# POLITECNICO DI TORINO Repository ISTITUZIONALE

# Nutrient cycling in bedform induced hyporheic zones

Original

Nutrient cycling in bedform induced hyporheic zones / Bardini, Laura; Boano, Fulvio; Cardenas, M. B.; Revelli, Roberto; Ridolfi, Luca. - In: GEOCHIMICA ET COSMOCHIMICA ACTA. - ISSN 0016-7037. - STAMPA. - 84:(2012), pp. 47-61. [10.1016/j.gca.2012.01.025]

*Availability:* This version is available at: 11583/2494895 since:

Publisher: Elsevier

Published DOI:10.1016/j.gca.2012.01.025

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

1	Nutrient cycling in bedform induced
2	hyporheic zones.
3	Revised version
4	
5	December 23, 2011
6	L. Bardini <sup>1</sup> , F. Boano <sup>1</sup> , M. B. Cardenas <sup>2</sup> , R. Revelli <sup>1</sup> and L. Ridolfi <sup>1</sup>

<sup>7</sup> <sup>1</sup>Department of Hydraulics, Transports, and Civil Infrastructures, Politecnico di Torino,

<sup>8</sup> Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Turin, Italy.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Geological Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas
78712, USA.

11

#### Abstract

The hyporheic zone is an ecotone connecting the stream and groundwater ecosys-12 tem that plays a significant role for stream biogeochemistry. Water exchange across 13 the stream-sediment interface and biochemical reactions in the streambed concur to 14 affect subsurface solute concentrations and eventually nutrient cycling in the fluvial 15 corridor. In this paper we investigate the interplay of hydrological and biochemical 16 processes in a duned streambed and their effect on spatial distribution of solutes. 17 We employ a numerical model to simulate the turbulent water flow and the pressure 18 distribution over the dunes, and then to evaluate the flow field and the biochemical 19 reactions in the hyporheic sediments. Sensitivity analyses are performed to analyze 20 the influence of hydrological and chemical properties of the system on solute reaction 21 rates. The results demonstrate the effect of stream velocity and sediment permeability 22 on the chemical zonation. Changing sediment permeability as well as stream 23 velocity directly affects the nutrient supply and the residence times in the 24 streambed, thus controlling the reaction rates under the dune. Stream water 25 quality is also shown to influence the reactive behavior of the sediments. In partic-26 ular, the availability of dissolved organic carbon determines whether the streambed 27 acts as a net sink or source of nitrate. This study represents a step towards a better 28 understanding of the complex interactions between hydrodynamical and biochemical 29 processes in the hyporheic zone. 30

# **1** INTRODUCTION

Majority of the world's rivers transports high levels of nutrients, such as organic carbon, nitrate and phosphate, due to anthropogenic activities (Boyer et al., 2006; Mulholland et al., 2008). In the last decades, the fate of these nutrients has attracted the interest of several researchers and, in particular, many studies have shown the significant role played on nutrient cycling by the exchange processes with the hyporheic zone, i.e. the interface region between stream water and groundwater (e.g., Findlay, 1995; Brunke et al., 1997; Boulton et al., 1998; Tonina and Buffington, 2009a).

The hyporheic fluxes occur generally in response to variations in bed topography (Ton-39 ina and Buffington, 2009b), with a very wide range of spatial and temporal scales (Car-40 denas, 2008b; Stonedahl, 2010). Small-scale exchanges are mainly induced by river bed 41 forms, like ripples and dunes (Elliott and Brooks, 1997a,b; Packman et al., 2001; Packman 42 et al., 2004; Boano et al., 2007; Cardenas and Wilson, 2007), while large-scale exchanges 43 depend on larger geomorphological features, like pool-riffle pairs (Tonina and Buffington, 44 2007), step-pool sequences (Harvey and Bencala, 1993) or meander bends (Boano et al., 45 2006; Cardenas, 2008a,b; Revelli et al., 2008). 46

The exchange of water and solutes across the streambed has an effect on the ecology 47 of the fluvial environment since it contributes to the connection of surface and subsur-48 face waters, which have very different chemical characteristics. The exchanged chemicals 49 enter the sediments with the water and they are transformed into oxidized or reduced 50 substances by biogeochemical reactions, mediated by the hyporheic microbiota. In par-51 ticular, organic substances are used as electron donors in a series of redox reactions, with 52 different electron acceptors, e.g., oxygen and nitrate. Nitrification and other secondary 53 reactions often occur as soon as water enters the hyporheic zone (Hunter et al., 1998). 54 These sediment-scale transformations have an influence on the quality of the upwelling 55 water and potentially also on the quality of the stream water. For example, Böhlke et 56 al. (2009) demonstrated with field measurements that benthic denitrification 57 contributes substantially to nitrate removal in streams. 58

<sup>59</sup> The interaction of hydrology and biogeochemistry in the hyporheic zone was taken into

account in different studies of both fluvial (e.g., Gu et al., 2007; Lautz and Fanelli, 60 2008; O'Connor and Hondzo, 2008) and marine (e.g. Meysman et al., 2007) 61 environments. In particular, Harvey and Fuller (1998) and Fuller and Harvey 62 (2000) provided observations of solute concentration gradients and reaction 63 rates beneath bedforms in real streams, determining the role of the hyporheic 64 zone in enhancing microbially mediated processes. Recently, mathematical models 65 have been increasingly used to investigate the effect of coupled hydrological and biogeo-66 chemical processes on the fate of nutrients. For instance, Cardenas et al. (2008) provided 67 a model for a rippled permeable seabed, by sequentially modeling turbulent-oscillatory 68 flow, porous media flow, and biogeochemical reactions. Another modeling approach was 69 suggested by Boano et al. (2010), who investigated the biogeochemical patterns and the 70 temporal evolution of reactive solutes in the hyporheic region of a meandering river, by 71 estimating and comparing the typical kinematic and chemical timescales. However, we 72 are still far from a complete understanding of the complex links between hydrodynamical 73 and biogeochemical processes in the hyporheic zone (Fleckenstein et al., 2010). 74

In this paper, we focus on the influence of surface water-groundwater exchange on the 75 main microbial transformations of nutrients occurring in the hyporheic zone. In particular 76 we develop a numerical model to analyze the exchange triggered by a duned streambed, 77 that represents a widespread configuration in fluvial environments. Our aim is to shed 78 light on the effects of this kind of bed forms on transport and reaction processes of organic 79 carbon and nitrogen, in order to provide significant insights for stream biogeochemistry. 80 The main results of the study are the description of the steady-state spatial distribution 81 of water-borne solutes below a stream dune and the analysis of the effects of stream water 82 quality, stream velocity, and sediment permeability on the reaction patterns. In particular, 83 we take into account four representative reactive compounds: dissolved organic carbon 84 (DOC), oxygen  $(O_2)$ , nitrate  $(NO_3^-)$  and ammonium  $(NH_4^+)$ . We chose these chemicals 85 because they are usually used as indicators of water quality in field studies (Aitkenhead-86 Peterson et al., 2009) and they have a direct influence on the equilibrium of the river 87 ecosystem. 88

The paper is divided in two parts, i.e. the model description, followed by the sensitivity 89 analyses. The simulation of the turbulent water flow represents the preliminary step for the 90 modeling: we numerically solve the Reynolds-Averaged Navier Stokes (RANS) equations 91 in order to obtain the pressure distribution over the dunes. Then, given the RANS-92 derived surficial pressure gradients, the hyporheic flow field is obtained by applying the 93 Darcy's law. Longitudinal groundwater flow, induced by the stream bed slope, is also 94 considered. The biogeochemical two-dimensional model is finally applied by coupling the 95 chemical reactions with both the hyporheic advective flow field and fluxes induced by 96 hydrodynamic dispersion, under appropriate boundary conditions. 97

The sensitivity analyses of the biochemical model are carried out for different hydrodynamic and chemical configurations. We study the effect of stream velocity, surface water chemistry, and sediment characteristics on the nutrient dynamics, in order to better understand the links between the hydrodynamic processes and the nutrient transformation rates in the hyporheic zone.

