

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**The Convection Dispersion Equation-
not the Question, the Answer!**

**Anion and Cation Transport through Undisturbed Soil Columns
during Unsaturated Flow**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Soil Science
at Massey University

Iris Vogeler

1997

Abstract

Prediction of solute movement through the unsaturated zone is important in determining the risk of groundwater contamination from both “natural” and surface applied chemicals. In order to understand better the mechanisms controlling this water-borne transport, unsaturated leaching experiments were carried out on undisturbed soil columns, about 3 litres in volume, for two contrasting soils. One was the weakly-structured Manawatu fine sandy loam, and the other the well-aggregated Ramiha silt loam. Anion transport was satisfactorily described using the convection dispersion equation (CDE), provided that anion exclusion for the Manawatu soil, and adsorption for the Ramiha soil were taken into account. At water flux densities of about 3 mm h^{-1} , a dispersivity of about 40 mm was obtained for the Manawatu soil, and a dispersivity of about 15 mm for the Ramiha soil. The difference was probably due to the contrasting structures of the two soils. Increasing the water flux density in the Manawatu soil to about 13 mm h^{-1} resulted in a slightly higher dispersivity of about 60 mm.

Flow interruption resulted in a subsequent drop in the effluent concentration for the Manawatu soil but not in the Ramiha soil. This suggests that the lag time for transverse molecular diffusion from “mobile” to “immobile” water domains was important in the Manawatu soil, but not in the Ramiha soil.

In both soils cation transport was described satisfactorily with the CDE in conjunction with cation exchange theory, providing that only 80% of the cations replaced by 1 *M* ammonium acetate were assumed to be involved in exchange reactions.

Column leaching experiments were also carried out using a rainfall simulator and larger columns of about 22 litres of the Manawatu soil with a short pasture on top. Solid chemical was applied to both a dry and a wet soil surface. Neither the pasture nor the initial water content had a significant effect on solute movement. Slightly higher dispersivities of about 70 mm were found.

Time Domain Reflectometry (TDR) was found to be valuable for monitoring solute transport in a repacked soil under transient water flow conditions. But in undisturbed soils TDR only proved to be accurate under steady-state water flow when absolute values of solute concentration were not sought.

The CDE was thus found to satisfactorily answer the question of how to describe transport of non-reactive and reactive solutes under bare soil and under short pasture. This applied during both steady-flow and transient wetting.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to god for creating such a wonderful soil, and for taking the time to separate the soil water into “mobile” and “immobile” fractions (or not?).

Special thanks to David Scotter for his excellent supervision, understanding and encouragement throughout my study. Dave, aside from being an expert in the field of soil physics, was always concerned for my future and well-being. Apart from tons of help and advice, he showed plenty of patience in watching bubbles throughout sleepless nights.

Thanks also to Brent Clothier for his patient discussion and constructive criticisms during the research and writing of my thesis, as well as for his friendship.

Appreciation and thanks are also extended to Russell Tillman and Steven Green. Steve’s introduction to the TDR-system and modelling was much appreciated.

The Department of Soil Science and the Environment Group of HortResearch as a whole have always been friendly, and gave help whenever I needed it.

Finally I would like to express my gratitude to my parents, brother and also to Shane for their love and support.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	x
List of Symbols	xvi

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Purpose of the Study	2
1.2 The Experimental Procedure of the Study	5
1.3 The Structure of the Study	6

CHAPTER 2

2. THE THEORY OF SOLUTE MOVEMENT IN SOILS	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Micro- and Macroscopic Views	9
2.2.1 Representative Elementary Volume and Representative Elementary Area	11
2.2.2 Flux and Resident Concentrations	12
2.3 The Language of Models	14
2.3.1 Transfer Function Approach	14
2.3.2 Partial Differential Equations	19
2.4 Stochastic-Convective Approaches	20
2.4.1 Convective-Lognormal Transfer Function	21
2.4.2 Burns' Leaching Equation	22
2.4.3 Transfer Function Approach linked with the Hydraulic Conductivity-Water Content Relationship	22

2.5 Convective-Dispersive Approach	23
2.5.1 Convection-Dispersion Equation as a Partial Differential Equation	24
2.5.2 Convection-Dispersion Equation as a Transfer Function Model	25
2.5.3 Bolt's Approach for Describing Solute Dispersion	27
2.6 The Mobile/Immobile Model	30
2.6.1 Mobile/Immobile Approach as a Partial Differential Equation	30
2.6.2 Mobile/Immobile Approach as a Transfer Function	31
2.6.3 Critique on the Mobile/Immobile Approach	31
2.6.4 The Link Between the Mobile/Immobile Approach and Bolt's Approach	33
2.7 Layer and Mixing Cell Models	34
2.8 Reactive Solutes	34
2.8.1 Solute Adsorption	35
2.8.2 Cation Transport	37
2.9 Boundary Conditions and Solutions for the Convection-Dispersion Equation	42
2.9.1 Flux and Resident Concentrations	42
2.9.2 Boundary and Initial Conditions	43
2.9.3 Analytical Solutions	46
2.9.4 Numerical Solutions	47
2.10 Classification of Solute Transport Models	49
2.11 Conclusions	51

CHAPTER 3

3. THE THEORY OF TIME DOMAIN REFLECTOMETRY FOR MEASURING SOIL WATER CONTENT AND SOLUTE CONCENTRATION	53
3.1 Introduction	53
3.2 The Measurement System	55
3.3 TDR for Measuring Soil Moisture Content	57
3.4 TDR for Measuring Solute Concentration	60
3.5 TDR for Monitoring Water and Solute Transport	64
3.6 Probe Configuration and Sensitivity	65
3.7 Installation of Transmission Lines	66
3.8 Conclusion	67

CHAPTER 4

4. TIME DOMAIN REFLECTOMETRY: CALIBRATION AND ITS USE TO MONITOR SOLUTE TRANSPORT	68
4.1 Introduction	68
4.2 Characterising Water and Solute Movement by TDR and Disk Permeametry	69
4.2.1 Abstract	69
4.2.2 Introduction	69
4.2.3 Theory	70
4.2.4 Materials and Methods	73
4.2.4.1 Use of TDR	73
4.2.4.2 Soil Material	75
4.2.4.3 TDR Calibration	75
4.2.4.4 Positive Charge Measurement	76
4.2.4.5 Column Experiment	76
4.2.5 Results and Discussion	79
4.2.5.1 Water-Content Calibration	79
4.2.5.2 Solute-Concentration Calibration	80
4.2.5.3 Column Experiment	82
4.2.5.3.1 Water Flow	82
4.2.5.3.2 Chloride Movement	83
4.2.6 Conclusions	87
4.3 TDR and Undisturbed Soil Columns of Manawatu Fine Sandy Loam	89
4.4 TDR Estimation of the Resident Concentration of Electrolyte in the Soil Solution	90
4.4.1 Abstract	90
4.4.2 Introduction	91
4.4.3 Theory	92
4.4.4 Materials and Methods	93
4.4.4.1 TDR Calibration	95
4.4.5 Results	96
4.4.5.1 Water Content Calibration	96
4.4.5.2 Solute Concentration Calibration	96
4.4.5.3 Leaching Experiments	98
4.4.6 Conclusions	102
4.5 Overall Conclusions	104

CHAPTER 5

5. ANION MOVEMENT THROUGH UNSATURATED SOIL	106
5.1 Introduction	106
5.2 Anion Transport Through Intact Soil Columns During Intermittent Unsaturated Flow	108
5.2.1 Abstract	108
5.2.2 Introduction	108
5.2.3 Theory	110
5.2.4 Materials and Methods	113
5.2.5 Results and Discussion	115
5.2.5.1 Water Flow and Storage	115
5.2.5.2 Chloride and Nitrate in the Effluent and Simulation Results using the CDE	117
5.2.5.3 Resident Solute Concentrations and Simulation Results using the CDE	118
5.2.5.4 Characterising Anion Movement using Suction Cup Data	119
5.2.5.5 Characterising Anion Movement using TDR	121
5.2.5.6 Simulation using the Mobile/Immobile Model	122
5.2.6 Conclusions	124
5.3 Solute Movement through Undisturbed Soil Columns Under Pasture during Unsaturated Flow	125
5.3.1 Abstract	125
5.3.2 Introduction	126
5.3.3 Theory	127
5.3.4 Materials and Methods	130
5.3.4.1 Column Experiments	130
5.3.4.2 Chemical Analysis	131
5.3.4.3 Rainfall Simulator	132
5.3.5 Results	134
5.3.5.1 Anion Movement	134
5.3.5.2 Resident Concentrations of Strontium	136
5.3.6 Discussion	137
5.3.6.1 Conclusions	138
5.4 Bolt's Approach and Anion Transport	139
5.5 Overall Conclusions	140

CHAPTER 6

6. CATION MOVEMENT THROUGH UNSATURATED SOIL	143
6.1 Introduction	143
6.2 Cation Transport During Unsaturated Flow Through Two Intact Soils	144
6.2.1 Summary	144
6.2.2 Introduction	144
6.2.3 Theory	146
6.2.4 Methods and Materials	149
6.2.5 Results and Discussion	150
6.2.5.1 Cation Exchange Capacity and Selectivity Coefficients	150
6.2.5.2 Anion Movement	153
6.2.5.3 Calcium and Magnesium Outflow	156
6.2.5.4 Resident and Solution Concentrations of Calcium and Magnesium	160
6.2.5.5 Suction Cup Measurements	162
6.2.5.6 Leaching of Potassium	163
6.2.6 Conclusions	165
6.3 Cation Movement and the Mobile/Immobile Concept	166
6.4 Overall Conclusions	167

CHAPTER 7

7. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	169
REFERENCES	174
APPENDIX A	193
A.1 Numerical Solutions for the CDE used in this Study	193
A.1.1 Non-reactive Solutes	193
A.1.2 Numerical Simulations for the Mobile/Immobile Approach	194
A.1.3 Numerical Simulation of Cation Movement	195
APPENDIX B	202
B.1 Program 1	202
B.2 Program 2	205
B.3 Program 3	207
B.4 Program 4	209
B.5 Program 5	212

List of Tables

Chapter 4

Table 4.1	Column data and model parameters obtained from the CDE. -----	94
-----------	---	----

Chapter 5

Table 5.1	Transport parameters obtained as described in the text. -----	115
Table 5.2	Parameters from column leaching experiments on Manawatu fine sandy loam using the CDE, the MIM, and Bolt's approach. -----	140

List of Figures

Chapter 2

Fig. 2.1	Simplified picture of the soil with macropores of various sizes, and soil matrix with micropores. -----	10
Fig. 2.2	Flux concentration (C_f) and resident concentration (C_r). -----	13
Fig. 2.3	Column leaching experiment with breakthrough-curves for non-reactive and reactive solutes, and anion exclusion. -----	15
Fig. 2.4	Comparison between simulations using the CDE and MIM, based on the approach of Bolt (1982), eq. [2.37]. -----	33
Fig. 2.5	Exchange isotherms for a homovalent system with cation species A and B for various values of the selectivity coefficient K_{A-B} . -----	39

Fig. 2.6 BTC's for a homovalent system with cation species *A* and *B* for various values of K_{A-B} for (a) an unfavourable isotherm, and (b) a favourable isotherm. ----- 40

Fig. 2.7 Flux (solid lines) and resident concentrations (broken lines) for two different Pèlect numbers. ----- 42

Fig. 2.8 Numerical grid. ----- 48

Chapter 3

Fig. 3.1 Schematic diagram of the TDR system. ----- 56

Fig. 3.2 An idealized TDR voltage trace vs. time. ----- 57

Chapter 4

Fig. 4.1 Diagram of the combined TDR and disk permeameter set-up. ----- 77

Fig. 4.2 Volumetric water content determined gravimetrically vs. TDR-measured dielectric constant. Also shown is the fitted function, and the empirical relationship suggested by Topp *et al.* (1980). ----- 80

Fig. 4.3 TDR-measured bulk soil electrical conductivity vs. electrical conductivity of the soil solution measured with a conductivity meter for different water contents of Ramiha silt loam. ----- 81

Fig. 4.4 TDR-measured water content for the vertically- and the horizontally-installed probe vs. time during infiltration. ----- 83

Fig. 4.5	The resident concentration estimated from the TDR-measured bulk soil electrical conductivity of the horizontally-installed probe during infiltration of KCl. -----	85
Fig. 4.6	The electrical conductivity of the soil solution calculated from the TDR-measured bulk soil electrical conductivity of the vertically-installed probe during infiltration of KCl. -----	86
Fig. 4.7	The anion exchange capacity measured for various concentrations of KCl in the soil solution. -----	87
Fig. 4.8	TDR-measured bulk soil electrical conductivity vs. electrical conductivity of the soil solution measured with a conductivity meter for different water contents for Manawatu fine sandy loam using disturbed and undisturbed soil columns. -----	97
Fig. 4.9	Normalised bulk soil electrical conductivity as measured by TDR and simulated curves for column A and column B. Also shown are the normalised resident concentrations calculated with values obtained from measurements on disturbed or undisturbed columns. -----	99
Fig. 4.10	Normalised anion breakthrough data and fitted curves using the CDE for column C and column D. -----	100
Fig. 4.11	Normalised bulk soil electrical conductivity as measured by TDR and simulated curves for column C and column D. Also shown are the normalised resident concentrations calculated from TDR-----	101

Chapter 5

Fig. 5.1	Experimental setup of the leaching experiment under pasture, including the rainfall simulator. -----	107
Fig. 5.2	Measured outflow flux density as a function cumulative infiltration for columns A and column B.-----	116
Fig. 5.3	Normalized anion breakthrough data and fitted curves using the CDE at the low flow rate for column A and column B, and for column B at the high flow rate. -----	117
Fig. 5.4	Anion concentrations in the soil solution inferred from soil extracts for column A and column B.-----	119
Fig. 5.5	(a) Normalised anion breakthrough data measured by suction cups and simulated curves for column A and column B. (b) Normalised bulk soil electrical conductivity as measured by TDR and simulated curves for column A and column B. -----	120
Fig. 5.6	Normalized anion breakthrough data and fitted curves using the mobile/immobile approach of the CDE at the low flow rate for column A and column B, and for column B at the high flow rate. -----	123
Fig. 5.7	Diagram of the rainfall simulator. -----	133
Fig. 5.8	Normalised anion breakthrough data and fitted curves using the CDE for Column I, and column II with solute either applied to a wet surface or a dry surface as a function of cumulative drainage. -----	135

- Fig. 5.9 Concentrations of Sr^{2+} in column I at the end of the experiment, as obtained from large samples and subsamples. Also shown are the simulations using the CDE in conjunction with cation exchange theory. ----- 137
- Fig. 5.10 Simplified picture of the soil with mobile, immobile and excluded water. ----- 141
- Chapter 6**
- Fig. 6.1 (a) Ammonium-acetate measured CEC, at the soil's pH, as obtained for columns A, B, C, and D, and independent measurements from the field for Manawatu and Ramiha soil as a function of depth.
(b) and (c) Initial relative concentrations of exchangeable cations from field measurements.----- 151
- Fig. 6.2 Relative amounts of charge on the exchange sites balanced by different cations as a function of the relative concentration in the soil solution for (a) the Ca-Mg-system, and (b) the K-(Ca + Mg)-system for the Manawatu fine sandy loam. ----- 153
- Fig. 6.3 Normalized anion breakthrough data during leaching and prediction using the CDE (a) for Manawatu soil columns A and column B, and (b) for Ramiha soil for columns C and D. (c) resident anion concentrations as a function of depth for Manawatu soil and Ramiha. Also shown are the predictions. ----- 154
- Fig. 6.4 Effluent concentrations of Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} as a function of cumulative infiltration for columns A, B, C, and D. Also shown are the simulations assuming the total measured CEC is involved and only 80% of the ammonium-acetate measured CEC is involved. ----- 157

