_v] \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi} \Big|_{T} \right\} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}
$$

$$
= \nabla \cdot [\lambda^{\psi} T + \rho_{\ell} L D_{\text{div}} \nabla \psi - c_{\ell} (T - T_0) \mathbf{q}_m] \tag{2.33}
$$

(from **2.26)**

$$
\begin{bmatrix}\nC - \rho_{\ell}(L + W) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T}\Big|_{\psi}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \left[\rho_{\ell}(L + W) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi}\Big|_{T}\right]\n\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}
$$
\n
$$
= \nabla \cdot \left[\lambda^{\psi} \nabla T + \rho_{\ell} L D_{\psi} \nabla \psi\right] - c_{\ell} \underline{q}_{m} \cdot \nabla T + L \nabla \cdot \underline{q}_{m}
$$
\n(2.34)

(from **2.27)**

$$
\left[C + L \theta_{a} \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial T}\Big|_{\psi} - (\rho_{\ell} W + \rho_{v} L) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T}\Big|_{\psi}\right] \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$

+
$$
\left[L \theta_{a} \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial \psi}\Big|_{T} - (\rho_{\ell} W + \rho_{v} L) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi}\Big|_{T}\right] \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}
$$

=
$$
\nabla \cdot [\lambda^{\psi} \nabla T + \rho_{\ell} L D_{\psi v} \nabla \psi] - c_{\ell} \underline{q}_{m} \cdot \nabla T
$$
(2.35)

Equations **(2.32)** through. **(2.35)** are valid subject to the restrictions placed on the earlier equations from which they are derived, and to the assumptions required **by** the subsequent derivations. In particular, the domain of validity must contain no discontinuities in soil properties and no points at which a wetting reversal occurs during the time of interest. Note, however, that the wetting history may be discontinuous spatially.

All of the equations developed in this section for unsaturated media are equally valid for saturated media when elastic storage can be neglected. This condition is met when the saturated region communicates freely with an unsaturated region. In this case, many of the terms in Equations (2.32) through **(2.35),** including all of the storage terms in the moisture equation, go to zero.

The restriction that no wetting reversal occur is rather limiting. It can, however, be dealt with in an approximate way **by** discretizing the time domain and assuming that changes in wetting history occur in finite regions of space at particular points in time. The solution at the end of one time period provides the initial condition for the following period. Such an approximation is depicted schematically in Figure 2.1 for infiltration into a previously drying soil. The smooth and step-like solid curves are the actual and approximated characteristics of the point at which $\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = 0$. Boundary and initial conditions are employed to match the regions along the vertical and horizontal dashed lines, respectively.

2.2.4 The O-T System

As an alternative to the ψ -T formulation outlined above, we may express the heat and mass continuity equations in terms of θ and T. The **LHS** of Equation **(2.17)** becomes

LHS =
$$
\left(1 - \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_{\ell}} + \frac{\theta_a}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial \theta}\Big|_T\right) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + \left(\frac{\theta_a}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial T}\Big|_{\theta}\right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$
 (2.36)

The time derivative $\frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial t}$ has been expanded above by assuming that, at each point inside the domain of interest, $\psi = \psi(\theta, T)$ (and therefore $\varphi_{_{\bf V}}$ = $\varphi_{_{\bf V}}(\theta,$ T)) is single-valued, i.e., there are no <u>temporal</u> discontinuities in wetting history, and that $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta}$ is finite.

We now consider the moisture fluxes. The gradient of ψ , appearing in the moisture flux expression, can be expanded in a fashion

Figure **2.1**

SCHEMATIC DIAGRAMS OF INFILTRATION, **BEGINNING AT** TIME **t ,** INTO **A** PREVIOUSLY DRYING, **HOMOGENEOUS** SOIL **COLUMN** OF **LENGTH** L. (a.) BOUNDARY **BETWEEN WETTING AND** DRYING, SEPARATING TWO TIME-SPACE DOMAINS WITHIN WHICH **EQS. (2.32)** THROUGH **(2.35)** ARE VALID. **(b.) AN** APPROXIMATION OF THE WETTING BOUNDARY **AND** THE ASSOCIATED REGIONS $(1-5)$ OF VALIDITY OF THE (ψ, T) EQUATIONS.

analogous to **(2.30),**

$$
\nabla \psi = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta} \bigg|_{T} \nabla \theta + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial T} \bigg|_{\theta} \nabla T + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial R_i} \nabla R_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial s_i} \nabla s_i \qquad (2.37)
$$

Since the domain has been restricted to one in which s is continuous, the last term is well-defined. The third term requires that wetting history be continuous in space. In a non-hysteretic, homogeneous soil, **(2.37)** reduces to

$$
\nabla \psi = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta} \bigg|_{T} \quad \nabla \theta \quad + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial T} \bigg|_{\theta} \quad \nabla T \tag{2.38}
$$

which is the relation used **by** Philip and de Vries **(1957).** An expression similar to **(2.37),** but neglecting the effects of temperature and inhomogeneity, was suggested **by** Childs (1964).

Substitution of **(2.36)** and **(2.37)** into the mass conservation equation **(2.17)** yields

$$
\left(1 - \frac{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\rho_{\ell}} + \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial \theta}\Big|_{T}\right) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + \left[\frac{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial T}\Big|_{\theta}\right] \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$

$$
= \nabla \cdot \left\{\left[\left(K + D_{\psi \mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta}\Big|_{T}\right] \nabla \theta + \left[\left(K + D_{\psi \mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial T}\Big|_{\theta} + D_{T \mathbf{v}}^{\psi}\right] \nabla T + \left(K + D_{\psi \mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial T}\Big|_{T}\right\} - S \tag{2.39}
$$

in which

$$
\underline{G} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial R_i} \nabla R_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial s_i} \nabla s_i
$$
 (2.40)

In order to reformulate the heat equations, we first adopt a new expression for the heat flux,

$$
\underline{q}_{h} = -\lambda^{\theta} \nabla T - \rho_{\alpha} L D_{\theta\nu} \nabla \theta + c_{\alpha} (T - T_{o}) \underline{q}_{m}
$$
 (2.41)

in which λ^{θ} is analogous to λ^{ψ} defined earlier, but represents the effective thermal conductivity in the θ -T system. The individual components of **(2.23)** and (2.41) are therefore not identical, although their sums are. The diffusivity $D_{\theta V}$ is the analogue of $D_{\psi V}$ and is given by

$$
D_{\theta v} = D_{\psi v} \left. \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta} \right|_{T}
$$
 (2.42)

This is derived by expanding $\nabla \psi$ in Equation (2.12).

In the θ -T system, Equation (2.24) is

$$
\left\{ C + [L_{o} + c_{p}(T - T_{o})] \theta_{a} \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial T} \Big|_{\theta} \right\} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$

+
$$
\left\{ [L_{o} + c_{p}(T - T_{o})] \theta_{a} \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{T} + c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T - T_{o}) - \rho_{\ell} W \right\}
$$

-
$$
- c_{p} \rho_{v} (T - T_{o}) - L_{o} \rho_{v} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}
$$

=
$$
\nabla \cdot [\lambda^{\theta} \nabla T + \rho_{\ell} L D_{\theta v} \nabla \theta - c_{\ell} (T - T_{o}) \underline{q}_{m}]
$$
(2.43)

Equation **(2.26)** becomes

$$
C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - (\rho_{\ell} L + \rho_{\ell} W) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [\lambda^{\theta} \nabla T + \rho_{\ell} L D_{\theta V} \nabla \theta] - c_{\ell} \mathbf{q}_{m} \cdot \nabla T + L \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_{m}
$$
\n(2.44)

and Equation **(2.27)** is equivalent to

 $\bar{\beta}$

Figure 2.2

AN APPROXIMATION OF THE WETTING BOUNDARY **AND** THE **ASSOCIATED** REGIONS **(1-8)** OF VALIDITY OF THE (e, T) **EQUATIONS, (2.39)** AND (2.43) THROUGH (2.45), FOR THE INFILTRATION **PROCESS** OF FIGURE 2.1.

$$
\left[C + L\theta_a \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial T} \Big|_{\theta} \right] \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \left[L\theta_a \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{T} - \rho_v L - \rho_g W \right] \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}
$$

= $\nabla \cdot [\lambda^{\theta} \nabla T + \rho_g L D_{\theta v} \nabla \theta] - c_g \underline{q_m} \cdot \nabla T$ (2.45)

Equation (2.45) is the form of the heat equation that should correspond to Equation **(16)** of de Vries **(1958).** In fact, there is a slight discrepancy, which apparently results from that author omitting the term $\rho_{\rho}D_{\text{TV}}$ $\nabla T \cdot \nabla L$. It turns out that Equation (2.45) is more compact, combining two of de Vries' transport terms into one.

The domain of validity for the θ -T equations must have no discontinuities in soil properties, no spatial or temporal discontinuities in wetting history, and no regions in which $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta}$ is infinite. The last restriction limits applicability to unsaturated soils.

For the wetting process considered earlier (Figure 2.1), the necessary sub-domain divisions for use of the θ -T equations are depicted in Figure 2.2.

2.2.5 Simplifications for Relatively Moist Media

Many terms in the equations derived in the preceding sections are often negligible for practical analyses. In this section, a simplified system is derived **by** neglecting mass and energy transport in the vapor phase. As can be seen from an analysis of the transport coefficients (Chapter **3),** this is a good approximation for sufficiently moist media; exact criteria will depend on the medium in question.

Neglecting mass storage and flux in the vapor phase, we

obtain the usual mass conservation equation of soil physics with an added sink term

$$
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (K \nabla \psi + K \underline{k}) - S \tag{2.46}
$$

The expression for heat storage is

$$
S_h = (C_d + c_g \rho_g \theta) (T - T_o)
$$
 (2.47)

and the heat flux is given **by**

$$
\underline{q}_h = -\lambda_0 \nabla T + c_\ell (T - T_o) (\underline{q}_m + \underline{q}_r)
$$
 (2.48)

where λ_0 does not allow for vapor distillation. The heat conservation equation is thus

$$
C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T - T_{o}) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}
$$

= $\nabla \cdot (\lambda_{o} \nabla T) - c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T - T_{o}) \nabla \cdot (q_{m}/\rho_{\ell} + q_{r}/\rho_{\ell})$
- $c_{\ell} (q_{m} + q_{r}) \cdot \nabla T$ (2.49)

Applying mass continuity in Equation (2.49), we obtain

$$
C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (\lambda_0 \nabla T) - c_g (q_m + q_r) \cdot \nabla T
$$
 (2.50)

The expansions used in Sections **2.2.3** and 2.2.4 may be applied to these equations in order to obtain ψ -T and θ -T systems.

In Equations (2.48) and (2.49), λ_{o} may be replaced by an effective conductivity, λ^{ψ} , which includes heat transport by vapor

distillation. The effective value is the one that would be measured experimentally, and it is just as easily computed theoretically as is λ_{α} .

2.3 Boundary and Initial Conditions for Vertical Flow

2.3.1 Surface Boundary Conditions

We now consider the specification of boundary conditions for the equations developed in the previous sections. In particular, we consider a natural soil system in which horizontal flow is negligible. An idealized bare (i.e., non-vegetated) soil surface is assumed. (Accordingly, root water flow is now neglected.) The idealization consists of the following additional assumptions:

- **1.** The land surface is approximately horizontal, and all mass and energy flow is normal thereto.
- 2. The interface between soil and atmosphere is a smooth flat plane. This surface is treated as a radiation source and sink, and as a momentum sink. (See Geiger, **1975, p. 18,** for the extreme extinction depths of solar radiation in soil.) Since vapor flux is allowed within the soil, it is not necessary to confine evaporation (that is, phase change to vapor) to the surface.
- **3.** Excess rainfall is stored on the surface up to a depth ε_{α} . Further excess is discharged from the system as surface runoff.
- 4. There is no lateral surface inflow to the system,

With the surface described above, it is possible to outline the various states (boundary conditions) that may come to be. Considering a sufficiently intense and lengthy rainstorm, followed **by** a sufficiently long period of high potential evaporation, we may distinguish the following states of the surface:

- **A.** Precipitation begins. At first, infiltration proceeds at the precipitation rate and there is no surface retention or runoff. The moisture content near the surface of the soil increases.
- B. When the soil surface reaches saturation, the rate of infiltration decreases, eventually approaching the saturation value of K. Ponding of water on the surface results.
- **C.** Surface retention storage capacity is filled. **All** further excess precipitation is discharged as surface runoff.
- **D.** Rainfall ends. Surface retention is depleted from above **by** evaporation and from below **by** infiltration.
- **E.** Surface storage is exhausted. Evaporation from the soil proceeds at the potential rate.
- F. The soil becomes so dry at the surface that moist air in equilibrium with it has relative humidity h significantly less than unity (Equation **2.8).**
- **G.** Eventually, another rainfall will return the system to state **A.**

Of course, not all of these states need occur for all meteorological input series. This conceptual model is similar to that proposed **by** Hillel **(1977).**

We now proceed to define mathematically the boundary conditions implied **by** states **A** through F above.

A. Unsaturated infiltration. This condition is simply expressed **by**

$$
\underline{k} \cdot (\underline{q}_m / \rho_{\ell})_{z=0} = -r \tag{2.51}
$$

where the coordinate, **z,** is measured relative to the land surface, and $r = \text{precipitation rate}$ [cm s⁻¹]

The flux of heat into the soil is given **by** an energy balance at the land surface,

$$
\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_h \Big|_{z=0} = - \mathbf{I}_s + \mathbf{I}_\ell + \mathbf{H} - \rho_\ell c_\ell (\mathbf{T}_r - \mathbf{T}_o) \ \mathbf{r} \tag{2.52}
$$

in which

 $\overline{1}$

$$
\mathfrak{q}_h \Big|_{z=0} = \mathfrak{q}_h \text{ at surface (given by Equation (2.23) or (2.41))}
$$
\n
$$
[cal cm^{-2} s^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
I_s = net \text{ shortwave radiation reaching surface from sky}
$$
\n
$$
[cal cm^{-2} s^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
I_{\ell} = net \text{ longwave radiation leaving surface [cal cm}^{-2} s^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
H = sensible heat transfer upwards [cal cm^{-2} s^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
T = template of precipitation [°K]
$$
\n
$$
(may be assumed equal to ambient air temperature)
$$

B. Saturated infiltration with rainfall. The pressure head is nonnegative and equal to the depth of ponded water,

$$
\psi\Big|_{z=0} = \varepsilon \tag{2.53}
$$

where **e** is the water depth [cm], whose growth is described **by**

$$
\frac{d\varepsilon}{dt} = r + (q_m/\rho_\ell)_{z=0} \cdot \underline{k} \tag{2.54}
$$

The heat flux boundary condition is derived **by** considering a heat balance for the ponded water, where the control volume has its top at the moving water surface and its bottom at an infinitesimally small depth beneath the ground surface.

Considering the shallow depth of the ponded water and the mixing induced **by** falling raindrops, the temperature of the water will be constant over z and equal to the soil temperature at $z = 0$. This holds well even after the rain has ceased (Geiger, **1975, p. 190).**

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[c_{\hat{\chi}} \rho_{\hat{\chi}} \epsilon(T) \right]_{z=0} - T_o \right) = c_{\hat{\chi}} \rho_{\hat{\chi}} (T_r - T_o) r + \underline{k} \cdot q_h \Big|_{z=0} - H + I_s - I_{\hat{\chi}} \tag{2.55}
$$

where

$$
I_s
$$
 = the total shortwave radiation absorbed by the water and by the surface of the soil

 I_{ϱ} = the net longwave back radiation leaving the water surface. Combining (2.54) and **(2.55),** we obtain the surface heat flux

$$
\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_h \Big|_{z=0} = c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} \epsilon \frac{\partial \underline{T}}{\partial t} \Big|_{z=0} - c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (\underline{T}_r - \underline{T} \Big|_{z=0}) r
$$

+ $c_{\ell} \underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_m (\underline{T} \Big|_{z=0} - \underline{T}_o) + H - \underline{T}_s + \underline{T}_\ell$ (2.56)

C. Surface retention full. The pressure head is given **by**

$$
\psi\Big|_{z=0} = \varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 \tag{2.57}
$$

The heat balance yields

$$
\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_h \Big|_{z=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} [c_\ell \rho_\ell \epsilon_o (T \Big|_{z=0} - T_o)] - c_\ell \rho_\ell (T_r - T_o) r
$$

+ H - I_s + I_\ell + c_\ell \rho_\ell (T \Big|_{z=0} - T_o) R_s (2.58)

where R_{s} is the surface runoff rate $\begin{bmatrix} cm & s^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$. Applying the mass continuity principle to the ponded water, we obtain

$$
\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_h \Big|_{z=0} = c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} \epsilon_o \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \Big|_{z=0} - c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T_r - T \Big|_{z=0}) r
$$

+ $c_{\ell} \underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_m (T \Big|_{z=0} - T_o) + H - I_s + I_{\ell}$ (2.59)

which is the same as Equation **(2.56).**

D. Surface retention depletion without rainfall. The pressure head at the ground surface is

$$
\psi\Big|_{z=0} = \varepsilon \tag{2.60}
$$

where

$$
\frac{d\varepsilon}{dt} = \underline{k} \cdot (\underline{q}_m / \rho_\ell)_{z=0} - e \tag{2.61}
$$

and e \lceil cm s⁻¹] is the actual rate of evaporation (vertical vapor flux above the ground surface), given **by** the flux-gradient relation

$$
e = - K_a (\rho_a - \rho_v) / \rho_{\ell} \qquad (2.62)
$$

in which

$$
K_a
$$
 = a vapor transport coefficient [cm s⁻¹]
 ρ_a = water vapor density at height z = a [g cm⁻³]

The heat balance now includes an evaporation term:

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} \epsilon(T \Big|_{z=0} - T_o) \right] = \underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_h \Big|_{z=0} - \left[L_o + c_p (T \Big|_{z=0} - T_o) \right] \rho_{\ell} e
$$

- H + I_s + I_l (2.63)

In combination with **(2.60)** and (2.20), **(2.61)** leads to

$$
\frac{k \cdot q_h}{2} \bigg|_{z=0} = c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} \varepsilon \left. \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \right|_{z=0} + c_{\ell} (T \bigg|_{z=0} - T_o) \frac{k \cdot q_m}{2} \bigg|_{z=0} + H - I_s
$$
\n
$$
+ I_{\ell} + \rho_{\ell} L e \qquad (2.64)
$$

E. Potential rate evaporation from soil surface. The mass flux condition is

$$
\underline{k} \cdot (\underline{q}_m / \rho_{\ell})_{z=0} = e \tag{2.65}
$$

with e given **by** Equation **(2.62).**

The heat balance is

$$
\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_h \Big|_{z=0} = [L_o + c_p(T \Big|_{z=0} - T_o)] \underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_m \Big|_{z=0} + H - I_s + I_\ell \qquad (2.66)
$$

or

$$
\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_h \Big|_{z=0} = \rho_{\hat{\chi}} \underline{\mathrm{Le}} + c_{\hat{\chi}} \rho_{\hat{\chi}} (\underline{r} \Big|_{z=0} - \underline{r}_o) \underline{\mathrm{e}} + \underline{H} - \underline{I}_s + \underline{I}_{\hat{\chi}} \tag{2.67}
$$

F. Soil-limited evaporation. Although this stage is often modeled differently than the previous one, the equations derived for stage **E** are also valid here. This is true because the concept of potential evaporation has not been introduced.

2.3.2 The Bottom Boundary Conditions

If there is an unconfined aquifer (saturated zone), then the lower boundary condition on moisture may be expressed

$$
\psi \bigg|_{z=z_{\rm s}} = 0 \tag{2.68}
$$

where $|z_{\rm s}|$ is the depth to the water table. Significant variation of z_s with time is a possibility in many systems. We may simulate this fluctuation **by** assuming a linear storage model for the aquifer

$$
n \frac{dz_{s}}{dt} = -\underline{k} \cdot (\underline{q}_{m}/\rho_{\hat{\chi}})_{z=z_{s}} - \beta (z_{s} - z_{o})
$$
 (2.69)

in which

^z**=** elevation of water table [cm] **⁵** β = groundwater discharge coefficient $[s^{-1}]$ z_o = base water table elevation [cm]

The last term in Equation **(2.69)** is lateral discharge from (to) the aquifer.

When it is known *a priori* that all infiltrated water eventually evaporates, and that there is no deep source of water for the soil zone, then the phreatic aquifer need not be modeled. In this case, the boundary condition is specified at a depth $|z_M|$, at which no moisture flow occurs,

$$
\frac{k \cdot q}{2m} \bigg|_{Z_{\mathbf{M}}} = 0 \tag{2.70}
$$

The lower heat boundary condition may be specified at a depth $|z_{\rm T}|$ where $\nabla \psi$ and ∇T are negligible (see 2.23)

$$
\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_h \Big|_{z=z_T} = c (T - T_o) \underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}_m \Big|_{z=z_T}
$$
 (2.71)

In general, either $|z_M|$ or $|z_T|$ may be greater.

2.3.3 Initial Conditions

The initial values of $\psi(z)$ or $\theta(z)$, as well as T(z), must be specified over the appropriate range of z. In addition, for hysteretic soils, the relevant wetting history information $R(z)$ must be given. The initial conditions are all specified at some time $t = t_0$ at the beginning of the time domain of interest.