103

104

### 2 MODEL DESCRIPTION

The problem of interest is sketched in Fig. 1. We consider a stream with mean water 105 depth, d, and bulk velocity, U. The streambed is formed of two-dimensional periodic dunes, 106 triangular in shape, with height H and length L. The dunes are asymmetric because of the 107 constant direction of the stream flow, and the position of the crest  $(L_c)$  is shifted towards 108 the downstream end of the dune. A Cartesian reference system is adopted, with x and y109 as the streamwise and upward coordinates, respectively, and the axis origin is placed at 110 the dune trough. Due to the periodicity of the streambed in the streamwise direction, we 111 focus on a single-dune cell of the 2D domain. 112

The goal is to estimate the spatial distribution of four solutes under the bed forms in steady-state conditions, given the physical and chemical properties of the stream and the hydraulic properties of the sediments. First, turbulent flow in the stream is simulated, and values of pressure on the streambed are evaluated. Then, we numerically simulate the solute concentrations below the dune surface by considering both the advective and dispersive flows and the biochemical processes. The compounds of interest are DOC, oxygen, nitrate and ammonium. We chose formaldehyde (CH<sub>2</sub>O) to represent the DOC substance for its simple chemical structure and because it can be a degradation product of more complicated DOC compounds. Moreover, it is usually selected as the representative DOC compound for numerical simulations or field investigations concerned with the study of chemical patterns in water (e.g., Hunter et al., 1998).

The governing equations and the modeling scheme of the pressure distribution, the hyporheic flow field and the biogeochemical reactions are described below.

#### 126 2.1 Pressure Distribution

The turbulent water flow over the dunes is simulated by numerically solving, in steadystate conditions, a finite-volume formulation of the Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) equations for an incompressible, homogeneous fluid (Cardenas and Wilson, 2007)

$$\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_i} = 0 \tag{1}$$

130

$$\rho U_j \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( 2\mu S_{ij} - \rho \overline{u'_j u'_i} \right)$$
(2)

where i, j = 1, 2 are spatial indexes corresponding to x and y directions  $(x_1 = x, x_2 = y)$ ,  $\rho$  and  $\mu$  are water density and dynamic viscosity, respectively, t is time,  $U_i$  and  $u'_i$  are the time-averaged and turbulent velocity components in  $x_i$  direction, respectively, and P is time-averaged pressure.  $S_{i,j}$  is the strain rate tensor

$$S_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} \right), \tag{3}$$

while  $-\overline{u'_{j}u'_{i}} = \tau_{ij}/\rho$  is the mean strain rate related to the Reynolds stresses  $(\tau_{ij})$  by

$$-\overline{u'_{j}u'_{i}} = \nu_t \left(2S_{ij}\right) - \frac{2}{3}\delta_{ij}k \tag{4}$$

where  $\nu_t$  is the kinematic eddy viscosity,  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta, and k is the turbulent kinetic energy.

The evaluation of the turbulent strain rates requires the adoption of a closure scheme to determine the eddy viscosity  $\nu_t$ . Here, the  $k - \omega$  turbulence closure scheme (Wilcox, 140 1991) is adopted, with the eddy viscosity

$$\nu_t = \frac{k}{\omega},\tag{5}$$

141 the specific dissipation  $\omega$ ,

$$\omega = \frac{\epsilon}{\beta^* k} \tag{6}$$

the turbulence dissipation rate  $\epsilon$ , and the closure coefficient  $\beta^*$ .

Two additional equations for k and  $\omega$  are required to complete the closure scheme. The steady state transport equations for k and  $\omega$  are

$$\rho \frac{\partial (U_j k)}{\partial x_j} = \rho \tau_{ij} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j} - \beta^* \rho \omega k + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ (\mu + \mu_t \sigma_k) \frac{\partial k}{\partial x_j} \right]$$
(7)

145

$$\rho \frac{\partial \left(U_{j}\omega\right)}{\partial x_{j}} = \alpha \frac{\rho \omega}{k} \tau_{ij} \frac{\partial U_{i}}{\partial x_{j}} - \beta \rho \omega^{2} k + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}} \left[ \left(\mu + \mu_{t} \sigma_{\omega}\right) \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x_{j}} \right]$$
(8)

The standard closure coefficient values are  $\alpha = 5/9$ ,  $\beta = 3/40$ ,  $\beta^* = 9/100$ , and  $\sigma_k = \sigma_{\omega}$ 147 = 0.5 (Cardenas and Wilson, 2007).

The RANS domain is represented by the water column above a single dune (Fig. 1). 148 A spatially periodic pressure condition is prescribed on the lateral boundaries, 149 with an additional pressure drop  $\Delta P$  between the left and right domain sides, 150 in order to consider the stream gradient. We assume therefore that the water 151 columns over two subsequent dunes exhibit the same pressure distribution 152 and a constant difference in magnitude, with lower values downstream. The 153 pressure drop is derived from the bed slope  $i_b$  and the dune length L by 154 applying the equation  $\Delta P = i_b L g \rho$ . A symmetry boundary condition (i.e., no 155 fluxes) is set at the top of the RANS domain since water depth is significantly 156 larger than the dune height  $(d \ll H)$  and the submergence is high. Thus, the 157

free surface is not influenced by the presence of bed forms and it is possible 158 to replace it with the symmetry condition. Finally, no-slip wall boundary 159 conditions  $(U_i = 0)$  are applied at the bottom of the domain. This allows us to 160 solve the problem for turbulent flow neglecting the influence of the subsurface 161 flow in the sediments on the surface flow, which is a standard assumption since 162 subsurface flow rates are usually much smaller than those in the stream. The RANS 163 simulations are solved using a finite-volume approach with a variable number of grid 164 elements (from 16000 to more than 80000) and a denser node spatial distribution near the 165 bottom of the domain. For further details see Cardenas and Wilson (2007). 166

From the solution of the RANS model, the pressure distribution on the duned streambed 167 is obtained. Fig. 2 shows some streambed pressure distributions on a 1-meter-long dune 168 for different values of the Reynolds number  $Re = U \cdot d/\nu$ , where  $\nu$  is the kinematic wa-169 ter viscosity. All pressure profiles have an asymmetrical shape, with a maximum at x =170 0.3 m and a marked minimum at the dune cres (x = 0.9 m). The figure shows that an 171 increase of the stream velocity leads to higher values of surface pressures. The resulting 172 pressure gradients determine the water exchange with the sediments, as described in the 173 next section. 174

#### 175 2.2 Hyporheic Flow Field and Biochemical Reactions

The pressure distribution over the dune is used as a boundary condition in the multicomponent reactive transport model in order to predict the solute fluxes and concentrations in the hyporheic zone, considering both the fluid dynamics and chemical processes. For this purpose, the hyporheic flow modeling represents a key step, since it determines the advective and dispersive transport patterns of the substances in the hyporheic zone.

The advective exchange of water across a duned streambed can be driven by two mechanisms of "pumping" and "turnover": the former is due to the presence of pressure gradients over the bed forms, the latter is linked to the temporary trapping and release of water by moving bed forms (Elliott and Brooks, 1997a). In this paper we assume that the dunes are not moving, since preliminary numerical simulations (not shown) indicated that water fluxes induced by turnover are negligible for our system.

