



HAL
open science

Worth of hydraulic and water chemistry observation data in terms of the reliability of surface water-groundwater exchange flux predictions under varied flow conditions

Daniel Partington, Matthew J Knowling, Craig T Simmons, Peter G Cook, Yueqing Xie, Takuya Iwanaga, Camille Bouchez

► To cite this version:

Daniel Partington, Matthew J Knowling, Craig T Simmons, Peter G Cook, Yueqing Xie, et al.. Worth of hydraulic and water chemistry observation data in terms of the reliability of surface water-groundwater exchange flux predictions under varied flow conditions. *Journal of Hydrology*, 2020, 590, pp.125441. 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125441 . insu-02935694

HAL Id: insu-02935694

<https://insu.hal.science/insu-02935694>

Submitted on 10 Sep 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Journal Pre-proofs

Research papers

Worth of hydraulic and water chemistry observation data in terms of the reliability of surface water-groundwater exchange flux predictions under varied flow conditions

Daniel Partington, Matthew J. Knowling, Craig T. Simmons, Peter G. Cook, Yueqing Xie, Takuya Iwanaga, Camille Bouchez

PII: S0022-1694(20)30901-X
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125441>
Reference: HYDROL 125441


To appear in: *Journal of Hydrology*

Received Date: 7 November 2019
Revised Date: 19 March 2020
Accepted Date: 18 August 2020

Please cite this article as: Partington, D., Knowling, M.J., Simmons, C.T., Cook, P.G., Xie, Y., Iwanaga, T., Bouchez, C., Worth of hydraulic and water chemistry observation data in terms of the reliability of surface water-groundwater exchange flux predictions under varied flow conditions, *Journal of Hydrology* (2020), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125441>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2020 Published by Elsevier B.V.



1 **Worth of hydraulic and water chemistry observation data in terms**
2 **of the reliability of surface water-groundwater exchange flux**
3 **predictions under varied flow conditions**

4
5 **Daniel Partington¹, Matthew J. Knowling², Craig T. Simmons¹, Peter G. Cook¹, Yueqing**
6 **Xie^{1,3}, Takuya Iwanaga⁴, Camille Bouchez⁵**

7
8 ¹National Centre for Groundwater Research and Training, & College of Science and
9 Engineering, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia

10 ²GNS Science, Lower Hutt, New Zealand

11 ³School of Earth Sciences and Engineering, Nanjing University, Nanjing, China

12 ⁴Integrated Catchment Assessment and Management (iCAM) Centre, The Fenner School of
13 Environment and Society, The Australian National University, Canberra , Australia

14 ⁵Univ Rennes, CNRS, Géosciences Rennes, UMR 6118, 35000 Rennes, France

15 Corresponding author: Daniel Partington (daniel.partington@flinders.edu.au)

16

17 Abstract

18 This study assesses the worth of routinely collected hydraulic data (groundwater head, stream
19 stage and streamflow) and lesser collected water chemistry data (Radon-222, Carbon-14,
20 electrical conductivity (EC)) in the context of making regional-scale surface water-groundwater
21 (SW-GW) exchange flux predictions. Using integrated SW-GW flow and transport numerical
22 models, first-order, second-moment (FOSM) analyses were employed to assess the extent of the
23 uncertainty reduction or lack thereof in SW-GW exchange flux predictions following acquisition
24 of hydraulic and water chemistry observation data. With a case study of the Campaspe River in
25 the Murray-Darling Basin (Australia), we explored the apparent information content of these
26 data during low, regular and high streamflow conditions. Also, a range of spatial and temporal
27 prediction scales were considered: catchment-wide and reach-based spatial scales and annual and
28 monthly temporal scales. Generally, the data worth evaluations showed significant variability
29 across predictions that were dependent on the spatiotemporal scale of the SW-GW exchange, the
30 magnitude and direction of the SW-GW exchange flux and the prevailing streamflow conditions.
31 These dependencies serve to emphasise the importance of prediction specificity with respect to
32 SW-GW exchange. Among existing data, the most worth was found in Radon-222, groundwater
33 hydraulic head, EC, and streamflow data showing average reductions in uncertainty of 41%,
34 38%, 32%, and 23% respectively. Assessment of type and spatiotemporal locations of potential
35 data showed Radon-222 to be the next most important observation type across many predictions
36 in locations with data paucity of all data types. Hydraulic observation data types were found to
37 inform SW-GW exchange flux best under high- and regular- streamflow conditions when the
38 magnitude of exchange fluxes were largest, whereas the water chemistry data was of highest

39 value for low- and regular- streamflow conditions where groundwater is discharging to the
40 stream.

Journal Pre-proofs

41 **1 Introduction**

42 Observation data underpins effective water resource management, and managers have
43 significant responsibility in decisions around data collection strategies. Conjunctive surface
44 water (SW) and groundwater (GW) resource management requires having a quantitative insight
45 into SW-GW exchange flux. Furthermore, the models that support such management are often
46 required to provide the SW-GW exchange across multiple spatiotemporal scales.

47 Numerous methods exist for SW-GW exchange flux measurement and estimation
48 (Fleckenstein et al. 2010; Kalbus et al. 2006). Means of estimating SW-GW exchange include
49 direct methods (e.g., seepage meters), aimed at measuring the actual SW-GW exchange flux in-
50 stream at a point. Direct methods are limited to very small spatial scales less than a few square
51 metres and cannot be extrapolated to reach or regional scale SW-GW exchange (Cook 2015).
52 Furthermore, such methods are limited by difficulty in identifying net SW-GW exchange – as
53 opposed to hyporheic flow – and thus have limited utility at larger spatial scales (e.g. kilometre
54 scale and greater).

55 The estimation of SW-GW exchange along stream reaches, as opposed to at a point,
56 include methods based on stream water balance, hydraulic head gradient, river chemistry and
57 ground water chemistry (see review by Cook 2015). The stream's water balance (through
58 differential gauging) can be used where the SW-GW exchange is a significant component of the
59 stream's water balance, greater than any uncertainties associated with other components of the
60 balance. SW-GW exchange can be estimated by Darcian flux based on the average hydraulic
61 head gradient across the stream and the average hydraulic conductivity of the streambed/aquifer.
62 The exchange can also be estimated with stable and radioactive geochemical tracers (Cook
63 2013), requiring information on features such as the flow in the stream, stream geometry, and

64 hyporheic cycling. Electrical conductivity (EC) is one stable tracer that, given significant
65 differences between the GW and SW EC can be used with end-member mixing analysis to
66 estimate inflow of GW to a stream (Barthold et al. 2011). The presence of Radon-222 (^{222}Rn) in
67 SW is indicative of GW discharge (Ellins et al. 1990), in the absence of significant hyporheic
68 flow. When the concentration of ^{222}Rn in the GW is measured at multiple locations along a
69 stream along with adequate sampling in the SW, then areas of GW discharge at the time of
70 sampling can be pinpointed, and exchange fluxes estimated. As ^{222}Rn is a gas with a half-life of
71 3.8 days, it will only remain in the stream for short periods of time. The conservative nature of
72 EC allows for differentiation of river water that briefly enters the streambed for a period before
73 returning to the stream, which with accumulation of ^{222}Rn could be otherwise misinterpreted as
74 regional GW discharge. Thus it is possible that these two observation data types contain unique
75 information (i.e. uncorrelated) with respect to SW-GW exchange fluxes, which will be tested
76 herein.

77 The use of physically based numerical modelling of flow in SW-GW systems, which is
78 commonly applied to support managing water resources, allows for groundwater hydraulic head,
79 stream stage and streamflow data to be integrated (e.g., Schilling et al. 2018; Wöhling et al.
80 2018). Furthermore, coupling of transport to such a flow model affords further integration of
81 various stream chemistry and geochemical data, e.g. EC, ^{222}Rn or ^{14}C . Numerical models
82 simulating SW-GW exchange that support water resources management provide an important
83 basis for assessing the extent to which observations can build confidence in the prediction of
84 SW-GW exchange, i.e., data worth (Fienen et al. 2010).

85 The level of confidence in regional scale predictions of SW-GW exchange flux obtained
86 from various models is partly limited by the quality (measurement noise), quantity and types of

87 available data that inform such model predictions. Predictions of surface water-groundwater
88 exchange at a regional scale are critical to support conjunctive management of surface and
89 groundwater resources within strongly connected SW-GW systems, i.e. systems whereby change
90 to management of a river has a notable impact on the underlying aquifer and vice versa.
91 Determining the most informative observational data types and spatiotemporal quantities of such
92 data is an ever increasing need for water resource management practitioners (Kikuchi 2017).

93 The use of numerical models as a tool to formally assess the benefit of different data
94 types and optimal data acquisition/experimental design within a formal “data worth” assessment
95 framework is continually growing in popularity (Kikuchi 2017). The problem of “data worth”, in
96 the context of water resources modelling, can be defined in terms of the reduction or lack thereof
97 in the uncertainty of any key prediction of management interest that is afforded through the
98 acquisition of observation data. A popular method used is first-order, second-moment (FOSM)
99 analysis, which assumes the model behaves linearly with respect to its input parameters and
100 simulated outputs. This approach is commonly used because of its suitability to be applied in
101 combination with complex models (which are often used to support environmental management)
102 owing to its computational efficiency (e.g. Dausman et al. 2010; Fienen et al. 2010; Moore and
103 Doherty 2005). Brunner et al. (2012) used this approach to explore the worth of groundwater
104 hydraulic head, ET and soil moisture observations in informing regional scale groundwater
105 models. Wallis et al. (2014) demonstrated the utility of a FOSM-based data worth analysis of
106 bromide, temperature, methane and chloride in the context of aquifer injection trials following
107 coal seam gas-related water production. Schilling et al. (2014) investigated the utility of novel
108 tree ring data in reducing predictive uncertainty of SW-GW exchange. More recently, Zell et al.
109 (2018) used a similar approach to analyse groundwater hydraulic head, stream discharge, SF₆,

110 CFCs and ^3H in GW transport times. Finally, Knowling et al. (2019b), explored the worth of
111 tritium-derived mean-residence time data for forecasts of spring discharge.