2.3.4 Sub-domain Matching Conditions

Since we have restricted the governing equations to be

applicable only for domains in which certain continuity conditions are satisfied, it may not be possible to describe a particular problem in terms of a single set of dependent variables defined over the entire region. Instead, it will be necessary to apply the appropriate equations within each valid sub-domain and to match these individual solutions **by** applying physical principles along the discontinuity. As an example, consider the case of a texturally stratified soil in which a discontinuity in soil properties exists along some surface Γ . The curve Γ splits the domain of interest into two sub-domains, D_1 and D_2 . Then we define ψ (or θ) and T fields within each domain and invoke the heat and mass equations.

$$
H(\psi^{(1)}, T^{(1)}) = 0
$$
 on D_1 (2.72a)

$$
M(\psi^{(1)}, T^{(1)}) = 0
$$
 on D_1 (2.72b)

$$
H(\psi^{(2)}, T^{(2)}) = 0
$$
 on D_2 (2.72c)

$$
M(\psi^{(2)}, T^{(2)}) = 0
$$
 on D_2 (2.72d)

where the superscript indexes the sub-domain and H and M represent the conservation equations. Portions of the boundaries of D_1 and D_2 will already have boundary conditions specified, since they lie on the boundary of **D.** Along F, however, additional conditions must be applied to link the sub-domains. These are obtained **by** requiring the continuity of temperature and pressure head, as well as normal mass and heat fluxes, across Γ . Mathematically, on Γ ,

$$
T^{(1)} = T^{(2)} \tag{2.73a}
$$

$$
\psi^{(1)} = \psi^{(2)} \tag{2.73b}
$$

$$
q_h^{(1)} \cdot \underline{n} = q_h^{(2)} \cdot \underline{n}
$$
 (2.73c)

$$
\underline{q}_{m}^{(1)} \cdot \underline{n} = \underline{q}_{m}^{(2)} \cdot \underline{n} \tag{2.73d}
$$

where n is the unit vector normal to Γ .

The procedure described above can be generalized to any number of sub-domains. Furthermore, Γ may be a moving boundary, such as a surface on which a wetting reversal is occurring.

The problem of a time discontinuity at some time t_1 (where initial conditions have been given at time $t_o < t₁$) is treated by solving the system from $t = t_0$ to $t = t_1$ and then starting from $t = t_1$ with the initial conditions given **by** the final solution from the previous time period.

2.4 Discussion of ψ- versus θ-based Systems

There are several significant differences between the ψ -based and θ -based equations. These are briefly reviewed here. Applicability. The use of ψ preserves the validity of the derived equations in saturated media. The θ -based equations employ the derivative $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta}$, which becomes infinite in saturated media, so ψ must then be used. Note that saturation may occur not only beneath the water table, but also in the cases of surface ponding and minor, temporary "perched water tables" that result from certain media discontinuities. Sub-domain transitions. Whenever R or s is discontinuous, the separate sub-domains must be matched as described in Section 2.3.4. The matching

condition $\psi^{(1)} = \psi^{(2)}$ is mathematically simpler when ψ is the dependent variable than when θ is. Note also that for discontinuous s , θ will itself be discontinuous, which is an undesirable attribute for a dependent variable.

Flux expressions. The mass flux expressions (and the convective heat flux terms) are somewhat simpler when $\nabla \psi$ instead of $\nabla \theta$ is used (e.g., Equation **(2.32)** versus **(2.39)).** This is due to the term **G,** which represents that part of the gradient of ψ resulting from gradients in s and R. However, if s and R are constant within a sub-domain, this distinction disappears.

Storage expressions. Moisture and heat storage terms are more conveniently expressed in terms of θ . When ψ is used, time changes in θ must be separated into those due to $\frac{S_{\mathbf{F}}}{\gamma_{\mathbf{F}}}$ and $\frac{S_{\mathbf{F}}}{\gamma_{\mathbf{F}}}$ (e.g., Equation T ψ **(2.25)** versus **(2.38)).**

Finally, we note that the choice between ψ and θ is not necessarily required; in theory, we can have "the best of both worlds." Retention of both θ and ψ as well as $\rho_{\mathbf{v}}$ in the particular terms where they arise naturally from the physics is also correct (e.g., Equation **(2.15)).** Exclusive use of one or the other in the derivatives is a mathematical technique that results in equations that may submit more readily to analysis.

In the following chapters, ψ will be treated as a dependent variable, and **0** will be considered a variable parameter whose value is determined by the state variables (ψ, T, R) through a diagnostic relation.

Chapter **3**

THE STORAGE **AND** TRANSPORT COEFFICIENTS OF WATER

AND HEAT IN **POROUS** MEDIA

3.1 Introduction

The various conservation equations derived in Chapter 2 are different expressions of only two independent prognostic (i.e., containing time derivatives) equations, those of mass and heat conservation. They contain more than two variables, however, since the storage and transport coefficients are not constants, but are functions of the state variables. This chapter contains the definitions of the diagnostic (i.e., lacking time derivatives) equations, which express the dependence of the conservation equation coefficients on a set of state variables.

Due to the complications of hysteresis, more than two state variables are required to describe the system dynamics properly. Indeed, the state set is potentially infinite-dimensional. This issue is dealt with first. **A** proposed model of the water retention process gives rise to the appropriate state set and, in effect, provides the extra prognostic relation necessary to predict the time path of the state set.

Having selected a complete state set, we proceed to define, as functions of the state variables, the other variables appearing in the conservation equations. These definitions constitute the necessary set of diagnostic equations.

In order to facilitate the computer modeling of moisture and heat transport in the soil, we seek analytical expressions defining the

diagnostic relations. Such formulations allow the experimental variation of soil properties in a simulation model with a minimum of effort. Given good mathematical models of the relevant physical properties of the soil, the behavior of all types of soils can be reproduced simply **by** varying a finite number of parameters.

The parameters of these models may also provide an objective means for hydrologic classification of soils, since there is a one-to-one correspondence between a particular soil and its parameters in a welldefined model. However, the usefulness of such a scheme would not be great unless the parameters could be related directly to some intrinsic, measurable characteristic of the soil. Direct physical significance of the parameters might therefore be considered another attribute of a good soil parameterization.

The macroscopic (hence, integrated, derived or statistical) nature of many of the important variables makes purely theoretical analyses of them difficult or impossible. Conceptual and empirical models therefore arise out of necessity. For the purposes of simulation, any distinction along these lines is immaterial. Provided a model is sufficiently complex to reproduce reasonably well all types of soil behavior, yet is simple enough to be manageable computationally, its origin is not critical. In general, a theoretical model is used here when a realistic one exists. Otherwise, a conceptual or empirical model is used.

3.2 The Retention of Water in a Porous Medium

3.2.1 A Qualitative Physical Description of Water Retention

The matric (or pressure) potential, ψ , is a variable employed in soil science to describe the energy level of liquid water within an unsaturated porous medium. The quantity $g\psi$ is the amount of work that must be done to move a unit mass of water, isothermally and reversibly, from a porous medium to the free (flat surface) state. The datum for ψ is thus conventionally specified as free liquid water at a fixed temperature, T_{0} , and at atmospheric pressure. Units of ψ are [cm].

The sum of matric plus gravity head may be viewed as a potential, the gradient of which is proportional to the force that causes liquid flow. This mechanical definition is suggestive of, and consistent with, the flux-gradient equation **(2.3)** when inertial terms are small, the net driving force on a "particle" of water being balanced **by** (velocity-proportional) viscous dissipation of energy (Philip, **1960).**

In thermodynamic terms, ψ is related to the specific differential Gibbs free energy function. Its gradient is thus a measure of the magnitude of local thermodynamic disequilibrium.

The forces ordinarily considered to be the determinants of ψ in unsaturated media are capillarity, which is manifested in the pressure differences across curved air-water interfaces under surface tension, and adsorption, which involves the relatively short-distance interaction of water with the surface of the solid (mineral) phase of the medium. The magnitudes of these forces are determined **by** the microscopic distribution of water in the medium, **by** the temperature, and **by** the nature of the

medium itself. The term "matric" potential satisfactorily accounts for both capillarity and adsorption as inseparable facets of the interaction of water with the soil matrix.

In saturated media, the term "pressure" potential is preferable, being more justifiable physically. We follow convention in using the same symbol, ψ , in saturated media. The resulting continuity between saturated and unsaturated regimes is quite convenient.

In relatively moist media, the effect of capillarity is dominant in determining ψ . Only the largest pores are air-filled, and the air-water interface has relatively small curvature. The pressure in the water just beneath the interface is (Bear, **1977)**

$$
P_{w} = P_{a} + \frac{2\sigma}{r_{c}}
$$
 (3.1)

in which

$$
p_w = \text{pressure in water} \qquad \qquad [\text{dynes cm}^{-2}]
$$
\n
$$
p_a = \text{pressure in air} \qquad \qquad [\text{dynes cm}^{-2}]
$$
\n
$$
\sigma = \text{interfacial surface tension} \qquad \qquad [\text{dynes cm}^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
r_c = \text{harmonic mean radius of curvature of the} \qquad [\text{cm}]
$$
\n
$$
\text{interface, negative for a concave water}
$$
\n
$$
\text{surface}
$$

In this situation, ψ is given by

$$
\psi = \frac{1}{\nu} \sqrt{\gamma} = \frac{2\sigma}{r_c \gamma} \tag{3.2}
$$

where

$$
\gamma = \rho_0 g = \text{specific gravity of liquid water}
$$
 [dyne cm⁻³]

and, in accordance with the definition of a datum for ψ , we have set $p_a = 0$. (It is assumed that the air pressure within the soil is in static equilibrium with the atmosphere.)

The amount of water retained at a given level of ψ in the capillary regime is thus determined **by** the distribution of the larger pore sizes. It follows that soil structure **-** the nature of aggregation of the soil - is a strong factor in determining the relation between ψ and θ for large θ .

As water is removed from the medium, the remaining water is, on the average, increasingly closer to the soild soil surfaces. The effect of adsorption thus takes over at low values of θ (and of ψ). In the adsorption regime, the moisture content at fixed ψ for any soil is correlated with the specific surface of the medium and can therefore be considered a function of soil texture.

Hillel **(1971),** on the basis of these considerations, describes how soil moisture characteristics (functions $\psi(\theta)$ for a particular soil at a fixed temperature and fixed wetting history) typically differ for various soils. The influence of texture is shown in Figure **3.1.** For fixed ψ , the clayey (high specific surface) soil retains more water than a soil with fewer fine particles. In contrast, a well-sorted sand loses practically all of its water when a critical pressure $(\gamma \psi)$ corresponding to the characteristic pore size is reached. Note also that heavier (more clay-like) soils tend to have larger porosities.

THE INFLUENCE OF SOIL TEXTURE **ON** MOISTURE **RETENTION** (After Hillel, **1971.)**

THE **INFLUENCE** OF SOIL **STRUCTURE ON MOISTURE** RETENTION (After Hillel, **1971.)**

The influence of soil structure (Figure **3.2)** is limited to the capillary regime, since a rearrangement of the soil particles of a given soil cannot result in a texture change. **A** well-aggregated soil behaves somewhat like a sand in the capillary regime, while a compacted, structureless version of the same soil exhibits a more gradual slope of the moisture characteristic.

The value of ψ at the boundary between the capillary and adsorption regimes, if indeed such a boundary can be defined, has not been clearly determined. Miller and Miller **(1955)** suggest that the capillary theory of soil water is valid "at least in the coarse-silt-tosand range, assuming agriculturally useful levels of available water are present." This qualification implies that Ψ is above the wilting point, about **-15,000** cm. This corresponds to a **pF** of 4.2, where **pF** is defined **by**

$$
pF = \log_{10}(-\psi), \quad \psi \text{ in cm.} \tag{3.3}
$$

Buckman and Brady **(1969)** place the division between capillary and hygroscopic (adsorbed) water at about **pF =** 4.5. Hillel **(1971)** states that capillarity is dominant below **pF = 3.0,** while adsorption is increasingly important at higher **pF.**

Carman and Raal **(1951)** observed that the condensation and adsorption of freon gas on packed (porous) powders exceeded that on loose powders for **pF** up to around **6.0.** They interpreted the data as implying that capillarity must also play a role in retention even at such large

pF. Philip and de Vries **(1957)** extended this conclusion, assuming that the results held for water and that they implied that capillarity fully determines moisture retention for **pF** below about **6.0.**

McQueen and Miller (1974) argue that the probable absence of tensile strength, especially in natural water, is reason to limit the validity of capillary theory to positive absolute pressures. The probability of vaporization at low, positive absolute pressures further limits the theory. The resultant conclusion is that capillarity is important only below $pF \approx 3.0$.

In actuality, the interaction of capillarity and adsorption is usually important (Edlefson and Anderson, 1943). Close to the soil particles, the adsorptive force fields are strong and, as a result, the pressure is "hydrostatically" distributed. The total (capillary plus adsorption) potential is constant locally, though the individual components vary over short (microscale) distances. Pressure will therefore be lowest at the air-water interface (i.e., farthest from the solid surface), and this is where the capillary formula is most likely to hold.

Since it is not clear, say, what range of **pF** may be treated using capillary theories, we shall be careful not to assume a particular model **of** soil behavior without attempting to find experimental justification. It will be seen, however, that the lack of knowledge concerning real soil properties necessitates the extrapolation of theoretical models beyond the ideal conditions of their formulation.

3.2.2 Hysteresis in the Moisture Retention Process

Hysteresis of the soil moisture characteristic is a nonuniqueness of the "functions" $\psi(\theta)$ and $\theta(\psi)$ for a particular soil at fixed temperature. When a completely water-saturated porous medium is dried continuously to complete dryness, the matric potential decreases monotonically from zero to some value near $\psi = -10^7$ (pF = 7). (Although the exact maximum **pF** may depend on the particular soil and the definition of complete dryness, we may arbitrarily define $\theta = 0$ at $pF = 7.0$ and consider any liquid that is more tightly bound to be part of the solid phase of the medium. This approach is justified since the soil is never subjected to stresses greater than those equivalent to **pF = 7,** corresponding to a relative humidity, by Equation (2.8) of about 10^{-3} .) This initial drying process is depicted **by** curve **A** in Figure **3.3.**

Upon re-wetting (curve B), it is observed that curve **A** is not re-traced. The liquid content during re-wetting is less than that during drying for a large range of ψ . In particular, for $\psi = 0$, the soil does not return to full saturation, as the presence of entrapped air reduces the pore space available for water. Only after a long period of time (on the order of weeks) does the entrapped air dissolve and diffuse out of the system, allowing complete water-saturation (Adam and Corey, **1968).**

If the soil is re-dried before the air is removed, a curve like **C** is traced. Subsequent complete drying and wetting proceeds along the cycle of curves B and **C,** which are termed the main wetting and drying curves, respectively. When wetting reversals occur anywhere other than at the common endpoints of curves B and **C,** they result in scanning curves,

THE HYSTERETIC SOIL-WATER RETENTION **PROCESS**

- **A** first drying curve
- B main wetting curve
C main drying curve
- main drying curve
- D primary wetting curve
E primary drying curve
- **E** primary drying curve
- F secondary drying curve

such as **D, E,** and F in Figure **3.3.** Curves **D** and **E** are primary wetting and drying (scanning) curves, while F is a secondary drying (scanning) curve. It is apparent from Figure **3.3** that the relation between moisture content, θ , and matric potential, ψ , at any time is dependent upon the wetting history of the medium.

Several explanations for the hysteretic behavior of the soil moisture characteristic have been suggested. The most popular model, which has been quite successful, explains the phenomenon in terms of capillarity and the so-called ink-bottle effect. In simplest terms, it states that at least some pores (relatively large intergranular voids connected **by** smaller passages) drain and refill at different capillary pressures (hence, matric heads). Miller and Miller **(1956)** recognized this effect as a natural implication of the capillary theory of moisture retention in soils.

Figure 3.4a shows how hysteresis in a single pore could occur, and Figure 3.4b exhibits a hypothetical pair of wetting and drying curves for the pore. The radius of the pore corresponds to ψ = -5 cm. When ψ reaches this value, the pore suddenly fills and the air-water interface migrates up into the next pore, where a new equilibrium is reached. The "neck" connecting these two pores has a radius corresponding to ψ = -15 cm, so a similar jump (termed a Haines jump after the investigator who observed the phenomenon experimentally) occurs when ψ is lowered to that value. The aggregated (macroscopic) interaction of all such pores then determines the behavior of the medium, as shown

 \sim

Figure 3.4

(a) "INK BOTTLE" HYSTERESIS IN **A** SINGLE PORE. (After Miller and Miller, **1956.); (b)** THE ASSOCIATED "MOISTURE RETENTION **CURVE"** FOR THE SINGLE PORE.

 \downarrow

 \mathcal{A}

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

in Figure **3.3.**

Hillel **(1971)** mentions three other possible contributors to hysteresis. The first is the contact angle (or raindrop) effect, which is the dependency of the angle of contact between the air-water interface and the solid phase on the motion of the interface. Entrapped air and swelling and shrinking are further sources of hysteresis.

3.2.3 An Empirical Model of the Main Wetting Curve

For the purpose of simulation, we seek a representation of the hysteretic soil moisture absorption/desorption process discussed in the previous sections. In this section, a mathematical expression for the main wetting curve (curve B of Fig. **3.3)** is chosen. In the next section, a model that expresses the main drying curves and all scanning curves in terms of the main wetting curve is presented. This model of Mualem **(1977)** is modified in this study to account for temperature effects to the first order.

Many empirically-based analytical forms for the isothermal soil moisture characteristic have been proposed. **A** representative, though far from exhaustive, sampling of them is reviewed here.

Brooks and Corey (1964, **1966),** having analyzed the desorption curves for many consolidated rock samples, found that the relation between ψ and θ could be expressed as

$$
\psi = \psi_{\mathbf{b}} \left(\frac{\theta - \theta_{\mathbf{r}}}{\mathbf{n} - \theta_{\mathbf{r}}} \right)^{-1/\lambda} \qquad \qquad \theta > \theta_{\mathbf{r}} \qquad (3.4)
$$

in which

$$
\psi_b = \text{the bubbleing potential}
$$
 [cm]

$$
\theta_r = \text{the residual moisture content}
$$

$$
\lambda = a \text{ fitted parameter}
$$

The empirical constants $\psi_{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathbf{b}}, \theta_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{b}},$ and λ have varying degrees of physical significance. The potential, ψ_b , is the value of ψ at which air is first drawn through the sample during dewatering in the laboratory. It is important to note that as $\theta \rightarrow n$, $\psi \rightarrow 0$, so Eq. (3.4) should not be used when $|\psi| < |\psi_b|$. The residual moisture content (related to $\theta_{\rm L}$ of Chapter 2) is a measure of the amount of water retained at some arbitrary value of p **F**. In practice, the value of θ _r is simply chosen to minimize, in some sense, the error in Equation (3.4).

Since Eq. (3.4) predicts that $\psi \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\theta \rightarrow \theta_{r}$, this model is unusuable for $\theta \approx \theta_r$ or smaller. For the data of Brooks and Corey (1966), this neglected water fills **10** to **30%** of the pore space, a consequence of the fact that ψ was not lowered beyond -500 cm in their experiments.

Mualem (1976a) fitted the published data for 45 soils to the Brooks and Corey model. Residual moisture contents ranged from **0.01** to **0.28,** but were mostly less than **0.10.** In general, Mualem's data included lower values of ψ , which reduced the value of θ_r that would fit the data. Nevertheless, the selection of model parameters was apparently biased by the varying degree of data in the low θ range. Typical values of model parameters for the entire **(pF < 7)** characteristic are therefore not available, and **Eq.** (3.4) has not been extensively verified for low moisture contents.
Equation (3.4) is extremely useful nevertheless. Its simple form allows the integration of various relations (to be discussed later) in order to obtain a relative hydraulic conductivity function in a manageable mathematical form. The various analytic expressions are useful in exact solutions of the isothermal liquid flow problem. Eagleson **(1978),** for instance, has used a soil model based, in part, on **Eq.** (3.4) to approximate analytically the long-term average of moisture transfers across the ground surface.

King **(1965)** included the region of water content near saturation in his model of the main wetting and drying curves. The proposed relation is

$$
\theta = n\delta \left[\frac{\cosh\left(\psi/\psi_0\right)^{\beta} + \varepsilon - \gamma}{\cosh\left(\psi/\psi_0\right)^{\beta} + \varepsilon + \gamma} \right]
$$
(3.5)

in which δ , ψ _o, β , ϵ , and γ are the parameters. Using this formula, King (1965) fit data well for several soil types, but for $|\psi|$ only up to **100** cm. The form of **Eq. (3.5)** brings analytical dividends in that it is invertible and differentiable. Gillham, et al. (1976) used a modified form of Equation **(3.5)** in a computer simulation. Serious drawbacks of the model include the number of parameters and the difficulty of determining them for a given soil, as well as the limited range of ψ over which it has been tested.

McQueen and Miller (1974) studied the relationship between ⁱand e for **pF** up to **7** (completely dry media). They concluded that **pF** can be represented empirically as a piecewise linear function of θ for values of θ not near saturation. The three segments proposed are as

follows:

- **1) pF 5.0 - 7.0,** "tightly adsorbed" segment
- 2) **pF 2.5 - 5.0,** adsorbed film segment
- **3) pF 0.0 - 3.0,** capillary segment.

From statistical analyses of hundreds of samples, McQueen & Miller (1974) hypothesized the existence of common pF-axis intercepts for each linear segment for all soils. Estimated values of these intercepts are **7.0, 6.25,** and **2.9** for segments **1,** 2, and **3,** respectively. It is also assumed that segments **1** and 2 join at **pF = 5.0,** where clay hydration occurs. If the absence of data for **pF** less than **2.5,** it is suggested that segments 2 and **3** be joined at **pF = 2.5.** The curve near saturation is to be drawn in subjectively, using any available information about ψ_h . As presented, the model can be used to define completely the moisture characteristic on the basis of a single data point, preferably in the range between **pF = 2.5** and **pF = 5.0** (e.g., the permanent wilting percentage, **pF =** 4.2).

Disadvantages of the piecewise log-linear model are its discontinuous slope, $\frac{d\Psi}{d\theta}$, and the probable over-specification of the curve that was necessary in order to achieve the goal of minimal data requirements.

The proposed form of the main wetting curve to be used in this study is based on the approach of McQueen and Miller (1974) in that it makes use of the approximate linear relation between θ and pF over certain ranges. In its simplest form, the proposed model may be written

A PIECEWISE LINEAR RELATION BETWEEN θ and pF

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{pF}) = \begin{cases} a_1 - s_1 \cdot \mathbf{pF} & \mathbf{pF}_0 \leq \mathbf{pF} \leq 7 \\ a_2 - s_2 \cdot \mathbf{pF} & \mathbf{pF}_{\min} \leq \mathbf{pF} \leq \mathbf{pF}_0 \\ \theta_{\mathbf{u}} & \mathbf{pF} \leq \mathbf{pF}_{\min} \end{cases}
$$
(3.6)

The significance of the various parameters is clear from Figure **3.5.** Recall that θ_{u} is somewhat less than n (Fig. 3.3). The results of Mualem (1974) support a value of 0.9 for θ ¹/n.