The water flow under the bed surface in steady-state conditions is estimated using the groundwater flow equations, i.e., the Darcy's law and the continuity equation

$$\mathbf{q} = -\frac{\kappa}{\mu} \left( \nabla P + \rho g \nabla y \right) \tag{9}$$

189

$$\nabla^2 \left(\frac{P}{\rho g} + y\right) = 0,\tag{10}$$

where  $\mathbf{q} = (q_x, q_y)$  is the Darcian velocity vector,  $\kappa$  is the permeability of the porous medium (assumed homogeneous), g is the gravitational acceleration,  $\rho$  is the water density, and P is the water pressure in the porous medium. The velocity  $\mathbf{q}$  includes both the pumping-induced flow and the basic groundwater flow, the latter due to the stream gradient. The pressure boundary conditions are described later.

As to the biochemical processes, the model considers three reactions, mediated by sub-195 surface microorganisms: aerobic respiration, denitrification and nitrification (see 196 Table 1). Reactions  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  describe the heterotrophic DOC biodegradation, 197 with the DOC as the electron donor and the oxygen (aerobic respiration) 198 and nitrate (denitrification) as the electron acceptors, respectively. Reaction 199  $r_3$  represents nitrification, i.e., the biological autotrophic oxidation of ammo-200 nium into nitrate, with oxygen as electron acceptor. Aerobic respiration and 201 nitrification start simultaneously, while denitrification only occurs when oxy-202 gen concentration falls under a limiting value, i.e. when anaerobic conditions 203 are established. 204

For the definition of the reaction kinetics we follow the approach described by Hunter et al. (1998) and, for redox reactions  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ , we consider separetely the rate of DOC oxidation and the rate of the *i*-th reduction half-reaction.

First-order degradation kinetics is assumed for the DOC oxidation rate  $\Gamma_{DOC}$ 

208

$$\Gamma_{DOC} = k_{DOC} \cdot C_{DOC} \tag{11}$$

where  $k_{DOC}$  is the DOC decay constant and  $C_{DOC}$  is the DOC molar concentration. The linear kinetics in equation (11) is the simplest way to model DOC degradation, but it could be replaced by more complex formulations (e.g., Monod) at the expense of a higher number of parameters.

The rate of reduction  $\Gamma_{red,i}$  of the *i*-th electron acceptor (i = 1 for oxygen, i = 2 for nitrate) is estimated by

$$\Gamma_{red,i} = \beta_i \cdot \Gamma_{DOC} \cdot f_i \qquad i = 1,2 \tag{12}$$

where  $\beta_i$  represents the ratio between the moles of transferred electrons per mole of oxidized DOC and the moles of electrons per mole of reduced compound in the *i*-th reaction, and  $f_i$  is the fraction of electrons consumed by the *i*-th reduction half-reaction. Values of  $\beta_i$  are given in Table 1. The  $f_i$  parameter is evaluated with a simplified Monod formulation

$$f_i = \left(1 - \sum_{n=0}^{i-1} f_n\right) \cdot \alpha_i \tag{13}$$

220 with  $f_0 = 0$  and

$$\alpha_i = \begin{cases} \frac{C_i}{C_{i,lim}} & \text{if } C_i < C_{i,lim} \\ 1 & \text{if } C_i \ge C_{i,lim} \end{cases}.$$
(14)

 $\alpha_i$  is a dimensionless parameter that considers the limitation of  $\Gamma_{red,i}$  due to the availability of the *i*-th reaction electron acceptor, while  $C_i$  and  $C_{i,lim}$  are, respectively, the molar concentration and the molar limiting concentration of the *i*-th reaction electron acceptor. When the electron acceptor exceeds the limiting concentration, the reduction rate is independent of  $C_i$ , while in the case of lower concentrations  $\Gamma_{red,i}$  is linearly proportional to  $C_i$ .

Lastly, a bimolecular expression is used for the nitrification  $(r_3)$  rate  $\Gamma_{nitr}$ 

$$\Gamma_{nitr} = k_n \cdot C_{NH_{\star}^+} \cdot C_{O_2} \tag{15}$$

where  $k_n$  is the second-order nitrification molar rate coefficient,  $C_{NH_4^+}$  and  $C_{O_2}$  are the

molar concentrations of ammonium and oxygen, respectively. Since the aim of the present work is to study the reactive behavior of hyporheic sediments in response to stream water quality and velocity and to sediment properties, we neglect the influence of temperature on reaction kinetics.

From equations (11–14) we define the net production rates of the four compounds of interest, adopting a negative sign for reaction terms decreasing the solute concentration

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}C_{DOC}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\Gamma_{DOC} \equiv R_{DOC} \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}C_{O_2}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\Gamma_{red,1} - 2\Gamma_{nitr} \equiv R_{O_2} \tag{17}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}C_{NO_3^-}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\Gamma_{red,2} + \Gamma_{nitr} \equiv R_{NO_3^-} \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}C_{NH_4^+}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\Gamma_{nitr} \equiv R_{NH_4^+} \tag{19}$$

DOC and ammonium show a negative one-term equation (eqns. (16) and (19)), since they take part as reactants in one process, DOC oxidation half-reaction and nitrification, respectively. Instead, oxygen and nitrate display double-term expressions (eqns. (17) and (18)), with different signs because they act, with different roles, in two reactions. The oxygen is consumed by both aerobic respiration  $r_1$  and nitrification  $r_3$ , while nitrate is removed by denitrification  $r_2$  and **produced** by nitrification  $r_3$ . The contribution of the different terms varies in time, according to the reactant concentrations.

The overall reaction rates (eqns. (16–19)) are then coupled with the hyporheic flow field (obtained by equations (9) and (10)) and hydrodynamic dispersion in order to define the governing equations of the steady-state reactive solute transport model

$$\theta R_s = \nabla (-\theta \mathbf{D} \nabla C_s + \mathbf{q} \cdot C_s) \qquad s = \text{DOC}, O_2, \text{NO}_3^-, \text{NH}_4^+$$
(20)

where  $\theta$  is the sediment porosity,  $R_s$  is the consumption/production rate of the com-

pound s, **D** is the hydrodynamic dispersion tensor and  $C_s$  is the molar concentration of 246 the chemical s. The expressions (20) are valid in steady-state conditions and under the 247 assumptions of no sorption phenomena and no solute source in the porous medium. Disper-248 sion represents a solute transport process, additional to the advective one, contributing 249 to the spreading of the chemicals in the hyporheic zone. In particular, hydrodynamic 250 dispersion combines mechanical dispersion, induced by the local velocity variations, and 251 molecular diffusion, caused by concentration gradients at microscopic level. The elements 252 of the dispersion tensor are (Bear and Verruijt, 1998) 253

$$\theta D_{ij} = (\alpha_L - \alpha_T) \cdot \frac{q_i q_j}{|\mathbf{q}|} + \delta_{ij} \cdot (\alpha_T |\mathbf{q}| + \theta \cdot \tau D_{mol})$$
(21)

where  $i, j = 1, 2, \alpha_L$  and  $\alpha_T$  are the longitudinal and transversal dispersivities, respectively,  $\tau$  is the tortuosity factor, and  $D_{mol}$  is the molecular diffusion coefficient. The values of the dispersivities  $\alpha_L$  and  $\alpha_T$  depend on sediment size and heterogeneity of the porous medium.