112 In the current study, the worth of existing and potential different hydraulic and water
113 chemistry data are quantitatively investigated in the context of SW-GW exchange flux
114 predictions over monthly and annual timescales and over a range of length scales (whole of river
115 (141 km) vs reach (0.8 - 40.4 km)), for a field site in south-eastern Australia (Campaspe River
116 catchment). We specifically consider the worth of: groundwater hydraulic head, streamflow,
117 stream stage/depth, stream EC, stream ^{222}Rn , and groundwater ^{14}C for such predictions. To the
118 best of the authors' knowledge, the benefit or otherwise of these tracer methods have not been
119 quantitatively evaluated compared to more traditional and routinely collected data types in the
120 context of SW-GW exchanges at the regional scale. This paper aims to answer:

121 **Q1.** To what degree, if at all, does the addition/omission of existing hydraulic observation
122 and/or chemical observation data reduce/increase the uncertainty of SW-GW exchange fluxes
123 and what is the spatiotemporal variability of such reductions/increases during low, regular
124 and high streamflow conditions?

125 **Q2.** Through consideration of potential future sampling locations and times, which hydraulic
126 and/or chemical data should be targeted in the future to yield the best reductions in
127 uncertainty of SW-GW exchange flux during low, regular and high streamflow conditions?

128 **2 Case Study: Campaspe River**

129 The Campaspe River, located in north-central Victoria, lies within the Murray-Darling
130 Basin, shown in Figure 1. The river runs for 220 km, beginning in the hilly terrain of the Great
131 Dividing Range and flowing down through undulating foothills to the wide flat riverine plain in

132 the north before it joins the Murray River; the river provides 0.9% of the inflow for the basin.
133 The Campaspe River overlies a series of alluvial aquifers, namely the Coonambidgal Formation,
134 Shepparton Formation, Calivil Formation and Renmark Group (the latter two also commonly
135 referred to collectively as the Deep Lead aquifer) which interact with the river along its length.
136 As shown in Figure 1, the hydrogeological units of the Lower Campaspe valley area are made up
137 of a Palaeozoic basement of fractured and faulted rocks, overlain by the Renmark Group which
138 contains a blanket of thinly bedded carbonaceous sand, silt, clay and peaty coal, then overlying
139 this is the Calivil Formation comprising coarse grained quartzose sand and gravel sheet with
140 minor kaolonite clay, and atop of the Calivil Formation the Shepparton Formation is made up of
141 fine-grained clastics and polymitic sand and gravel. Finally, incised into the Shepparton
142 Formation, the Coonambidgal Formation is made up of primarily light grey or brown silty clay,
143 with sand beds often at the base (Arad and Evans 1987). The main groundwater resource in the
144 Lower Campaspe Valley is the Deep Lead aquifer. Conjunctively managing both the Campaspe
145 River and Deep Lead aquifer necessitates estimation of SW-GW exchange flux.

146 **Figure 1. Campaspe River study area (a), location of Campaspe River catchment within**
147 **the Murray-Darling Basin (b), and 3D model of hydrogeological units within the study area**
148 **(c).**

149 Average annual rainfall ranges from 424 to 746 mm, with the higher rainfall occurring at
150 higher elevations above Lake Eppalock, and lower rainfall occurring in the Lower Campaspe
151 Valley. On average, the highest rainfall occurs between June and August, with the driest months
152 being January to March. As well as providing sustained flow, the Lake Eppalock dam
153 (completed in 1964) allows enhanced recharge to the Lower Campaspe Valley, due to its use in
154 providing irrigation water in the area. The focus of this study is the area downstream of Lake

155 Eppalock and all the way to where the Campaspe River joins the Murray River. Large diversions
156 from the Campaspe River until recent years were made through offtakes from the Campaspe
157 Weir (constructed in the late 1800s) in the Campaspe Irrigation District (CID). Significant
158 groundwater pumping developed in the Lower Campaspe area in the 1960's.

159 *2.1 Existing and potential observation data*

160 Observation data types considered in this study include routinely collected and publicly
161 available hydraulic data, i.e., streamflow (daily), stream stage (daily) and groundwater hydraulic
162 head data (variable, usually quarterly) (Australian Bureau of Meteorology
163 (<http://www.bom.gov.au>), Victorian Government (<http://data.water.vic.gov.au>)). We also used
164 existing EC data from the Victorian Government at stream gauges (<http://data.water.vic.gov.au>).
165 As part of this study we collected surface (multiple times) and groundwater (once) ^{222}Rn data
166 (spot sampling), and new groundwater ^{14}C to supplement existing ^{14}C data collected in previous
167 studies (Cartwright et al. 2012; Cartwright et al. 2006; Cartwright et al. 2010) (spot sampling).
168 All considered observation data sampling locations are shown in Figure 2, where it can be seen
169 that the majority of groundwater head observations are located in the north of the study area. All
170 data collected previously and part of this study is herein referred to as “existing data”, as opposed
171 to “potential data” which herein refers to as yet uncollected data. A dense network of future
172 potential observation locations (i.e. data not yet collected) was considered spanning the entire
173 study area, which includes GW sampling locations for groundwater hydraulic head and ^{14}C and
174 SW sampling locations for stream stage, streamflow, stream ^{222}Rn and stream EC. The potential
175 locations were chosen with the aim of filling the spatial gaps in data, e.g. hydraulic head in the
176 south of the study area.

177 **Figure 2. Locations for observation data, including a) existing hydraulic (groundwater**
178 **hydraulic head, stream stage and streamflow) and b) chemical (stream ^{222}Rn , ^{14}C , stream**
179 **EC) data. Potential future observation data (c) collection locations considered are also**
180 **shown. The potential GW observations cover the extent of the aquifers, with gaps existing**
181 **in the south of the study area due to the presence of only bedrock. The number of locations**
182 **for each data type is shown in brackets in the legend.**

183 **3 Methodology**

184 *3.1 Integrated SW-GW model setup*

185 The integrated SW-GW numerical models described below collectively serve as a tool for
186 quantifying regional-scale SW-GW exchange flux prediction uncertainty and its reduction (or
187 lack thereof) through the collection of various types of hydraulic and chemical data. A
188 requirement for effective model usage in this context is that the models provide a robust basis for
189 representing the primary processes and parameters on which predictions of interest may depend.
190 For example, Fienen et al. (2010) showed that spatially distributed parameterisation schemes are
191 necessary for effective predictive uncertainty estimation and to avoid corrupted data worth
192 interpretations that may arise when adopting more parsimonious parameterisation schemes. As
193 such, the numerical models employed here are physically based and highly parameterised (>
194 1500 parameters), to allow simulation of surface and subsurface hydraulics (hydraulic head,
195 stream stage and flow) and transport (^{222}Rn , ^{14}C and EC), and to robustly express uncertainty in
196 regional-scale SW-GW exchange flux predictions (e.g., Hunt et al. 2007; Knowling et al. 2019a),
197 respectively.

198 The integrated models considered herein comprise a series of SW-GW flow models and a
199 series of SW-GW and SW solute transport models (Figure 3). The flow modelling in this study
200 was carried out using MODFLOW-NWT (Niswonger et al. 2011). Assimilation of the hydraulic
201 data (groundwater hydraulic head, streamflow, stream stage) is achieved through the integrated
202 SW-GW flow models. The flow models simulate 3D saturated groundwater flow (ignoring
203 unsaturated flow) and 1D surface flow routing through rivers (by the kinematic wave equation;
204 SFR2 (Niswonger and Prudic 2005)). The flow model focuses representation of surface flow on
205 the Campaspe River, ignoring some of the small tributaries that feed into the main river
206 downstream of Lake Eppalock. This simplification is made as little flow arises from these
207 tributaries other than in large rainfall events.

208 The flow solutions obtained from the steady and transient MODFLOW-NWT models
209 were subsequently used to simulate transport of ^{14}C using MT3D-USGS (Bedekar et al. 2016a;
210 Bedekar et al. 2016b). Due to existing limitations in simulating radioactive decay and
211 evapoconcentration with the stream flow transport (SFT) package of MT3D-USGS, the
212 simulation of EC and ^{222}Rn stream concentrations was carried out with an analytical steady-state
213 transport model which accounts for evapoconcentration, decay and hyporheic exchange (similar
214 to that of Cook et al. (2006) but rearranged to solve for concentration as shown in the Appendix)
215 using the MODFLOW-simulated streamflows and SW-GW exchange fluxes as inputs. With this
216 SW transport model, GW ^{222}Rn and EC concentrations were treated as a static boundary (see
217 Table 2). It is assumed that over the monthly time-step used in the flow model that the river is
218 completely flushed and that all inflows (and corresponding concentrations) are steady, hence the
219 use of the steady-state transport model.

220 The series of flow and transport models, shown in Figure 3, were used as a basis for
221 representing the different hydraulic and chemical data types. Firstly, groundwater hydraulic
222 head, streamflow, and stream depth/stage, are simulated under pre-clearance conditions in a
223 steady-state flow model (SS) (MODFLOW-NWT). Secondly, transient SW-GW flow (TR) is
224 simulated spanning the period 1840 to 2018. In the transient flow model, it is assumed that
225 clearance of native trees and shrubs was immediate (1840) and that irrigation was static (using
226 long term average). ^{14}C was simulated in two models, firstly using the output from the SS flow
227 model but simulating transport for 40,000 yrs (TR1_{C14}) with an initial concentration of ^{14}C set to
228 0 PMC across the model domain; subsequently the final concentration of ^{14}C in the TR1_{C14}
229 simulation was passed as the initial conditions for the post-clearance to present day simulation of
230 ^{14}C (TR2_{C14}). Inflow from recharge was assigned as 100 PMC in both ^{14}C simulations. The
231 Campaspe river flows and SW-GW exchange fluxes simulated at each stream reach in the period
232 of interest from the transient flow solution (TR) (June 2016-May 2017) were passed to the 1D
233 transport model for simulation of ^{222}Rn (SS_{Rn}) and EC (SS_{EC}) at each of the months within this
234 period of interest. Groundwater concentrations for ^{222}Rn and EC were assigned as static.