If desired, it is possible to introduce continuity and an arbitrary degree of curvature at the points p_{o} and p_{min} by generalizing **Eq. (3.6)** to the form

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{p}F) = \frac{1}{M} \ln[\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{p}F)} + \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{p}F)}] - \frac{1}{M'} \ln[\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{M}'(\mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{p}F)} + \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{M}'\theta} + \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{M}'\theta} + \theta_{\mathbf{u}} \quad (3.7)
$$

In the limit as M and M' go to infinity, **Eq. (3.7)** becomes exactly equivalent to **(3.6).** Equation **(3.7)** might be preferred to **(3.6)** because of its increased versatility and its continuous differentiability at **pF** and pF_{min} .

The curvature at p_{min} is a relatively small effect, and the saturated region is conveniently modeled with $\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi}$ equal to zero. For these reasons, we let M' go to infinity in this study. The main wetting curve is then described **by**

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{pF}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M} \ln[\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{pF})} + \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{pF})}] & \mathbf{pF}_{\text{min}} \leq \mathbf{pF} \leq 7 \\ \theta_{\mathbf{u}} & \mathbf{pF} \leq \mathbf{pF}_{\text{min}} \end{cases}
$$
(3.8)

 $\frac{1}{2}$

BEHAVIOR OF **EQ. (3.9)** FOR DIFFERENT **VALUES** OF THE **CURVATURE** PARAMETER, M

Equation **(3.8)** is expressible, redefining the constants, as

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(pF) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M} \ln[p_1(-\psi)]^{q_1} + p_2(-\psi)^{q_2} & \text{if } p_1 \leq p^2 \leq 7 \\ \theta_{\mathbf{u}} & \text{if } p_1 \leq p^2_{\mathbf{min}} \end{cases}
$$
(3.9)

in which

$$
p_1 = e^{Ma_1}
$$

\n
$$
q_1 = -s_1 M \log e \t q_2 = -s_2 M \log e \t (3.10)
$$

A typical set of curves is shown for different values of M in Figure **3.6.**

Values of the parameters are determined easily from a minimal amount of information.

3.2.4 **A** Conceptual Model of Hysteresis

In recent years, a series of papers (Mualem, **1973,** 1974, **1977;** Mualem and Dagan, **1975)** has described a set of models that may be used to model mathematically the phenomenon of hysteresis in the soil moisture retention process. The basic conceptual model (Mualem, 1974) accounts for the capillary hysteresis effect described in Section **3.2.2.**

Mualem (1974) hypothesized that a porous medium could be modeled as a continuous set of pore groups. Each pore group is defined **by** r, the radius of the pore openings, and **p,** the radius of the pores themselves. The relative volume of the medium occupied **by** a pore group is given by the distribution function $f(r, \rho)$. That is, $f(r, \rho)$ drdp is the proportion of the bulk medium occupied **by** the pore group having opening sizes between r and r **+** dr and having pore radii between **p** and $p + dp$.

Following Mualem (1974), we normalize r and **p** to a zero-one interval,

$$
\bar{r} = \frac{r - R_{\min}}{R_{\max} - R_{\min}}
$$
 (3.11)

$$
\bar{\rho} = \frac{\rho - R_{\text{min}}}{R_{\text{max}} - R_{\text{min}}} \tag{3.12}
$$

The values R_{min} and R_{max} are thus related to full saturation and complete dryness, respectively.

The behavior of a pore is taken to be fully defined by $f(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho})$. In particular, it is independent of the states of the surrounding pores. This is called the "independent domain model."

The volumetric liquid content of the medium is obtained at any time **by** integrating the pore group distribution function over the portion of the unit square in \bar{r} - $\bar{\rho}$ space that corresponds to the wetted pores. The extent of this region defines the wetting history of the medium.

As an example, consider wetting the medium from complete dryness (i.e., wetting along the main wetting curve). The process of wetting is defined **by** an increase in the equilibrium radius of curvature of the air-water interface, R. When this radius increases from R to R **+** dR, the groups whose pore radii are between R and R **+** dR are wetted. This main wetting process is represented **by** the Mualem diagram of Figure **3.7,** in which the shaded domain represents saturated pores.

Now consider the main drying curve. When the soil drains from $R + dR$ to R, only the groups with pore radii $\overline{\rho}$ between R and R + dR and with opening radii r less than R are emptied (Figure **3.8).**

Any subsequent reversals result in more complex saturation regions. Figure **3.9** shows how two primary scanning curves and one higher order curve appear on the diagram.

Figure **3.7**

THE WETTED PORE DOMAIN IN **THE** MAIN WETTING **PROCESS** (After Mualem, 1974.)

THE WETTED PORE DOMAIN IN THE MAIN DRYING **PROCESS** (After Mualem, 1974.)

Figure **3.9**

THE WETTED DOMAINS DURING SCANNING **PROCESSES.** (After Mualem, 1974.) (a.) PRIMARY DRYING AFTER REVERSAL **AT** R **. (b.)** PRIMARY WETTING AFTER REVERSAL **AT** R . (c.) SIXTH ORDER WETTING **PROCESS. NOTE** THAT R_1 < R_4 < R_6 < R_5 < R_3 < R_1

Note in particular that for a high order scanning curve, alternate successive values of the reversal radius R are either monotonically increasing or decreasing, depending on the direction of the reversal. **If,** in the example in Figure 3.9c, wetting proceeds to a point where R exceeds R_5 , then the last wet/dry loop is effectively erased from the memory of the medium. We see that the number of variables necessary to define the state of the system fluctuates. Theoretically, it is possible for the state vector to become arbitrarily large, although one might intuitively limit its size on the basis of the system dynamics.

Mualem (1974) used a simplified form of the pore group distribution function. It is

 $f(\overline{r}, \overline{\rho}) = h(\overline{r}) \& (\overline{\rho})$

which constitutes the similarity hypothesis. In a subsequent paper (Mualem, **1977),** he proposed an extended similarity hypothesis in the form

$$
f(\overline{r}, \overline{\rho}) = h(\overline{r}) h(\overline{\rho})
$$
 (3.13)

Using the extended similarity hypothesis, Mualem **(1977)** showed that a universal hysteresis function could be derived. On the basis of one main curve, the other main curve and all scanning curves can be defined. The advantage of this model is that it greatly reduces the amount of information (data or parameters) necessary to define fully the water retention behavior of a soil.

The independent domain models described above fail when pore behavior is governed **by** surrounding pores. This occurs when there is significant hysteresis for $\psi > \psi_b$. The dependent domain model (Mualem and Dagan, **1975)** was developed and tested as a generalization of the independent domain model in order to deal with this problem. Unfortunately, the extended similarity hypothesis, which reduces the amount of information needed to describe hysteresis, has not yet been validated for the dependent domain model. In this study, the independent domain model is used.

The use of a conceptual model based on the capillary model of moisture retention to predict the behavior of hysteresis in the "adsorption regime,"where **pF** is, say, greater than 4, is open to question. Nevertheless, Mualem **(1977)** has found that this model is very good for **pF** up to **6,** the highest value with which he worked. Whatever the physical explanation, it appears that the independent domain theory should be quite adequate for low moisture contents.

The cumulative integral of $h(R)$ is defined as

$$
H(R) = \int_{0}^{R} h(\vec{r}) d\vec{r}
$$
 (3.14)

Since, by definition, $h(\vec{r})$ is non-negative, the function $H(R)$ is monotonically increasing. When the medium is fully wetted,

$$
\theta = \theta_{u} = \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} f(\vec{r}, \vec{\rho}) d\vec{r} d\vec{\rho}
$$

$$
= \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} h(\vec{r}) h(\vec{\rho}) d\vec{r} d\vec{\rho}
$$

$$
= [H(1)]^{2}
$$

whence

$$
H(1) = \theta_{u}^{1/2} \tag{3.15}
$$

In general, the main wetting process is described (see Figure **3.7) by**

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(R) = \int_{0}^{R} h(\overline{\rho}) d\overline{\rho} \int_{0}^{1} h(\overline{r}) d\overline{r}
$$

= H(R) H(1) (3.16)

whence

$$
H(R) = \theta \frac{-1/2}{u} \theta W(R)
$$
 (3.17)

Similarly, the main drying curve (Figure **3.8** and curve **C** of Figure **3.3)** is given **by**

$$
\theta_d(R) = H(1) H(R) + H(R) [H(1) - H(R)] = [2\theta_u^{1/2} - H(R)] H(R)
$$
 (3.18)

Mualem (1977) , assuming the ψ -R relation to be a one-to-one function, replaces R in the above equations by ψ . But constancy of R implies only constant moisture percentage, thus in a system in which the temperature varies, this simple substitution is improper. In this work,

we shall generalize Mualem's model to account for temperature effects. We assume (see the discussion of temperature effects in Section **3.3.2)** that the temperature dependence of ψ has the form

$$
-\frac{1}{\psi}\left.\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial T}\right|_{\theta} = -\frac{1}{\psi}\left.\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial T}\right|_{R} = a \equiv -C_{\psi} = \text{constant} \tag{3.19}
$$

Integration of Equation **(3.19)** yields the relation

$$
\Psi \equiv \psi e \qquad \qquad (3.20)
$$

We may thus substitute Ψ for R in Equations (3.17) and (3.18) to obtain

$$
H(\Psi) = \theta_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1/2} \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi)
$$
 (3.21)

and

$$
\theta_{d}(\Psi) = [2\theta_{u}^{1/2} - H(\Psi)] H(\Psi) = [2 - \theta_{u}^{-1} \theta_{w}(\Psi)] \theta_{w}(\Psi)
$$
 (3.22)

A primary drying curve (Figure 3.9a and curve **E** of Fig. **3.3)** is described **by**

$$
\theta \left(\begin{smallmatrix} R_1 & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{smallmatrix} \right) = H(1) H(R) + H(R) [H(R_1) - H(R)] \tag{3.23}
$$

where the notation indicates that the normalized capillary radius increased (wetting) from 0 to R_1 , and decreased (drying) to R. Using Eqs. **(3.16)** and **(3.17),** and replacing R **by** Y, we obtain

$$
\theta(\psi_{\min} \Psi_1 \psi) = \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi) \{1 + \theta_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}[\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_1) - \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi)]\}
$$
(3.24)

In a similar manner, the primary wetting curve (Fig. **3.9b** and curve **D** of Fig. **3.3)** is derived. It is

$$
\theta(\begin{array}{c}\Psi\\ \n\end{array} + \frac{\Psi}{1}) = H(1) H(R) + H(R_1) [H(1) - H(R)]
$$

= $\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi) + \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_1) [1 - \theta_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi)]$ (3.25)

Routine application of the theory yields all of the higher order scanning curves (e.g., Fig. 3.9c and curve F of Fig. **3.3).** As noted earlier, however, the introduction of higher order scanning curves poses serious operational problems as a result of the variable and potentially large state set. As a first approximation to the simulation of the second and higher order scanning curves, the Mualem model will be simplified in this study. As an expedient, it will be assumed that the higher order curves are coincident with the primary curves. Although this contradicts the theory, it allows quite accurate modeling of the most important effects of hysteresis without the computational difficulties inherent in describing the more detailed behavior. We treat high order scanning curves **by** assuming them to lie on a primary curve for the appropriate process (drying or wetting). For wetting, then,

$$
\theta(\cdots \psi_1^{\psi}) \approx \theta(\begin{array}{c} \psi_{\text{max}} \\ \psi_0 \end{array}) \tag{3.26}
$$

The value of Ψ_{α} is defined by the constraint that

$$
\theta(\begin{array}{cc} \Psi_{\text{max}} & \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_0 & 1 \end{array}) = \theta_1 \tag{3.27}
$$

where θ_1 is the value of θ (corresponding to Ψ_1) when the last reversal occurred. Using Equation (3.25) to solve for $\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{\mathbf{o}})$ ($\Psi_{\mathbf{o}}$ itself is not

needed), we have

is

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_0) = \theta_{\mathbf{u}}[\theta_1 - \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_1)] [\theta_{\mathbf{u}} - \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_1)]^{-1}
$$
 (3.28)

The approximation for the higher order drying scanning curves

$$
\theta(\ldots \stackrel{\Psi_1}{\Psi}) \approx \theta(\Psi \stackrel{\Psi_0}{\min} \Psi)
$$
 (3.29)

where, using **Eq.** (3.24),

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{0}) = \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{1}) + \theta_{\mathbf{u}}[\theta_{1} \ \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{1})^{-1} - 1] \tag{3.30}
$$

We now summarize the proposed model of the soil moisture retention process. Although **Eq. (3.9)** was introduced for isothermal conditions, we may generalize it, using the argument preceding **Eq. (3.20),** to obtain

Main Wetting Curve

$$
\theta_{w}(\Psi) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M} \ln[p_{1}(-\Psi)]^{q_{1}} + p_{2}(-\Psi)]^{q_{2}} & \text{if } p_{\min} \leq P_{F} \leq 7 \\ \theta_{u} & \text{if } p_{\min} \end{cases}
$$
(3.31)

where

$$
PF = \log(-\Psi) = pF + a(T - T_o) \log e
$$
 (3.32)

and the reference temperature, T_{0} , in Eq. (3.20) is the temperature at which the parameters of **Eq. (3.9)** are defined. We may take it to be the same T_{o} as that introduced in Eq. (2.18) .

The derived curves are repeated below:

Main Drying Curve

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{d}}(\Psi) = \left[2 - \theta_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi)\right] \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi) \tag{3.33}
$$

Primary Drying. Scanning Curve

$$
\theta(\psi_{\min}^{\Psi_1} \psi) = \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi) \{1 + \theta_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}[\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_1) - \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi)]\}
$$
(3.34)

Primary Wetting Scanning Curve

$$
\theta(\begin{array}{c}\Psi\\ \Psi_1\end{array}) = \theta_w(\Psi) + \theta_w(\Psi_1)[1 - \theta_u^{-1} \theta_w(\Psi)] \qquad (3.35)
$$

Higher Order Drying Scanning Curve

$$
\theta(\ldots \stackrel{\Psi_1}{\Psi}) = \theta(\Psi \stackrel{\Psi_0}{\min} \Psi) \tag{3.36}
$$

where

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{\mathbf{0}}) = \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{1}) + \theta_{\mathbf{u}}[\theta_{1} \ \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{1})^{-1} - 1]
$$

Higher Order Wetting Scanning Curve

$$
\theta(\ldots \psi_1^{\psi}) = \theta(\begin{array}{c} \psi \\ \max \\ \psi \\ 0 \end{array}) \qquad (3.37)
$$

where

$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{0}) = \theta_{\mathbf{u}}[\theta_{1} - \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{1})][\theta_{\mathbf{u}} - \theta_{\mathbf{w}}(\Psi_{1})]^{-1}
$$

We now clarify the meaning of \underline{R} , the wetting history, which was introduced in Chapter 2. As mentioned earlier, the dimension of \underline{R}

increases as the wetting history becomes more complex, assuming the general model of Mualem (1974). With the approximation that high order scanning curves lie on primary curves, the state set is truncated. Given the present value of ψ and one other number, it is possible to compute the present value of θ . This single state variable is the value Ψ_{α} at which the last reversal from a main curve occurred. For a higher order curve, Ψ_{α} is artificial and is calculated as discussed earlier. For a main curve, Ψ is either Ψ _{min} or Ψ _{max}. Thus, any curve can be represented as a primary scanning curve. It is a wetting curve if $\Psi > \Psi_{0}$ and drying if $\Psi < \Psi_{0}$.

The complete state set may now be considered to consist of ψ (or Ψ), T and Ψ_{α} . The vector <u>R</u>, in this study, therefore has only one component $-\Psi_{0}$.

3.3 Hydraulic Conductivity

3.3.1 Introductory Remarks

Equation **(2.3)** states that when a head gradient is applied to a partially saturated porous medium, the resulting liquid flow rate is directly proportional to the magnitude of the applied gradient. In fact, many deviations from linearity have been reported. Swartzendruber **(1969)** reviews in detail the experimental observations, their suggested causes, and the implications for problem-solving, noting that some flow systems may be quite insensitive to the observed non-proportionalities. Furthermore, the Buckingham-Darcy equation **(2.3)** is the foundation of virtually all modern, physically-based studies of liquid transport in

the soil. It is not the purpose of this study to break new ground on the non-proportionality question.

The hydraulic conductivity, K, is a function of both θ and T (or ψ and T). The temperature effect is apparently attributable to the temperature dependence of viscosity, as will be discussed in Section **3.3.3.** The isothermal hydraulic conductivity exhibits little or no hysteresis when expressed as a function of **6.** Obviously, the hysteresis in the relation between θ and ψ results in significant hysteresis of K when it is expressed as a function of ψ .

For a fixed temperature, K has its maximum value at saturation and decreases monotonically over many orders of magnitude upon desatura tion. Hillel (1971) gives typical saturation K's of 10⁻² to 10⁻³ cm s⁻¹ for sandy soils and 10^{-4} to 10^{-7} ${\rm cm\,\,s}^{-1}$ for clayey soils.

The conductivity effectively reaches zero when only a small amount of adsorbed liquid remains. At these very low moisture contents, vapor diffusion takes over as the dominant water transport mechanism. Rose **(1963),** offering data from several media, suggests that the value of moisture content at which liquid flow becomes negligible, which we have denoted by θ_k , corresponds to a relative humidity of h = 0.6, i.e.,

$$
\theta_{k} = \theta (pF \stackrel{\sim}{=} 5.85)
$$

The capillary model of water retention has been applied **by** several soil scientists and petroleum engineers to the calculation of hydraulic conductivity. The basic approach is to extract pore-size distribution information from the soil moisture characteristic, then to apply viscous flow theory, and finally to aggregate the behavior of individual pores to describe the overall medium. Variations on this theme result in the models of Childs and Collis-George **(1950),** Burdine **(1953),** Marshall **(1958),** Millington and Quirk **(1959),** Kunze, et al. **(1968),** and Mualem (1976a). Mualem and Dagan **(1978)** present a unified derivation of several of these models.

These models of hydraulic conductivity, which are based on surface tension, viscous flow theory, are open to the same criticism as the capillary hysteresis conceptual model already presented. At low moisture contents, adsorption forces become important, so the capillary theory is incomplete. Furthermore, the physical properties of tightlybound water may differ significantly from those of free water (Carman, **1953),** resulting in such effects as non-linearity in the flux-gradient relation (Miller and Low, **1963).** Hillel **(1971)** writes

> "The results of these [surface tension, viscous flow] theories, while more generally applicable than those based on earlier models, still appear to be valid only for certain coarse materials in which capillary hysteresis phenomena predominate."

Nevertheless, the experimental results of those investigators mentioned above, together with the evidence from other tests (Brooks and Corey, 1964, **1966;** Jackson, et al., **1965;** Green and Corey, **1971;** Jackson, **1972)** support the general use of such models in practical applications. As Jackson, et al. **(1965)** note,

> "The agreement between the experimental and theoretical values at these low water contents may be fortuitous, but the fact that they are of the same order of magnitude lends confidence to the calculation of conductivities at water contents where measurement is extremely difficult."

In the next section, a method for calculating the relative hydraulic conductivity at constant temperature is presented. The subsequent section deals with the temperature effect and summarizes the model of hydraulic conductivity used in this work.

3.3.2 Calculation of Relative Hydraulic Conductivity

Mualem (1976a) compared the measured conductivities for 45 soils with the values calculated **by** several methods. The best overall performance was yielded **by** a model proposed in that paper. It is

$$
K_{r}(\theta) = S_{e}^{1/2} \left[\int_{0}^{S_{e}} \frac{dS}{\psi(S)} \right]^{2} \left[\int_{0}^{1} \frac{dS}{\psi(S)} \right]^{-2}
$$
(3.38)

$$
K_{r}(\theta) = \frac{K(\theta)}{K(\theta_{u})} = \text{relative hydraulic conductivity}
$$

$$
S_{e} = \frac{\theta - \theta_{k}}{\theta_{u} - \theta_{k}} = \text{{}``effective'' saturation}
$$
 (3.39)

^S= dummy integration variable for **^S**

It should be noted that the exponent of S_{ρ} , left undetermined in the derivation, has been chosen to give the best fit for the 45 soils. **A** similar advantage was not granted, for instance, to the Millington-Quirk method, which nevertheless performed rather well. Since the most systematic test and validation of any model appear to be that of Mualem $(1976a)$, Eq. (3.38) will be used in this analysis.

As mentioned earlier, the hysteresis in the $K(\theta)$ relation is usually small (Talsma, **1970;** Rogers and Klute, **1971;** Nielsen and Biggar, **1961;** Topp and Miller, **1966;** Youngs, 1964; Elrick and Bowman, 1964). Mualem **(1976b)** examines the hysteresis of the hydraulic conductivity both theoretically and experimentally. In both cases, the results indicate only a small non-uniqueness of $K(\theta)$. Since hysteresis is negligible, it must be possible to integrate **Eq. (3.38)** using any curve of the hysteretic $\psi(\theta)$ family. For convenience, the main wetting curve, Eq. **(3.31),** is used.

In order to evaluate **(3.38)** for fixed temperature, it is necessary to invert **(3.31)** and to perform the indicated integration. For M going to infinity, these operations can be done analytically. Otherwise, a numerical scheme must be used.