The biogeochemical model domain is a single dune, triangular in shape (see Fig. 2). As to the boundary conditions, we impose on the lateral boundaries the periodic conditions

$$P(x_{min}, y) = P(x_{max}, y) + \Delta P \tag{22}$$

260

$$C_s(x_{\min}, y) = C_s(x_{\max}, y) \tag{23}$$

with  $x_{min}$  and  $x_{max}$  as the horizontal coordinates of the initial and terminal points of the dune and  $\Delta P$  as the pressure drop between the lateral boundaries of the domain, equal to that one applied to the free surface.

On the upper layer, i.e., on the sediment-water interface, we prescribe a Dirichlet condition with the RANS-derived pressure distribution and the constant solute concentrations in the stream. Finally, a no flow condition is applied to all the chemicals at the bottom of the dune, and the porous media is chosen deep enough so as not to affect the pathlines in the main zone of study, close to the bed surface.

### 3 RESULTS

The chemical zonation in the streambed is investigated through the numerical simulation of the governing equations of the reactive solute transport model. For this purpose, we employ a numerical code that uses a finite-volume approach, with adaptive meshing and error control. In particular, we choose a non uniform mesh, with a higher node density in the zone of interest, near the bed surface, for a total number of 3781 grid nodes and 7216 triangular elements.

We consider a typical dune triangular geometry, with a length L = 1 m, a bed form 276 height H = 0.075 m and the crest located at  $L_c = 0.9$  m (asymmetric dune, see Fig. 1). 277 The streambed is homogeneous and isotropic, with a porosity  $\theta = 0.4$  and a tortuosity 278 factor  $\tau = 0.74$ , while the mean water depth, d, is 0.5 m. With regard to the reaction 279 constants, we choose values within the ranges suggested by Van Cappellen and Wang 280 (1996). In order to consider a typical average condition, for the nitrification rate con-281 stant we use the value  $k_n = 5 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ L/(mg s)}$ , while for the DOC reaction rate we select 282  $k_{DOC} = 5 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . Oxygen and nitrate limiting concentrations  $(C_{O_2,lim} \text{ and } C_{NO_3^-,lim})$ 283 are set at 1 mg/L and 0.5 mg/L, respectively. As to the other physical and chemical 284 parameters, i.e., the in-stream solute concentrations, the stream velocity U, the sediment 285 permeability  $\kappa$  and dispersivities  $\alpha_L$  and  $\alpha_T$ , we perform a sensitivity analysis in order to 286 investigate their impact on the biochemical processes in the streambed. 287

288

### 289 3.1 Impact of Stream Water Quality

Three configurations, characterized by different values of in-stream solute concentrations 290 (see Table 2), are considered: a polluted stream, with high nutrient concentrations (case 291 1), a pristine stream with no DOC limitation (case 2) and a pristine stream with DOC 292 limitation (case 3). The pristine stream configuration is split in two cases in 293 order to consider the remarkable effects of DOC availability on the kinetics 294 of reactions. The permeability  $\kappa$  is set equal to  $10^{-10}$  m<sup>2</sup>, characteristic of well-sorted 295 coarse sands to gravels. The longitudinal dispersivity is assumed equal to 3 mm (i.e., a 296 few grain diameters), while the transversal dispersivity  $\alpha_T$  is a tenth of the longitudinal 297

one  $\alpha_L$ . The stream velocity U is 0.34 m/s and the stream slope is  $1.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ .

The results of the simulations are displayed in Fig. 3 (case 1), 4 (case 2) and 5 (case 3). 299 Two advective flow cells are visible below the streambed surface, with different width and 300 depth. The cell in the right-hand part of the dune is wide and quite deep (65 cm); mean 301 flow direction in the cell is the same as the stream flow. On the contrary, the left cell is 302 narrower and shallower, with mean flow opposite to the stream flow. A stagnation point 303 is also present at the deepest point of this cell. Both advective cells delimit an advective 304 water exchange area, where water from the stream moves along advective flowpaths before 305 leaving the sediments, with different residence times depending on path length. Beneath 306 this zone the flow field is dominated by groundwater underflow, induced by the stream 307 slope, and water flow is not affected by the presence of the dunes. The same reversed 308 hyporheic circulation cells and flow stagnation zones were recently observed 309 in a flume and modeled by CFD from Endreny et al. (2011). The flow cells 310 have a direct influence on solute spatial distribution. In fact, even though 311 dispersion tends to smooth concentration gradients, the solute concentration 312 fronts clearly reflect the shape of the water exchange area. 313

The substantial role played by advection and dispersion fluxes is demon-314 strated in Fig. 6, where oxygen concentrations of case 2 are shown for different 315 dune vertical sections, in the case of diffusive transport only, i.e., switching 316 off water flow and the resulting advective and dispersive fluxes. Oxygen pen-317 etration in the porous medium occurs with such a low velocity that the com-318 pound is completely removed within the first 5 millimeters of sediments in all 319 the considered sections. Another key point is that the diffusive transport is 320 downward directed, so all solutes entering the sediments are slowly moved to 321 deeper layers and are not returned back to the stream. Thus, the advective 322 and dispersive fluxes are fundamental for controlling the nutrient fate in the 323 streambeds. 324

We now analyze the three basic cases to investigate the effect of stream water quality. We consider at first the polluted stream configuration shown in Fig. 3. DOC exhibits a smooth spatial distribution, with two roughly circular fronts of different sizes and concentrations decreasing with depth. In fact, both advection and dispersion are important mechanisms for delivery of DOC into the porous medium, where it is **progressively degraded (eqn. (16)).** Thus, the hyporheic zone acts as a sink of DOC for the stream. However, the DOC is still present at the bottom of the dune with a concentration of 30 mg/L, since it is not a limiting reactant for the two reactions.

Oxygen displays a similar behavior, with concentration decreasing with depth. How-333 ever, oxygen fronts are steeper than DOC ones, because of the fast oxygen consumption by 334 two contemporary reactions , i.e., aerobic respiration and nitrification (eqn. (17)). 335 Moreover, due to the low in-stream oxygen concentration and the high availability of 336 DOC and  $NH_4^+$ , oxygen is completely removed within the first 30 cm of depth, i.e. within 337 the water exchange area. These simulated oxygen distributions reproduce well 338 the general features of the patterns observed experimentally by Precht et al. 339 (2004).340

Ammonium also exhibits steep fronts and remarkable variations of concentration in the hyporheic zone, because of the fast kinetics of the nitrification process in which it plays the part of the reactant (eqn. (19)). Eventually, a concentration of 4.5 mg/L is achieved when **nitrification** stops due to the lack of oxygen. Thus, ammonium spatial distribution is strictly related to the oxygen zonation.

A different behavior is shown by nitrate, which exhibits a maximum concentration 346 at 15 cm of depth (see Fig. 3). The reason for this behavior is that the compound has 347 the double role of product and reactant in the nitrification and denitrification reactions, 348 respectively (eqn. (18)). The removal of nitrate through denitrification begins only when 349 the oxygen falls below the limiting concentration  $C_{O_2,lim}$ , so up to that threshold the 350 compound is only produced by nitrification. In deeper sediments, denitrification 351 prevails and nitrate is completely removed within the first 35 cm of depth. 352 This behavior is confirmed by Fig. 7a and 7b, that show the spatial patterns 353 of nitrification and denitrification rates. Nitrification rate has a maximum 354 value (0.34  $mg/(m^3 \cdot s)$ ) near the streambed, due to the high concentrations 355

of oxygen and ammonium, and it decreases with depth, as the consequence 356 of the lower reactant concentrations. Instead, denitrification rate displays a 357 downward increase, together with the nitrate concentrations, a maximum value 358  $(0.38 \text{ mg/(m^3 \cdot s)})$  at approximately 35 cm of depth and a fast decrease. Both 359 reactions are active in the central part of the domain, with different rates; as 360 long as nitrification prevails on denitrification there is a net nitrate production 361 and viceversa. The strong nitrate production within the first 20 cm of depth 362 contributes to enhance the nitrate concentration gradient and, consequently, 363 the upward dispersive fluxes (see equation (20)), that are comparable or higher 364 than the advective ones, with the exception of the dune crest (see Fig. 7c, 365 7d, 7e, 7f). Part of produced nitrate is released into the stream due to the 366 combination of strong upward advective and dispersive transport, and the 367 dune thus represents a source of nitrate for the stream. 368