235

236 **Figure 3. a) The series of flow and transport models employed and the associated data**
237 **types simulated by each, b) a 3D model schematic, including spatial grid and boundary**
238 **conditions: drains (DRN), Campaspe River (SFR), general head (GHB), Murray River**
239 **(RIV), pumping (WEL), and recharge (RCH), which is depicted in the overlaid and**
240 **elevated surface with 11 time invariant recharge zones.**

241 The numerical grid was discretised into 1 km x 1 km cells (Figure 3b) with 7 layers of
242 variable thickness covering the 6 hydrogeological units shown in Figure 1c. The mean, minimum
243 and maximum values of each unit are shown below in Table 1.

244 **Table 1. Summary of hydrogeological layer thicknesses including, mean, minimum,**
245 **maximum thickness and percent volume. Hydrogeological units are abbreviated as**
246 **Coonambidgal (co), Shepparton (sh), Calivil (ca), Renmark (re), Newer Volcanics (nv),**
247 **Basement (ba).**

248 Variable time steps are employed that are 40 yrs (1840-1880), 84 yrs (1881-1965), 20
249 yrs (1966-2005), 10 yrs (2006-2015) and then monthly from January 2015 to March 2018. SW-
250 GW exchange flux predictions of interest considered herein for the purposes of the current data
251 worth analysis are made over a one year period of simulation between the start of June 2016 and
252 the end of May 2017. The exchange fluxes are considered along the entire river from Lake
253 Eppalock to the Murray River (141 km), and for reaches between river gauges along this length
254 of river (11 reaches ranging from 0.8 to 40.4 km in length). The outputs of SW-GW exchange
255 flux from the transient flow model at each reach were considered at the monthly (important for
256 river operations and ecological assessment) and yearly resolution (important for water
257 allocations). Also considered was the spatial sum of the SW-GW exchange flux along the whole
258 river at monthly and annual time scales (important for groundwater use management strategies).
259 These different spatiotemporal predictions give rise to a total of 156 predictions of interest.

260 The MODFLOW-NWT models were forced by recharge using the RCH (specified flux)
261 package, by groundwater pumping using the WEL (specified flux) package (applied from 1966
262 onwards), and by rivers and drains using the SFR (streamflow routing and head-dependent
263 exchange flux, applied to the Campaspe River, which is the focal point of this study), RIV (head-
264 dependent exchange flux applied to the Murray River) and DRN (head-dependent flux)

265 packages. Stream diversions in-to and out-of the Campaspe River are also captured using the
266 SFR package. The locations of the boundary conditions are shown in Figure 3. There is no
267 pumping or artificial drainage in the pre-clearance steady-state (SS) flow model. Zonal rainfall
268 reduction parameters (11 zones) are set to 1% (i.e. assuming very low recharge at a time when
269 the land was densely covered in vegetation) and are multiplied by the spatially varying map of
270 temporal long-term average rainfall over this period for specifying the recharge boundary
271 condition. As rainfall reduction parameters were used for recharge, evapotranspiration was not
272 explicitly modelled in this study. In the post-clearance transient flow model (TR) the zonal
273 values for each of the 11 zones are modified to reflect the land use, soil type and mean annual
274 rainfall and multiplied by temporally varying spatial maps of rainfall to provide the temporal
275 recharge input maps for the model. In the post-clearance transient flow model (TR) irrigation is
276 embedded in the recharge factor for requisite zones as reflected by the land use. Temporally
277 static aquifer and stream properties were spatially parameterised using pilot points. The locations
278 of pilot points, which also correspond with the locations of potential observations, were
279 automatically generated (see SI).

280 Model history matching was performed on the basis of groundwater hydraulic head,
281 streamflow, stream stage, stream ^{222}Rn , groundwater ^{14}C and stream EC, at the locations shown
282 in Figure 2. Model parameters (Table 2) for stream and aquifer properties were subject to
283 estimation through history matching. History matching was carried out using the parameter
284 estimation suite PEST (Doherty 2016) using Tikhonov regularisation.

285 **Table 2. Summary of model parameterization. For the aquifer property parameters, the**
 286 **hydrogeological units are abbreviated as follows: Coonambidgal (co), Shepparton (sh),**
 287 **Calivil (ca), Renmark (re), Newer Volcanics (nv), Basement (ba).**

288 The flow and transport models were built utilising FloPy (Bakker et al. 2016). The in-
 289 stream transport model for ^{222}Rn and EC was implemented in Python (see SI).

290 3.2 Assessment of predictive uncertainty in SW-GW exchange flux

291 The worth of data is considered herein as the reduction or lack thereof of the uncertainty
 292 of the prediction of interest (SW-GW exchange) with the addition of various acquired or
 293 potential observation data. A brief overview of the key theoretical aspects underlying the
 294 approach adopted for the quantification of predictive uncertainty and data worth is now provided.

295 The posterior (i.e., post-history matching) parameter covariance matrix ($\bar{\Sigma}_{\theta}$) can be
 296 estimated with Schur's complement as (Christensen and Doherty 2008; Doherty 2015; Tarantola
 297 2005; White et al. 2016):

$$298 \quad \bar{\Sigma}_{\theta} = \Sigma_{\theta} - \Sigma_{\theta} \mathbf{J}^T [\mathbf{J} \Sigma_{\theta} \mathbf{J}^T + \Sigma_{\epsilon}]^{-1} \mathbf{J} \Sigma_{\theta} \quad (1)$$

299 Where, Σ_{θ} is the prior parameter covariance matrix, Σ_{ϵ} is the epistemic noise covariance
 300 matrix (i.e. accounting for both measurement and model error), and \mathbf{J} is the Jacobian matrix of
 301 partial first derivatives of model outputs (for which there are corresponding observations) with
 302 respect to parameters θ . The second term on the RHS of (1) expresses the reduction in
 303 uncertainty surrounding parameters as a result of conditioning the model on the information
 304 contained in the observations.

305 The prior and posterior uncertainty variance for a prediction s , $\bar{\sigma}_s^2$, respectively can be
 306 estimated via uncertainty propagation:

$$307 \quad \sigma_s^2 = \mathbf{y}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\theta \mathbf{y} \quad (2)$$

308 And

$$309 \quad \bar{\sigma}_s^2 = \mathbf{y}^T \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\theta \mathbf{y} \quad (3)$$

310 Where \mathbf{y} is the sensitivity vector for prediction s with respect to the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ (a row
311 extracted from the \mathbf{J} matrix).

312 This study assumes the parameter covariance matrix ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\theta$) is a diagonal matrix (does not
313 contain non-zero off-diagonal elements). This assumption means that zero correlation exists
314 between parameters. The assumption of zero correlation between spatially distributed
315 parameters, and in particular pilot point aquifer and river property parameters was considered
316 appropriate given the limited spatial coverage of both aquifer and river property information as
317 well as the large distance separating pilot points (on average, 6 km x 6 km). The lower and upper
318 bounds of the parameter range (see Table 2) are specified based on hydrological and geological
319 expert knowledge (in this case conservative) and are assumed to represent the 5th and 95th
320 percentile of the (assumed Gaussian) parameter distribution.

321 The Jacobian matrix \mathbf{J} was populated using 1% two-point derivative increments. These
322 derivatives with respect to a parameter set were obtained following a history matching
323 undertaking that is unrelated to the implementation of the data worth analyses presented herein
324 (see SI for details).

325 The epistemic noise covariance matrix ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon$) is also assumed diagonal. It is specified
326 practically by assigning observation weights (inversely proportional to the standard deviation of
327 noise) (Doherty 2015). Observation weights are specified on the basis of a subjective assessment
328 of the measurement noise standard deviation (Table 3), before being adjusted in accordance with

329 model-to-measurement residuals to account for model error. Weight adjustment is undertaken in
330 such a way that the weight of any observation cannot be increased (thereby respecting the
331 contribution to epistemic noise from measurement noise), and that the contribution of each
332 observation group to the model-to-measurement objective function is equal to the number of
333 non-zero weighted observations in that group (Doherty 2016). The use of model-to-measurement
334 residuals to approximate model error is deemed appropriate given that this quantity can never be
335 known, and that the residuals constitute the only information available for reflecting model error
336 with respect to different types of observation and simulated outputs. For potential observations,
337 i.e., where no measurements exist for which to undertake the above-described weight adjustment,
338 weights are specified based on the average (adjusted) weight assigned to existing observations of
339 the same group/type. The observation noise variance for all but stream flow was fixed as stream
340 flow measurement error is known to become larger at higher flows, particularly when
341 extrapolating the rating curve (Di Baldassarre and Montanari 2009) and an assumed 40% error
342 accounts for a worse case evaluation of this error. The posterior parameter covariance matrix and
343 ensuing data worth analysis was calculated using the Python package pyEMU (White et al.
344 2016).