3.3.3 Temperature Effects

The temperature dependencies of K and ψ , for fixed θ , are implied **by** the surface tension, viscous flow model (Miller and Miller, **1956;** Childs and Collis-George, **1950)** of soil water as

$$
C_{\psi} \equiv \frac{1}{\psi} \left. \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial T} \right|_{\theta} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{dT} - \frac{1}{\rho_{\varrho}} \frac{d\rho_{\varrho}}{dT}
$$
 (3.49)

and

$$
C_{K} \equiv \frac{1}{K} \left. \frac{\partial K}{\partial T} \right|_{\theta} = -\frac{1}{\mu} \frac{d\mu}{dT} + \frac{1}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{d\rho_{\ell}}{dT}
$$
(3.50)

where

$$
C_{\psi} = \text{the temperature coefficient of } \psi \qquad [\,^{\circ}K^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
C_{K} = \text{the temperature coefficient of } K \qquad [\,^{\circ}K^{-1}]
$$
\n
$$
\mu = \text{the dynamic viscosity} \qquad [\text{dyne s cm}^{-2}]
$$

For pure, free water at **20'C,** the quantities in (3.49) and **(3.50),** estimated from data on $\sigma(T)$, $\mu(T)$, and ρ_{ρ} (T) (Eagleson, 1970), are

$$
\frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{dT} \approx -1.9 \times 10^{-3} \text{ g}^{-1}
$$

$$
\frac{1}{\mu} \frac{d\mu}{dT} \approx -2.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ g}^{-1}
$$

$$
\frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{d\rho_{\ell}}{dT} \approx -2.1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ g}^{-1}
$$

According to (3.49) and **(3.50),** these would imply

$$
c_{\psi} \approx -1.7 \times 10^{-3} \text{ °K}^{-1}
$$
 (3.51)

and

$$
C_K \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ °K}^{-1}
$$
 (3.52)

Experimental validation of **(3.51)** and **(3.52)** is far from complete. Equation **(3.52)** appears valid for saturated sands (Swartzendruber, **1969).** For unsaturated media, it has been easier to study the temperature dependence of the isothermal liquid diffusivity defined **by**

$$
D = K \left. \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta} \right|_T
$$

We would expect

$$
C_{D} \equiv \frac{1}{D} \left. \frac{\partial D}{\partial T} \right|_{\Theta} = C_{K} + C_{\psi} \approx 2.3 \times 10^{-2} \text{ °K}^{-1}
$$
 (3.53)

assuming that **(3.51)** and **(3.52)** hold. Jackson **(1963)** presents data that support **(3.53)** for three moderately wet, heavy-textured soils. **A**

further investigation (Jackson, **1965),** which carefully separates out the simultaneous vapor transport, shows that this dependence holds approximately for very dry media containing little more than an adsorbed monolayer of water $(pF \approx 6.3)$. For even drier soil, the value of C_D increases three- or four-fold.

The experiments on **D** essentially verify the equation

$$
C_{\psi} + C_{K} \approx \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{dT} - \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{d\mu}{dT}
$$
 (3.54)

Assuming that there are not, purely **by** coincidence, significant equal and opposite errors in (3.49) and **(3.50),** we have an experimental validation **of**

$$
C_K \simeq -\frac{1}{\mu} \frac{d\mu}{dT}
$$

Since the surface tension effect is much smaller, significant (but less than a factor of ten) departures from (3.49) may occur.

Many investigators have attempted to determine the temperature dependence of ψ . The results of virtually every one refute (3.49), and yet the observed data suggest no consistent alternative to it. Jury and Miller (1974) give data suggesting a C_{ψ} on the order of -10^{-2} $\circ \text{K}^{-1}$ for a wet sand, as do Taylor and Stewart **(1960)** for a silt loam. The data of Taylor **(1958)** give even larger magnitudes. Campbell and Gardner **(1971),** reporting on four heavy-textured soils, give data corresponding to magnitudes of C_{1b} ranging from 10^{-3} to 10^{-2} \degree K⁻¹, but having positive and negative signs, even for a single soil at different ψ and T. The most negative values of C₁, for a given soil, in that study, are obtained at

the lower heads **(pF >** 4), while positive or less negative values result for **pF <** 4. Among different soils, correlation to soil type appears rather weak. Kijne and Taylor (1964) give data for a silt loam that suggest consistently positive C_{th} , on the order of 10^{-1} $\degree K^{-1}$, for pF from **3** to **5.**

Faced with the inconsistencies of the $\psi(T)$ data, as well as their apparent contradiction of the diffusivity data, we shall tentative**ly** accept the hypothesis expressed in (3.49) and **(3.50).** Further careful experimental and theoretical analyses of these temperature effects are needed. Inasmuch as C₁ is uncertain, the sensitivity of transport processes in the soil to its value should be examined.

We may now express the hydraulic conductivity as a function of and T. It is

$$
K(\theta, T) = K_{\alpha} K_{r}(\theta) K_{r}(T)
$$

in which

 $K_S = K(\theta = \theta_u, T = T_o) =$ saturated reference conductivity $[\text{cm s}^{-1}]$ $K_T(T) = \left| \frac{D}{\mu(T)} \right|$ = temperature correction of hydraulic conductivity

where the density effect is considered negligible compared to the viscosity effect.

3.4 Tortuosity

Due to the presence of the soil matrix, the effective diffusion coefficient of a gas in a porous medium is lower than that in free air. The reduction is a result both of the reduced crosssectional area for flow and of the tortuosity of the diffusion path. Lai, et al. **(1976)** discussed previous studies of gas diffusion in porous media and performed field measurements of the process. Their data support the use of a reduction factor, $\alpha \theta_a$ in Eq. (2.12), given **by**

$$
\alpha \theta_{\mathbf{a}} = \theta_{\mathbf{a}}^{5/3}
$$

Thus,

$$
\alpha = \theta_{\mathbf{a}}^{2/3} \tag{3.55}
$$

3.5 Thermal Properties

3.5.1 Heat Capacity

The (bulk) heat capacity of a unit volume of soil is the weighted average of the capacities of the constituents. Thus, in the definition of **C** following **Eq.** (2.24), we have

$$
C = C_d + c_p \rho_v \theta_a + c_q \rho_l \theta \qquad (3.56)
$$

According to de Vries **(1966),** the dry heat capacity is estimated well for most soils from the relation

$$
C_d = 0.46 \theta_m + 0.60 \theta_o
$$
 (cal g⁻¹ c⁻¹) (3.57)

in which

 θ_m is the volume fraction of soil minerals θ_{α} is the volume fraction of organic matter

Note that

$$
1 - n = \theta_{\rm m} + \theta_{\rm o}
$$

so we may eliminate θ_m from (3.57) to obtain

$$
C_A = 0.46(1-n) + 0.14 \theta_0 \tag{3.58}
$$

3.5.2 Thermal Conductivity

It can be shown that the two conductivities, λ^{ψ} and λ^{θ} , defined in Chapter 2, are virtually the same; the minor distinction need not be discussed here. We shall henceforth use the symbol λ without a superscript, with the understanding that it may be used in either the (ψ, T) or the (θ, T) system.

A physical theory for the calculation of the effective thermal conductivity of a partially saturated porous medium has been developed **by** de Vries **(1966).** The theory has its roots in the work of Maxwell and Lord Rayleigh, who calculated the effective electrical conductivity of a non-homogeneous medium. The details of this model will not be presented here. It has been applied **by** several workers with varying degrees of success (Jury and Miller, 1974; Wierenga, et al., **1969;** Hadas, **1977;** Sepaskhah and Boersma, **1979;**

Kimball, et al., **1976).** The seemingly ad hoc introduction of various corrections to the theory makes it undesirable for this study, in which a simple, but general, representation of λ is sought. It should be remembered, however, that some elements of this theory appear in this paper, e.g., the factor ζ in Eq. (2.10) .

Both experimental and theoretical work have established the general nature of the dependence of λ on θ and T. For constant temperature, the thermal conductivity increases rapidly as the medium is initially wetted. The formation of water rings between adjacent soil particles accounts for this rapid increase in thermal conductivity. At some moisture content around the field capacity **(pF** ~ **2.5),** the rate of increase becomes significantly lower, assuming the temperature has a value normally encountered in natural environments. Conductivity is a maximum at saturation.

The temperature dependence of λ enters through the effect of vapor diffusion (and transport of latent heat). This effect becomes significant above 40° C, where the saturated vapor pressure becomes sufficiently large to affect the overall heat transport process. We shall neglect it here.

As an approximate representation of the thermal behavior of most soils, we shall adopt the following piecewise linear relation:

$$
\lambda(\theta) = \begin{cases} \lambda_0 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) & \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta_f}\right) & 0 \le \theta \le \theta_f \\ \lambda_1 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) & \left(\frac{\theta - \theta_f}{n - \theta_f}\right) & \theta_f < \theta \le n \end{cases}
$$
(3.59)

in which

$$
\theta_f = \theta \text{ at field capacity} = \theta (PF = 2.5)
$$
\n
$$
\lambda_o = \text{dry thermal conductivity of medium} \qquad (\text{cal cm}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ °C}^{-1})
$$
\n
$$
\lambda_2 = \text{saturated thermal conductivity} \qquad (\text{cal cm}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ °C}^{-1})
$$
\n
$$
\lambda_1 = \text{an intermediate value of } \lambda.
$$

Typical values of λ_0 are in the range of 3 x 10⁻⁴ to 7 x 10⁻⁴ cal cm⁻¹ C^{-1} , while λ_2 is about an order of magnitude larger. The value λ_1 is about midway between the other two.

3.5.3 The Thermal Gradient Ratio, ζ

The value of ζ is a by-product of the theory of de Vries (1966) for the calculation of λ . Philip and de Vries (1957) give values of ζ at **20C** for various values of n and **6,** and for quartz and non-quartz soil minerals. (Quartz is the only common mineral with a thermal conductivity different from the norm.) The values range from **1.3** (n = **0.7,** $\theta = 0.1$) to 3.2 (n = 0.3, $\theta = 0$). It appears that a value of $\zeta = 2$ will suffice as an approximate value for most situations.

3.5.4 The Heat of Wetting

The heat of wetting is given (Edlefson and Anderson, 1943, **p. 237;** de Vries, **1958) by**

$$
W = -j^{-1} g(\psi - T \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial T})
$$
 (3.60)

in which

 j = mechanical equivalent of heat = 4.18×10^7 erg/cal.

Chapter 4

NUMERICAL SOLUTION OF THE **MASS AND HEAT** CONSERVATION **EQUATIONS**

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines a numerical scheme for the solution, in one dimension, of the conservation equations derived in Chapter 2, subject to given initial and boundary conditions. The application of Galerkin's method of weighted residuals converts the partial differential equations to a system of non-linear ordinary differential equations whose unknowns are the values of the state variables at a finite number of points. Boundary conditions are easily applied at this stage. **A** finite difference approximation is introduced to evaluate the time derivatives, resulting in a completely algebraic system of equations. This final system, which is still non-linear, is solved **by** an iterative series of successive linearizations.

4.2 Application of Galerkin's Method of Weighted Residuals

4.2.1 Preliminaries

In Chapter 2, several expressions of mass and heat conservation were presented. Those chosen for use in this study are based on the dependent (state) variables ψ and T. The mass conservation equation is (2.32) and the heat equation is (2.33) . The versatility of the (ψ, T) system has already been discussed. The particular choice of Equation **(2.33),** rather than (2.34) or **(2.35),** is based both on the symmetric nature of the matrices resulting from the numerical methods, and on its direct physical significance.

Introducing new notation for the coefficients in the continuity equations, we have, from **(2.32),**

$$
M(\psi, T) = c_1 \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + c_2 \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (c_3 \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} + c_4 \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} + c_5) + c_6 = 0
$$
 (4.1)

and, from **(2.33),**

$$
H(\psi, T) = d_1 \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + d_2 \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (d_3 \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} + d_4 \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} + d_5) = 0
$$
 (4.2)

where the one-dimensional equations have been adopted. $M(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $H(\cdot,\cdot)$ are differential operators. The coefficients in (4.1) and (4.2) are defined below:

$$
c_1 = (1 - \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_{\ell}}) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi} \bigg|_{T} + \frac{\theta_a}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial \psi} \bigg|_{T}
$$
(4.3a)

 \mathcal{A}^{out}

$$
c_2 = (1 - \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_g}) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi} + \frac{\theta_a}{\rho_g} \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi}
$$
 (4.3b)

$$
c_3 = K + D_{\psi v} \tag{4.3c}
$$

$$
c_4 = D_{\text{TV}}^{\psi} \tag{4.3d}
$$

$$
c_5 = K \tag{4.3e}
$$

$$
c_6 = S \tag{4.3f}
$$

$$
d_{1} = [L_{0} + c_{p} (T - T_{0})] \theta_{a} \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial \psi} \Big|_{T} + [c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T - T_{0}) - \rho_{\ell} W]
$$

$$
- c_{p} \rho_{v} (T - T_{0}) - L_{0} \rho_{v}] \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \psi} \Big|_{T}
$$
(4.4a)

$$
d_2 = C + [L_0 + c_p(T - T_0)] \theta_a \frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi}
$$

+ $[c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T - T_0) - \rho_{\ell} W - c_p \rho_v (T - T_0) - L_0 \rho_v] \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi}$ (4.4b)

$$
d_{3} = \rho_{\ell} L D_{\psi v} + c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T - T_{o}) (K + D_{\psi v}) \qquad (4.4c)
$$

$$
d_4 = \lambda^{\psi} + c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T - T_o) D_{TV}^{\psi}
$$
 (4.4d)

$$
d_5 = c_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} (T - T_o) [K - \int_{-L}^{Z} S(z') dz']
$$
 (4.4e)

The coefficients d_3 , d_4 , and d_5 are obtained from (2.33) by use of the one-dimensional versions of (2.14) and **(2.25).** The depth L is at least as great as the depth of the root zone.

Before applying the finite element method, we shall define the solution domain and its discretization. We are concerned with the flow of moisture and heat inside the region bounded **by** the land surface $(z = 0)$ and some arbitrary depth, $z = -L$ (Figure 4.1).

FINITE **ELEMENT** GRID FOR ANALYSIS OF ONE-DIMENSIONAL

MASS AND HEAT TRANSPORT

We divide this domain into **N-1** elements (sub-domains), bounded **by N** nodes. An arbitrary numbering system to be adopted here assigns the index **1** to the lowest node, 2 to the second, and so on up to the top node, **N.** The element numbering system is the same, except that the top element is, of course, number **N-i.**

We shall seek approximate solutions of (4.1) and (4.2) having the form (Neuman, et al., **1975)**

$$
\hat{\psi}(z,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \psi_j(t) \, \mathbf{U} \, \omega_j^{e}(z) \tag{4.5}
$$

and

$$
\hat{T}(z,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} T_j
$$
 (t) U_e^e (z) \t\t(4.6)

where $\hat{\psi}$ and \hat{T} are the approximate solutions. The moisture potential and temperature at the j'th node are given by ψ_1 and T_2 respectively. J J The <u>trial function</u>, ω_i^e (z), is non-zero only on element e. Its value varies linearly from unity at node **j** to zero at the other end of the element (Figure 4.2).

4.2.2 Application to a Single Element

Ordinarily, one applies Galerkin's method directly over the entire region of interest. In the present development, we will apply Galerkin's method instead to each element separately, and then combine the local, or element, equations **by** matching boundary conditions among the elements, obtaining a global system of equations.

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

This is done for two reasons. The first reason is the inapplicability of the governing equations at various discontinuities. This issue is discussed in Section 2.3.4. Secondly, this approach clarifies the evaluation of the global coefficient matrices, a task that is often a notational nightmare. It can be shown that the equations resulting from either approach are identical.

Let us define some notation to facilitate manipulations on the element level. We denote the trial functions locally **by**

$$
\phi_{1}^{\mathbf{e}} \equiv \omega_{\mathbf{e}}^{\mathbf{e}} \tag{4.7}
$$

$$
\phi_2^{\mathbf{e}} \equiv \omega_{\mathbf{e}+1}^{\mathbf{e}} \tag{4.8}
$$

We therefore have

$$
\phi_1^e = \frac{z_{e+1} - z}{z_{e+1} - z_e} = \frac{z_{e+1} - z}{\Delta^e}
$$
\n
$$
\phi_2^e = \frac{z - z_e}{z_{e+1} - z_e} = \frac{z - z_e}{\Delta^e}
$$
\n(4.9)

in which Δ^e is the length of element e.

Inside a single element, (4.5) and (4.6) simplify, as a result of the definition of ω_i^e , to

$$
\hat{\psi} = \bar{\psi}_1^e \phi_1^e + \bar{\psi}_2^e \phi_2^e \qquad (4.10)
$$

104

and

in which

$$
\hat{T} = \bar{T}_1^e \phi_1^e + \bar{T}_2^e \phi_2^e
$$
\nin which

\n
$$
\bar{\psi}_1^e \equiv \psi_e \qquad \bar{\psi}_2^e \equiv \psi_{e+1}
$$
\n(4.11)

and
$$
\overline{T}_1^e = T_e
$$
 $\overline{T}_2^e = T_{e+1}$

In the following treatment of the local equations, the superscript e may now be dropped, as it appears on all variables. The subscripts are understood to denote the local nodal numbering system of the element.

Following Galerkin's method of weighted residuals (Pinder and Gray, **1977, p. 57)** for each element, we require that the residuals obtained by substituting $\hat{\psi}$ and \hat{T} into M and H be orthogonal to the set of trial functions.

Mathematically,

 \bullet

$$
\int_{\Delta} M \ (\hat{\psi}, \ \hat{T}) \ \phi_i \ dz = 0 \qquad i = 1, 2 \qquad (4.12)
$$

$$
\int_{\Delta} H (\hat{\psi}, \hat{T}) \phi_i dz = 0 \qquad i = 1, 2
$$
 (4.13)

The subsequent steps necessary to convert (4.12) and (4.13) into computationally practical forms will be illustrated here only for the mass equation. The heat equation is, **by** analogy, similar.

Let us substitute (4.1) into (4.12) , using (4.10) and (4.11) . This yields

$$
\int_{\Delta} [c_1 \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial t} + c_2 \frac{\partial \hat{T}}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (c_3 \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial z} + c_4 \frac{\partial \hat{T}}{\partial z} + c_5) + c_6] \phi_i dz = 0
$$

i = 1, 2 (4.14)

We next apply integration **by** parts to the third term, which may be recognized as the flux divergence.

$$
\int_{\Delta} (c_1 \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial t} + c_2 \frac{\partial \hat{T}}{\partial t}) \phi_i dz + \int_{\Delta} (c_3 \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial z} + c_4 \frac{\partial \hat{T}}{\partial z} + c_5) \phi_i dz
$$

+
$$
\int_{\Delta} c_6 \phi_i dz = \left[(c_3 \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial z} + c_4 \frac{\partial \hat{T}}{\partial z} + c_5) \phi_i \right]_{z_1}^{z_2} = \left[-Q_m \phi_i \right]_{z_1}^{z_2} i = 1, 2
$$

(4.15)

in which the z's are the element end points, subscripted according to the local numbering system. Checking the definitions of c_3 , c_4 and c_5 , we see that (4.15) defines Q_m implicitly as

$$
Q_m = (q_{\hat{\chi}} + q_v) \cdot k / \rho_{\hat{\chi}}
$$
 (4.16)

The primed trial function denotes the z-derivative.

We substitute $\hat{\psi}$ and \hat{T} into (4.15). This yields the following pair of equations:

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{2} \overline{\psi}_{j} \int c_{1} \phi_{j} \phi_{i} dz + \sum_{j=1}^{2} \overline{T}_{j} \int c_{2} \phi_{j} \phi_{i} dz
$$

+
$$
\sum_{j=1}^{2} \overline{\psi}_{j} \int c_{3} \phi_{j} \phi_{i} dz + \sum_{j=1}^{2} \overline{T}_{j} \int c_{4} \phi_{j} \phi_{i} dz
$$

+
$$
\int c_{5} \phi_{i} dz + \int c_{6} \phi_{i} dz = \left[-Q_{m} \phi_{i} \right]_{z_{1}}^{z_{2}} i = 1, 2 (4.17)
$$
In Equation (4.17), the primed state variables are time derivatives. Equations (4.17) , with $i = 1, 2$, can be interpreted as approximate mass conservation relations for nodes 1 and 2. Their sum is a mass conservation condition for the element.

4.2.3 Evaluation of Element Matrix Integrals

The integrals in (4.17) remain to be evaluated. If the 'c' coefficients were constant in an element, this would be a trivial operation, since the ϕ 's are simple linear functions. In general, however, the c's are functions of the state variables. **A** standard integration procedure, which will be used here, is the functional coefficient scheme (Pinder and Gray, **1977, p. 132).** The coefficient is assumed to vary linearly within the element. Its value at the nodes is given **by**

$$
c_{m1} = c_{m}(\overline{\psi}_{1}, \overline{T}_{1})
$$

\n
$$
c_{m2} = c_{m}(\overline{\psi}_{2}, \overline{T}_{2})
$$

\n
$$
m = 1, 2, ..., 6
$$
 (4.18)

If c is discontinuous at a node, it is evaluated as the limit of c that is approached from inside the element.

Given this form for the variation of the c's, we may proceed to evaluate the integrals in (4.17), using the definitions (4.9). Taking the first one as an example, we have

$$
\int c_1 \phi_j \phi_i dz = c_{11} \int \phi_1 \phi_j \phi_i dz + c_{12} \int \phi_2 \phi_j \phi_i dz \quad (4.19)
$$

where, in general,

$$
\int_{\Delta} \phi_k \phi_j \phi_i dz = \begin{cases} \frac{\Delta}{4} & i = j = k \\ \frac{\Delta}{12} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
$$
 (4.20)

The result is similar for the integrals containing c_2 .

Now consider the second type of integral appearing in (4.17). It is

$$
\int c_3 \phi_j' \phi_i' dz = \sum_{k=1}^{2} c_{3k} \int \phi_k \phi_j' \phi_i' dz
$$
 (4.21)

in which

$$
\int_{\Delta} \phi_k \phi_j^* \phi_i^* dz = \phi_j^* \phi_i^* \frac{\Delta}{2} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\Delta} & i = j \\ -\frac{1}{2\Delta} & i \neq j \end{cases}
$$
 (4.22)

The integrals containing c_4 are similar.