We focus now on the pristine stream configuration with no DOC limitation (case 2, 369 Fig. 4). All solute in-stream concentrations are lower than in the polluted case, with the 370 exception of oxygen, which keeps the same value (Table 2). The decrease of the solute 371 concentrations has a direct influence on the rate of the three studied reactions. Oxygen 372 shows a more gradual decay and wider concentration fronts, due to the decrease of both 373 aerobic respiration and nitrification rates caused by lower concentrations of DOC and 374 ammonium, respectively. The slower oxygen consumption leads in turn to a downward 375 shift of the net denitrifying zone. Thus, nitrate and oxygen are completely 376 removed deeper in the porous medium than in case 1. The spatial patterns of 377 nitrification and denitrification rates are shown in Fig. 8a and 8b. The values 378 are in general one or two orders of magnitude lower than those seen for case 1. 379 Besides, the maximum nitrification rate is highly lower than the denitrification 380 one. The lower nitrate production has a direct effect on the magnitude of the 381 dispersive transport of nitrate. Fig. 8c, 8d, 8e and 8f show the advective and 382 dispersive fluxes with the former prevalent on the latter in the shallow layers. 383 In this case the dune represents a sink of nitrate for the stream. 384

The wider concentration fronts are even more evident for the pristine stream configu-385 ration with DOC limitation (case 3, Fig. 5). Aerobic respiration rate is so slow, due 386 to the DOC scarcity, that oxygen can be found even at the bottom of the streambed (6 387 mg/L), preventing the denitrification process which requires anaerobic conditions. Thus, 388 denitrification does not occur in the sediments in this case. Aerobic respi-389 ration is active up to the bottom of the streambed, while nitrification stops 390 shallower, at 60 cm of depth, for lack of ammonium. For this reason nitrate 391 concentrations show an increase with depth up to 60 cm of depth, while they 392 keep a constant value under that layer. As seen for case 1, the hyporheic zone 393 behaves as a net nitrate source because of the strong nitrate dispersive trans-394 port (induced by nitrate production), upward directed, near the bed surface. 395 The different behavior of the hyporheic zone in the three cases is clearly underlined by 396

the values of the Integrated oxygen Aerobic Respiration rates (IAR) and the Nitrification
(IN) and Denitrification (ID) rates (see Table 3)

$$IAR = \int_{A_s} \Gamma_{red,1} \cdot \mathrm{d}A,\tag{24}$$

399

$$IN = \int_{A_s} \Gamma_{nitr} \cdot \mathrm{d}A,\tag{25}$$

400

$$ID = \int_{A_s} \Gamma_{red,2} \cdot \mathrm{d}A,\tag{26}$$

where  $A_s$  is the subsurface domain area, i.e. the volume of sediments per unit stream width.

Table 3 shows that aerobic respiration rate IAR increases with increasing in-stream concentrations of DOC (e.g., compare cases 2 and 3). In fact, increasing in-stream DOC concentration concurs to increase oxygen reduction rate  $\Gamma_{red,1}$  (see equations (11) and (12)), and thus IAR.

If we focus on nitrate, the ratio between ID and IN indicates the reactive behavior of the dune as a net sink (ID/IN > 1) or source (ID/IN < 1) of nitrate. This happens because there is no net solute flux trough the lateral

boundaries due to the periodic boundary conditions, and thus net nitrate pro-410 duction equals net exchange flux through the streambed. In Table 3 we observe 411 that the hyporheic zone can act as a net source of nitrate in both polluted and pristine 412 streams (cases 1 and 3), despite these cases representing two seemingly opposite chemical 413 conditions. The DOC availability is a discriminating parameter for the degradation rates 414 in pristine streams; high concentrations of labile DOC enhance both aerobic res-415 piration and denitrification rates, leading to a faster removal of oxygen and a 416 net consumption of nitrate in hyporheic sediments. 417

#### 418 3.2 Impact of Stream Velocity

Increasing stream velocity values are considered for the three cases in Table 2, in order to estimate and compare the solute reaction rates, reflecting the behavior of the streambed. The stream velocity ranges from 0.21 m/s to 0.39 m/s, which correspond to Reynolds number *Re* between 106670 and 195630.

A variation of the stream velocity induces two opposite effects on solute reactions. From 423 a hydrodynamical point of view, an increase in U implies higher inward water fluxes due to 424 the higher pressure gradients on the dune surface. This leads to larger fluxes of substances 425 from the stream to the sediments which can enhance reaction rates. Neverthless, hyporheic 426 microbes have less time for performing biochemical reactions because of the lower residence 427 time of the compounds in the streambed, potentially leading to lower reaction rates. The 428 net effect on reaction rates depends on the interaction between these opposite factors, i.e. 429 higher solute inputs and lower residence times (Arnon et al., 2007; Cardenas et al., 2008). 430 Looking at the results (Table 4), it can be observed that all integrated solute reac-431 tion rates increase with the stream velocity, even if with different relative variations. In 432 particular, the IN parameter shows a higher sensitivity to the stream velocity variations 433 than the other ones, with consequences on the general streambed reactive behavior. These 434 trends demonstrate that in the simulated conditions the increase of inward solute 435 fluxes, with U, have a predominant role for the solute reaction rate, while the 436 decrease of the residence times in the porous medium is less important. 437

As to the net nitrate production rate, we consider the ratio of ID to IN. Fig. 9 shows that the increase of the stream velocity does not change dramatically the streambed behavior but it clearly leads to limiting the sink role (case 2), and to enhance the source role (case 1) of the hyporheic zone. This behavior is the result of **a higher sensitivity of nitrification to stream velocity, compared to denitrification.** 

### <sup>443</sup> 3.3 Impact of Sediment Hydraulic and Transport Properties

We focus on the pristine stream configuration with no DOC limitation (case 2). Although 444 recently it has been demonstrated that sediment permeability heterogeneity 445 influences hyporheic exchange (Sawyer and Cardenas, 2009), in this section 446 the role of permeability is investigated, under the hypothesis of homogeneity, 447 for the sake of simplicity. The stream velocity U is set to the constant value of 0.27 448 m/s, while the sediment permeabilities and dispersivities are varied to investigate the 449 influence of the size of sediment grains (see Table 5). Since dispersivity is proportional 450 to the sediment grain size,  $d_g$ , and permeability scales with  $d_g^2$ , it follows that a ten-fold 451 increase in  $\kappa$  results in approximately a three-fold increase in  $\alpha_L$ . Again, values of the 452 transversal dispersivities  $\alpha_T$  are chosen as a tenth of the longitudinal ones. 453

The results underline a marked effect of the permeability on the solute spatial distri-454 bution (see Fig. 10), with less steep fronts corresponding to higher values of permeability 455 and dispersivity. The increase of  $\kappa$ ,  $\alpha_L$  and  $\alpha_T$  results in more efficient advective and 456 dispersive transport and enhanced solute penetration. For  $\kappa = 10^{-11} \text{ m}^2$  DOC degra-457 dation is fast and the compound is completely removed within the first 30 cm of depth 458 (Fig. 10a), while for  $\kappa = 5 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}^2$  high DOC values (38 mg/L) are still present at 459 the bottom of the streambed (Fig. 10d). It is also interesting to observe the different 460 streambed aerobic conditions in the opposite cases, with the aerobic zone confined in the 461 shallower layers for the low permeability case and filling almost all the porous medium for 462 the high permeability case. 463

The integrated reaction rates show an increase with increasing sediment permeability (Table 5), with different sensitivities. This behavior is caused by the higher nutrient supply from the stream with increasing permeability, and is similar to the effect of increasing stream velocity. Values of IN show that nitrification, more than denitrification, is sensitive to permeability, which leads to a shift from the hyporheic zone acting as a net nitrate sink (ID/IN > 1) to source (ID/IN < 1) with increasing  $\kappa$ .

