Inferring Transit Times Distributions from atmospheric tracer data : Assessment of the predictive capacities of Lumped Parameter Models on a 3D cristalline aquifer.

tested.

VII - Conclusion

CIENCES

^a Geosciences Rennes (UMR 6118 CNRS), Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France. ^b Agroparistech, 16 rue Claude Bernard, 75005 Paris, France.

^c University of California, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, 1 Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, USA. ^d EHESP Rennes, Sorbonne Université Paris, France.

^e IFP Energie Nouvelles, 1-4 rue du Bois-Préau, 92852 Rueil Malmaison Cedex, France.

(TTDs) are never directly accessible from field measurements but always deduced from a



III - In silico results

1 – In silico reference measurements: the tracer apparent ages

Tracer concentrations of CFC-11, ⁸⁵Kr and SF₆ are synthetically sampled in 73 sampling zones over all the supplying area of the pumping well.

Reference tracer concentrations C_{Tr} sampled for each sampling zone can readily be converted into apparent ages \hat{A}_{Tr} : $C_{\mathrm{Tr}}(t,\mathbf{x}) = \mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(\hat{A}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(t,\mathbf{x})) e^{-\lambda \, \hat{A}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(t,\mathbf{x})}$



Time at which 25, 50 and 75 % of the water is renewed is determined in 73 sampling zones covering the supplying area of the pumping well with the reference TTDs of each sampling zone. These renewal times correspond to the quartiles of the reference TTDs.



Map of the different renewal times (from left to right, times at which 25, 50 and 75% of the water is renewed corresponding to $Q_1, Q_2, \& Q_2$) obtained with the in-silico model. The pumping well is identified by the black square.

Map of the apparent ages obtained with the in-silico model in the contact zone of the Plœmeur site. Contour of the map is determined by taking the supplying limit of the pumping well. From left to right: CFC-11, SF6 and 85Kr apparent ages. The pumping well is identified by the black square.

J. Marçais^{a,b}, J.-R. de dreuzy^a, T. R. Ginn^c, P. Rousseau-Gueutin^d, S. Leray^e

2 – In silico reference renewal times

measurements have been determined. 3 – Extensive analysis on these sampling zones shows that LPMs can be highly effective for establishing accurate predictions. The 2 parameters LPMs yield everywhere to accurate predictions on renewal times (with less than 10% error). By comparison, the 1 parameter LPMs, exponential and Dirac, cannot give relevant predictions everywhere. 4 – Two tracers with sufficiently different atmospheric concentrations chronicles give accurate predictions provided that relevant LPMs be used.



$$\chi = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{C_{\mathrm{Tr}_{n}}^{\mathrm{ref}}} \cdot \mid C_{\mathrm{Tr}_{n}}^{\mathrm{ref}}(t) - \int_{0}^{t} \mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{Tr}_{n}}(t-u) f_{(\pi_{1},\cdots,\pi_{N})}(u) \,\mathrm{d}u \mid \right)^{2}$$

$$= \max_{n \in \llbracket 1; \mathbb{N} \rrbracket} \frac{1}{C_{\mathrm{Tr}_n}^{\mathrm{ref}}} \cdot \mid C_{\mathrm{Tr}_n}^{\mathrm{ref}} - \int_0^t \mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{Tr}_n}(t-u) f_{(\pi_1, \cdots, \pi_{\mathrm{N}})}(u) \,\mathrm{d}u \mid$$

3 – Evaluating predictive performance of calibrated LPMs

Once calibrated, quartiles of the LPMs are derived and compared to the reference quartiles. As for the reference quartiles, quartiles of these LPMs correspond to the renewal times at which 25% (or 50 and 75%).

To evaluate the predictive performance of these LPMs we compare the prediction of renewal times given by these LPMs to the reference renewal times.

 θ is introduced to quantify the quality of the predictions given by the LPMs:

$$heta = rac{1}{3}\sum_{i=1}^{3} |Q_i^{ ext{ref}} - Q_i^{(\pi_1, \cdots, \pi_{ ext{N}})}|$$

where $Q_i^{(\pi_1,\dots,\pi_N)}$ is the quartile of a N-parameters LPM.

	Statistics on ρ [%]		Statistics on θ [years]	
	$\bar{\rho}$	$\sigma(ho)$	$\bar{ heta}$	$\sigma(heta)$
Inverse Gaussian	1.1	3.3	3.2	1.8
Shifted Exponential	3.8	3.6	3.3	1.7
Uniform	3.7	6.4	3.7	1.8

3-parameters LPMs Statistics on ρ [%] | Statistics on θ [years] $ar{ ho} \qquad \sigma(ho)$ $\sigma(\theta)$



Characteristic renewal time of 25% of the water to the sampling zone

 (Q_1) for the 3 parameters (a) sums of Dirac LPM and (b) shifted inverse gaussian LPM.

The 3-parameter Dirac combination can closely fit the atmospheric tracer concentrations (CFC-11, ⁸⁵Kr & SF₆). Predictions are however not as good as with the 2-parameters LPMs or 3-parameters shifted inverse Gaussian.

The 3-parameters Shifted Inverse Gaussian leads to calibration comparable to the 2-parameters LPMs. The gain in term of predictions is marginal compared to the Inverse Gaussian model.

1 – Quality of calibration does not grant the accuracy of predictions. In term of indicators, small values of ρ does not imply small values of θ .

2 – The likelihood of distributions shape conditions the accuracy of predictions. This implies considering analytic with at least 2 parameters. Indeed, the 2-parameters LPMs can capture in some ways the first two moments (mean and variance) of the TTD.

3 – Two tracers concentrations with the same age range are needed to provide the complementary information needed to inform the first two moments of the TTD.

4 – Different results might be expected for aquifer with broader ranges of transit times than those of the Plœmeur aquifer. In this case, tracers with different age ranges might be

1 – A methodology to assess LPMs predictions capabilities have been developed with in silico modeling of a 3D complex aquifer. 2 – This methodology has been applied to the Ploemeur crystalline aquifer. 73 sampling zones have been designed all across the aquifer: in silico TTDs and in silico tracer