The gravity flow term is given **by**

$$
\int c_5 \phi_1^{\dagger} dz = \sum_{k=1}^{2} c_{5k} \int \phi_k \phi_1^{\dagger} dz
$$
 (4.23)

with

$$
\int_{\Delta} \phi_k \phi_1^{\dagger} dz = \frac{\Delta}{2} \phi_1^{\dagger} = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} & \text{if } = 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } = 2 \end{cases}
$$
(4.24)

The sink term is

$$
\int c_6 \phi_i dz = \sum_{k=1}^{2} c_{6k} \int \phi_k \phi_i dz
$$
 (4.25)

where

$$
\int_{\Delta} \phi_k \phi_i dz = \begin{cases} \frac{\Delta}{3} & i = k \\ \frac{\Delta}{6} & i \neq k \end{cases}
$$
 (4.26)

Finally, we may evaluate the right-hand-side term. It is

$$
\left[-\mathbf{Q}_{m} \phi_{i}\right]_{z_{1}}^{z_{2}} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Q}_{m} \Big|_{z_{1}} & i = 1 \\ -\mathbf{Q}_{m} \Big|_{z_{2}} & i = 2 \end{cases}
$$
(4.27)

Having evaluated the coefficients in (4.17), we now rewrite that system of equations in matrix form:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{A}_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\
\mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\overline{\psi}_1^{\mathsf{T}} \\
\overline{\psi}_2^{\mathsf{T}}\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{B}_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{12} \\
\mathbf{B}_{21} & \mathbf{B}_{22}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\overline{\mathbf{T}}_1^{\mathsf{T}} \\
\overline{\mathbf{T}}_2^{\mathsf{T}}\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{C}_{11} & \mathbf{C}_{12} \\
\mathbf{C}_{21} & \mathbf{C}_{22}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\overline{\psi}_1 \\
\overline{\psi}_2\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{D}_{11} & \mathbf{D}_{12} \\
\mathbf{D}_{21} & \mathbf{D}_{22}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\overline{\mathbf{T}}_1 \\
\overline{\mathbf{T}}_2\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{E}_1 \\
\mathbf{E}_2\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{F}_1 \\
\mathbf{F}_2\n\end{bmatrix} =\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{Q}_{\mathsf{m}} \\
\mathbf{Z}_1\n\end{bmatrix} (4.28)
$$

These equations, combined with the corresponding heat equations, constitute a set of four ordinary differential equations for the four state variables $-\overline{\psi}_1$, $\overline{\psi}_2$, \overline{T}_1 , and \overline{T}_2 .

4.2.4 Application of Boundary Conditions

In a problem where flux boundary conditions are prescribed, the relevant Q's are substituted into the right-hand-side vector, and the four unknown states are found **by** integrating the system. On the

other hand, if one or more of the states is fixed at a node (first-type boundary condition), the equation(s) containing the (unknown) flux through that node is (are) eliminated from the system of equations, keeping the solution uniquely determined. After solution, the neglected equations may be used to determine boundary fluxes.

4.2.5 Linking Elements Together

We now describe how the subdomains are linked together to obtain a global system of equations. Recall that the boundaries separating individual elements are points at which discontinuities may occur. Coupling will be accomplished through the matching of boundary conditions at the discontinuities (Section 2.3.4). We will illustrate this linkage for a pair of elements. The extension to several elements should be obvious **by** induction.

First of all, we note that Equation (4.28) will hold for each element. Since we are now dealing with more than one element, the element superscript will be reintroduced. It will take on values of **1** and 2. Recall that both node (local or global) and element indices increase in the positive z direction.

The coupling conditions (2.73a) and **(2.73b)** give us

$$
\overline{\psi}_2^1 = \overline{\psi}_1^2
$$

$$
\overline{\mathbf{T}}_2^1 = \overline{\mathbf{T}}_1^2
$$

while condition $(2.73d)$, given continuity of q_r , yields

$$
\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{m}}\Big|_{\mathbf{z}_{2}^{1}} = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{m}}\Big|_{\mathbf{z}_{1}^{2}}
$$

Reintroducing the global index for the coordinate z and for the state variables, and adding together the second row of (4.28) for element **1** and the first row for element 2, we obtain

and the first row for element 2, we obtain\n
$$
\begin{bmatrix}\nA_{11}^{1} & A_{12}^{1} & 0 \\
A_{21}^{1} & A_{22}^{1} + A_{11}^{2} & A_{12}^{2} \\
0 & A_{21}^{2} & A_{22}^{2}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\psi_{1}^{1} \\
\psi_{2}^{1} \\
\psi_{3}^{1}\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\nB_{11}^{1} & B_{12}^{1} & 0 \\
B_{21}^{1} & B_{22}^{1} + B_{11}^{2} & B_{12}^{2} \\
B_{21}^{1} & B_{22}^{1} & B_{22}^{2}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\nT_{1}^{1} \\
T_{2}^{1} \\
T_{3}^{1}\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n+\n
$$
\begin{bmatrix}\nc_{11}^{1} & c_{12}^{1} & 0 \\
c_{21}^{1} & c_{22}^{1} + c_{11}^{2} & c_{12}^{2} \\
0 & c_{21}^{2} & c_{22}^{2}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\psi_{1} \\
\psi_{2} \\
\psi_{3}\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\nD_{11}^{1} & D_{12}^{1} & 0 \\
D_{21}^{1} & D_{22}^{1} + D_{11}^{2} & D_{12}^{2} \\
D_{21} & D_{22}^{2} & D_{22}^{2}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\nT_{1} \\
T_{2} \\
T_{3}\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n+\n
$$
\begin{bmatrix}\nE_{1}^{1} \\
E_{2}^{1} + E_{1}^{2} \\
E_{2}^{2}\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\nF_{1}^{1} \\
F_{2}^{1} + F_{1}^{2} \\
F_{2}^{2}\n\end{bmatrix} =\n\begin{bmatrix}\nQ_{m} \\
Q_{m} \\
Q_{n} \\
Q_{n} \\
Q_{n} \\
Q_{3}\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n(4.29)

Once again, we see that the total number of unknowns **(6)** is equal to the number of equations **(3** each from the mass and heat conservation conditions). The boundary conditions may be applied as described in the previous section.

The extension of this procedure to cover **N** nodes **(N-1** elements) is straightforward. The final pair of matrix equations is

$$
\underline{A}_1 \underline{\psi}^{\dagger} + \underline{B}_1 \underline{T}^{\dagger} + \underline{C}_1 \underline{\psi} + \underline{D}_1 \underline{T} + \underline{E}_1 + \underline{F}_1 = \underline{Q}_1 \tag{4.30}
$$

and

$$
\underline{\mathbf{A}}_2 \underline{\psi}' + \underline{\mathbf{B}}_2 \underline{\mathbf{T}}' + \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2 \underline{\psi} + \underline{\mathbf{D}}_2 \underline{\mathbf{T}} + \underline{\mathbf{E}}_2 = \underline{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \tag{4.31}
$$

The elements of the heat equation, (4.31), are implied **by** analogy with those defined for the mass equation.

Note that the matrices appearing in (4.30) and (4.31) are all symmetric and tridiagonal. This will be an important factor in choosing a solution strategy. Recall also that there are strong non-linearities embodied in the coefficient matrices and in the vectors. The problem of integrating (4.30) and (4.31) is thus non-trivial.

In the following developments, we shall not deal explicitly with the boundary conditions. They are easily incorporated as described earlier.

4.3 Approximation of the Time Derivatives

Contract Contract

The time derivatives in (4.30) and (4.31) are evaluated **by** finite difference. In this work, a fully implicit, backward difference scheme is used. This means that all terms other than the time derivative are evaluated at the end of the time step:

$$
\underline{A}_{1}^{k} \xrightarrow{\underline{\psi}^{k} - \underline{\psi}^{k-1}} \underline{B}_{1}^{k} \xrightarrow{\underline{T}^{k} - \underline{T}^{k-1}} + \underline{C}_{1}^{k} \underline{\psi}^{k} + \underline{D}_{1}^{k} \underline{T}^{k} + \underline{E}_{1}^{k} + \underline{F}_{1}^{k} = \underline{Q}_{1}^{k} \qquad (4.32)
$$

in which At is the time increment. An implicit integration scheme is usually much more stable than an explicit one. The heat equation is treated in the same fashion.

Let us rewrite (4.32) considering ψ^k to be the unknown. This yields

$$
(\frac{1}{\Delta t} \underline{A}_{1}^{k} + \underline{C}_{1}^{k}) \underline{\psi}^{k} = -(\frac{1}{\Delta t} \underline{B}_{1}^{k} + \underline{D}_{1}^{k}) \underline{T}^{k} + \frac{1}{\Delta t} \underline{A}_{1}^{k} \underline{\psi}^{k-1} + \frac{1}{\Delta t} \underline{B}_{1}^{k} \underline{T}^{k-1}
$$

$$
- \underline{E}_{1}^{k} - \underline{F}_{1}^{k} + \underline{Q}_{1}^{k} \tag{4.33}
$$

Similarly, for the heat equation, we have

$$
(\frac{1}{\Delta t} \underline{B}_{2}^{k} + \underline{D}_{2}^{k}) \underline{T}^{k} = -(\frac{1}{\Delta t} \underline{A}_{2}^{k} + \underline{C}_{2}^{k}) \underline{\psi}^{k} + \frac{1}{\Delta t} \underline{A}_{2} \underline{\psi}^{k-1} + \frac{1}{\Delta t} \underline{B}_{2}^{k} \underline{T}^{k-1} - \underline{E}_{2}^{k} + \underline{Q}_{2}^{k}
$$
(4.34)

4.4 Iterative Solution Strategy

The following iterative strategy is proposed for the solution of (4.33) and (4.34):

1. Extrapolate the solutions for the last two time steps **(k-2** and k-1) forward to obtain an estimate of $\underline{\psi}^{\bf k}$ and $\underline{\tau}^{\bf k}.$ (If this is the first time step, only the **k-i** "solution" is available **-** it is the initial condition. In this case, we can assume $\underline{\psi}^{\bf k}$ and $\underline{\tau}^{\bf k}$ are given by the initial conditions, for a first guess.)

2. Use the estimated states to evaluate all components (except k) in (4.33). Solve the resulting tridiagonal matrix equation for $\frac{\omega_{\text{L}}}{\text{R}}$.

3. Use the latest estimates of ψ^k and \underline{T}^k to evaluate (4.34) and solve for $\mathbf{\underline{r}}^{\mathbf{k}}$

4. Repeat steps 2 and **3** until some convergence criterion is met.

With this algorithm, we never need to solve a matrix equation any more complex than one in which the matrix is tridiagonal. **A** very

fast procedure exists for the solution of such equations (Pinder and Gray, **p. 23, 1977).**

Note that it is possible to incorporate any of the boundary conditions, including the non-linear ones, described in Section **2.3.1,** into this iterative procedure, using the methods of Section 4.2.4.

4.5 Treatment of Hysteresis and Soil Discontinuities

The use of Equations (4.1) and (4.2) has been restricted (Section 2.2.3) to domains on which $\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial w}$ and other storage parameters are continuous in time, and on which the various conductivities and diffusivities are continuous in space. In general, this will require that no discontinuities in the relevant soil properties occur inside a particular domain, and that no temporal reversals in wetting history occur during the time period of interest. These restrictions were illustrated in Figure 2.1. To them we add the convenient modeling assumption that the wetting history is spatially continuous within the domain. Although this is theoretically inconsistent with the approximations used for ψ and T, it appears justifiable if the length of the domain is small compared to the scale of the phenomenon under study. Alternatively, one could allow wetting discontinuities inside elements, but this would complicate the evaluation of the integrals in the element matrices as the interior discontinuities would invalidate the direct use of the functional coefficient scheme described in Section 4.2.3.

The "domains" on which the conservation equations are to be applied may now be identified. Spatially, they are simply the individual elements of the finite element discretization. As demonstrated in general

terms in Section 2.3.4 and for the finite element model in Section 4.2.5, these domains are coupled through matching of boundary conditions. Temporal discontinuities are allowed to occur between time steps.

The hysteresis model described in Section 3.2.4 is applied at each node of each element in order to determine the values of θ and $\frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}$ at all time. Since we have chosen to keep the wetting history spatially continuous, we will require that a wetting reversal occur instantaneously (between time steps) throughout an entire element. The reversal moisture content may vary continuously in the element. **A** wetting reversal will be assumed to occur at time t^k in element e if the (space) average moisture content in the element at time t^k is greater (less) than the average content at time t^{k-1} , where the element was previously drying (wetting). The reversal actually computed, then, will precede the adoption of a new scanning curve **by** one time step.

An alternative to this procedure would be to choose the proper scanning curve each iteration on the basis of the most recently calculated moisture contents for the present time step. The lag would then be avoided. Preliminary numerical experiments with this more rigorous procedure yielded approximately the same results. Apparently, the rather samll time step required **by** the system non-linearities also minimizes the error in the time-lagged hysteresis procedure.

4.6 Lumping the Storage Matrices

Several investigators (e.g., Neuman, et al., **1975;** Mercer and Faust, **1976)** have found that the form of the storage matrices (i.e., **A**

and B in Eqs. (4.30) and (4.31)) generated **by** the Galerkin method often lead to numerical difficulties. **A** commonly accepted means of overcoming these problems is to diagonalize, or lump, the storage matrix. Preliminary results of this study confirmed the superiority of a diagonalized storage matrix, which has therefore been adopted in this work.

Consider the first matrix of **Eq.** (4.28). Using (4.17), (4.19) and (4.20), we obtain

$$
\begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \Delta \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_{11}}{4} + \frac{c_{12}}{12} & \frac{c_{11}}{12} + \frac{c_{12}}{12} \\ \frac{c_{11}}{12} + \frac{c_{12}}{12} & \frac{c_{11}}{12} + \frac{c_{12}}{4} \end{bmatrix}
$$

In the present work, the following modification is introduced:

$$
\begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \Delta \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & 0 \\ \frac{c_{12}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{c_{12}}{2} \end{bmatrix}
$$
 (4.35)

A similar modification is used in evaluating the other storage matrices.

4.7 <u>Mass and Energy Balances; Evaluation of $\frac{d\phi}{d\psi}$ </u>

4.7.1 General Balance Considerations

Consider now the finite element equations resulting from the application of Galerkin's method to a single element. In matrix form, these equations (for mass or heat) are given **by** (4.28). Using (4.17) and the results of Section 4.2.3, together with the lumped storage assumption, we obtain

$$
\begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{\Delta c_{11}}{2} & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\Delta c_{12}}{2}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{\vec{v}_{1}^{k} - \vec{v}_{1}^{k-1}}{\Delta t} \\
\frac{\vec{v}_{2}^{k} - \vec{v}_{2}^{k-1}}{\Delta t}\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{c_{21}}{2} & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\Delta c_{22}}{2}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{\vec{r}_{1}^{k} - \vec{r}_{1}^{k-1}}{\Delta t} \\
\frac{\vec{r}_{2}^{k} - \vec{r}_{2}^{k-1}}{\Delta t}\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n
$$
+\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{c_{31} + c_{32}}{2\Delta} & -\frac{c_{31} + c_{32}}{2\Delta} \\
-\frac{c_{31} + c_{32}}{2\Delta} & \frac{c_{31} + c_{32}}{2\Delta}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\vec{v}_{1}^{k} \\
\vec{v}_{1}^{k}\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{c_{41} + c_{42}}{2\Delta} & -\frac{c_{41} + c_{42}}{2\Delta} \\
-\frac{c_{41} + c_{42}}{2\Delta} & \frac{c_{41} + c_{42}}{2\Delta}\n\end{bmatrix}\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\vec{r}_{1}^{k} \\
\vec{r}_{2}^{k}\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n
$$
+\n\begin{bmatrix}\n-\frac{1}{2}(c_{51} + c_{52}) \\
\frac{1}{2}(c_{51} + c_{52})\n\end{bmatrix} +\n\begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{\Delta}{6}(2c_{61} + c_{62}) \\
\frac{\Delta}{6}(c_{61} + 2c_{62})\n\end{bmatrix} =\n\begin{bmatrix}\nQ_{m} \\
z_{1} \\
z_{2}\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n(4.36)

Addition of the two lines of (4.36) results in the cancellation of the internal flux terms, yielding

$$
\Delta \left[\frac{c_{11}}{2} \left(\bar{\psi}_1^k - \bar{\psi}_1^{k-1} \right) + \frac{c_{12}}{2} \left(\bar{\psi}_2^k - \bar{\psi}_2^{k-1} \right) + \frac{c_{21}}{2} \left(\bar{T}_1^k - \bar{T}_1^{k-1} \right) + \frac{c_{22}}{2} \left(\bar{T}_2^k + \bar{T}_2^{k-1} \right) \right] + \Delta t \Delta \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(c_{61} + c_{62} \right) \right] = \left[Q_m \Big|_{z_1} - Q_m \Big|_{z_2} \right] \cdot \Delta t \qquad (4.37)
$$

In physical terms, this is equivalent to a mass balance for the element over one time step:

(length of element) x (average storage change)

⁺(duration of time step) x (length of element) x (average sink strength)

= (duration of time step) x (sum of inward flux rates)

Assume that the sink terms and boundary fluxes are defined as constants (e.g., time averages) for the duration of the time step. Then, the only mass balance error resulting from **Eq.** (4.37) will result from the failure of the first term to describe exactly the storage change in the element. We proceed to illustrate the origin of this error.

We define the water mass stored in an element at time step **k** as follows:

$$
\Sigma^{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \frac{\Delta}{2} \left(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\mathbf{k}} \right) \tag{4.38}
$$

where S_m has been defined in Eq. (2.2) . The subscripts 1 and 2 denote, as usual, the local (element) node index. Using **Eq.** (2.2) together with the values $\bar{\psi}_1^k$, $\bar{\psi}_2^k$, \bar{T}_1^k , and \bar{T}_2^k , it is possible to evaluate (4.38).

We now write an expression for the change in storage during a time step. It is

$$
\Sigma^{k} - \Sigma^{k-1} = \frac{\Delta}{2} (s_{m1}^{k} - s_{m1}^{k-1} + s_{m2}^{k} - s_{m2}^{k-1})
$$
 (4.39)

With our definition of element storage, then, the change in storage is a simple linear combination of the changes in the nodal values of **S** m Comparing (4.37) and (4.39), we identify

$$
s_{mi}^{k} - s_{mi}^{k-1} \cong c_{1i}(\overline{\psi}_{i}^{k} - \overline{\psi}_{i}^{k-1}) + c_{2i}(\overline{T}_{i}^{k} - \overline{T}_{i}^{k-1}) \qquad (4.40)
$$

where we recognize the possibility that the expression in (4.37) may not be exactly equivalent to (4.39), the "actual" storage change defined here. Recall that the c coefficients are defined, essentially, as

$$
c_1 = \frac{\partial S_m}{\partial \psi} \Big|_{T}
$$

$$
c_2 = \frac{\partial S_m}{\partial T} \Big|_{\psi}
$$
 (4.41)

(The node index will be omitted in the following development.) Thus, if c_1 and c_2 were constant in time, (4.40) would be an exact relation. Due to the non-linearity of storage as a function of ψ and T, however, a finite mass balance error will, in general, result. The magnitude of this error for a given problem can be estimated **by** the use of a Taylor series.

4.7.2 An Improved Estimate of $\frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}$

In the present problem, we have chosen (Section 4.3) to evaluate the coefficients in (4.36) , including c_1 and c_2 , at the k time level, i.e., at the end of the time step. In most situations, the quantity $\frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}$, which appears in both c₁ and c₂ (see (4.3a), (4.3b) and (3.20)), is **by** far the largest source of non-linearity and, hence, of error in (4.40). This is also true in the heat equation. **By** designing a special scheme to evaluate $\frac{d\theta}{dW}$, we should be able to reduce the balance error significantly.

Let us for the moment treat c_1 and c_2 as though their variability were fully attributable to $\frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}$, i.e.

$$
c_1 = \hat{c}_1 \frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}
$$

$$
c_2 = \hat{c}_2 \frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}
$$

in which $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_2$ are "relatively constant." Then (from (4.41)),

$$
S_{m}^{k} = S_{m}^{k-1} + \int_{t}^{t} \left(\hat{c}_{1} \frac{d\theta}{d\Psi} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tau} + \hat{c}_{2} \frac{d\theta}{d\Psi} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \tau} \right) d\tau
$$
 (4.42)

According to our finite difference approximations,

$$
\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \frac{\psi^{k} - \psi^{k-1}}{\Delta t}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{T^{k} - T^{k-1}}{\Delta t}
$$

i.e., the derivatives are constant. Then, (4.42) yields

$$
s_{m}^{k} \cong s_{m}^{k-1} + \left[\hat{c}_{1} \frac{\bar{\psi}^{k} - \bar{\psi}^{k-1}}{\Delta t} + \hat{c}_{2} \frac{\bar{T}^{k} - \bar{T}^{k-1}}{\Delta t}\right] \int_{t}^{k} \frac{d\theta}{d\Psi} d\tau \qquad (4.43)
$$

where the approximation sign results from the removal of c_1 and c_2 (which are not entirely constant) from the integral. The integral is

$$
\int_{t}^{k} \frac{d\theta}{d\Psi} d\tau = \int_{\Psi} \frac{d\theta}{d\Psi} \left(\frac{d\Psi}{d\tau}\right)^{-1} d\Psi
$$

\n
$$
\approx \frac{\Delta t}{\Psi^{k} - \Psi^{k-1}} \int_{\Psi^{k-1}}^{\Psi^{k}} \frac{d\theta}{d\Psi} d\Psi
$$

\n
$$
= \frac{\Delta t}{\Psi^{k} - \Psi^{k-1}} (e^{k} - e^{k-1})
$$

It follows that a more exact expression than (4.40) with the c's simply evaluated at time t^k can be used. It is

$$
s_{m}^{k} - s_{m}^{k-1} \cong \hat{c}_{1} \left(\frac{\theta^{k} - \theta^{k-1}}{\psi^{k} - \psi^{k-1}}\right) (\bar{\psi}^{k} - \bar{\psi}^{k-1}) + \hat{c}_{2} \left(\frac{\theta^{k} - \theta^{k-1}}{\psi^{k} - \psi^{k-1}}\right) (\overline{T}^{k} - \overline{T}^{k-1})
$$

We have thus determined an "optimal" expression for $\frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}$ during a time

step. The coefficients \hat{c}_1 and \hat{c}_2 are still evaluated at the k time level, while the effective value of $\frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\mathrm{d}\Psi}$ is an average over the time step before time t^k . As before, the coefficients must be evaluated on the basis of a last estimate of the system state at time t^k in the iterative process outlined in Section 4.4.