470

# 4 CONCLUSIONS

The solute spatial distribution in the hyporheic zone is due to a strong interplay of 471 both hydraulic and biogeochemical processes. Nutrients enter the sediments because of 472 pressure-induced water exchanges, and there they are both transported by advective and 473 dispersive fluxes, and then biochemically transformed by hyporheic **microbiota**. So, a 474 variation of the transport conditions or the chemical kinetics, induced by different stream 475 and sediment characteristics, can have a direct influence on the reaction potential of the 476 streambed, with ecological implications. If we focus on the hyporheic fauna, the 477 exchanges of water, nutrients and organic matter through the streambed and 478 the chemical concentrations in the sediments are fundamental for microbiota 479 and invertebrates. 480

Our simulations show that the stream water quality can strongly affect the biochemical 481 reactions. In general, the streambed always acts as a sink of DOC, oxygen and ammonium, 482 while nitrate, that is subject to production and consumption reactions, displays a more 483 complex behavior. In the considered cases, high in-stream concentrations of solutes have 484 been shown to enhance **nitrification** process leading to strong nitrate production in the 485 porous medium. In these conditions the hyporheic zone behaves as a nitrate source for 486 the stream. In pristine streams nitrate fate has proved to be strictly linked to DOC 487 A scarcity of DOC can limit denitrification and prevent nitrate removal, availability. 488 leading to a streambed acting as a nitrate source. Instead, high concentrations of DOC 489 favour denitrification and lead to a net nitrate consumption. 490

Stream velocity and sediment permeability have displayed a direct effect on transport phenomena. Increasing stream velocity implies larger solute fluxes to sediments but also lower residence times of the compounds in the hyporheic zone and a lower time for reac-

tions. In our simulations, the higher solute supply clearly prevails over the lower residence 494 times, since all reaction rates increase with stream velocity. In particular, nitrification 495 appears to be more sensitive to changes in stream velocity than denitrification. The con-496 sequence is that high stream velocities damp the sink role and enhance the source role 497 of the streambed. The hydraulic properties of sediments have a similar influence on so-498 lute spatial distribution. Higher values of permeability improve the transport efficiency 499 and increase reaction rates, strongly affecting the reactive behavior of the hyporheic zone. 500 In particular, high-permeability sediments enhance nitrate production and can induce a 501 switch from nitrate sink to source behavior. 502

Acknowledgments F.B. and R.R. would like to thank the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MIUR) for supporting the research with PRIN 2008A7EBA3\_002 "Role of interactions between surface water and groundwater in the transport of solutes at slope scale". L.B. also thanks the MIUR for funding the PhD project. M.B.C. was supported by a National Science Foundation CAREER grant (EAR-0955750).

### 508 References

[Aitkenhead-Peterson J. A., Steele M. K., Nahar N. and Santhy K. (2009)] Dissolved organic carbon and nitrogen in urban and rural watersheds of south-central Texas:
land use and land management influences, *Biogeochemistry* 96, pp. 119–129,
doi:10.1007/s10533-009-9348-2.

- [Arnon et al. (2007)] Arnon S., Gray K. A. and Packman A. I. (2007a) Biophysicochemical
   process coupling controls nitrate use by benthic biofilms, *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 52(4), pp.
   1665–1671.
- <sup>516</sup> [Bear and Verruijt, 1998] Bear J. and Verruijt A. (1998) Modeling groundwater flow and
   <sup>517</sup> pollution, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland
- <sup>518</sup> [Boano et al., 2006] Boano F., Camporeale C., Revelli R. and Ridolfi L. (2006) Sinuosity<sup>519</sup> driven hyporheic exchange in meandering rivers, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 33, L18406,
  <sup>520</sup> doi:10.1029/2006GL027630.
- <sup>521</sup> [Boano et al., 2007b] Boano F., Revelli R. and Ridolfi L. (2007b) Bedform-induced hy-<sup>522</sup> porheic exchange with unsteady flows, *Adv. Water Resour.* **30**(1), pp. 148–156.
- <sup>523</sup> [Boano et al., 2010] Boano F., Demaria A., Revelli R. and Ridolfi L. (2010) Biogeochem <sup>524</sup> ical zonation due to intra-meander hyporheic flow, *Water Resour. Res.* 46, W02511,
   <sup>525</sup> doi:10.1029/2008WR007583.
- <sup>526</sup> [Bottacin-Busolin and Marion, 2010] Bottacin-Busolin A. and Marion A. (2010) Com<sup>527</sup> bined role of advective pumping and mechanical dispersion on time scales
  <sup>528</sup> of bed forms-induced hyporheic exchange, *Water Resour. Res.* 46, W08518,
  <sup>529</sup> doi:10.1029/2009WR008892.
- <sup>530</sup> [Boulton et al., 1998] Boulton A. J., Findlay S., Marmonier P., Stanley E. H. and Valett
  <sup>531</sup> H. M. (1998) The functional significance of the hyporheic zone in streams and rivers,
  <sup>532</sup> Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst. 29, pp. 59–81.

<sup>533</sup> [Boyer et al., 2006] Boyer E. W., Howarth R. W., Galloway J. N. et al. (2006) River<sup>534</sup> ine nitrogen export from the continents to the coasts, *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycle* 20(1),
<sup>535</sup> GB1S91.

<sup>536</sup> [Brunke and Gonser, 1997] Brunke M. and Gonser T. (1997) The ecological significance
<sup>537</sup> of exchange processes between rivers and groundwater, *Freswater Biol.* **37**, pp. 1–33,
<sup>538</sup> doi:10.1046/j.1365-2427.1997.00143.x.

[Cardenas, 2008a] Cardenas M. B. (2008a) The effect of river bend morphology on flow and
timescales of surface water-groundwater exchange across pointbars, J. Hydrol. 362(1–2),
pp. 134–141.

<sup>542</sup> [Cardenas, 2008b] Cardenas M. B. (2008b) Surface water-groudwater interface geo<sup>543</sup> morphology leads to scaling of residence times, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 35, L08402,
<sup>544</sup> doi:10.129/2008GL033753.

<sup>545</sup> [Cardenas and Wilson, 2007] Cardenas M. B. and Wilson J. L. (2007) Dunes, turbulent
<sup>546</sup> eddies, and interfacial exchange with permeable sediments, *Water Resour. Res.* 43,
<sup>547</sup> W08412, doi: 10.1029/2006WR005787.

<sup>548</sup> [Cardenas et al., 2008] Cardenas M. B., Cook P., Jiang and Traykovski H. (2008) Con<sup>549</sup> straining denitrification in permeable wave-influenced marine sediment using linked hy<sup>550</sup> drodinamic and biogeochemical modeling, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 275, pp. 127–137.

[Elliott and Brooks, 1997a] Elliott A. H. and Brooks N. H. (1997a) Transfer of nonsorbing
 solutes to a streambed with bed forms: Theory, *Water Resour. Res.* 33(1), pp. 123–136.