- Fig. 6.5 Relative concentrations on the exchange sites of X_{Ca} and X_{Mg} at the end of the experiment for columns A, B, C, and D. Also shown are the simulations using 80 % and 100% of the ammonium-acetate measured CEC. ----- 161
- Fig. 6.6 Measured concentrations C from the suction cups for Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} as a function of cumulative infiltration for columns A and B. Also shown are the simulations using 80 % of the ammonium-acetate measured CEC. ----- 162
- Fig. 6.7 (a) Effluent concentrations for K^+ during leaching with $Ca(NO_3)_2$ solution and $MgCl_2$ solution as a function of cumulative infiltration for columns A, B, C, and D. Also shown for the Manawatu soil are the simulations using 80% of the ammonium-acetate measured CEC, and a K_{K-CM} value of $3.1 \text{ (mol m}^{-3}\text{)}^{1/2}$.
 (b) Measured concentrations of K^+ on exchange sites for columns A, and B, and initial K^+ concentrations for the Manawatu soil. Also shown are the simulated concentrations.
 (c) Measured concentrations of K^+ on exchange sites for columns C, and D, and initial K^+ concentrations for the Ramiha soil. ----- 164
- Fig. 6.8 Effluent concentrations of Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} as a function of cumulative infiltration for columns A and B. Also shown are the simulations using the mobile/immobile approach of the CDE and assuming only 80% of the ammonium-acetate measured CEC is involved. ----- 167

List of Symbols

Roman Symbols

a	empirical constant	$[\text{m}^3 \text{kg}^{-1}]$
a_1, a_2	variables in computer program	-
b	empirical constant	-
b_1, b_2	variables in computer program	$[\text{kg or mol m}^{-3}]$
c	propagation of an electromagnetic wave in free space	$[\text{m s}^{-1}]$
c_1, c_2	variables in computer program	$[(\text{mol m}^{-3})^2]$
c_3	empirical constant	-
d	empirical constant	-
f	fraction of exchange sites in immobile water domain	-
f_c	temperature correction coefficient	-
$f_i(Q)$	solute probability function of cumulative infiltration	$[\text{m}^{-1}]$
$f_i(t)$	solute travel-time probability function	$[\text{s}^{-1}]$
g	solute life-time probability function	$[\text{s}^{-1}]$
h_o	pressure head	$[\text{m}]$
l	column length or calibration length	$[\text{m}]$
l_a	apparent TDR probe length	$[\text{m}]$
l_t	TDR probe length	$[\text{m}]$
n	constant in Eq. 2.22 and Eq. 2.40	-
q_d	diffusional flux exchange between mobile and immobile water	$[\text{kg or mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}]$
q_i	solute flux in immobile phase	$[\text{kg or mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}]$
q_m	solute flux in mobile phase	$[\text{kg or mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}]$
q_w	water flux density	$[\text{m s}^{-1}]$
q_s	solute flux density	$[\text{kg or mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}]$
r	voltage reflection coefficient	-
t	time	$[\text{s}]$
t'	input time	$[\text{s}]$
v	pore water velocity	$[\text{m s}^{-1}]$

v_p	relative velocity setting on TDR instrument	-
v_e	propagation velocity of an electromagnetic pulse	$[m\ s^{-1}]$
x	variable in computer program	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
y	variable in computer program	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
z	depth	$[m]$
A_s	cross-sectional area	$[m^2]$
A	ion species	-
B	ion species	-
C	concentration in soil solution	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
$C_a(z)$	depths-dependent initial soil solution concentration	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_{ai}	total initial anion concentration	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_A	concentration of cation species A in soil solution	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_B	concentration of cation species A in soil solution	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_f	flux-averaged solute concentration	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_i	resident soil solution concentration in immobile phase	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_m	resident soil solution concentration in mobile phase	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
$C_o(t)$	time-dependent input solution concentration	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_r	resident soil solution concentration	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_s	soil solution concentration of ion species s	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_T	total cation concentration in soil solution	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
C_l	constant concentration	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-3}]$
D_s	hydrodynamic dispersion coefficient	$[m^2\ s^{-1}]$
D_i	diffusion coefficient in soil	$[m^2\ s^{-1}]$
D_m	dispersion coefficient in mobile phase	$[m^2\ s^{-1}]$
D_w	soil water diffusivity	$[m^2\ s^{-1}]$
D_o	diffusion coefficient in water	$[m^2\ s^{-1}]$
F_{in}	solute mass flux entering soil volume	$[kg\ or\ mol\ s^{-1}]$
F_{ex}	solute mass flux leaving soil volume	$[kg\ or\ mol\ s^{-1}]$
I	ionic strength	-
J_c	convective solute flux in mobile water	$[kg\ or\ mol\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}]$

J_{disp}	dispersive solute flux in mobile water	[kg or mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹]
J_E	diffusional flux exchange between mobile and immobile water	[kg or mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹]
J_L	longitudinal diffusional flux	[kg or mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹]
K_{A-B}	selectivity coefficient for cation species A and B	-
K_{M-D}	selectivity coefficient in Gapon equation	[(mol kg ⁻³) ^{1/2}]
K_d	distribution coefficient	[m ³ kg ⁻¹]
K_G	geometric constant of TDR probe	[m ⁻¹]
K_s	saturated hydraulic conductivity	[m s ⁻¹]
K_w	hydraulic conductivity	[m s ⁻¹]
L_D	diffusion/dispersion length parameter	[m]
L_{diff}	diffusion length parameter	[m]
L_{dis}	dispersion length parameter	[m]
L_{mim}	mobile/immobile exchange length parameter	[m]
M_o	pulse of solute applied to soil surface	[kg or mol m ⁻²]
M	total solute concentration	[kg or mol m ⁻³]
M_i	solute mass in immobile phase	[kg or mol m ⁻³]
M_m	solute mass in mobile phase	[kg or mol m ⁻³]
P	Péclet number	-
R	retardation factor	-
R_C	radius of cylinders of porous soil	[m]
R_H	radius of cylindrical macropores	[m]
R_S	radius of spheres	[m]
Q	cumulative drainage or infiltration	[m]
R	solute retardation factor	-
S	sorptivity	[m s ^{-1/2}]
S_s	amount of solute adsorbed	[kg or mol kg ⁻¹]
T	travel time of electromagnetic pulse	[s]
V_o	zero reference voltage	[V]
V_f	final reflected voltage at very long time	[V]
V_i	voltage of incident step	[V]
V_r	voltage after reflection from probe end	[V]

X_A	charge concentration of cation species A on exchanger	$[\text{mol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1}]$
X_{CEC}	charge concentration of adsorbed cations	$[\text{mol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1}]$
Z_o	characteristic impedance	$[\Omega]$
Z_L	impedance of TDR probe	$[\Omega]$

Greek Letters

α	mass transfer coefficient	$[\text{s}^{-1}]$
β	constant	-
δ	Dirac delta function	-
ε	dielectric constant	-
γ	constant	-
λ	dispersivity	$[\text{m}]$
λ_{eff}	effective dispersivity	$[\text{m}]$
λ_m	dispersivity in mobile water	$[\text{m}]$
λ_{meff}	effective dispersivity in mobile phase	$[\text{m}]$
λ_{num}	numerical dispersivity	$[\text{m}]$
μ_l	mean of the lognormal distribution	$[\text{s}]$
ρ_b	soil bulk density	$[\text{kg m}^{-3}]$
σ	bulk soil electrical conductivity	$[\text{S m}^{-1}]$
σ_l	variance of the lognormal distribution	$[\text{s}]$
σ_s	surface conductance	$[\text{S m}^{-1}]$
σ_w	pore water electrical conductivity	$[\text{S m}^{-1}]$
τ	tortuosity factor	-
θ	volumetric water content	$[\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}]$
θ_a	residual water content	$[\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}]$
θ_i	immobile water fraction	$[\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}]$
θ_m	mobile or effective water fraction	$[\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}]$
θ_n	initial water content	$[\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}]$

θ_s	saturated water content	$[\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}]$
θ_x	excluded water fraction	$[\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}]$
ω	attenuation coefficient	-

Subscripts

n	depth position
j	time index
Ca	calcium
D	divalent
K	potassium
Na	sodium
M	monovalent
Mg	magnesium
CM	calcium plus magnesium

Abbreviations

BTC	breakthrough curve
CDE	convection dispersion equation
CEC	cation exchange capacity
CLT	convective lognormal transfer function
E_l	expected mean travel time at reference depth l
E_z	expected mean travel time at depth z
MIM	mobile/immobile concept
pdf	probability density function
REV	representative elementary volume
REA	representative elementary area
TDR	time domain reflectometry
Var_l	variance at reference depth l
Var_z	variance at depth z