Where $\frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}$ appears in d_1 and d_2 , the heat storage coefficients, it will be evaluated **by** means of the same procedure.

4.7.3 Saturation Conditions

Following the lead of Neuman, et al. **(1975),** we recognize that the saturated regions will respond instantaneously to their boundary conditions, the storage coefficient being zero. In order to deal with nodes that might de-saturate during a given time step, it is convenient to lower Ψ^{k-1} to the bubbling pressure at saturated nodes at the beginning of a time step. Neuman, et al. **(1975)** show that this modification results in an equivalent statement of the original problem, and is therefore justifiable. In the present work, it was found that this procedure stabilized an otherwise non-converging iteration cycle in the numerical algorithm.

4.8 **A** FORTRAN Code for Execution of the Numerical Model

The numerical method described in this chapter has been coded in the FORTRAN language for computer execution. The program, SPLaSHWaTrl, is documented in Appendix **A.** The FORTRAN listing appears in Appendix B.

Chapter **5**

TESTS OF THE NUMERICAL METHOD

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate the performance of the numerical procedure outlined in Chapter 4. **A** related purpose is to examine the validity of certain models of the soil properties proposed in Chapter **3.**

We may identify three criteria for the evaluation of the numerical procedure. The first is accuracy, which we shall loosely define as the ability of the numerical model to reproduce satisfactorily the true solution to a mathematical statement of a problem. More specific definitions of accuracy are stability **--** the ability **of** a procedure to dampen errors in a solution as computations progress **--** and convergence **--** the tendency toward perfect accuracy that results from finer spatial and temporal discretization. For the complex, non-linear problem treated here, analytical demonstrations of stability and convergence appear difficult, thus we shall infer that the method is stable and convergent if it is accurate in a representative set of applications.

A second criterion is consistency, defined herein as the successful preservation of total mass and energy **by** the numerical scheme. This issue has already been addressed theoretically in Section 4.7. The method proposed there for evaluation of $\frac{\mathrm{d}\,\theta}{\mathrm{d}\,\Psi}$ will

be evaluated in this chapter.

Convergence of the iterative solution procedure at each time step will be defined as the automatic termination of the iterative scheme presented in Section 4.4, i.e., the decay toward zero of the difference between successive iterations. Though this is not the traditional usage of "convergence" (see above), we shall employ it here. Successful completion of a simulation run implies convergence for that problem.

The validity of the numerical model, and of the soil property representations, will be evaluated in terms of the criteria set forth above. An attempt is made to isolate the question of validity of the numerical model from that of validity of the physical theory. The latter is judged sufficiently well-established for application. This isolation is accomplished **by** comparing the numerical solutions to solutions obtained analytically or quasi-analytically, thereby avoiding the complication of data uncertainty. The exception is the example of hysteretic redistribution given in Section **5.3,** a problem for which no analytic solution has yet been given in the literature.

Since analytic solutions of the entire set of equations are not available, it is necessary to test different features of the numerical model separately. Having established the validity of the model for simulating various processes independently, it will be assumed that the model may be used for more complex situations. The demonstrated ability to handle strong non-linearities (Section **5.2)** and highly-coupled problems (Section **5.5)** helps justify this assumption.

5.2 Isothermal Infiltration into Yolo Light Clay

The problem of infiltration into Yolo light clay was solved **by** Philip **(1957)** using a "quasi-analytic" solution procedure. His classic example has since become a standard against which many subsequent solutions have been compared.

This problem is solved here neglecting the vapor and thermal effects, in order to be consistent with Philip's solution. The governing equation is thus

$$
\frac{d\theta}{d\psi}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\left[K\left(\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial z} + 1\right)\right]
$$

with the following boundary and initial conditions:

Although Philip **(1957)** considers a semi-infinite medium, we may use a finite column for times before the wetting front nears the lower boundary.

Haverkamp et al. **(1977)** have fitted equations closely to the data describing the Yolo light clay. Their expression for the moisture retention curve is

$$
\theta = \begin{cases} 0.124 + \frac{274.2}{739 + (\ln(-\psi))^4} & \psi < -1 \text{ cm} \\ 0.495 & \psi \ge -1 \text{ cm} \end{cases}
$$
(5.1)

The relative hydraulic conductivity is given as

$$
K_{\mathbf{r}}(\psi) = \frac{124.6}{124.6 + (-\psi)^4}
$$
 (5.2)

These functions are illustrated **by** the circles in Figures **5.1** and **5.2.** Saturated conductivity is given as 1.23×10^{-5} cm s⁻¹.

Equation (3.8) was also fitted to the $\theta(\psi)$ data used by Haverkamp et al. **(1977).** The parameters used are

This relation is plotted in Figure **5.1** for comparison with **Eq. (5.1).** Note that the main difference is due to the inability of **(3.8)** to reproduce the observed curve near saturation.

Using **Eq. (3.38)** and **Eq. (3.8)** with the parameters above, we may derive numerically a relative hydraulic conductivity function. This is plotted in Fig. **5.2** for comparison with **(5.2).** Note the rather large discrepancy in the drier region. This is not unusual for a derived conductivity function.

The numerical model was used to simulate this isothermal infiltration problem. The top **5** cm. was divided into ten equal-sized elements; the next **25** cm. into twenty-five elements; and the bottom 20 cm. into ten elements. The time step size in this and subsequent examples was controlled automatically **by** a rule that sought to keep the

FIGURE 5.1. MAIN WETTING CURVE OF YOLO LIGHT CLAY.

 \sim

 \sim \sim

FIGURE 5.2. RELATIVE HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY OF YOLO LIGHT CLAY.

 \bar{z}

 $\hat{\pmb{\epsilon}}$

number of iterations required for convergence near some pre-specified number from 2 to **10.**

The solution computed using **(5.1)** and **(5.2)** is plotted in Figure **5.3.** The agreement with Philip's solution is very good. Computation time was about **38** seconds on an IBM **370/168** machine for the entire simulation. The mass balance error (defined as the relative difference between cumulative inflow and total storage change) was about **0.5** per cent. The consistency could be improved **by** reducing the convergence criterion, with a consequent increase in computation time.

This problem was also solved without the special scheme for evaluation of $\frac{d\theta}{d\psi}$. Given the same total execution time, the mass balance error increased **by** almost an order of magnitude.

The problem was also solved using the soil properties defined **by (3.8)** and **(3.38).** The solution, plotted in Figure 5.4, is rather good, especially when one considers the error in the calculated relative conductivity function shown in Figure **5.2.** Note that the numerical solution incorrectly predicts saturation to a significant depth; this is a result of the "corner" at saturation given **by (3.8)..** Despite this error in the shape of the front, the depth of the front is rather well predicted.

Finally, we consider the problem of ponded water at the surface, corresponding to a boundary condition of positive matric potential at the surface. **A** solution is again given **by** Philip **(1958).** For this problem, we use Equations **(5.1)** and **(5.2)** to represent the

FIGURE 5.3. INFILTRRTION INTG TOLO LIGHT CLRY BASED ON EQS. (5.13 **AND** (5.23.

FIGURE 5.4. INFILTRATION INTO YOLO LIGHT CLAY BASED ON EQS. (3.8) AND (3.38).

FIGURE 5.5. INFILTRATION INTO YOLO LIGHT CLAY WITH PONDING, BASED ON EQS. (5.1) AND (5.2).

soil properties. The surface boundary condition is changed to

 $\psi = 25$ cm **t** > 0 **z = 0**

The solution is plotted in Figure **5.5.** Agreement with the quasianalytic solution is very good.

5.3 Isothermal Infiltration and Redistribution in Uplands Sand

Staple **(1969)** studied the problem of soil moisture redistribution following infiltration into an initially-dry sand both experimentally and numerically. His main wetting curve for Uplands sand was fitted to Equation **(3.8).** Using **(3.8),** the scanning curves were derived using the model presented in Section 3.2.4, and the relative conductivity function was derived using Equation **(3.38).** These soil properties are plotted in Figure **5.6.** Two of the primary drying scanning curves are shown. Saturated conductivity is 2.15×10^{-3} cm s⁻¹.

The experiment performed **by** Staple **(1969)** was to allow one inch of water to infiltrate "with a head not exceeding a depth of **1** cm" into sand that was very dry initially. Infiltrated water was then allowed to percolate downward in the column and measurements were made. (Unfortunately, the time of the infiltration phase was not given.) The following initial and boundary conditions were employed here:

$$
\psi = -2.25 \times 10^{6} \text{ cm} \qquad t = 0 \qquad 0 \ge z \ge -30 \text{ cm}
$$

$$
\psi = 0.5 \text{ cm} \qquad t_{i} \ge t > 0 \qquad z = 0
$$

$$
q_{\ell} = 0 \qquad t > t_{i} \qquad z = 0
$$

$$
\psi = -2.25 \times 10^{6} \text{ cm} \qquad t > 0 \qquad z = -30 \text{ cm}
$$

FIGURE 5.6. HYDRAULIC PROPERTIES OF UPLANDS SAND.

where t_i is the time at which the cumulative infiltration is equal to 2.54 cm of water. **A** uniform finite element discretization of **1** cm. was employed.

The solution to this problem, using the properties in Figure **5.6,** is plotted in Figure **5.7** for two values of the redistribution time, $t - t_i$. (The value of t_i was 222 seconds.) The profiles are in general agreement, though the shapes of the fronts are not predicted especially well. The anomalously high moisture content at the surface at **90** seconds is apparently related to swelling of the soil, a phenomenon that was neglected in the formulation of the model. The other errors are probably attributable to approximations in the soil property data.

The same problem was also solved **by** assuming that drainage occurred along the main wetting curve, i.e., hysteresis was neglected. The results appear in Figure **5.8,** where it is apparent that redistribution proceeds much too quickly. Some insight into the difference between Figures **5.7** and **5.8** may be gained **by** examining the moisture retention curves in Figure **5.6.** When hysteresis is neglected, drainage of the wetted region proceeds along the lower curve, the main wetting curve, and much water is released readily to seep into the lower depths. When hysteresis is properly modeled, drainage occurs along the drying curves, which specify more moisture retention at a given value of **pF.** The wetted region thus drains more slowly.

It should be noted that infiltration into a very dry sand

is one of the more difficult problems in numerical modeling of soil water dynamics, often presenting serious problems with respect to accuracy and stability (Narasimhan and Witherspoon, **1978).** Nevertheless, the present model handled the infiltration stage in this example quite well.

5.4 Advection and Dispersion of Heat in a Uniform Moisture Flow

Having looked at some problems in which the moisture field is subjected to large changes in boundary conditions, or stresses, we now turn to a problem in which the thermal regime is **highly** stressed. We consider the problem of advection and dispersion of heat in a saturated porous medium with a large flow rate. Though the rather extreme example to be proposed is not likely to occur in a natural environment, it does serve as a test of the model's validity.

In a non-elastic, homogeneous, saturated porous medium the one-dimensional heat conservation equation reduces to

$$
c \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \lambda \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} - c_{\ell} q_{\ell} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}
$$

in which q_{ℓ} is the vertical component of q_{ℓ} , and all of the coefficients are constants. Let these coefficients take the following values:

C = 9.79 x 10⁻¹ cal cm⁻³ K⁻¹
\n
$$
\lambda
$$
 = 3.6 x 10⁻³ cal cm⁻¹s⁻¹K⁻¹
\n $c_{\rho, q_{\rho}} = -9.98 \times 10^{-4}$ cal cm⁻² s⁻¹K⁻¹

The thermal properties, C and λ , have values typical for soils, while

the advection term, $c_{\varrho} q_{\varrho}$, represents a strong liquid flow. It is well-known (e.g., Pinder and Gray, **1977, p.** 148) that the advection term is the source of difficulty in solving this equation with finite difference and finite element methods, so this extreme example was chosen.

The problem statement is completed with the following initial and boundary conditions:

$$
T = T_0
$$

\n
$$
- \lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} + c_{\ell} q_{\ell} (T - T_0) = c_{\ell} q_{\ell} (T_1 - T_0)
$$

\n
$$
\frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = 0
$$

\n
$$
t > 0
$$

\n
$$
t > 0
$$

\n
$$
z = -50 \text{ cm}
$$

in which

$$
T_o = 20^{\circ}C
$$

$$
T_1 = 21^{\circ}C.
$$

Note that the surface boundary condition is a statement of a specified heat flux at the surface. It is a non-homogeneous, mixed-type boundary condition. Physically, this problem represents a sudden rise to T_1 of the temperature of the liquid supplied to the soil at its surface.

For a semi-infinite domain, the solution to this problem can be found **by** application of Fourier transforms. Defining

$$
D = \frac{\lambda}{C}
$$

and

$$
u = \frac{c_{\ell}q_{\ell}}{c}
$$

FIGURE 5.9. ADVECTION AND DISPERSION OF HEAT IN A SATURATED POROUS MEDIUM.

and recalling that we have defined z negative downward from the surface, we may write the analytic solution to this problem as

$$
T = T_0 + \frac{1}{2}(T_1 - T_0) \left\{ erf c \left(\frac{-z - ut}{2\sqrt{Dt}} \right) - \frac{u}{D} \left(-z + ut + \frac{D}{u} \right) \right\}
$$

.
$$
exp \left(\frac{-zu}{D} \right) erf c \left(\frac{-z + ut}{2\sqrt{Dt}} \right) + \left(\frac{4u^2 t}{D\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} exp \left[- \left(\frac{-z - ut}{2\sqrt{Dt}} \right)^2 \right] \right\}
$$
(5.3)

in which erfc is the complementary error function and exp is the exponential function.

The problem was solved numerically using the same discretization as for the Yolo light clay examples. The time step size ranged from an initial value of **10** seconds to a final value of about **500** seconds. The solution is plotted, along with **(5.3),** in Fig. **5.9.** The agreement is excellent. The relative error in the heat balance was less than **107** for this linear problem.

5.5 Coupled Diffusion of Heat and Vapor in a Very Dry Porous Medium

The final example presented here is designed to test the ability of the model to simulate properly the dynamics of vapordominated systems with strong coupling between moisture and heat fields.

A very dry soil column at some equilibrium temperature and matric potential (and therefore vapor density) is subjected to a sudden increase in vapor density at one end, while the temperature is held at its original value. The other end is closed to heat and

moisture flow. Vapor will diffuse into the column, condense, and release latent heat. There will thus be a temporary rise in the temperature of the medium, though it will eventually return to the value at the boundary as heat diffuses back out of the column.

In the absence of liquid flow, and using the "simple theory" of vapor transport described in Chapter 2, the governing equations reduce to

$$
\frac{\theta_{a}}{\rho_{\ell}} \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial t} + \left(1 - \frac{\rho_{v}}{\rho_{\ell}} \right) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = D^{*} \frac{\partial^{2} \rho_{v}}{\partial z^{2}}
$$
(5.4)

$$
c\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \rho_g L \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \lambda \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2}
$$
 (5.5)

in which

$$
\mathbf{D}^{\star} = \frac{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{a}}}{\rho_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}} \alpha \theta_{\mathbf{a}}
$$

The heat of wetting has not been included; it is equivalent mathematically to L. Expanding the θ derivative,

 \mathbf{r}

$$
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \rho} \left| \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T} \right|_{\rho} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$

this system may be written as a pair of nonlinear diffusion equations in two unknowns, coupled through their storage terms,

$$
\frac{\theta_{a}}{\rho_{g}} + \left[1 - \frac{\rho_{v}}{\rho_{g}}\right] \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \rho_{v}} \Bigg|_{T} \frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial t} + \left[1 - \frac{\rho_{v}}{\rho_{g}}\right] \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T} \Bigg|_{\rho_{v}} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
$$
\n
$$
= D^{*} \frac{\partial^{2} \rho_{v}}{\partial z^{2}}
$$
\n(5.6)

$$
\left[c - \rho_{\ell} L \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T} \bigg|_{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}} \right] \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \rho_{\ell} L \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}} \bigg|_{T} \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial t}
$$

$$
= \lambda \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{T}}{\partial z^2} \tag{5.7}
$$

For small perturbations about a basic state--the initial conditions--we may linearize Eqs. **(5.6)** and **(5.7) by** evaluating the coefficients at the basic state. Crank **(1956, p. 306)** has shown how a dependent variable transformation may then be used to convert these equations to a pair of independent diffusion equations. For further details, the reader is directed to that reference, which also contains the solutions to the resulting diffusion equations.

The boundary and initial conditions are
$$
\rho_{v} = \rho^{*}
$$
\n
$$
T = T^{*}
$$
\n
$$
\rho_{v} = \rho^{*} + \Delta \rho
$$
\n
$$
T = T^{*}
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\partial \rho_{v}}{\partial z} = 0
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = 0
$$
\n
$$
\left.\begin{matrix}\n\frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = 0 \\
\frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = 0\n\end{matrix}\right\}
$$
\n
$$
t > 0
$$
\n
$$
z = -5 \text{ cm}
$$

In the numerical model, conditions on $\rho_{\mathbf{v}}$ are implemented by applying the appropriate conditions on ψ . The following numerical values were employed for the analytic solution:

$$
\rho^* = 6.342 \times 10^{-6} \text{ g cm}^{-3}
$$

\n
$$
\Delta \rho = 6.67 \times 10^{-7} \text{ g cm}^{-3}
$$

\n
$$
T^* = 20^{\circ}C
$$

General expressions described in Chapter **3** and employed in the numerical model were used to evaluate the coefficients in (5.6) and (5.7), given the initial conditions and typical parameter values, for use in the analytic solution. The same parameters were used as input to the numerical model, which did not use the linearization. **A** ten-element discretization was used.

The numerical and analytic solutions for temperature and vapor density are shown in Fig. **5.10.** The agreement is good. The small errors are probably attributable to the spatial discretization scheme,

FIGURE **5.10. COUPLED** DIFFUSION OF **HEAT** AND **MOISTURE IN** A VERY DRY **POROUS** MEDIUM.

to the non-linearities neglected in the analytic solution, and to the somewhat different treatments of vapor transport (simple theory and theory of Philip and de Vries). Mass and heat balance errors were both on the order of 10^{-4} at the end of the simulation.

The same problem was run using the standard method for evaluating $\frac{d\theta}{d\psi}$. The energy balance errors were about the same, as might be expected, since energy storage is essentially linear in this problem. The mass balance error, however, was increased to about 10^{-2} given the same execution time. Therefore, the method proposed in Section 4.7.2 for evaluating the storage coefficient reduces the mass balance error **by** two orders of magnitude.

5.6 Summary

The numerical model described in Chapter 4 has been subjected to a variety of tests for validity. These tests included some extremely nonlinear problems and a problem in which the heat and moisture fields were strongly coupled. The physical processes of liquid and vapor transport, and of heat transport (sensible and latent) **by** conduction and **by** advection, were all simulated using the model. In addition, the models of soil properties developed in Chapter **3** were tested.

In all cases, the numerical model converged to solutions that preserve mass and heat well. Comparisons to several analytic and quasianalytic solutions demonstrate that the model is very accurate.

A new method for iterative estimation of the storage coefficients in the numerical model appears to yield significant improve-

ments in mass and energy balances compared to traditional techniques. Further investigation of this procedure is warranted.

 $\overline{}$

 \sim

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\cdot} }$

 \mathcal{A}

Chapter **6**

SUMMARY, **CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS** FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

6.1 Summary

A general mathematical description of the coupled dynamics of moisture and heat flow in porous media has been presented. The Philip and de Vries **(1957)** formulation has been re-cast in terms of matric potential, accounting for the complications of hysteresis and of soil heterogeneities. **A** practical model for simulating hysteresis, based on the work of Mualem **(1977),** has been proposed. In addition, a suggested extension of Mualem's theory allows incorporation of the effects of temperature on moisture retention.

A numerical (finite element) method for the solution of the general conservation equations has been outlined. It includes a new procedure for evaluating the storage coefficients that appears to offer very large improvements in mass and energy balances in nonlinear problems.

A FORTRAN computer code has been developed in order to execute the complex numerical solution procedure. The numerical method and the computer code have been shown to perform well in simulating **highly**coupled, hysteresis-affected, or very nonlinear problems. Comparisons to analytic solutions verified that the model will simulate correctly the transport of mass in both the liquid and vapor phases and the transport of sensible and latent heat **by** conduction and **by** advection. The mass and energy balance properties of the model are excellent.

6.2 Conclusions

The myriad experimental and theoretical studies conducted **by** soil scientists, hydrologists, geologists, physicists, etc. during the past years have supplied us with much information about transport processes in porous media. Although there remain even today basic physical questions that are not entirely resolved, it appears possible to synthesize the available knowledge into a coherent theoretical framework that will allow us to study systematically the dynamics of coupled mass-energy systems in soils that interact with the wide spectrum of naturally-occurring climates and vegetal systems. The exposition of such a framework and the demonstration of its viability are the goals toward which the present work has been directed.

6.3 Recommendations for Further Research

The theory presented in this work has been precise, but cumbersome. Physically-based studies of large-scale, complex systems- such as the air-land-sea system that provides us with weather and climate- cannot be expected to incorporate the exact physical details of millions of tiny system components. Even if an "infinite" computer were available, the problem of managing data would easily overwhelm us, and the assessment of initial conditions would be hopeless.

Clearly, simplified representations of the soil column and of its aggregate areal response to atmospheric forcing must be developed. Employing the model developed in this paper as the apparatus for a potentially infinite number of experiments on the "true" physical system, it should be possible to develop parameterizations that

faithfully reproduce the behavior of the one-dimensional system.