345 **Table 3. Assumed observation noise (used together with model-to-measurement residual**
346 **information to populate Σ_ϵ).**

347 The worth of different observation data is evaluated in different ways in this study.
348 Firstly, we consider the worth with observation data groups by themselves, i.e. the ability of an
349 individual observation data group to reduce uncertainty on a prediction of SW-GW exchange. To
350 do this, predictive uncertainty with that particular observation data group is estimated by
351 evaluating equation 1 and 3 twice, once where the particular observation data does not appear in

352 Σ_{ϵ} , which we term the ‘base’ uncertainty ($\bar{\sigma}_{s\ base}$), and again where Σ_{ϵ} contains the particular
 353 observation data group, which gives the ‘group’ predictive uncertainty ($\bar{\sigma}_{s\ group}$). The
 354 calculation of reduction in uncertainty through adding the observation data type group ($DW_{add}\%$)
 355 is calculated as:

$$356 \quad DW_{add}\% = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\sigma}_{s\ group}}{\bar{\sigma}_{s\ base}}\right) \times 100\% \quad (4)$$

357 Secondly, to evaluate the mutually exclusive information that exists in each observation
 358 data group we consider the difference between predictive uncertainty reduction using all
 359 observation data groups and omitting an observation data group from all groups. To do this, we
 360 again evaluate equation 1 and 3 twice, once where in Σ_{ϵ} all observation data groups are
 361 considered together ($\bar{\sigma}_{s\ all}$), and again with all observation data groups except for the one of
 362 interest considered ($\bar{\sigma}_{s\ all-group}$). Then we compare the two against the ‘base’ uncertainty:

$$363 \quad DW_{remove}\% = \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}_{s\ all-group} - \bar{\sigma}_{s\ all}}{\bar{\sigma}_{s\ base}}\right) \times 100\% \quad (5)$$

364 Finally, in the context of the potential observations, we evaluate the next most important
 365 observations (using built in functions in pyEMU; White et al. (2016)) by iterating over each of
 366 the potential observations alone (for select predictions) and in groups (for all predictions within a
 367 group) to find the best reduction in uncertainty, then we add that observation or group of
 368 observations to the list of existing observations and repeat the process. The addition of the
 369 previously identified best observation or observation group accounts for any correlation between
 370 observations or groups of observations.

371 In order to answer the first question posed (**Q1**) regarding the degree to which water
 372 chemistry data and hydraulic data reduces the uncertainty surrounding the 156 predictions of
 373 SW-GW exchange, each of the observation data types (or “groups”) were first considered

374 individually for existing observation data with the “base” containing no observation data (Table
375 4). Then the potential data (Q2) were evaluated with the “base” consisting of all existing
376 observation data. The individual contribution of each potential observation to the whole of river
377 exchange at three different times covering low, regular and high streamflow conditions was
378 examined to determine the worth of particular potential data types and quantities of value.

379 **Table 4. Data worth assessments employed for the range of SW-GW exchange predictions**
380 **from the Campaspe transient flow model (TR).**

381 **4 Results and Discussion**

382 *4.1 Simulated SW-GW exchange behaviour*

383 The behaviour of SW-GW exchange flux is first examined at each of the TR model’s 122
384 stream segments on a monthly basis as a means of establishing an understanding of dynamics
385 and spatiotemporal variability of the exchanges before considering the data worth analysis.

386 Throughout the results section we adopt the convention of denoting gaining conditions in
387 a stream by negative values and losing conditions by positive values. The monthly flows are
388 herein subjectively categorised as either low (<35th percentile), regular (between 35th and 80th
389 percentile), or high (>80th percentile). Each of the flow categorisations is also associated with
390 clearly differing SW-GW exchange patterns.

391 The post-clearance transient flow simulation generally showed that SW-GW exchanges
392 along the length of the river exhibit gaining behaviour (Figure 4). The exception to this being
393 during high flow events, when the river transitions to a largely losing river (0.23 m²/d) as
394 significant inflows from Lake Eppalock raise the stream stage and reverse the hydraulic gradient
395 along the majority of the river. The exchange fluxes per unit length of stream at any point along

396 the stream during the simulation period range from losing by $9 \text{ m}^2/\text{d}$ during the October 2016
397 high flow event to gaining at $-9 \text{ m}^2/\text{d}$ as the system recovers in the following month. The
398 spatially and temporally averaged SW-GW exchange along the entire river is gaining at
399 approximately $-1.1 \text{ m}^2/\text{d}$. Reach r3 shows the strongest variance in exchange flux along its length
400 through differing inflow conditions followed by r5, r6 and r8, while r10 and r11 show the least
401 variance and are always gaining.

402

403 **Figure 4. Simulated SW-GW exchange fluxes per unit length of stream at each reach along**
404 **the Campaspe River. Coloured lines depict exchange fluxes under differing low, regular or**
405 **high flow conditions for each month. The black line depicts the temporally averaged**
406 **exchange flux. The dotted grey vertical lines indicate gauge locations with the 11 between-**
407 **gauges-reaches annotated at the top of the graph.**

408 The simulated SW-GW exchange fluxes for the whole river and for each of the 11 river
409 reaches for annual average and monthly average time scales (i.e. 156 predictions) range from -
410 3.08 to $2.23 \text{ m}^2/\text{d}$ (shown in Figure 5). The strongest losing flux appears along reach 3 during the
411 high flow event in October 2016. The simulated SW-GW exchange flux was highest along reach
412 3. Reach 6 (r6) just upstream of the Campaspe weir exhibits losing conditions, while all other
413 reaches show gaining conditions. For the examined year, there is a clear link between the inflow
414 from Lake Eppalock and the pattern of exchange fluxes (Figure 5).

415

416 **Figure 5. Heatmap of simulated SW-GW exchange per unit length along the whole of the**
417 **river and along each of the 11 reaches at annual and monthly time scales, which comprises**

418 **the 156 predictions of interest. Red cells in the heatmap indicate losing conditions and blue**
419 **cells indicate gaining conditions. The left panel shows the location and length of each of the**
420 **reaches for reference. The bottom panel indicates the annual average (mean) inflow from**
421 **Lake Eppalock to the system as well as the monthly inflow with the colours of the bars**
422 **indicating whether the flow is low, regular or high.**

423 4.2 Worth of existing hydraulic and water chemistry data types (Q1)

424 Assessment of the worth of individual observational data types alone (i.e., $DW_{add}\%$) for
425 the spatial and temporally aggregated whole of river annual exchange showed that hydraulic
426 head followed by EC, ^{222}Rn and flow observation groups had sizeable worth of $> 40\%$ (the green
427 dots in Figure 6a). Similar relative trends across data types were seen for the uncertainty
428 increases *without* individual data groups when compared to all data groups ($DW_{remove}\%$). The
429 lower values in $DW_{remove}\%$ as compared to $DW_{add}\%$ arise because the former yields the unique
430 information contained in an individual data group; this allows for assessment of the extent of
431 correlation and redundancy of individual data groups. It was evident from the analysis of
432 $DW_{remove}\%$ for the spatially and temporally averaged SW-GW exchange prediction, that the head,
433 streamflow, ^{222}Rn and EC data contain unique information.

434 Across all 156 predictions for SW-GW exchange flux predictions along the Campaspe
435 River, the median worth obtained from both $DW_{add}\%$ and $DW_{remove}\%$ showed that head data were
436 significant whereas the streamflow data were less informative. Furthermore, there appears to be
437 redundancy in the flow data. Also, the median worth of ^{222}Rn was significant whereas the EC
438 data was much lower (Figure 6a). Stream stage and ^{14}C were both poor, with the distribution of
439 $DW_{add}\%$ for stream stage data close to zero. The large range in worth of head, flow, ^{222}Rn and
440 EC data types and the degree of information redundancy across the 156 predictions highlights the

441 nature of the local information content that particular data types have for specific predictions.
442 The local information content is highlighted by the outliers in $DW_{remove}\%$ showing unique
443 information in head, ^{14}C and ^{222}Rn for some predictions of SW-GW exchange.

444 **Figure 6. Analysis of worth for the whole of river annual exchange (green dots) shown by a)**
445 **% reduction in predictive uncertainty for SW-GW exchange associated with each**
446 **particular observation group ($DW_{add}\%$), and b) difference in reduction between using all**
447 **observation data types and using all except for a particular group from the combination**
448 **($DW_{remove}\%$). Furthermore, boxplots are shown for the distributions across all 156 SW-**
449 **GW exchange predictions.**

450 The worth for the 156 SW-GW exchange predictions shows distinct patterns that are
451 associated with inflow to the Campaspe River from Lake Eppalock (Figure 7). During the large
452 flow event during October 2016, across all reaches and the whole river there was consistently
453 poorer worth for predictions within that month. The relative lack of information resident in the
454 data types continues in the following months associated predictions, while the system recovers.
455 The whole of river predictions show an expected dampened variability and higher average worth
456 due to its spatially integrated nature. At the end of the river system in reaches r10 and r11 all data
457 types are seen to have quite low worth, except ^{222}Rn which appears to be the only data-type to
458 show value in reach r10. The poor performance at the end of system could be due to a “boundary
459 effect”, related to the fact that both the Murray River boundary condition and underlying
460 groundwater general head boundary conditions possibly influence the model to such an extent
461 that they overpower the information content of any existing observational data. Potential
462 boundary effects could be avoided by extending the northern boundary of the model past the

463 Murray River and converting the Murray River to a flow routing representation rather than the
464 fixed head representation that was implemented.

465 **Figure 7. Heatmaps of percentage reduction in SW-GW exchange uncertainty obtained**
466 **with all data (a), and with each of the observation data types alone (b-g). The reduction is**
467 **shown for each SW-GW exchange flux considered, i.e. for each of the stream reaches (r1-**
468 **r11) and whole of river (nrf), and at each of the temporal scales of annual and monthly**
469 **between the start of June 2016 and end of May 2017. The inflow to the system is shown**
470 **under the first heatmap (a) from which the high flow event in October can be seen. The**
471 **locations and lengths of reaches (r1-r11) are shown to the left of the first heatmap for**
472 **reference.**

473 The analysis of existing observation data types, firstly, identified that the temporal
474 integration in annual predictions (both whole of river and reach scale) generally led to better
475 reductions in uncertainty than in the monthly predictions. These are plausible given that the
476 annual signal is smoothed. For hydraulic head, ^{14}C and ^{222}Rn , there were not data available in
477 every month of the year, but particular data were at least present enough in the seemingly
478 dependent months (during large exchanges) required to inform the annual SW-GW exchange
479 prediction.

480 4.3 *Worth of individual potential future hydraulic and water chemistry data points (Q2)*

481 We analysed the worth from individual potential in-stream observations to explore the
482 extent to which the whole of river SW-GW exchange prediction reliability could be improved
483 through data acquisition at new sampling locations. The worth of individual potential
484 observations of stage, flow, ^{222}Rn and EC at select times when flow conditions were low (July

485 2016), high (October 2016) and regular (November 2016) are shown in Figure 8; the
486 corresponding SW-GW exchange along the stream at each of these times is also shown. The
487 value of both stage and EC potential observations are shown to be poor across these flow
488 conditions, with only ^{222}Rn (low and regular flow conditions) and flow (high and regular flow
489 conditions) showing considerable value. Under low flow conditions, ^{222}Rn data displayed the
490 highest utility where existing data were not present and where the stream exhibits strong gaining
491 conditions in the first 40 km of the stream. Also, ^{222}Rn showed considerable value in the slightly
492 gaining areas at around 130 km downstream, likely due to the paucity in local existing data for
493 all data types. However, ^{222}Rn data were seen to be of low utility when high flow conditions
494 prevail with a corresponding reversal of hydraulic gradient resulting in a mostly losing river, as
495 simulated during the high flow event in October 2016. In the high flow event instance, there is a
496 trend of increasing flow data worth with distance downstream.

497

498 **Figure 8. Further reduction in uncertainty for net SW-GW exchange in October 2016,**
499 **November 2016 and May 2017 obtained through potential observations of stream stage,**
500 **flow, ^{222}Rn and EC at 80 locations along the stream. Each potential observation is**
501 **considered alone but added to the existing observations across all observation data types.**
502 **Underlying each uncertainty reduction plot is the pattern of exchange along the river**
503 **during each of the months with the scatter showing the exchange rate (m^2/d) and the**
504 **colours representing the exchange flux along the reach at that location; reds indicate losing**
505 **and blues indicate gaining conditions. The mean exchange rate is shown in light grey on**
506 **each of these plots to give context to the exchange conditions relative to the mean.**

507 To explore the extent of reduction in uncertainty obtained through potential addition of
508 subsurface data to the existing dataset, we analysed the whole of river SW-GW exchange flux
509 during low, high and regular flow conditions through both head and ^{14}C in the shallow and deep
510 aquifers at the potential sampling locations (Figure 9). The SW-GW exchange along the
511 Campaspe River in the highest (southern) parts of the model domain is very sensitive to the GW
512 level which is strongly connected at the top of the catchment to the heads in the narrow alluvial
513 channels and hence it is observational data located here that appears to inform the whole of river
514 SW-GW exchanges the most, although the reductions in predictive uncertainty are only
515 marginal. This generally highlights opportunity for more value from targeted observations in the
516 southern part of the catchment in the narrow alluvial valleys. The deep heads are seen to hold the
517 least value of the potential observations across flow conditions. As expected, due to the lesser
518 variance of subsurface data as compared to stream data, spatial patterns of worth are more
519 consistent across the low, regular and high flow conditions. Furthermore, there is clear crossover
520 of high utility potential sampling locations for shallow and deep ^{14}C and shallow head too in the
521 southern part of the catchment, although shallow head also appears of some value along the
522 entire length of the stream.

523

524 **Figure 9. Percent reduction in uncertainty for annual whole of river SW-GW exchange**
525 **fluxes of the Campaspe River obtained through hydraulic head and ^{14}C at potential**
526 **sampling locations (identical to pilot points) in the shallow and deep aquifers.**

527 *4.4 Worth of potential future hydraulic and water chemistry data types (Q2)*

528 For all of the potential data and also each of the data type groups, we examined the
529 benefit of using all potential data (Figure 10), which highlights the extent to which particular

530 predictions can be improved (as compared to existing data) under comprehensive sampling of all
531 data types and individual data types. The potential hydraulic head data showed improvement in
532 terms of SW-GW prediction reliability in the middle section of the river prior to the largest of the
533 high-flow events and a few months after the recovery of this event (Figure 10b). The stage data
534 again shows little value, no matter the location or time of sampling (Figure 10c). The ubiquitous
535 poor worth of stage data was surprising as it could be assumed that the intrinsic link between
536 hydraulic head and stage in the calculation of the exchange flux would result in stage data
537 containing prediction-relevant information. We posit a potential reason for this is the stream
538 stage as simulated by the numerical model showed less variance (minimum and maximum of
539 $1.21\text{E-}4$ and $1.11\text{E-}2$) than the observed data owing to the representation of a rectangular channel
540 and associated parameterisation. For example, the effective stream width may have been
541 overestimated in the model and hence the associated error with the simulated stage was
542 potentially overrated. This led to a poor rating in stage data but is likely more linked to the
543 modelling assumptions, e.g. a perfectly known riverbed elevation, and structure for the
544 Campaspe River, rather than the “true” worth of the data itself.

545 Further reductions in predictive uncertainty up to around 25% are seen with the addition
546 of the flow, head and EC data. The addition of potential ^{222}Rn data (Figure 10f) shows clear
547 improvements for reaches r2–r9. Especially of interest are those improvements in worth at the
548 time prior to the high flow in October 2016 and just after. Assessment of potential ^{14}C data
549 showed significant improvement of a further 40% reduction in most predictions along reaches
550 r1–r5 (Figure 10e), suggesting that the existing spatiotemporal ^{14}C data locations were
551 suboptimal in this context of SW-GW exchange. However, the comprehensive sampling of both

552 ^{222}Rn and ^{14}C through space and time is likely impractical due to the costs, especially for ^{14}C
553 which would incur drilling costs.

554 **Figure 10. Difference in uncertainty reductions between existing and potential observation**
555 **data for all data (a) and for each of the individual observation groups (b-g).**

556 The analysis of the ten “next best” most important observations to collect on top of all
557 existing data during low, high and regular streamflow conditions showed that the optimal
558 location set is different under differing flow conditions. ^{222}Rn was the most beneficial data type
559 to collect next with head, ^{14}C , and flow also in the top ten (Figure 11). Interestingly, during low
560 and high streamflow conditions, within-stream observations of ^{222}Rn and flow were distributed
561 in the upper, middle and lower reaches of the stream, whereas for regular flow conditions, the
562 observation data were in the middle and lower reaches only. The role of ^{14}C observations in the
563 top left of the maps (Figure 11a-c) are at first perhaps counter-intuitive, however, this location
564 represents the longest flow path through the aquifers before exiting through the northern
565 boundary, informing the velocity of flow and its variation and hence the hydraulic conductivity
566 of the aquifers and its effective porosity, the former of which in turn informs the SW-GW
567 exchange along the river.

568 **Figure 11. Locations and rank of 10 next most important potential observations to add to**
569 **the existing observations for whole of river exchange during months of low, high and**
570 **regular streamflow conditions (a-c). Further reduction in uncertainty (%) due to each of**
571 **the 10 next most important potential observations (d-f).**

572 Finally, we examined the next most important observation groups for each of the 156
573 SW-GW exchange predictions (Figure 12), i.e. using all potential data within each data type.

574 This assessment showed that potential ^{222}Rn was the most important group across the majority of
575 predictions, followed by shallow head, ^{14}C , EC, flow, deep head and lastly stage, which was
576 ranked 7th for the majority of predictions (Figure 12).

577 **Figure 12. Ranking (x-axis) of best uncertainty reduction across each of the 156 predictions**
578 **of interest in a “next most important” type analysis. The uncertainty reduction is based on**
579 **each observation group for potential observations when added to the existing data.**

580 4.5 General observations

581 The above results have demonstrated that the worth of different hydraulic and chemical
582 observations in the context of making SW-GW predictions is dependent on the prevailing
583 streamflow conditions, the magnitude and direction of the SW-GW exchange and the spatial and
584 temporal scale of the exchange considered. It has also demonstrated the large variability in worth
585 across different SW-GW exchange predictions as a result of these dependencies. These findings
586 are in addition to previously reported dependence of data worth on prediction specificity more
587 generally (e.g. Dausman et al. 2010; White et al. 2016).

588 4.5.1 Influence of streamflow conditions and magnitude and direction of SW-GW exchange

589 The prediction-specificity of data worth with respect to prevailing stream flow conditions
590 can be explained by the sensitivities of the different SW-GW exchange predictions to uncertain
591 model parameters that are conditioned on the basis of both existing and potential hydraulic and
592 chemical observational data. During high-flow conditions, generally lower data worth is
593 apparent. This is because SW-GW exchange predictions under high-flow conditions depend on a
594 larger portion of uncertain model parameters (e.g., recharge and aquifer properties for the TR
595 model); this results in lower worth given the limit on the ability of information to “spread” from

596 data in space and time. That is, there are a number of prediction-parameter sensitivities that are
597 heightened as the Campaspe flow system is perturbed firstly by large losing SW-GW exchanges,
598 and secondly by the presence of distributed above-average recharge which also propagates
599 through the subsurface. Furthermore, the uncertainty in the flow observations increases with high
600 flows. As the stream is largely losing during high flows, the SS_{EC} and SS_{Rn} transport parameters
601 become less sensitive with respect to the corresponding SW-GW predictions. During low-flow
602 conditions, where rainfall recharge is often relatively small and the river is generally weakly
603 gaining along the Campaspe River, the SW-GW exchange predictions are generally less sensitive
604 to the flow model parameters. This allows for the information contained in the ^{222}Rn and EC
605 observations to be used more effectively through the SS_{EC} and SS_{Rn} transport parameters.

606 For example, in the annual whole of river SW-GW exchange flux prediction, it was
607 apparent (Figure 8) that in-stream sampling of ^{222}Rn can lead to a further reduction in uncertainty
608 (up to 10%) during low flows, with some value during regular flow conditions (up to 6%) but
609 with reduced utility (<0.5%) in high streamflow conditions. This is because the predictions
610 during lower flow show higher sensitivity to the parameters that are conditioned by the
611 information contained in the ^{222}Rn observations. It is thus necessary to target the particular time
612 and location carefully for sampling water chemistry data due to the transient and local
613 information content. This is further evidenced by the improvements through all potential data for
614 each data type which showed the theoretically possible improvements when comprehensive
615 sampling takes place in space and time. This differs in comparison to the hydraulic data, which
616 seems to show similar patterns across sampling times in worth for groundwater hydraulic head
617 and streamflow data points as explained above (Figure 8 and Figure 9). Despite the similar

618 patterns, the “flow of information” from hydraulic observation data appears to be larger under
619 regular and high flow conditions.

620 As was explained at the start of the results (4.1), the general patterns between flow
621 conditions and SW-GW exchange are clear. The apparent information content in all observation
622 data appears linked to the magnitude and direction of the SW-GW exchange flux in many
623 predictions. It was evident that for the very weakest exchanges, the poorest worth was found, no
624 matter the data type; however, the opposite was not true for the strongest SW-GW exchanges
625 which exhibit more complex worth patterns across data type.

626 4.5.2 Influence of spatial and temporal scale of SW-GW exchange

627 The simulated variability in monthly reach-scale SW-GW exchange in the Campaspe
628 River was clear, and so were the corresponding reductions in predictive uncertainty due to data
629 collection. When averaging the SW-GW exchange over the whole of the river, the worth of data
630 was reasonably consistent on a monthly basis for each data type alone and for all data types, with
631 a clear trend in variability being linked to the flow conditions (discussed above). Furthermore,
632 the consistent data worth across months was also consistently close to the best uncertainty
633 reductions from the reaches, i.e. the reductions were not a simple average of the individual reach
634 uncertainty reductions, but more closely linked to the best reductions. This is expected due to the
635 spatial integration of information contained in the hydraulic and chemical data. A similar pattern
636 with respect to temporal integration of information is present in comparing monthly to annual
637 SW-GW exchanges.

638 There was no clear relationship between the length of the reach and annual reductions in
639 predictive uncertainty. However, the lowest uncertainty reductions were apparent in the shortest

640 reach r10 (0.8 km). The lack of a clear relationship is likely due to a combination of the above-
641 mentioned factors of prevailing flow conditions and magnitude of the SW-GW exchange fluxes.

642 4.5.3 Model simplifications and assumptions

643 Interestingly, even though the water chemistry data provide more indirect means to
644 calculate SW-GW exchange flux than the hydraulic data (i.e., chemistry data serve as proxy for
645 flux), these data types alone showed greater worth in many predictions. For the cases in which
646 the river is not experiencing low-flow conditions and gaining, we would posit that this is partly a
647 result of the simplified 1D transport models (SS_{Rn} and SS_{EC}) used to map the ^{222}Rn and EC
648 observations to SW-GW exchange predictions through the SS_{Rn} and SS_{EC} transport parameters.
649 The parameterisation, spatial scale of river segments, and process assumptions that were applied
650 to the simplified 1D transport model (e.g., the uniform fixed groundwater concentrations of ^{222}Rn
651 and EC, and the monthly steady-state assumption) likely inflates their sensitivity for these data
652 types and hence their worth to SW-GW exchange predictions (Fiene et al. 2010). Future
653 modelling of in-stream ^{222}Rn and EC transport would benefit from testing this by further
654 evaluating the worth of these data types in a transient transport model with spatiotemporally
655 varying parameters, including the inputs of both ^{222}Rn and EC. With appropriate data collection
656 of times series data of near-stream GW ^{222}Rn and EC, future modelling of the Campaspe system
657 may benefit from explicit modelling of groundwater transport of ^{222}Rn and EC to help
658 demonstrate that current the boundary simplification of ^{222}Rn and EC to static GW conditions
659 does not introduce large impacts to the data worth analysis.

660 The simulation of SW-GW exchange is of course subject to some simplifying
661 assumptions that were employed to develop a tractable regional-scale model of the Campaspe
662 system for the data worth analysis. Such simplifications include, but are not limited to, that of

663 ignoring unsaturated zone flow processes, ignoring representation of overland flow during
664 flooding and mostly non-contributing small tributaries, and the exclusion of a hyper-resolution
665 model grid for solving the governing equations. For example, in the case of ignoring unsaturated
666 flow, it has been shown previously by Brunner et al. (2010) that the violation of the assumption
667 of a hydraulically connected losing-gaining system will lead to underestimation of infiltration of
668 GW. More generally, model simplifications (e.g., 1D steady-state transport, surface flow
669 representation, ignoring unsaturated flow processes, numerical discretization errors, etc.) are
670 likely to lead to uncertainty variance under-estimation (e.g., Knowling et al. 2019b; White et al.
671 2014); however, our relativistic (i.e., concerning changes in second moments) analysis of worth
672 is expected to be somewhat immune to the impact of such model simplifications. As the
673 Campaspe system becomes better characterised in the future and the model employed herein is
674 refined, exploration of such simplifications could potentially benefit the interpretation of worth.

675 4.5.4 Choice of data types

676 This study focused on the worth of particular observational data in the context of SW-
677 GW exchange. It was not exhaustive of all possible data types, and didn't include, e.g. other
678 stream chemistry data, such as stream ^{14}C , dissolved organic carbon (DOC) or total inorganic
679 carbon (TIC), due to the complexity of additional carbon processes required to model these. It is
680 recognised that, e.g., hydrometeorological data such as evapotranspiration and precipitation data,
681 physical stream property measurements, aquifer property measurements and data informing the
682 3D hydrostratigraphic model including its geometry and internal facies distribution may also be
683 of worth and warrant investigation in future studies.

684 4.5.5 Choice of FOSM

685 Our use of FOSM techniques involves consideration of only relative quantities (i.e.,
686 changes in uncertainty following parameter conditioning). A number of works have
687 demonstrated its particular robustness in this context (e.g., Dausman et al. 2010; Herckenrath et
688 al. 2011). The computational efficiency of FOSM ultimately allowed for a detailed exploration
689 of a number of different predictions in this study; far more than would have been possible within
690 reasonable time constraints on the basis of a less approximate but more computationally
691 demanding non-linear uncertainty quantification method (Nowak et al. 2012; Wöhling et al.
692 2018; Wu et al. 2014). However, in highly non-linear models (Herckenrath et al. 2011;
693 Kunstmann et al. 2002), FOSM has been shown to yield similar results to the Monte Carlo type
694 methods. It would nevertheless be of benefit in the future to quantify the impact of the linearity
695 assumption in this case study through a Monte Carlo sampling-type approach.

696 5 Conclusions

697 As water resource management and the understanding of river ecosystem functioning
698 both rely on estimation of SW-GW exchange fluxes, meaningful estimation of the exchange flux
699 at appropriate scales must be accompanied by a corresponding quantitative assessment of the
700 exchange flux uncertainty, which, ideally is minimised through smart data collection. The FOSM
701 analysis of spatiotemporally varying SW-GW exchange flux predictions presented in this study
702 provides useful insight into the worth of various hydraulic and water chemistry observation data
703 types in isolation, in various combinations and under individual and comprehensive sampling
704 strategies during low, regular and high streamflow conditions.

705 The worth of particular data types is dependent on streamflow conditions, the magnitude
706 and direction of the SW-GW exchange flux and the spatiotemporal resolution of the SW-GW

707 exchange prediction of interest. The unique information in different data types is evidenced by
708 the significant spread of uncertainty reductions across the different predictions. For the
709 spatiotemporal averaging of whole of river annual SW-GW exchange flux predictions,
710 reductions in predictive uncertainty were generally higher than for the finer scale reach and
711 monthly predictions. For the finer scale, the necessity of local scale (time and space)
712 observations is more pertinent for obtaining considerable uncertainty reductions.

713 With the large variability in worth of varying data types for different specific predictions
714 of SW-GW exchange, we have shown where and when particular data might be of most worth.
715 Hydraulic groundwater head and stream flow were found to inform SW-GW exchange flux best
716 under high- and regular- streamflow conditions. ^{222}Rn and EC were of highest value for low- and
717 regular- streamflow conditions where the stream is gaining.

718 **6 Acknowledgments**

719 This work was funded by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority through the MDBA-
720 NCGRT Strategic Groundwater Research Partnership. The authors thank Grace Lin for the
721 development of figures. All data pre-processing including links to input data, model building,
722 running and post-processing scripts along with key data outputs are provided at
723 [https://github.com/daniel-](https://github.com/daniel-partington/CampaspeModel/tree/amal_speed/CampaspeModel/models/Campaspe_Cascade)
724 [partington/CampaspeModel/tree/amal_speed/CampaspeModel/models/Campaspe_Cascade](https://github.com/daniel-partington/CampaspeModel/tree/amal_speed/CampaspeModel/models/Campaspe_Cascade).
725 Links for all data used in this study are detailed in the supplementary material, except for surface
726 water extractions and private bore extractions data due to privacy constraints.

727

728

References

- 729 Arad, A. & R. Evans, 1987. The hydrogeology, hydrochemistry and environmental isotopes of
730 the Campaspe River aquifer system, north-central Victoria, Australia. *Journal of*
731 *Hydrology* 95(2):63-86.
- 732 Bakker, M., V. Post, C. D. Langevin, J. D. Hughes, J. T. White, J. J. Starn & M. N. Fienen, 2016.
733 Scripting MODFLOW Model Development Using Python and FloPy. *Groundwater*
734 54(5):733-739 doi:10.1111/gwat.12413.
- 735 Barthold, F. K., C. Tyralla, K. Schneider, K. B. Vaché, H. G. Frede & L. Breuer, 2011. How
736 many tracers do we need for end member mixing analysis (EMMA)? A sensitivity
737 analysis. *Water Resources Research* 47(8) doi:doi:10.1029/2011WR010604.
- 738 Bedekar, V., E. D. Morway, C. D. Langevin & M. Tonkin, 2016a. MT3D-USGS version 1.0.0:
739 Groundwater Solute Transport Simulator for MODFLOW: U.S. Geological Survey
740 Software Release, 30 September 2016. USGS.
- 741 Bedekar, V., E. D. Morway, C. D. Langevin & M. Tonkin, 2016b. MT3D-USGS version 1: A
742 U.S. Geological Survey release of MT3DMS updated with new and expanded transport
743 capabilities for use with MODFLOW: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods.
744 69.
- 745 Brunner, P., J. Doherty & C. T. Simmons, 2012. Uncertainty assessment and implications for
746 data acquisition in support of integrated hydrologic models. *Water Resources Research*
747 48(7):n/a-n/a doi:10.1029/2011WR011342.
- 748 Brunner, P., C. T. Simmons, P. G. Cook & R. Therrien, 2010. Modeling Surface Water-
749 Groundwater Interaction with MODFLOW: Some Considerations. *Ground Water*
750 48(2):174-180 doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2009.00644.x.
- 751 Cartwright, I., T. R. Weaver, D. I. Cendón, L. K. Fifield, S. O. Tweed, B. Petrides & I. Swane,
752 2012. Constraining groundwater flow, residence times, inter-aquifer mixing, and aquifer
753 properties using environmental isotopes in the southeast Murray Basin, Australia.
754 *Applied Geochemistry* 27(9):1698-1709 doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2012.02.006.
- 755 Cartwright, I., T. R. Weaver & L. K. Fifield, 2006. Cl/Br ratios and environmental isotopes as
756 indicators of recharge variability and groundwater flow: An example from the southeast
757 Murray Basin, Australia. *Chemical Geology* 231(1):38-56
758 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2005.12.009>.
- 759 Cartwright, I., T. R. Weaver, C. T. Simmons, L. K. Fifield, C. R. Lawrence, R. Chisari & S.
760 Varley, 2010. Physical hydrogeology and environmental isotopes to constrain the age,
761 origins, and stability of a low-salinity groundwater lens formed by periodic river
762 recharge: Murray Basin, Australia. *Journal of Hydrology* 380(1):203-221
763 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.11.001>.
- 764 Christensen, S. & J. Doherty, 2008. Predictive error dependencies when using pilot points and
765 singular value decomposition in groundwater model calibration. *Advances in Water*
766 *Resources* 31(4):674-700 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2008.01.003>.

- 767 Cook, P. G., 2013. Estimating groundwater discharge to rivers from river chemistry surveys.
768 *Hydrol Process* 27(25):3694-3707 doi:doi:10.1002/hyp.9493.
- 769 Cook, P. G., 2015. Quantifying river gain and loss at regional scales. *Journal of Hydrology* 531,
770 Part 3:749-758 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.10.052>.
- 771 Cook, P. G., S. Lamontagne, D. Berhane & J. F. Clark, 2006. Quantifying groundwater discharge
772 to Cockburn River, southeastern Australia, using dissolved gas tracers ²²²Rn and SF₆.
773 *Water Resources Research* 42(10):n/a-n/a doi:10.1029/2006WR004921.
- 774 Dausman, A. M., J. Doherty, C. D. Langevin & M. C. Sukop, 2010. Quantifying Data Worth
775 Toward Reducing Predictive Uncertainty. *Ground Water* 48(5):729-740
776 doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2010.00679.x.
- 777 Di Baldassarre, G. & A. Montanari, 2009. Uncertainty in river discharge observations: a
778 quantitative analysis. *Hydrol Earth Syst Sci* 13(6):913-921 doi:10.5194/hess-13-913-
779 2009.
- 780 Doherty, J., 2015. Calibration and Uncertainty Analysis for Complex Environmental Models.
781 PEST: complete theory and what it means for modelling the real world. Watermark
782 Numerical Computing.
- 783 Doherty, J. E., 2016. PEST, Model-Independent Parameter Estimation User Manual Part I:
784 PEST, SENSAN and Global Optimisers.
- 785 Ellins, K. K., A. Roman-Mas & R. Lee, 1990. Using ²²²Rn to examine groundwater/surface
786 discharge interaction in the Rio Grande de Manati, Puerto Rico. *Journal of Hydrology*
787 115(1):319-341 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694\(90\)90212-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(90)90212-G).
- 788 Fienen, M. N., J. E. Doherty, R. J. Hunt & H. W. Reeves, 2010. Using prediction uncertainty
789 analysis to design hydrologic monitoring networks: Example applications from the Great
790 Lakes water availability pilot project Scientific Investigations Report. - edn.
- 791 Fleckenstein, J. H., S. Krause, D. M. Hannah & F. Boano, 2010. Groundwater-surface water
792 interactions: New methods and models to improve understanding of processes and
793 dynamics. *Advances in Water Resources* 33(11):1291-1295
794 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2010.09.011>.
- 795 Herckenrath, D., C. D. Langevin & J. Doherty, 2011. Predictive uncertainty analysis of a
796 saltwater intrusion model using null-space Monte Carlo. *Water Resources Research* 47(5)
797 doi:10.1029/2010wr009342.
- 798 Hunt, R. J., J. Doherty & M. J. Tonkin, 2007. Are Models Too Simple? Arguments for Increased
799 Parameterization. *Ground Water* 45(3):254-262 doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2007.00316.x.
- 800 Kalbus, E., F. Reinstorf & M. Schirmer, 2006. Measuring methods for groundwater –
801 surface water interactions: a review. *Hydrol Earth Syst Sci* 10(6):873-887
802 doi:10.5194/hess-10-873-2006.
- 803 Kikuchi, C., 2017. Toward Increased Use of Data Worth Analyses in Groundwater Studies.
804 *Groundwater* 55(5):670-673 doi:10.1111/gwat.12562.

- 805 Knowling, M. J., J. T. White & C. R. Moore, 2019a. Role of model parameterization in risk-
806 based decision support: An empirical exploration. *Advances in Water Resources* 128:59-
807 73 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2019.04.010>.
- 808 Knowling, M. J., J. T. White, C. R. Moore, P. Rakowski & K. Hayley, 2019b. On the
809 assimilation of environmental tracer observations for model-based decision support.
810 *Hydrol Earth Syst Sci Discuss* 2019:1-19 doi:10.5194/hess-2019-436.
- 811 Kunstmann, H., W. Kinzelbach & T. Siegfried, 2002. Conditional first-order second-moment
812 method and its application to the quantification of uncertainty in groundwater modeling.
813 *Water Resources Research* 38(4):6-1-6-14 doi:10.1029/2000wr000022.
- 814 Moore, C. & J. Doherty, 2005. Role of the calibration process in reducing model predictive error.
815 *Water Resources Research* 41(5):n/a-n/a doi:10.1029/2004WR003501.
- 816 Niswonger, R. G., S. Panday & M. Ibaraki, 2011. MODFLOW-NWT, A Newton formulation for
817 MODFLOW-2005: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods. 44.
- 818 Niswonger, R. G. & D. E. Prudic, 2005. Documentation of the Streamflow-Routing (SFR2)
819 Package to include unsaturated flow beneath streams—A modification to SFR1: U.S.
820 Geological Survey Techniques and
821 Methods 6-A13, 50 p.
- 822 Nowak, W., Y. Rubin & F. P. J. de Barros, 2012. A hypothesis-driven approach to optimize field
823 campaigns. *Water Resources Research* 48(6):n/a-n/a doi:10.1029/2011WR011016.
- 824 Schilling, O. S., J. Doherty, W. Kinzelbach, H. Wang, P. N. Yang & P. Brunner, 2014. Using
825 tree ring data as a proxy for transpiration to reduce predictive uncertainty of a model
826 simulating groundwater–surface water–vegetation interactions. *Journal of Hydrology*
827 519, Part B:2258-2271 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.08.063>.
- 828 Schilling, O. S., C. Gerber, D. J. Partington, R. Purtschert, M. S. Brennwald, R. Kipfer, D.
829 Hunkeler & P. Brunner, 2018. Advancing Physically-Based Flow Simulations of Alluvial
830 Systems Through Atmospheric Noble Gases and the Novel ^{37}Ar Tracer Method. *Water*
831 *Resources Research*:n/a-n/a doi:10.1002/2017WR020754.
- 832 Tarantola, A., 2005. Inverse problem theory and methods for model parameter estimation.
833 SIAM.
- 834 Wallis, I., C. Moore, V. Post, L. Wolf, E. Martens & H. Prommer, 2014. Using predictive
835 uncertainty analysis to optimise tracer test design and data acquisition. *Journal of*
836 *Hydrology* 515:191-204 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.04.061>.
- 837 White, J. T., J. E. Doherty & J. D. Hughes, 2014. Quantifying the predictive consequences of
838 model error with linear subspace analysis. *Water Resources Research* 50(2):1152-1173
839 doi:10.1002/2013WR014767.
- 840 White, J. T., M. N. Fienen & J. E. Doherty, 2016. A python framework for environmental model
841 uncertainty analysis. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 85:217-228
842 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.08.017>.

- 843 Wöhling, T., M. J. Gosses, S. R. Wilson & P. Davidson, 2018. Quantifying River-Groundwater
844 Interactions of New Zealand's Gravel-Bed Rivers: The Wairau Plain. Groundwater:n/a-
845 n/a doi:10.1111/gwat.12625.
- 846 Wu, B., Y. Zheng, Y. Tian, X. Wu, Y. Yao, F. Han, J. Liu & C. Zheng, 2014. Systematic
847 assessment of the uncertainty in integrated surface water-groundwater modeling based on
848 the probabilistic collocation method. Water Resources Research 50(7):5848-5865
849 doi:10.1002/2014WR015366.
- 850 Zell, W. O., T. B. Culver & W. E. Sanford, 2018. Prediction uncertainty and data worth
851 assessment for groundwater transport times in an agricultural catchment. Journal of
852 Hydrology doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.02.006>.
- 853

Appendix A: 1D steady-state transport model for ^{222}Rn and EC

The 1D steady-state model presented in Cook et al. (2006) for determining SW-GW flows with ^{222}Rn observation data, used a mass balance of streamflow and radon similar to the following, but here we have added in inflows from tributaries and precipitation:

$$\frac{\partial Q(x)}{\partial x} = I_{GW}(x) - O_{GW}(x) + I_{TR}(x) - L(x) + (P(x) - E(x))w(x) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\frac{\partial Q(x).c_S}{\partial x} = I_{GW}(x).c_{GW} - O_{GW}(x).c_S + I_{TR}(x).c_{TR} - L(x).c_S + P(x).w(x).c_R - k.w(x).c_S - \lambda.d.w(x).c_S + F \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Where Q is the rate of streamflow [L^3/T], x is the distance along the stream [L]. Varying along the x -axis, $I_{GW}(x)$, $O_{GW}(x)$, $I_{TR}(x)$ and $L(x)$ are the groundwater inflow rates, stream losing rates, tributary and diversion inflows, and losses through direct pumping [$\text{L}^3/\text{L}/\text{T}$]. $E(x)$ is the evaporation rate [L/T] $P(x)$ is the precipitation rate [L/T], and $w(x)$ is the width of the river [L] along x . c_S , c_{GW} , c_{TR} , and c_R are the concentrations [M/L^3] of the stream, groundwater, tributaries and rainfall respectively. k is the gas transfer velocity across the water surface [L/T], λ is the radioactive decay constant [T^{-1}], d is the mean stream depth [L] and F is the flux of radon through the hyporheic zone [$\text{M}/\text{L}/\text{T}$].

$$F = \frac{\gamma h w \theta}{1 + \lambda t_h} - \frac{\lambda h w \theta}{1 + \lambda t_h} c_S \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Where γ is the production rate within the hyporheic zone [$\text{M}/\text{L}^3/\text{T}$], h is the mean depth of the hyporheic zone [L], and θ is its porosity [-]. t_h is the mean residence time of water within the hyporheic zone. Expanding the partial derivative in (2) and substituting in (1) with the chain rule and rearranging yields:


$$Q(x) \frac{\partial c_S}{\partial x} = I_{GW}(x).(c_{GW} - c_S) + I_{TR}(x).(c_{TR} - c_S) + P(x).w(x).(c_R - c_S) + E(x).w(x).c_S - k.w(x).c_S - \lambda.d.w(x).c_S + F \quad (\text{A.4})$$


For a given stream length dx with a boundary upstream concentration of c_S we can solve for the downstream concentration $c_{S/DS}$ with:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{222} \mathbf{Rn}: c_{S/DS} = c_S - \frac{dx}{Q(x)} (I_{GW}(x) \cdot (c_{GW} - c_S) + I_{TR}(x) \cdot (c_{TR} - c_S) + P(x) \cdot w(x) \cdot (c_R - c_S) + \\ E(x) \cdot w(x) \cdot c_S - k \cdot w(x) \cdot c_S - \lambda \cdot d \cdot w(x) \cdot c_S + F) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$


Noting the conservative nature of EC (we have no degassing, decay or production in the hyporheic zone) we can write a similar expression for EC as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{EC}: c_{S/DS} = c_S - \frac{dx}{Q(x)} (I_{GW}(x) \cdot (c_{GW} - c_S) + I_{TR}(x) \cdot (c_{TR} - c_S) + P(x) \cdot w(x) \cdot (c_R - c_S) + \\ E(x) \cdot w(x) \cdot c_S) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$










a.





b.























Table 1. Summary of hydrogeological layer thicknesses including, mean, minimum, maximum thickness and percent volume. Hydrogeological units are abbreviated as Coonambidgal (co), Shepparton (sh), Calivil (ca), Renmark (re), Newer Volcanics (nv), Basement (ba).

Hydrogeological Unit	Thickness			Percentage of active model volume (%)
	Mean (m)	Minimum (m)	Maximum (m)	
Coonambidgal	5.9	1.0	31.8	0.67
Shepparton	52.3	0.3	122.3	26.58
Calivil	26.1	1.0	82.7	9.76
Renmark	40.4	0.4	163.4	11.90
Newer Volcanics	4.6	0.1	14.3	0.05
Basement	74.4	9.7	109.5	50.93

Table 2. Summary of model parameterization. For the aquifer property parameters, the hydrogeological units are abbreviated as follows: Coonambidgal (co), Shepparton (sh), Calivil (ca), Renmark (re), Newer Volcanics (nv), Basement (ba).

Parameter set	Model	Type	Number	Initial Range	Log Variance (σ_θ^2)
Aquifer properties (7 HGUs)					
Horizontal hydraulic conductivity (K_h)	SS, TR	Pilot points (PP) (416)	co: 31 sh: 107 ca: 77 re: 58 nv: 4 ba: 137	co: 4.44 – 444 m/d sh: 0.1 – 10 m/d ca: 4.25 – 425 m/d re: 6.75 – 675 m/d nv: 5 – 500 m/d ba: 0.1 – 10 m/d	0.25 (m/d) ² 0.25 (m/d) ² 0.25 (m/d) ² 0.25 (m/d) ² 0.25 (m/d) ² 0.25 (m/d) ²
Vertical hydraulic conductivity	SS, TR	-	1	-	-
Specific storage	SS, TR	PP (416)	see K_h	1E-6 – 1E-4 (-)	0.25 (-)
Specific yield	SS, TR	PP (416)	see K_h	1E-2 – 0.44 (-)	0.53 (-)
Porosity (7 HGUs)	TR1 _{C14} , TR2 _{C14}	Zonal	7	0.05 - 0.4 (-)	5.1E-2 (-)
Dispersivity (7 HGUs)	TR1 _{C14} , TR2 _{C14}	Zonal	7	1E-5 – 100 m	3.06 m ²
Recharge					
Pre-clearance rainfall Proportion for recharge	TR	Zonal	16	1E-3 – 0.5 (-)	0.46 (-)
Rainfall proportion for recharge	SS	Zonal	16	1E-4 – 0.9 (-)	2E-3 - 0.55(-)
GW boundary under Murray					
GHB level adjuster	SS, TR	-	1	0.01 – 70.0 m	9.9E-3 m ²
GHB conductivity	SS, TR	-	1	1E-8 – 50.0 m/d	5.88 (m/d) ²
Murray River properties					
Murray River streambed K	SS, TR	-	1	1E-8 – 20.0 m/d	5.41(m/d) ²
Drain properties					
Drain bed K	TR	-	1	1E-8 – 20.0 m/d	5.41(m/d) ²
Drain bed adjust	TR	-	1	0.001 – 0.1 m	0.25 m ²
Campaspe River properties					
Stream dispersivity	TR1 _{C14} , TR2 _{C14}	-	1	1E-5 – 1000.0 m	4.0 m ²
Riverbed hydraulic cond.	SS, TR	PP	80	1E-4 – 10.0 m/d	1.56 (m/d) ²
River width	SS, TR	PP	80	4.0 – 40.0 m	6.25E-2 m ²
Riverbed roughness	SS, TR	PP	80	0.001 – 0.1 d/m ^{1/3}	0.25 (d/m ^{1/3}) ²
GW EC concentration	SS _{EC}	-	1	1E3 – 5E3 μ S/cm	0.03 (μ S/cm) ²
GW ²²² Rn concentration	SS _{Rn}	-	1	1E4 – 5E4 mBq/l	0.03 (mBq/l) ²
Gas transfer velocity	SS _{Rn}	-	1	0.6 – 1.4 m/s	8.46E-3 (m/s) ²
Hyporheic zone porosity	SS _{Rn}	-	1	0.1 – 0.4 (-)	2.27E-2 (-)
Hyporheic zone production	SS _{Rn}	-	1	1E3– 1E4 mBq/l/d	0.0625 (mBq/l/d) ²
Hyporheic zone residence time	SS _{Rn}	-	1	0.05 – 5.0 d	0.25 d ²
Hyporheic zone depth	SS _{Rn}	-	1	0.0 - 1.0 m	0.26 m ²
TOTAL			1546		

Table 3. Assumed observation noise (used together with model-to-measurement residual information to populate Σ_ϵ).

Observation data type	Observation noise (σ_ϵ)
Hydraulic head	1 m
Stream stage	1 m
Streamflow	40% of observation value [m^3/d]
^{222}Rn	50 mBq/l
^{14}C	10 PMC
Electrical conductivity	100 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$

Table 4. Data worth assessments employed for the range of SW-GW exchange predictions from the Campaspe transient flow model (TR).

	$\bar{\sigma}_s$	Combinations	Predictions
Q1	Adding individual data types with existing data	6	All (156)
	Removing individual data types with existing data	6	All (156)
Q2	Added benefit of each potential observation for annual whole river exchange: SW observations	316	Whole river exchange (4)
	Added benefit of each potential observation for annual whole river exchange: GW observations	376	Whole river exchange (4)
	Next best observation group (potential observations)	7	All (156)
	Next best observation (potential observations) for low, regular and high streamflow conditions	10	Whole river exchange (4)

Daniel Partington: Conceptualisation, methodology, software, validation, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing, visualisation

Matthew J. Knowing: Conceptualisation, methodology, formal analysis, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

Craig T. Simmons: Conceptualization, supervision, project administration, funding acquisition, writing – review and editing

Peter G. Cook: Conceptualization, supervision, project administration, funding acquisition, writing – review and editing

Yueqing Xie: Conceptualization

Takuya Iwanaga: Conceptualization, methodology, software, data curation, validation, writing – review and editing

Camille Bouchez: Conceptualization, writing – review and editing

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Highlights

- Worth of data depend on spatiotemporal scale, flow and exchange conditions
- Hydraulic data informs SW-GW exchange flux best under high/regular flow conditions
- Radon-222 and EC data hold value for low/regular flow conditions where gaining