[Elliott and Brooks, 1997b] Elliott A. H. and Brooks N. H. (1997b) Transfer of nonsorbing
solutes to a streambed with bed forms: Laboratory experiments, *Water Resour. Res.* **33**(1), pp. 137–151.

<sup>556</sup> [Findlay, 1995] Findlay S. (1995) Importance of surface-subsurface exchange in stream
<sup>557</sup> ecosystems: The hyporheic zone, *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 40, pp. 159–164.

23

<sup>558</sup> [Fleckenstein et al., 2010] Fleckentein J. H., Krause S., Hannah D. M. and Boano F.
<sup>659</sup> (2010) Groundwater-surface water interactions: new methods and models to improve
<sup>660</sup> understanding of processes and dynamics, *Adv. Water Resour.* 33(11), pp. 1291–1295.

<sup>561</sup> [Gu et al., 2007] Gu C., Hornberger G. M., Mills A. L., Herman J. S. and Flewelling S.

A. (2007) Nitrate reduction in streambed sediments: Effects of flow and biogeochemical kinetics, *Water Resour. Res.* **43**, W12413, doi:10.1029/2007WR006027.

- <sup>564</sup> [Harvey and Bencala, 1993] Harvey J. W. and Bencala K. E. (1993) The Effect of
  <sup>565</sup> Streambed Topography on Surface-Subsurface Water Exchange in Mountain Catch<sup>566</sup> ments, *Water Resour. Res.* 29(1), pp. 8998, doi:10.1029/92WR01960.
- <sup>567</sup> [Hunter and Van Cappellen, 1998] Hunter K. S., Wang Y. and Van Cappellen P. (1998)
  <sup>568</sup> Kinetic modeling of microbially-driven redox chemistry of subsurface environments:
  <sup>569</sup> Coupling transport, microbial metabolism and geochemistry, J. Hydrol. 209, pp. 53–
  <sup>570</sup> 80.
- <sup>571</sup> [Lautz and Fanelli, 2008] Lautz L. K. and Fanelli R. M. (2008), Seasonal biogeochemical
  <sup>572</sup> hotspots in the streambed around restoration structures, *Biogeochemistry* 91, pp. 85–
  <sup>573</sup> 104.
- <sup>574</sup> [Meysman et al., 2007] Meysman F.J.R., Galaktionov O. S., Cook P. L. M., Janssen F.,
  <sup>575</sup> Huettel M. and Middelburg J. J. (2007) Quantifying biologically and physically induced
  <sup>576</sup> flow and tracer dynamics in permeable sediment, *Biogeosciences* 4, pp. 627–646.
- <sup>577</sup> [Mulholland et al., 2008] Mulholland P. J., Helton A. M., Poole G. C. et al. (2008) Stream
  <sup>578</sup> denitrification across biomes and its response to anthropogenic nitrate loading, *Nature*<sup>579</sup> 452(7184), pp. 202–246.
- [Packman and Brooks, 2001] Packman A. I. and Brooks N. H. (2001) Hyporheic exchange
  of solutes and colloids with moving bed forms, *Water Resour. Res.* 37(10), pp. 2591–2605.

<sup>583</sup> [Packman et al., 2004] Packman A. I., Salehin M. and Zaramella M. (2004) Hyporheic
<sup>584</sup> exchange with gravel beds: basic hydrodinamic interactions and bedform-induced ad<sup>585</sup> vective flows, J. Hydraul. Eng. 130, pp. 647–656.

[Revelli et al., 2008] Revelli R., Boano F., Camporeale C. and Ridolfi L. (2008) Intrameander hyporheic flow in alluvial rivers, *Water Resour. Res.* 44, W12428,
doi:10.1029/2008WR007081.

- [Stonedahl et al., 2010] Stonedahl S. H., Harvey J. W., Wrman A., Salehin M. and Pack man A. I. (2010) A multiscale model for integrating hyporheic exchange from ripples to
   meanders, *Water Resour. Res.* 46, W12539, doi:10.1029/2009WR008865.
- [Tonina and Buffington, 2007] Tonina D. and Buffington J. M. (2007) Hyporheic exchange
   in gravel bed rivers with pool-riffle morphology: Laboratory experiments and three dimensional modeling, *Water resour. Res.* 43, W01421, doi:10.1029/2005WR004328.
- <sup>595</sup> [Tonina and Buffington, 2009a] Tonina D. and Buffington J. M. (2009a) Hyporheic Exchange in Mountain Rivers I: Mechanics and Environmental Effects, *Geography Compass*<sup>597</sup> 3, doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00226.x.

<sup>598</sup> [Tonina and Buffington, 2009b] Tonina D. and Buffington J. M. (2009b) Hyporheic Exchange in Mountain Rivers II: Effects of Channel Morphology on Mechanics, Scales,
<sup>600</sup> and Rates of Exchange, *Geography Compass* 3, doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00225.x.

[Van Cappellen and Wang, 1996] Van Cappellen P. and Wang Y. (1996) Cycling of iron
and manganese in surface sediments: a general theory for the coupled transport and
reaction of carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, sulfur, iron and manganese, Am. J. Sci. 296, pp.
197-243.

[Packman and Brooks, 2001] Packman A. I. and Brooks N. H. (2001) Hyporheic exchange
of solutes and colloids with moving bed forms, *Water Resour. Res.* 37(10), pp. 2591–
2605.

25

<sup>608</sup> [Packman et al., 2004] Packman A. I., Salehin M. and Zaramella M. (2004) Hyporheic
<sup>609</sup> exchange with gravel beds: basic hydrodinamic interactions and bedform-induced ad<sup>610</sup> vective flows, J. Hydraul. Eng. 130, pp. 647–656.

[Revelli et al., 2008] Revelli R., Boano F., Camporeale C. and Ridolfi L. (2008) Intrameander hyporheic flow in alluvial rivers, *Water Resour. Res.* 44, W12428,
doi:10.1029/2008WR007081.

- [Stonedahl et al., 2010] Stonedahl S. H., Harvey J. W., Wrman A., Salehin M. and Packman A. I. (2010) A multiscale model for integrating hyporheic exchange from ripples to
  meanders, *Water Resour. Res.* 46, W12539, doi:10.1029/2009WR008865.
- <sup>617</sup> [Tonina and Buffington, 2007] Tonina D. and Buffington J. M. (2007) Hyporheic exchange <sup>618</sup> in gravel bed rivers with pool-riffle morphology: Laboratory experiments and three-<sup>619</sup> dimensional modeling, *Water resour. Res.* **43**, W01421, doi:10.1029/2005WR004328.
- [Tonina and Buffington, 2009a] Tonina D. and Buffington J. M. (2009a) Hyporheic Exchange in Mountain Rivers I: Mechanics and Environmental Effects, *Geography Compass* **3**, doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00226.x.

[Tonina and Buffington, 2009b] Tonina D. and Buffington J. M. (2009b) Hyporheic Exchange in Mountain Rivers II: Effects of Channel Morphology on Mechanics, Scales,
and Rates of Exchange, *Geography Compass* 3, doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00225.x.

<sup>626</sup> [Van Cappellen and Wang, 1996] Van Cappellen P. and Wang Y. (1996) Cycling of iron
<sup>627</sup> and manganese in surface sediments: a general theory for the coupled transport and
<sup>628</sup> reaction of carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, sulfur, iron and manganese, Am. J. Sci. 296, pp.
<sup>629</sup> 197-243.

Reaction index	Reaction type	Reaction	$\beta$ value
$r_1$	Aerobic respiration	$CH_2O + O_2 \longrightarrow CO_2 + H_2O$	1
$r_2$	Denitrification	$5\mathrm{CH}_{2}\mathrm{O} + 4\mathrm{NO}_{3}^{-} + 4\mathrm{H}^{+} \longrightarrow 5\mathrm{CO}_{2} + 2\mathrm{N}_{2} + 7\mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O}$	0.8
$r_3$	Nitrification	$\mathrm{NH}_4^+ + \mathrm{2O}_2 \rightarrow \mathrm{NO}_3^- + 2\mathrm{H}^+ + \mathrm{H}_2\mathrm{O}$	-

Table 1: List of the reactions considered in the simulations.

Table 2: Solute in-stream concentrations for cases 1, 2 and 3.

Case	$C_{ m DOC,0}$ mg/L	$C_{O_2,0}$ mg/L	$\begin{array}{c} C_{\mathrm{NO}_3^-,0} \\ \mathrm{mg/L} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} C_{\mathrm{NH}_{4}^{+},0} \\ \mathrm{mg/L} \end{array}$
1	150	10	8	5.00
2	50.0	10	1	0.05
3	5.00	10	1	0.05

Table 3: IAR, ID and IN rates for cases 1, 2 and 3.

Case	IAR	ID	IN	ID/IN
-	$\mu { m g}/({ m m}{\cdot}{ m s})$	$\mu { m g}/({ m m}{\cdot}{ m s})$	$\mu { m g}/({ m m}{\cdot}{ m s})$	-
1	106	31.4	55.9	0.56
2	49.5	1.14	0.87	1.31
3	6.14	0	1.08	0

Case	U	IAR	ID	IN	ID/IN
-	m/s	$\mu { m g}/({ m m}{\cdot}{ m s})$	$\mu { m g}/({ m m}{\cdot}{ m s})$	$\mu { m g}/({ m m}{\cdot}{ m s})$	-
1	0.21	78.1	26.6	38.1	0.7
1	0.24	85.8	28.1	42.8	0.66
1	0.27	93.2	29.4	47.5	0.62
1	0.30	100	30.5	52.0	0.59
1	0.33	106	31.4	55.9	0.56
1	0.36	111	32.2	59.4	0.54
1	0.39	116	32.9	62.8	0.52
2	0.21	38.3	1.05	0.62	1.68
2	0.24	41.4	1.08	0.69	1.57
2	0.27	44.4	1.11	0.76	1.47
2	0.30	47.2	1.13	0.82	1.39
2	0.33	49.5	1.14	0.87	1.31
2	0.36	51.5	1.15	0.92	1.25
2	0.39	53.4	1.15	0.96	1.19
3	0.21	4.99	0	0.80	0
3	0.24	5.32	0	0.88	0
3	0.27	5.63	0	0.95	0
3	0.30	5.91	0	1.02	0
3	0.33	6.14	0	1.08	0
3	0.36	6.33	0	1.13	0
3	0.39	6.50	0	1.18	0

Table 4: IAR, ID and IN rates for cases 1, 2 and 3, with different stream velocities.

Table 5: IAR, ID and IN rates for case 2, with different permeabilities and dispersivities.

$\frac{10^{11} \cdot \kappa}{m^2}$	$lpha_L$ mm	$lpha_T$ mm	$\frac{\rm IAR}{\mu g/(m \cdot s)}$	$\frac{\text{ID}}{\mu \text{g}/(\text{m} \cdot \text{s})}$	$\frac{\rm IN}{\mu g/(m \cdot s)}$	ID/IN -
1.00	1.00	0.10	13.2	0.54	0.18	3.09
5.00	2.20	0.22	33.1	0.97	0.52	1.88
10.0	3.00	0.30	44.4	1.11	0.76	1.47
50.0	6.60	0.66	76.9	1.49	1.58	0.94



Fig. 1. Modeling scheme. Top part shows the pressure and velocity boundary conditions for the stream water turbulent flow over the streambed; bottom part shows the pressure and concentration boundary conditions for the solute reactive transport in the porous medium. The model domain represents an asymmetrical stream dune of length L = 1 m, height H = 0.075 m, with the crest shifted on the right ( $L_c = 0.9$  m). The streambed depth is 0.8 m. The stream velocity U varies from 0.21 to 0.39 m/s in the simulations.



Fig. 2. RANS-derived pressure distributions for stream velocities U = 0.21 m/s (solid line), 0.30 m/s (dashed line) and 0.39 m/s (dotted line), corresponding to Reynolds numbers Re = 106670, 154120 and 195630, respectively (L = 1 m,  $L_c = 0.9$  m, H = 0.075 m, d = 0.5 m).



Fig. 3. Solute spatial distribution for the polluted stream (case 1). Stream velocity is U = 0.33 m/s, sediment permeability is  $\kappa = 10^{-10}$  m<sup>2</sup>, longitudinal dispersivity is  $\alpha_L = 3$  mm. DOC reaction rate is  $k_{DOC} = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$  s<sup>-1</sup>, nitrification rate is  $k_n = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$  L/(**mg·s**). In-stream concentrations are shown in Table 2. Vectors are only indicative of flow direction.



Fig. 4. Solute spatial distribution for the pristine stream with no DOC limitation (case 2). Stream velocity is U = 0.33 m/s, sediment permeability is  $\kappa = 10^{-10}$  m<sup>2</sup> and longitudinal dispersivity is  $\alpha_L = 3$ mm. DOC reaction rate is  $k_{DOC} = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$  s<sup>-1</sup>, nitrification rate is  $k_n = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$  L/(mg·s). In-stream concentrations are shown in Table 2. Vectors are indicative of flow direction.



Fig. 5. Solute spatial distribution for the pristine stream with DOC limitation (case 3). Stream velocity is U = 0.33 m/s, sediment permeability is  $\kappa = 10^{-10}$  m<sup>2</sup>, longitudinal dispersivity is  $\alpha_L = 3$  mm. DOC reaction rate is  $k_{DOC} = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$  s<sup>-1</sup>, nitrification rate is  $k_n = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$  L/(**mg·s**). In-stream concentrations are shown in Table 2. Vectors are only indicative of flow direction.



Fig. 6. Oxygen concentrations for case 2, under diffusive conditions, at x = 0 m (solid line), x = 0.5 m (dashed line) and x = 0.9 m (dotted line).



Fig. 7. Nitrification and denitrification rates (Fig. 7a, 7b), logarithmic values and longitudinally-averaged vertical profiles of advective (Fig. 7c, 7d) and dispersive (Fig. 7e, 7f) fluxes of nitrate (case 1). Vectors are only indicative of flux direction.



Fig. 8. Nitrification and denitrification rates (Fig. 8a, 8b), logarithmic values and longitudinally-averaged vertical profiles of advective (Fig. 8c, 8d) and dispersive (Fig. 8e, 8f) fluxes of nitrate (case 2). Vectors are only indicative of flux direction.



Fig. 9. Ratio of ID to IN rates vs. Reynolds numbers for case 1 (solid line), case 2 (dashed line) and case 3 (dotted line).



Fig. 10. Solute spatial distributions for case 2 (see Table 2), with stream velocity U = 0.27 m/s and sediment permeabilities  $\kappa = 10^{-11}$  m<sup>2</sup> (Fig. 9a),  $5 \cdot 10^{-11}$  m<sup>2</sup> (Fig. 9b),  $10^{-10}$  m<sup>2</sup> (Fig. 9c),  $5 \cdot 10^{-10}$  m<sup>2</sup> (Fig. 9d). DOC reaction rate is  $k_{DOC} = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$  s<sup>-1</sup>, nitrification rate is  $k_n = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$  L/(mg·s). All concentrations are expressed in mg/L.