Another major problem is that of studying the interaction of the soil with the overlying vegetation and atmosphere. Tied in with this is the question of how properly to treat the problem of areal inhomogeneity of soil and vegetal response. Analysis of these problems would probably be facilitated **by** the development of simplified models of the components, such as the soil parameterization that has been mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

REFERENCES

- Adam, K. M. and **A.** T. Corey, Diffusion of entrapped gas from porous media, Colo. State Univ. Hydrology Paper No. **27, 1968.**
- Bear, **J.,** Notes on Hydraulics of Groundwater in Aquifers, Lecture notes for **CE523,** Princeton University, **1977.**

Brooks, R. H. and **A.** T. Corey, Hydraulic properties of porous media, Colo. State Univ. Hydrology Paper No. **3,** 1964.

- **,** Properties of porous media affecting fluid flow, Journal of the Irrigation and Drainage Division, **ASCE, 92** (IR2), **1966.**
- Buckman, H. **0.** and **N. C.** Brady, The Nature and Properties of Soils, Macmillan Co., New York, **1969.**
- Burdine, **N.** T., Relative permeability calculations from pore size distribution data, Petroleum Trans., Am Inst. of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers, **198, 71-77, 1953.**
- Campbell, **G. S.** and W. H. Gardner, Psychrometric measurement of soil water potential: Temperature and bulk density effects, Soil Sci. Soc. **Am.** Proc., **35 (1), 8-12, 1971.**
- Carman, P. **C.,** Properties of capillary-held liquids, **J.** Phys. Chem., **57, 56-64, 1953.**
- Carman, P. **C.** and F. **A.** Raal, Physical adsorption of gases on porous solids. I. Comparison of loose powders and porous plugs, Proc. Royal Soc. London, **A:209, 59-69, 1951.**
- Childs, **E. C.,** The ultimate moisture profile during infiltration in a uniform soil, Soil Sci., **97(3), 173-178,** 1964.
- Childs, **E. C.** and **N.** Collis-George, The permeability of porous materials, Proc. Roy. Soc. London, **A:201,** 392-405, **1950.**
- Corey, W., Mathematical study of the first stage of drying of a moist soil, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **27(2),** 130-134, **1963.**
- Crank, **J.,** The Mathematics of Diffusion, Oxford University Press, New York, **1956.**

Eagleson, P. **S.,** Dynamic Hydrology, McGraw-Hill, New York, **1970.**

, Climate, soil, and vegetation, **3. A** simplified model of soil moisture movement in the liquid phase, Water Resour. Res., 14(5), **722-730, 1978.**

Edlefsen, **N. E.** and **A.** B. **C.** Anderson, Thermodynamics of soil moisture, Hilgardia, **15(2),** 1943.

- Elrick, **D. E.** and **D.** H. Bowman, Note on an improved apparatus for soil moisture flow measurements, Soil Sci. Soc. **Am.** Proc., **28(3),** 450-453, 1964.
- Freeze, R. **A.,** The mechanism of natural ground-water recharge and discharge **1.** One-dimensional, vertical, unsteady, unsaturated flow above a recharging or discharging ground-water flow system, Water Resour. Res., 5(1), **153-171, 1969.**

, Three-dimensional, transient, saturated-unsaturated flow in a groundwater basin, Water Resour. Res., **7(2), 347-366, 1971.**

- Gardner, W. R., Some steady-state solutions of the unsaturated moisture flow equation with application to evaporation from a water table, Soil Sci., 85(4), **228-232, 1958.**
- Geiger, R., The Climate Near the Ground (translated from the fourth German edition), Harvard University Press, Cambridge, **1965.**
- Gillham, R. W., **A.** Klute, and **D.** F. Heermann, Hydraulic properties of a porous medium: measurement and empirical representation, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 40(2), **203-207, 1976.**
- Green, R. **E.** and **J. C.** Corey, Calculation of hydraulic conductivity: **A** further evaluation of some predictive methods, Soil Sci. Soc. Am.Proc., **35(1),** 3-8, **1971.**
- Hadas, A., Evaluation of theoretically predicted thermal conductivities of soils under field and laboratory conditions, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 41(3), 460--466, **1977.**
- Hanks, R. **J.** and **S. A.** Bowers, Numerical solution of the moisture flow equation for infiltration into layered soils, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 26(6), 530-534, **1962.**
- Haverkamp, R., M. Vauclin, **J.** Touma, P. **J.** Wierenga, and **G.** Vachaud, **^A**comparison of numerical simulation models for one-dimensional infiltration, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 41(2), **285-294, 1977.**
- Hillel, **D.,** Soil and Water **-** Physical Principles and Processes, Academic Press, **1971.**

, Computer Simulation of Soil-Water Dynamics, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, **1977.**

Jackson, R. **D.,** Water vapor diffusion in relatively dry soil: IV. Temperature and pressure effects on sorption diffusion coefficients, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **29(2),** 144-148, **1965.**

, Temperature and soil-water diffusivity relations, Soil Sci. Soc. **Am.** Proc., 27(4), **363-366, 1963.**

, On the calculation of hydraulic conductivity, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **36(2), 380-382, 1972.**

- Jackson, R. **D.,** R. **J.** Reginato, and **C.** H. M. van Bavel, Comparison of measured and calculated hydraulic conductivities of unsaturated soils, Water Resour. Res., **1(3), 375-380, 1965.**
- Jury, W. **A.** and **E. E.** Miller, Measurement of the transport coefficients for coupled flow of heat and moisture in a medium sand, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 38(4), **551-557,** 1974.
- Kijne, **J.** W. and **S. A.** Taylor, The temperature dependence of soil water vapor pressure, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **28(5), 595-599,** 1964.
- Kimball, B. **A.,** R. **D.** Jackson, R. **J.** Reginato, F. **S.** Nakayama,and S.B. Idso, Comparison of field-measured and calculated soil-heat fluxes, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 40(1), **18-25, 1976.**
- King, L. **G.,** Description of soil characteristics for partially saturated flow, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 29(4), **359-362, 1965.**
- Klute, **A.,** Some theoretical aspects of the flow of water in unsaturated soils, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc,, **16(2),** 144-148, **1952.**
- Kunze, R. **J., G.** Uehara, and K. Graham, Factors important in the calculation of hydraulic conductivity, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **32(6), 760-765, 1968.**
- Lai, **S., J.** M. Tiedje, and **A. E.** Erickson, In situ measurement of gas diffusion coefficient in soils, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 40(1), **3-6, 1976.**
- Marshall, T. **J., A** relation between permeability and size distribution of pores, **J.** Soil Sci., **9(1), 1-8, 1958.**
- Mercer, **J.** W. and **C.** R. Faust, The application of finite-element techniques to immiscible flow in porous media, in International Conference on Finite Elements in Water Resources, Part II, Water Resources Program, Princeton University, **1976.**
- McQueen, I. **S.** and R. F. Miller, Approximating soil moisture characteristics from limited data: Empirical evidence and tentative model, Water Resour. Res., **10(3), 521-527,** 1974.

Miller, **E. E.** and R. **D.** Miller, Theory of capillary flow: I. Practical implications, Soil Sci. Soc. **Am.** Proc., **19(3), 267-271, 1955.**

, Physical theory for capillary flow phenomena, **J. Appl.** Phys., 27(4), 324-332, **1956.**

Miller, R. **J.** and P. F. Low, Threshold gradient for water flow in clay systems, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **27(6), 605-609, 1963.**

Millington, R. **J.,** and **J.** P. Quirk, Permeability of porous media, Nature, **183, 387-388, 1959.**

- Milly, P. **C. D.,** Comment on "Analysis of water and heat flow in unsaturated **-** saturated porous media" **by** M. Sophocleous, (unpublished manuscript), M. I. T., Cambridge, Massachusetts, **1979.**
- Milly, P. **C. D.,** Documentation of a numerical model for the simulation of moisture and heat transport in soils, M. I. T. Technical Report in preparation, Cambridge, **1980.**

Mualem, Y., Modified approach to capillary hysteresis based on a similarity hypothesis, Water Resour. Res., **9(5),** 1324-1331, **1973.**

, A conceptual model of hysteresis, Water Resour. Res., **10(3),** 514-520, 1974.

, A new model for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated porous media, Water Resour. Res., **12(3), 513-522,** 1976a.

, Hysteretical models for prediction of the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated porous media, Water Resour. Res., **12(6),** 1248-1254, **1976b.**

, Extension of the similarity hypothesis used for modeling the soil water characteristics, Water Resour. Res., 13(4), **773-780, 1977.**

Mualem, Y. and **G.** Dagan, **A** dependent domain model of capillary hysteresis, Water Resour. Res., **11(3),** 452-460, **1975.**

, Hydraulic conductivity: Unified approach to the statistical models, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 42(3), **392-395, 1978.**

Narasimhan, T. **N.** and P. **A.** Witherspoon, Numerical model for saturated unsaturated flow in deformable porous media I. Theory, Water Resour. Res., **13(3), 657-664, 1977.**

, Numerical model **for** saturated **-** unsaturated flow in deformable porous media **3.** Applications, Water Resour. Res., **14(6),** 1017-1034, **1978.**

- Neuman, **S.** P., R. **A.** Feddes and **E.** Bresler, Finite element analysis of two-dimensional flow in soils considering water uptake **by** roots, I. Theory, Soil Sci. Soc. **Am.** Proc., **39(2),** 224-230, **1975.**
- Nielsen, **D.** R. and **J.** W. Biggar, Measuring capillary conductivity, Soil Sci., **92(3), 192-193, 1961.**
- Philip, **J.** R., The theory of infiltration: **1.** The infiltration equation and its solution, Soil Sci., **83(5), 345-357, 1957.**

, The theory of infiltration: **6.** Effect of water depth over soil, Soil Sci., **85(5), 278-286, 1958.**

, Energy dissipation during absorption and infiltration: I, Soil Sci., **89(3), 132-136, 1960.**

, Similarity hypothesis for capillary hysteresis in porous materials, **J.** Geophys. Res., **69(8), 1553-1562,** 1964.

- Philip, **J.** R. and **D. A.** de Vries, Moisture movement in porous materials under temperature gradients, Trans. Amer. Geophys. Union, **38(2), 222-232, 1957.**
- Pinder, **G.** F. and W. **G.** Gray, Finite Element Simulation in Surface and Subsurface Hydrology, Academic Press, New York, **1977.**
- Poulovassilis, **A.,** Hysteresis of pore water, an application of the concept of independent domains, Soil Sci., **93(6),** 405-412, **1962.**
- Rogers, **J. S.** and **A.** Klute, The hydraulic conductivity **-** water content relationship during nonsteady flow through a sand column, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **35(5), 695-700, 1971.**
- Rose, **D. A.,** Water movement in porous materials: Part 2 **-** The separation of the components of water movement, Brit. **J. Appl.** Phys., 14, 491-496, **1963.**
- Rubin, **J.,** Numerical method for analyzing hysteresis-affected, postinfiltration redistribution of soil moisture, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **31(1), 13-20, 1967.**

, Theoretical analysis of two-dimensional, transient flow of water in unsaturated and partly unsaturated soils, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **32(5), 607-615, 1968.**

Sasamori, T., **A** numerical study of atmospheric and soil boundary layers, **J.** Atmos. Sci., **27(8), 1122-1137, 1970.**

Sepaskhah, **A.** R. and L. Boersma, Thermal conductivity of soils as a function of temperature and water content, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 43(3), 439-444, **1979.**

- Sophocleous, M., Analysis **of** water and heat flow in unsaturated saturated porous media, Water Resour. Res., **15(5), 1195-1206, 1979.**
- Staple, W. **J.,** Comparison of computed and measured moisture redistribution following infiltration, Soil Sci. Soc. **Am.** Proc., **33(6),** 840-847, **1969.**
- Swartzendruder, **D.,** The flow of water in unsaturated soils, in Flow Through Porous Media, ed. R. **J.** M. De Wiest, Academic Press, New York, **1969.**
- Talsma, T., Hysteresis in two sands and the independent domain model, Water Resour. Res., **6(3), 964-970, 1970.**
- Taylor, **S. A.,** The activity of water in soils, Soil Sci., **86(2), 83-90, 1958.**
- Taylor, **S. A.** and **G.** L. Stewart, Some thermodynamic properties of soil water, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 24(4), 243-247, **1960.**
- Topp, **G. C.** and **E. E.** Miller, Hysteretic moisture characteristics and hydraulic conductivities for glass-bead media, Soil Sci. Soc. Am Proc., **30(2), 156-162, 1966.**
- Vauclin, **1., G.** Hamon, and **G.** Vachaud, Simulation of coupled flow of heat and water in a partially saturated soil. Determination of the surface temperature and evaporation rate from a bare soil, in Influence des Gradients Thermiques sur les Transferts d'Humidite dans la Zone non Saturee, **A.** T. P. Hydrogeologie **1652,** Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Grenoble, **1977.**
- de Vries, **D. A.,** Simultaneous transfer of heat and moisture in porous media, Trans. Amer. Geophys. Union, **39(5), 909 - 916, 1958.**
- **,** Thermal properties of soils, in Physics of Plant Environment, ed. W. R. Van **Wijk,** North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, **1966.**
- Whisler, F. **D.** and **A.** Klute, The numerical analysis of infiltration, considering hysteresis, into a vertical soil column at equilibrium under gravity, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **29(5), 1965.**
- Wierenga, P. **J., D.** R. Nielsen, and R. M. Hagan, Thermal properties of a soil based upon field and laboratory measurements, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., **33(3), 354-360, 1969.**
- Youngs, **E. G.,** An infiltration method of measuring the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated porous materials, Soil Sci., **97(5), 307-311,** 1964.

APPENDIX **A**

DOCUMENTATION OF SPLaSHWaTrl

A.1 Introduction and Contents

This appendix provides documentation of the computer code for execution of the numerical algorithm outlined in Chapter 4. The computer program is named "SPLaSHWaTrl", an acronym for "Simulation Program for Land Surface Heat and Water Transport, Edition **1."**

We first present the large-scale organization of SPLaSHWaTrl, which is defined roughly **by** the main program of the code. The concept of a simulation period is introduced as a fundamental element in the main program.

In order that various computational tasks be executed, the main program calls many subroutines. Ideally, each subroutine has a well-defined role in the algorithm. The purpose of each subroutine is described in Section **A.3.**

Execution of SPLaSHWaTrl requires the definition of an input file containing all of the system parameters, initial conditions and boundary conditions. The format of the input file is presented in Section A.4.

Finally, some listings of sample input and output files are given. Such examples can be helpful when a user must debug the program, possibly after a change to a new computer system or when modifications of the code have been made. These listings constitute Section **A.5.**

An extensive list of definitions of the FORTRAN variables used in SPLaSHWaTrl is given in the main program listing (Appendix B). For the user's convenience, much of the documentation contained in this appendix is also found in the comment statements of the program listing.

A.2 Structure of SPLaSHWaTrl **-** An Overview

A.2.1 The Simulation Period

The fundamental time period for specification of boundary conditions in a simulation is the "simulation period." **By** definition, a simulation period is a time interval during which the specified surface boundary conditions are constant. In the current version, the user may specify either the average mass flux rate or the matric potential at the surface during the simulation period. Similarly, the other condition may be expressed either as a given heat flux or as a known temperature.

In general, a simulation period will consist of more than one time step. The time step size is controlled automatically **by** the program. Considerations of "accuracy" and numerical "convergence," as defined in Chapter **5,** limit the size of the time step.

A.2.2 Flow of Control in the Main Program

The structure of the main program of SPLaSHWaTrl is illustrated in Fig. **A.l.** After initial input and computations, the specified simulation periods are modeled sequentially **by** looping through the remainder of the program, once for each period. Inside a given simulation period, a time step loop is executed as many times as necessary to reach the end

Figure **A.l.** Flowchart for SPLaSHWaTrl Main Program.

of the period, given the constraints on the time step size.

For a given time step (Section 4.4), the mass and energy equations are solved alternately to obtain successive estimates of matric potential and temperature at the end of the current time step. For isothermal problems of moisture transport, the heat equation is omitted.

When convergence of the calculated solution is obtained (or if a specified maximum number of iterations is exceeded), the new moisture contents are calculated and mass and energy balances are calculated, if desired. If the time has reached the end of the current simulation period, a new period is begun. Otherwise, a new time step follows.

Further details of the operation of the main program may be found in the program listing. Documentation of the various subprograms is presented in the following section and in the program listing.

A.3 SPLaSHWaTrl Subprograms

A.3.1 INIT2

This subroutine is called only once, at the start of execution, in order to perform the initial calculations and input and output operations. Specifically, it performs the following operations:

- 1. Set the values of constants.
- 2. Read the option codes, simulation parameters, initial conditions, element information, etc.
- **3.** Write initial output as requested.
- 4. Call SOILI2 to get soil parameters.
- **5.** Initialize PP, TT, X, XOLD; initialize mass and energy

balance variables, time variables.

A.3.2 NEWPR2

This subroutine begins a new simulation period **by** reading the duration and the boundary conditions. Optionally, an initial time step length for the period may be specified (see Section **A.3.3).** If **NBCP (NBCT)** equals one, a specified matric head (temperature) equal to BCP (BCT) is applied as the surface boundary condition. If **NBCP (NBCT)** equals two, a surface mass (heat) flux of BCP (BCT) is indicated.

Program execution is terminated in this subroutine when a negative duration is specified for a simulation period.

The simulation period number, NPER, is incremented during each call, and the time at the end of the period, **TEND,** is computed. The time step counter is set to zero.

A.3.3 NWSTP2

This subroutine is called **by** the main program to begin a new time step. It computes a new time step length, updates the wetting history, computes estimates **(by** extrapolation) of the solution for the new time step, and updates various vectors. ENTRY NEWIT2, contained in this subprogram, is called at the start of subsequent iterations in the same time step. It increments KIT, the iteration counter, and updates PPOLD and TTOLD.

The length of the first time step in a simulation period may be specified as DLT in input to NEWPR2 (Section **A.3.2).** For other time steps, or if DLT is less than zero, the new value is calculated **by** an

algorithm that tends to maintain the number of iterations per time step near a specified value, ITDES. If KIT from the last time step exceeds ITDES, the value of DELT is reduced **by** a factor of the square of their ratio. If KIT is less than ITDES, the time step length is increased **by** a factor of 1.2. If necessary, the value of DELT is reduced to prevent the time step from overshooting the end of the simulation period.

A.3.4 PPRAM2

For both nodes of each element, PPRAM2 computes the values of the coefficients and the gravity term in the mass conservation equation. This will allow the various discontinuities that may occur across element boundaries. The components of the coefficients that depend only on ψ and T are continuous at node points and may therefore be calculated using the global node index; these computations are inside the first **DO** loop. In the second loop, the mass equation coefficients are calculated using the element and local node indices.

The evaluation of $\frac{d\theta}{d\Psi}$ may be performed in two ways. If J9 has been given as zero, it is simply computed as the derivative of the current scanning curve, evaluated at the end of the time step (using the latest estimates of ψ and T). If J9 is equal to one and a significant change in \$ occurs, the iterative method described in Section **4.7** is employed.

If the isothermal liquid flow option is invoked (124 **= 3),** many unnecessary computations in PPRAM2 are skipped.

A.3.5 TPRAM2

This subroutine calculates the coefficients of the heat equation at both nodes of each element. It is analogous to PPRAM2.

Note that some variables calculated in PPRAM2 (e.g., RHOV) are saved in storage for use in TPRAM2 so that they need not be recalculated.

A.3.6 MAT2

MAT2 assembles the global coefficient matrices of the Galerkin expressions for the mass or energy conservation equations.

Three weighting options are provided for evaluation of the storage matrices. If **J3 (J4)** is equal to zero, the mass (energy) equation is evaluated according to the expression generated **by** the Galerkin method (e.g., the matrix two lines above (4.35)). When **J3 (J4)** is equal to two, the lumping scheme of (4.35) is used. For **J3 (J4)** equal to one, the following expression is employed:

$$
\begin{vmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{vmatrix} = \Delta \begin{vmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & C_{11} & C_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{C_{11}}{6} + \frac{C_{12}}{3} \end{vmatrix}
$$

Element conductivity terms are evaluated using the functional coefficient scheme (which results in an arithmetic average) when **J8** is equal to one. **A** geometric mean is used for **J8** equal to two.

A.3.7 EQN2

This subroutine performs the finite difference of the time derivatives and sets up the matrix equation for the matrix solver (Section 4.3). Note that the ordering of the arguments in the **CALL** statements in the main program depends on which equation is being solved. The variable names used in **EQN2,** therefore, do not always correspond to those in the

COMMON block, their definition being determined **by** the **CALL** statement.

The matrix **"SAVE"** retains the lines of the matrix equation corresponding to the end nodes for later calculation of the end fluxes.

A.3.8 PBC2

This subroutine adjusts the matrix equation to account for boundary conditions. (The boundary conditions are specified **by** input in NEWPR2.) PBC2 incorporates the mass boundary condition, and ENTRY TBC2 applies the heat boundary condition. The method for application of boundary conditions is described in Section 4.2.4.

A type I boundary condition (specified ψ or T) at node i is incorporated as follows:

- **1.** Set i'th element of right-hand side vector equal to known value of state variable.
- 2. Set i'th diagonal element of matrix equal to unity. Other elements in i'th row of matrix set to zero.
- **3.** Use known value of i'th state to evaluate any terms involving it in other lines of the matrix equation. Move these known terms to the right-hand-side vector, and replace the relevant matrix elements with zero. In this way, the matrix will remain symmetric.

A flux boundary condition is incorporated simply **by** adding to or subtracting from the right-hand-side vector the specified flux into the system at the relevant node. See, for example, Equation (4.29).

In the current version of SPLaSHWaTrl, a first-type B.C. is applied to matric head at the bottom of the column **by** allowing no change in the initial condition. Heat flux at the bottom of the column is zero except for advection **by** moisture flow; there is no temperature gradient.

The surface boundary conditions are applied according to the rules discussed in Section **A.3.2.**

A.3.9 SOLVE2

The Thomas algorithm for solution of a tridiagonal matrix equation is used to solve the mass or energy equation, yielding the values of matric head or temperature at each node. The algorithm is presented **by** Pinder and Gray **(p. 23, 1977).**

Note that the second argument in **SOLVE2** contains the righthand-side of the equation when the subroutine is called, while the subroutine returns the solution in the same vector.

A.3.10 CHK2

This subroutine checks for convergence of the mass $(K = 1)$ or energy $(K = 2)$ solution. It returns a value of $J = 1$ if convergence is obtained and $J = 0$ otherwise.

For $K = 1$, convergence is obtained when the relative difference between PP and PPOLD,

$$
\frac{PP(I) - PPOLD(I)}{PP(I)}
$$

is less than PERR for all I. For K **=** 2, the criterion is that TT and TTOLD differ **by** no more than TERR for all I.

A.3.ll RHOZZ2

This subprogram defines three functions of temperature saturation vapor density and its derivative and the correction of hydraulic conductivity for temperature effects.

The vector RZ contains the saturation vapor density values for integer values of temperature from **0*C** to **80*C.** Actual values for any T are found **by** linear interpolation. The slope, DRZDT, is estimated as the difference between the two closest values of RZ tabulated (since the corresponding difference in T is unity).

The temperature correction for hydraulic conductivity is

$$
CKTZ = \frac{\mu(T_o)}{\mu(T)} = (CKTN \cdot VISCC)^{-1}
$$

The value of **CKTN** is calculated **by** an initial call to this function from INIT2 (with **CKTN = 1).** The viscosity is calculated **by** one of two formulas depending on whether T is greater than or less than **20'C** (CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, **1979, p. F-51).**

A.3.12 BAL2

This subroutine need not be called to complete the execution of any simulation. If desired, it is called after each time step to produce an accounting of the mass and energy budget for the simulation. The total storage of mass and energy is calculated, assuming linear variation of storage inside elements. Changes in storage for the most recent time step and for the entire simulation are compared to the corresponding net fluxes, and errors are computed. All balance information is printed out.

A.3.13 SOILI2

This subroutine performs calculations involving the hydraulic properties of soils. It uses the models of moisture retention and hydraulic conductivity presented in Chapter **3.** Alternatively, the user may specify **J5 = 1** and supply his own FORTRAN statements at the appropriate lines in the code; in this case, hysteresis is not allowed.

The first entry point, SOILI2, is used in a one-time call from INIT2 to initialize various soil variables. For each soil type, a set of parameters that determine its hydraulic behavior is read. The parameters of **Eq. (3.8)** are derived from the input variables **by** a fitting procedure.

The input variables are θ_{11} , the negative of the wetting equivalent of the bubbling potential, the moisture content at the wilting point, the parameter M, the PF intercept of the capillary segment of the main wetting curve, and the saturated hydraulic conductivity at reference temperature T_{0} . The PF-intercept of the adsorption segment of the main wetting curve is taken as **7.0,** and the PF at the wilting point is 4.2. PFK, the maximum value of PF at which the liquid phase is discontinuous, is set equal to **5.85.**

Given the input parameters, SOILI2 makes initial estimates of a₁, a₂, s₁, and s₂, assuming that M is infinite (Figs. 3.5 and 3.6). The parameters a_1 and a_2 are then adjusted iteratively to fit the main wetting curve at saturation and at the wilting point, using the finite value of M.

In order that the relative hydraulic conductivity integral **(3.38)** may be evaluated, the main wetting curve is approximated **by** a

piecewise linear relation between $\theta_{\mathbf{w}}$ and PF. Thus,

PF = PFR_{j,k} - SS_{j,k}(
$$
\theta_w
$$
 - XR_{j,k}) {
 $zR_{j,k} < \theta_w \leq XR_{j,k+1}$
 $k = 1, 2, ..., 8$
 $zR_{j,k+1} \leq PF < PFR_{j,k}$

for soil type **j,** where

$$
\begin{cases}\n\theta_{w}(\text{PFR}_{j,k}) = \text{XR}_{j,k} \\
\text{SS}_{j,k} = \frac{\text{PFR}_{j,k} - \text{PFR}_{j,k+1}}{\text{XR}_{j,k+1} - \text{XR}_{j,k}}\n\end{cases}\n\quad k = 1, 2, ..., 9
$$

The PFR_{j,k} and XR_{j,k} are chosen such that

$$
R_{k} = \frac{a_{1j} - s_{1j} \text{ PFR}_{j,k+1}}{\theta_{w} (\text{PFR}_{j,k+1})} \quad k = 1, 2, ..., 7
$$

in which a_{1i} and s_{1j} are the soil parameters a_1 and s_1 for soil type j. The values of R_k are 0.01, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9, and 0.99 for $k = 1$, 2, **... , 7,** respectively. In addition,

$$
XR_{j,1} = \theta_{kj} \qquad PFR_{j,1} = PFK
$$

$$
XR_{j,9} = \theta_{uj} \qquad PFR_{j,9} = \log_{10}(PB_j)
$$

where θ_{kj} , θ_{uj} and PB_j are θ_k , θ_u and PB for soil j.

Using this representation for $\Psi(\theta_{\bf w})$, we may evaluate the integrals appearing in **(3.38).** In general,

$$
\int_{0}^{S} \frac{dS'}{\psi(S')} = \frac{-1}{\theta_{u} - \theta_{k}} \int_{\theta_{k}}^{0} 10^{-PF} d\theta
$$

Substituting our piecewise expression for PF and integrating, we obtain

$$
\int_{0}^{S} \frac{dS'}{\psi(S')}
$$
 = $[(\theta_{u} - \theta_{k}) \ln 10]^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} SS_{j,i}^{-1} (PR_{j,i+1}^{-1} - PR_{j,i}^{-1}) + SS_{j,m}^{-1} (PWET^{-1} - PR_{j,m}^{-1}) \right\}$ $PR_{j,m+1} \leq PWET \leq PR_{j,m}$

in which

$$
PR_{j,i} = -10^{PFR}j,i
$$

and

PWET =
$$
\theta_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1}(\theta)
$$

Defining

$$
ENT_{j,m} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} SS_{j,i}^{-1} (PR_{j,i+1}^{-1} - PR_{j,i}^{-1})
$$

we then have, from **(3.38)**

$$
K_{r}(\theta) = S_{e}^{1/2} \{ [ENT_{j,m-1} + SS_{j,m}^{-1} (PWET}^{-1} - PR_{j,m}^{-1})] ENT_{j,8}^{-1} \}
$$

PR_{j,m+1} \leq PWET \leq PR_{j,m}

The quantities PR, **ENT,** etc., are calculated,as outlined above, by a call to SOILI2 before the actual start of the simulation. Later calls to ENTRY SOIL32 are used to calculate hydraulic conductivity during a simulation (see below).

ENTRY SOIL12 is called (for **J5** not equal to **1)** at the beginning of a new time step. It updates the wetting history, if necessary, of any element. If the change in average moisture content during the most recent time step was in the opposite direction of that during the previous time step, the history is updated, following the procedure described in Section **3.3.**

A call to ENTRY SOIL22 will calculate moisture content and, if KODE equals **2,** the slope of the current scanning curve. Equations **(3.36)** and **(3.37),** along with **(3.8),** are used for this purpose. They may be differentiated, using (3.34) and **(3.35),** to obtain the formulas for the slopes. When **J5** equals unity, hysteresis is ignored, and the moisture characteristic and its slope are defined **by** user-supplied FORTRAN statements.

ENTRY SOIL32 calculates the relative hydraulic conductivity, given the moisture content, using the formula given above. It first determines in which interval the moisture content falls, then uses a modified Newton-Raphson algorithm to find the corresponding value of PF and, hence, PWET. The formula is then used. If **J5** is equal to one, a user-supplied FORTRAN statement is used to express K_r as a function either of θ or of ψ (or Ψ).

The liquid island enhancement factor for vapor flow is calculated in SOIL32 using **Eq. (2.13).**

A.3.14 XWET

XWET is a function subprogram that computes the moisture content of the main wetting curve as a function of PF and the soil index. It uses **Eq. (3.38).**

A.4 Input Data for SPLaSHWaTrl

The input data required for running the current version of the numerical simulation model are listed in Table **A.l.,** Definitions of most of the FORTRAN variables are given in the comment statements at the beginning of the main program (Appendix B). The remaining variables, which are all in record type **6,** are defined in subroutine SOILI2.

The number of type-7 records is one more than the desired number of simulation periods. In the last record, a negative value for **DURTN** should be entered; this will terminate execution. (The other variables in that record will then be ignored.)

TABLE **A.l.** Input Format for SPLaSHWaTrl

A.5 Two Examples: Input and Output

A.5.1 Example **1**

The first example given here is the problem of coupled heat and vapor diffusion examined in Section **5.5.** The input and output are given for two 500-second simulation periods. Note that, although the boundary conditions do not change, it is convenient to use separate simulation periods in order to obtain output at desired times.

Example **1** Input

OUTPUT OPTIONS **--** 1=ACTION **0=NO** ACTION

 \sim

172

 $\sim \omega_{\rm c}$

SIMULATION **OPTIONS**

 \sim \sim

 ϵ

OTHER SIMULATION **SCALARS**

NODAL DATA N=== D==P=

INPUT SOIL PARAMETERS

 \sim

 ~ 10

COMPUTED SOIL PARAMETERS

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

the control of the control of the control of

ELEMENT DATA

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\log n))$. The set of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$

ELEMENT	ΙS	IΗ	X(L,1)	X(L, 2)	XWRE(L.1)	XWE $(L, 2)$	XOLD
			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
2			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
з			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
Δ			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
5			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
6			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
8			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
9			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172
10			0.0172	0.0172	0.0	0.0	0.0172

SIMULATION PERIOD **NUMBER 1**

 ~ 100

MASS BALANCE INFORMATION

DATA FOR CURRENT TIME **STEP**

CUMULATIVE **DATA**

0.11401D-04 **CAL/CM2-S** 0.11401D-04 **CAL/CM2-S**

0.97591D-02 CAL/CM2 0.97567D-02 CAL/CM2

3 -1379138.14 8 **-1379095.30** 4 **-1379137.77 9 -1378251.36** **5 -1379137.20 10 -1364372.29**

-0.00002

-0.02430

 \mathcal{L}^{max}

RATE OF STORAGE **CHANGE**

2 **-1379138.37 7 -1379133.94**

DATA FOR CURRENT TIME **STEP**

NET FLUX RATE

PERCENT ERROR

NET TOTAL **FLUX** TOTAL STORAGE **CHANGE**

PERCENT ERROR

CUMULATIVE **DATA**

MATRIC **HEAD**

-1379139.00 -1379136.35 -1241223.30

1 6 11 ENERGY **BALANCE** INFORMATION

TEMPERATURE

 ~ 100

MOISTURE **CONTENT**

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\sim 10^{11}$ km s $^{-1}$

SIMULATION PERIOD **NUMBER** 2

 ~ 100

 α , α , α

MASS BALANCE INFORMATION

DATA FOR CURRENT TIME **STEP**

PERCENT ERROR

-0.01267

CUMULATIVE **DATA**

يتعيناني

PERCENT ERROR **-0.02076**

 $\sim 10^{11}$ km $^{-1}$

ENERGY **BALANCE** INFORMATION

DATA FOR CURRENT TIME **STEP**

CUMULATIVE **DATA**

PERCENT ERROR

-0.01661

 $\sim 10^{11}$

 ~ 1000 km s $^{-1}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

a Partido de Santos

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}(\mathbf{A})$

 $\sim 10^{11}$ km s $^{-1}$

MATRIC **HEAD**

TEMPERATURE -----------

MOISTURE **CONTENT**

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\log n))$. The set of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$

 $\gamma_{\rm{1}}$.

 ~ 100

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}))$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$. The contribution of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$
$A.5.2$ Example 2

 \bullet

The second example simulates isothermal infiltration into Yolo light clay using (5.1) and (5.2). This is the problem whose solution is plotted in Figure 5.3. Simulation periods ending at 10^3 sec. and 10^4 sec. are used. The computed soil parameters, although included in the output, are irrelevant, as the hydraulic functions were specified explicitly in SOILI2.

Example 2 Input

1 0.0

OUTPUT OPTIONS **--** 1=ACTION **O=NO** ACTION

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 $\sim 5\%$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 \sim

SIMULATION OPTIONS

 \bullet

OTHER SIMULATION **SCALARS**

NODAL DATA

NODE	z	P	T
1	-50.00	-600.	20.0
2	-48.00	-600.	20.0
3	-46.00	$-600.$	20.0
4	-44.00	$-600.$	20.0
5	-42.00	-600.	20.0
6	-40.00	-600.	20.0
7	-38.00	-600.	20.0
8	-36.00	-600.	20.0
9	-34.00	$-600.$	20.0
10	-32.00	$-600.$	20.0
11	-30.00	-600.	20.0
12	-29.00	$-600.$	20.0
13	-28.00	-600.	20.0
14	-27.00	-600.	20.0
15	-26.00	$-600.$	20.0
16	-25.00	$-600.$	20.0
17	-24.00	-600.	20.0
18	-23.00	$-600.$	20.0
19	-22.00	-600.	20.0
20	-21.00	-600.	20.0
21	-20.00	$-600.$	20.0
22	-19.00	$-600.$	20.0
23	-18.00	$-600.$	20.0
24	-17.00	$-600.$	20.0
25	-16.00	$-600.$	20.0
26	-15.00	$-600.$	20.0

27	-14.00	-600.	20.0
28	-13.00	-600.	20.0
29	-12.00	$-600.$	20.0
30	-11.00	-600.	20.0
31	-10.00	$-600.$	20.0
32	-9.00	-600.	20.0
33	-8.00	-600.	20.0
34	-7.00	$-600.$	20.0
35	-6.00	-600.	20.0
36	-5.00	-600.	20.0
37	-4.50	-600.	20.0
38	-4.00	$-600.$	20.0
39	-3.50	$-600.$	20.0
40	-3.00	$-600.$	20.0
41	-2.50	-600.	20.0
42	-2.00	-600.	20.0
43	-1.50	$-600.$	20.0
44	-1.00	-600.	20.0
45	-0.50	-600.	20.0
46	0.0	$-600.$	20.0

INPUT **SOIL** PARAMETERS

COMPUTED SOIL PARAMETERS

--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------

 \blacksquare

 $\sim 10^{11}$

 \sim \sim

ELEMENT DATA

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

SIMULATION PERIOD **NUMBER 1**

MASS BALANCE INFORMATION

DATA FOR CURRENT TIME **STEP**

PERCENT ERROR **-0.25290**

CUMULATIVE **DATA**

PERCENT ERROR **-0.81632**

MATRIC **HEAD**

 ~ 100 km s $^{-1}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$. The $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

الاحتجاج والمرادي والاستحصاح والمتعارف والمنافر والمتحال والتعاري والمتحال والمتحال والمعارض والمنافرة والمنافرة

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim

 $\ddot{}$

SIMULATION PERIOD NUMBER 2

MASS BALANCE INFORMATION

DATA FOR CURRENT TIME **STEP**

 \bar{z}

CUMULATIVE **DATA**

 \sim

MATRIC **HEAD**

 \sim

 \mathcal{L}

 \mathcal{L}

MOISTURE **CONTENT** -----------------

Appendix B

Listing of SPLaSHWaTrl

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim

 \sim

189

 \sim

 \sim

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

192

 \sim \sim

 ~ 40

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}),\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}})$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim \sim

194

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

195

 $\mu_{\rm{eff}}$, $\mu_{\rm{eff}}$, $\mu_{\rm{eff}}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$. The set of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \, \mathrm{d} \xi \, \mathrm$

 \sim

 \sim

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}),\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{$

198

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}))$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 α

199

 \sim

 λ

 ~ 10

 $\sim 10^{11}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 201

 $\sim 10^{11}$ km s $^{-1}$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\sim 10^7$

 ~ 10

 $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x})$.

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}), \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}})$

 \sim

```
COMMON BCP, BCT, CPLGE, CPSI, DELT, DELTO, DLOGE, DLN10. DLT. DURTN. PERR.
                                                                    PPR00510
    *PN, RHOL, ST, STI, SX, SXI, TEND, TERR, TFLUX, THETA, TIME, TSAVE1. TSAVE2.
                                                                    PPR00520
                                                                     PPR00530
    *TZERO.XFLUX.ZETA
                                                                     PPR00540
     COMMON IH(46), IS(46)
     COMMON I1, I2, I3, I4, I5, I6, I7, I8, I9, I10, I11, I12, I13, I14, I15, I16, I17, PPR00550
    #118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, J1, J2, J3, J4, J5, J6, J7, J8, J9, ITDES. PPR00560
     *KIT, KK, KT, NBCP, NBCT, NL, NN, NPER, NS, NSTEPS
                                                                     PPR00570
                                                                     PPR00580
     DIMENSION CKT(46), DA(46)
                                                                    PPR00590
     DIMENSION INT2(46)
PPROO610
     IF(117.EQ.1. AND. I24.NE.3) WRITE(6.1040).
*********PPR00620
                                                                     PPR00630
C
                                                                     PPR00640
   CALCULATE THE MOISTURE CONTENT, XX, AND THE SPECIFIC MOISTURE
\mathbf{c}PPR00650
C.
   CAPACITY, DXDP.
C
                                                                     PPROD660
                                                                     PPR00670
     CALL SOIL22(2)
                                                                    PPR00680
\mathbf{c}*PPR00690
                                                                     PPR00700
C
                                                                     PPR00710
\mathbf cCALCULATE THE HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY
                                                                     PPR00720
     CALL SOIL32
                                                                     PPR00730
\mathbf{C}pPR00740
C******PPR00750
\mathbf{C}PPR00760
\mathbf{c}IN THE FIRST LOOP. WE COMPUTE THOSE VARIABLES THAT CAN BE
   DEFINED UNIQUELY AT EACH NODE, INDEPENDENT OF THE ELEMENT. THESE
                                                                    PPR00770
C
\mathbf{c}WILL DEPEND ONLY ON TEMPERATURE AND MATRIC POTENTIAL.
                                                                    PPR00780
                                                                    PPR00790
\mathbf{C}والمحاول والمتحدث والمتداري والمتوارد والمتداري
                                                                    *PPROOBOO
PPR00810
     DO 10 I=1.NN
     IF(KT.EQ.1) INT2(I)=0PPR00820
                                                                     PPR00830
     IF(I24.EQ.3) GO TO 10
     TK=TT(I)+273.16PPR00840
                                                                     PPR00850
     CKT(I)=CKTT2(TT(I))GORT = 2.13D - 04/TKPPR00860
      RH = DE XP(PP(I)*GORT)PPR00870
                                                                     PPR00880
      RHOV(I)=RH*RHOZZ2(TT(I))
                                                                     PPR00890
      DA(I) = 5.8D - 07 * TK * * 2.3COR(I)=DEXP(-CPSI*(TT(I)-TZERO))PPR00900
      B3(I) = RHOV(I)*GORTPPR00910
      B4(I) = RH * DRZDT2(TT(I)) - B3(I) * PP(I)/TKPPR00920
      IF(I17.EQ.1) WRITE(6,1030) I, CKT(I).COR(I), RHOV(I), RH, GORT.DA(I). PPR00930
     1B3(I), B4(I)PPR00940
                                                                     PPR00950
  10 CONTINUE
                                                                     PPR00960
      IF(I17.EQ.1.AND.124.NE.3) WRITE(6.1010).
                                                                    *PPR00970
\mathbf{c}PPR00980
        IN THE SECOND LOOP, WE COMPUTE VARIABLES THAT ARE DEFINED
                                                                     PPR00990
\mathbf c\mathbf{c}AT EACH END (NODE) OF EACH ELEMENT. THIS INCLUDES THE ACTUAL
                                                                     PPR01000
```
207

 \sim

 α

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

208

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$. In the contract of the contract of $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}))$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right) = \$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$. The contribution of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

 $\sim 10^6$

 $\bar{\beta}$

 \sim

211

 $\sim 10^6$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$. The contribution of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$

212

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \left(\frac{d\mu}{\mu} \right)^2 \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \left(\frac{d\mu}{\mu} \right)^2$

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\sim 10^6$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2$

*,1)',4X,'D(I.2)'.5X,'F(I)'/(/3XI4.3X.4(2D10.2.IX).DIO.2)) MATO1010 1020 FORMAT(//10X,'TEMPERATURE MATRICES'/10X.20(1H-)//5X.'I'.6X.'A(I.1)MAT01020 $1', 4X, 'A(I,2)'; 5X, 'B(I,1)'; 4X, 'B(I,2)'; 5X, 'C(I,1)'; 4X, 'C(I,2)'; 5X. 'MAT01030$
2D(I.1)'.4X.'D(I.2)'.6X.'F(I)'/(/3X.14.3X.4(2D10.2.1X).D10.2)) MAT01040 $2D(I,1)'$,4X.'D(I,2)',6X,'F(I)'/(/3X.14.3X.4(2010.2.1X).DIO.2)) MAT01040
END MAT01050 **END** . . **MAT01050** ******** ************ ****** ****** ********* ** * *********** *************MATO1O6O

 \sim

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$. The contribution of the contribution of $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

217

 \sim \sim

 $\sim 10^{11}$

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$.

 $\sim 10^{-10}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \mathcal{A}^{\pm}

 \sim

218

 \sim

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$

 \mathbf{r}

 \sim

 $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{G}}$.

 \sim

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$. The contribution of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

 \sim

221

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$. The set of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$

 \mathcal{L}^{max} , where \mathcal{L}^{max}

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim \sim

 \cdot

 \sim

 $\sim 10^7$

223

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\Delta \phi$ and $\Delta \phi$ are $\Delta \phi$.

224

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$

U-1

 $\sim 10^{11}$

 \bullet

227

 α

 \bar{r}

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{q}_i}$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

228

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

229

 $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}}$.

 $\label{eq:R1} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}) \end{split}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$. The set of the set of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

 $\sim 10^{-10}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \,$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}))$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$.

 α

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{eff}}$

 \bar{e}

 $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\rm eff}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2$

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\Delta \phi$

 \mathcal{L}^{\pm}

 \sim

 \sim

 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac$