

**ASSESSMENT OF INFILTRATION PROCESS
CONSIDERING SLOPE AND DIURNAL TEMPERATURE
VARIATION IN HUMID SUBTROPICAL REGION**

LOHIT JAIN



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

AUGUST 2022

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2022

**ASSESSMENT OF INFILTRATION PROCESS
CONSIDERING SLOPE AND DIURNAL TEMPERATURE
VARIATION IN HUMID SUBTROPICAL REGION**

by

LOHIT JAIN

Department of Civil Engineering

Submitted

In fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

AUGUST 2022

This thesis is dedicated to

My Parents

(Mrs. Alka Jain and Mr. Vijay Jain)

For their constant encouragement, endless love and support

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis, entitled “*Assessment of infiltration process considering slope and diurnal temperature variation in humid subtropical region*”, being submitted by Mr. Lohit Jain to the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi, for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, is a record of bonafide research work carried out by him under my supervision. The thesis work, in our opinion, has reached the standard, fulfilling the requirements for the said degree. Further, we certify that this submission is Mr. Lohit’s own work and that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person which to a substantial extent has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma of any University or Institute, except where due acknowledgement has been made in the text.

(Sumedha Chakma)
Associate Professor
Department of Civil Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During my doctoral studies, I have been very fortunate to be a part of the prestigious institute IIT Delhi, an institute of eminence. I consider it a proud privilege to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Sumedha Chakma, Department of Civil Engineering, for his excellent supervision during this research work. Prof. Sumedha Chakma has been a source of vital support, constant motivation, and valuable suggestions that have helped me shape this dissertation. In addition to their technical guidance, he has set forth examples of personal attributes which I hope to emulate as a good human being. I sincerely acknowledge my SRC members, Prof. Alok Madan, Prof. Sawan Suman, and Prof. C. T. Dhanya, for their valuable feedback. I am thankful to the Ministry of Education for funding me with the Junior and Senior Research Fellowship.

I am incredibly thankful to my sister Saloni Jain for motivating me from time to time and supporting me in this journey. She has been a constant source of inspiration to me, and without her help, this work would not be able to reach the finishing line

I am very thankful to my wife, Anubhuti Jain, to help me in this challenging journey and to tolerate me in the most critical period of my life. She is the reason I could focus on my work without any interruption. For the successful completion of this thesis, I am deeply indebted to several people, of which a few names cannot go without being mentioned here. I wish to extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Alemayehu Abate Shawul, Dr. Tamru Tesseme Argawa. Mr. Abhay Guleria, all my lab-mates and fellow researchers in the water resources department.

I am equally grateful to the staff members of the Simulation Laboratory, Department of Civil Engineering, who, with their immense cooperation and friendly attitude, made work as exciting initiative to look forward to in routine. I cannot thank enough Mr. Rajveer Agrawal, Mr. N. R.

Gehlot, Mr. Amit Bundela, Mr. Teeka Ram and Mr. Yadram who lent their prompt help in anything and everything.

Apart from these, my special acknowledgement is due for Dr. Neeta who shared endless moments of laughter and she has proven herself to be a dependable friend time and again. Heartfelt appreciation is reserved for all my friends, whom I may have missed out on mention, for their help.

I have no word to express my gratitude and regard toward my father and mother for their contribution whatever I have achieved till date is beyond comparison. Their unconditional love, affection, and encouragement have helped me move ahead in my difficult times and complete my work successfully. Last but not least, I would like to thank my mother-in-law and father-in-law for their constant encouragement and love, without which I would not have been able to succeed.

Lohit Jain

ABSTRACT

The water infiltration into a soil system is a complex process dealing with oversimplified standard models by not considering important physical features like slope and temperature variation that govern the soil-water interaction and flow. Quantitative infiltration analysis of a soil surface becomes very complex when the collective impacts of slope and temperature are considered for micro-macro flow based on the land use and land type (LULC). This study focuses on the infiltration responses of the topsoil layer in the ponding condition for flat surface (0° - 4°), gentle slope (5° - 15°), and moderate slope (16° - 25°) depending on the availability at the site incorporating the diurnal temperature variation by conducting Double-ring experiments in morning and afternoon session for each category of slope keeping all other factors similar. The influence of slope was investigated separately as well on the conceptually designed hillslope experimental set-up by analysing simulated rainfall and generated runoff on the soil samples extracted from the agriculture, landfill, and bare surfaces incorporating the effects of 10° , 20° , and 30° slopes. The experimental study was emphasised four common LULC such as agricultural field, grassland, bare surfaces, and, from the environmental perspective, solid waste landfill for the impacts of slope and temperature variation on corresponding infiltrated volume. Three popular classical infiltration models, such as Kostiakov, Horton, and Philip models, were optimised to generate the parameters producing the closest outcomes to the observed cumulative infiltration in all slope and temperature variation conditions based on the field experimental data. Statistical tools- Coefficient of determination (R^2), Nash Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE), Percentage Biased (PBIAS), and Root mean Square Error- observations standard deviation ratio (RSR) were engaged to evaluate the best performing model incorporating the slope and temperature impacts. Total 20 scenarios were studied to determine the quantitative impact of local topographical and local climatic conditions on cumulative

infiltration. After the experimental studies, the physical-based analytical infiltration module was developed by combining the modified Green-Ampt model for micropores flow in the soil matrix and the Hagen Poiseuille-Manning equation for preferential flow from macropores incorporating the impacts of diurnal temperature variation on soil-water physical characteristics and inclination of surfaces. The model was calibrated by experimental data observed from flat and gentle slope surfaces for all focused LULC in morning and afternoon sessions and validated the estimated cumulative infiltration for moderate slope in a higher temperature range. The results show that initial and final infiltration rates were not significantly correlated with temperature and slope; however, initial infiltration rates were majorly affected by the LULC and were found 2.56 times higher for harvested agricultural areas than grass areas. Cumulative infiltration was generally lowest in solid waste landfill and highest in bare surfaces among all selected (LULC). Cumulative infiltration volume has positively correlated with slope and temperature variation for all LULC under ponded conditions. The observations of the hillslope experimental set-up show that agricultural soil has experienced higher abstractions for all slopes and got saturated earlier than other-focused land uses. The infiltrated volume was significantly affected by the slope of the surface when runoff was allowed and showed the average reduction in cumulative infiltration was analysed as 7.62% and 27.8% when the surface slope increased from 10° to 20° and 30° respectively. The mean rise in runoff was observed as 18.34% and 45.5% for the same increment of the slope. Overall, the Philip model showed the most efficient performance after the developed infiltration model (GIM) as per the statistical analysis.

The study is expected to be valuable for decision making in land management of focused land covers, irrigation management in terms of estimating field-scale runoff and infiltration by providing experimental supported data. The developed General Infiltration Model (GIM) proved to be more efficient and useful for better estimating the infiltration characteristics

incorporating the combined impacts of slope and temperature. The results are expected to be useful for landfill management regarding the environmental aspects situated in the humid subtropical region of India.

सार

मृदा प्रणाली में पानी की अंतःस्यंदन एक जटिल प्रक्रिया है जो मिट्टी-पानी के संयोजन और प्रवाह को नियंत्रित करने वाली ढलान और तापमान भिन्नता जैसी महत्वपूर्ण भौतिक विशेषताओं पर विचार न करके अतिसरलीकृत मानक मॉडल से निपटती है। मिट्टी की सतह का मात्रात्मक अंतःस्यंदन विश्लेषण बहुत जटिल हो जाता है जब भूमि उपयोग और भूमि प्रकार (एल्यूएलसी) के आधार पर सूक्ष्म मैक्रो प्रवाह के लिए ढलान और तापमान के सामूहिक प्रभावों पर विचार किया जाता है। यह अध्ययन समतल सतह (0°-4°), जेंटल ढलान (5°-15°), और मध्यम ढलान (16°-25°) के लिए एकत्रित पानी की स्थिति में अन्य सभी कारकों को समान रखते हुए ढलान की प्रत्येक श्रेणी के लिए सुबह और दोपहर के सत्र में डबल-रिंग प्रयोग करके दैनिक तापमान भिन्नता को शामिल करते हुए ऊपरी मिट्टी की परत की अंतःस्यंदन प्रतिक्रियाओं पर ध्यान केंद्रित करता है, जो प्रयोगात्मक पर ढलान की उपलब्धता पर निर्भर करता है। ढलान के प्रभाव की अलग-अलग जांच की गई और साथ ही अवधारणात्मक रूप से डिजाइन किए गए पहाड़ी ढलान प्रयोगात्मक सेट-अप पर नकली वर्षा का विश्लेषण करके और कृषि, लैंडफिल, और खुली सतहों से 100, 200, और 300 ढलानों के प्रभावों को शामिल करते हुए मिट्टी के नमूनों पर उत्पन्न अपवाह का विश्लेषण किया गया। प्रायोगिक अध्ययन ने चार सामान्य एल्यूएलसी जैसे कृषि क्षेत्र, घास के मैदान, खुली सतह, और पर्यावरणीय दृष्टिकोण से, ढलान के लिए ठोस अपशिष्ट लैंडफिल और संबंधित अंतःस्यंदन की मात्रा पर तापमान भिन्नता प्रभावों पर जोर दिया। क्षेत्र प्रयोगात्मक डेटा के आधार पर सभी ढलान और तापमान भिन्नता स्थितियों में देखे गए संचयी अंतःस्यंदन के निकटतम परिणाम उत्पन्न करने के लिए तीन लोकप्रिय पारंपरिक अंतःस्यंदन मॉडल, जैसे कि कोस्टियाकोव, हॉर्टन और फिलिप मॉडल के पैरामीटर अनुकूलित किए गए थे। सांख्यिकीय उपकरण- निर्धारण का गुणांक (R²), नैश सटक्लिफ दक्षता (NSE), प्रतिशत बायस्ड (PBIAS), और रूट माध्य वर्ग त्रुटि- अवलोकन मानक विचलन अनुपात (RSR) का उपयोग ढलान और तापमान प्रभावों को शामिल करते हुए सर्वश्रेष्ठ प्रदर्शन करने वाले मॉडल का मूल्यांकन करने के लिए किया गया था। संचयी अंतःस्यंदन पर स्थानीय स्थलाकृतिक और स्थानीय जलवायु परिस्थितियों के मात्रात्मक प्रभाव को निर्धारित करने के लिए कुल 20 परिदृश्यों का अध्ययन किया गया था। प्रायोगिक अध्ययनों के बाद, भौतिक-आधारित विश्लेषणात्मक अंतःस्यंदन मॉड्यूल को मिट्टी के मैट्रिक्स में माइक्रोप्रोर्स प्रवाह के लिए संशोधित ग्रीन-

एम्प्ट मॉडल और मिट्टी पर दैनिक तापमान भिन्नता के जल भौतिक विशेषताओं पर प्रभाव और सतहों का झुकाव को शामिल करते हुए मैक्रोपोर्स से अधिमानी प्रवाह के लिए हेगन पॉइजुइल-मैनिंग समीकरण को मिलाकर विकसित किया गया। मॉडल को सुबह और दोपहर के सत्रों में सभी केंद्रित LULC के लिए सपाट और जेंटल ढलान सतहों से देखे गए प्रयोगात्मक डेटा द्वारा कैलिब्रेट किया गया था और उच्च तापमान सीमा में मध्यम ढलान के लिए अनुमानित संचयी अंतःस्यंदन को मान्य किया गया। परिणाम बताते हैं कि प्रारंभिक और अंतिम अंतःस्यंदन दर तापमान और ढलान के साथ महत्वपूर्ण रूप से सहसंबद्ध नहीं थे; हालाँकि, प्रारंभिक अंतःस्यंदन की दर LULC द्वारा प्रमुख रूप से प्रभावित हुई थी और घास वाले क्षेत्रों की तुलना में कटाई वाले कृषि क्षेत्रों के लिए 2.56 गुना अधिक पाई गई। सभी चयनित (एल्यूएलसी) के बीच संचयी अंतःस्यंदन आम तौर पर ठोस अपशिष्ट लैंडफिल में सबसे कम और खुली सतहों में सबसे अधिक थी। संचयी अंतःस्यंदन मात्रा तालाब की परिस्थितियों में सभी LULC के लिए ढलान और तापमान भिन्नता के साथ सकारात्मक रूप से सहसंबद्ध है। पहाड़ी ढलानों के प्रायोगिक सेट-अप के अवलोकन से पता चलता है कि कृषि मिट्टी ने सभी ढलानों के लिए उच्च अमूर्तता का अनुभव किया है और अन्य केंद्रित भूमि उपयोगों की तुलना में पहले संतृप्त हो गई है। जब अपवाह की अनुमति दी गई थी तब सतह के ढलान से अंतःस्यंदन की मात्रा काफी प्रभावित हुई थी और दिखाया गया था कि संचयी अंतःस्यंदन में औसत कमी का विश्लेषण 7.62% और 27.8% के रूप में किया गया था, जब सतह ढलान क्रमशः 10° से 20° और 30° तक बढ़ गया था। ढलान की समान वृद्धि के लिए अपवाह में औसत वृद्धि 18.34% और 45.5% के रूप में देखी गई थी। कुल मिलाकर, फिलिप मॉडल ने सांख्यिकीय विश्लेषण के अनुसार विकसित अंतःस्यंदन मॉडल (जीआईएम) के बाद सबसे कुशल प्रदर्शन दिखाया।

प्रायोगिक समर्थित डेटा प्रदान करके क्षेत्र-स्तरीय अपवाह और अंतःस्यंदन के आकलन के संदर्भ में केंद्रित भूमि कवर के भूमि प्रबंधन, सिंचाई प्रबंधन में निर्णय लेने के लिए प्रस्तुत अध्ययन के मूल्यवान होने की उम्मीद है। विकसित सामान्य अंतःस्यंदन मॉडल (जीआईएम) ढलान और तापमान के संयुक्त प्रभावों को शामिल करते हुए अंतःस्यंदन की विशेषताओं का बेहतर आकलन करने के लिए अधिक कुशल और उपयोगी साबित हुआ। भारत के आर्द्र उपोष्णकटिबंधीय क्षेत्र में स्थित पर्यावरणीय पहलुओं के संबंध में प्रस्तुत परिणामों के लैंडफिल प्रबंधन के लिए उपयोगी होने का अनुमान है।

CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
LIST OF NOMENCLATURE	xxii
CHAPTER 1.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	5
1.3 Objectives of the study.....	6
1.4 Scope of the research	7
1.5 Organisation of the Dissertation	8
CHAPTER 2.....	10
Literature Review	10
2.1 General.....	10
2.2 Factors affecting infiltration	11
2.2.1 Temperature	13
2.2.2 Slope of surface.....	15
2.2.3 Land use/cover	16
2.3 Modelling evaluation of infiltration process.....	19

2.3.1 Empirical and Semi-Empirical models	20
2.3.2 Physical-based models	27
2.3.2.1 The Green-Ampt model	27
2.3.2.2 Richard equation	29
2.4 The existence of macropores	32
2.4.1 Development of macropores	33
2.4.2 Equivalent size range	34
2.4.3 Incorporation of macroporosity	35
2.5 Infiltration experimental techniques	39
2.6 Model parameterisation and performance evaluation.....	42
2.6.2 Statistical performance parameters	43
2.7 Research gap	45
Chapter 3	47
Infiltration assessment of soil cover on municipal solid waste landfill	47
3.1 Background.....	47
3.3 Materials and methods	49
3.3.1 Study area.....	49
3.3.2 Field Experiment.....	52
3.3.3 Performance assessment	57
3.4 Results.....	58
3.5 Discussion	70
3.6 Outcomes of the study	73
Chapter 4	75
Development of infiltration models for green covers.....	75

4.1 Background	75
4.2 Methodology	77
4.2.1 Study area.....	78
4.2.2 Data collection	79
4.2.3 Data analysis	82
4.3 Results.....	84
4.3.1 Influence of land uses on infiltration process	85
4.3.2 Effects of diurnal temperature variation on infiltration rate and volume	86
4.3.3 Effects of natural slope on infiltration process	88
4.4 Discussion	93
4.4.1 Effect of slope variation on infiltration process.....	93
4.4.2 Effect of diurnal temperature on cumulative infiltration	95
4.4.3 Impacts of land use on infiltration	96
4.5 Major outcomes	98
Chapter 5	101
Development of General infiltration model.....	101
5.1 Background	101
5.2 Methodology	104
5.2.1 Study area.....	104
5.2.2 Experimental methods and data collection	105
5.2.3 The General Infiltration Model.....	108
5.2.4 Calibration and validation.....	117
5.2.5 Parameter estimation of classical infiltration models	118
5.2.6 Performance assessment	119
5.3 Results.....	119

5.3.1 Infiltration characteristics with slope and temperature variation.....	119
5.3.2 Analysis of performance of the infiltration models	123
5.3.3 Prediction of cumulative infiltration depth	131
5.4 Discussion	137
5.4.1 Effects of land use and land cover on infiltration process	137
5.4.2 Influence of climatic and topographic factors	139
5.4.3 Performance of the models	141
5.4.4 Sensitivity analysis.....	144
5.4.5 Limit of reliability of DRI.....	147
5.5 Finding of the study	148
Chapter 6	151
Hillslope experimental analysis for different land uses.....	151
6.1 Background.....	151
6.2 Materials and methods	155
6.2.1 Experimental setup.....	156
6.2.2 Model optimisation	159
6.3 Results.....	164
6.4 Discussion	177
6.5 Outcomes of the study	183
Chapter 7	185
Summary and Conclusions	185
7.1 Summary of the study outcomes.....	185
7.2 Future Scope	189
References.....	190

APPENDICES214

BRIEF BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR217

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Maximum and minimum range of macropores based on the previous studies.....	35
Table 3.1 Average initial and final infiltration rate for different scenario	53
Table 3.2 Average soil characteristics of top 20 cm layer at Okhla landfill.....	56
Table 3.3 Statistical comparative analysis of simulated infiltration rate data derived from optimised model parameters for 4° and 23° slope surfaces in morning and afternoon sessions	64
Table 3.4 Statistical comparative analysis of simulated cumulative infiltration data derived from optimised model parameters for 4° and 23° slope surfaces in morning and afternoon sessions.	65
Table 4.1 Agricultural and grass surface soil characteristics based on laboratory experiments	81
Table 4.2 Comparison of infiltration characteristics for grass and agricultural surfaces based on field experiments.....	84
Table 4.3 Parameters of (a) Kostiakov (b) Horton and (c) Philip infiltration models, determined using double-ring infiltrometer experiments on various slopes of grass and agricultural surface in morning and afternoon sessions.....	91
Table 4.4 Coefficient values of Cumulative infiltration projection model for grass and agricultural fields	92
Table 5.1 Soil characteristics of selected LULC based on laboratory experiments	107
Table 5.2 Observed infiltration characteristics with various field experimental scenarios for selected LULC	120
Table 5.3 Model parameter values corresponding for all models and scenarios based on the experimental data on various slopes in morning and afternoon sessions	124

Table 5.4 Statistical comparison of model validation for arithmetic average approach estimating cumulative infiltration on moderate slope and higher temperature range.....	134
Table 5.5 Statistical comparison of model validation for parameters estimated as function of temperature and slope, assessing cumulative infiltration on moderate slope and higher temperature range.....	135
Table 5.6 Contribution of surface slope based on sensitivity analysis of landfill cover, bare surface and grassland	145
Table 5.7 Contribution of diurnal temperature based on sensitivity analysis of landfill cover, bare surface and grassland	145
Table 5.8 Contribution of surface slope and diurnal temperature in cumulative infiltration based on sensitivity analysis for landfill cover, bare surface and grassland.....	146
Table 5.9 Steady deep flow rate measured on the field through different ‘point measurements’ by DRI for all focused experimental sites.....	147
Table 6.1 Input parameters from the field and laboratory experiments.....	161
Table 6.2 R and MSE for number of Neurons in ANN-a and ANN-b	163
Table 6.3 Infiltration parameters for different slopes and land-uses based on hillslope experimental setup	166
Table 6.4 Statistical comparison of infiltration models for agricultural Surface.....	171
Table 6.5 Statistical comparison infiltration models for bare soil Surface.....	174
Table 6.6 Statistical comparison of infiltration models for landfill soil	176

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 Okhla solid waste landfill experimental location Delhi, India	50
Figure 3.2 Okhla landfill Experimental site, (a) entry-exit point of solid waste, (b) storage of solid waste, (c) borrowed soil storage for cover, Delhi (May 2016)	51
Figure 3.3 Double ring infiltrometer experiment on solid waste landfill site, Okhla.....	53
Figure 3.4 Particle size distribution curve of Okhla landfill top surface sample.....	54
Figure 3.5 Maximum dry density variation with the increasing moisture content for the soil samples collected from the landfill cover	55
Figure 3.6 (a) Porosity and void ratio at increasing moisture content for the Okhla top layer soil. (b) Okhla landfill top layer soil characteristics	56
Figure 3.7 Experimental observed (a) infiltration rate and (b) cumulative infiltration curves for plain and inclined surfaces in morning and afternoon sessions on solid waste landfill surface	59
Figure 3.8 Comparative curves based on calibrated parameters of classical infiltration models for 23° inclined surface, (a) cumulative infiltration: temperature variation from 38°C to 42°C, (b) infiltration rate: temperature variation from 38°C to 42°C, (c) cumulative infiltration: temperature variation from 31°C to 38°C (d) infiltration rate: temperature variation from 31°C to 38°C	60
Figure 3.9 Comparative curves based on calibrated parameters of classical infiltration models for 4° (Categorised as flat), (a) cumulative infiltration: temperature variation from 34°C to 42°C, (b) infiltration rate: temperature variation from 34°C to 42°C, (c) cumulative infiltration: temperature variation from 26°C to 35°C (d) infiltration rate: temperature variation from 26°C to 35°C, (Okhla landfill).	63

Figure 3.10 Comparative infiltration rate curves for morning and afternoon sessions on 4° (Plain) and 23° (slope) simulated by (a) SCS method (b) Kostiakov model (c) Modified Kostiakov model (d) Smith model (e) Horton Model and (f) Philip model.	67
Figure 3.11 Comparative cumulative infiltration curves for morning and afternoon sessions on 4° (Plain) and 23° (slope) surface, simulated by (a) SCS method (b) Kostiakov model (c) Modified Kostiakov model (d) Smith model (e) Horton Model and (f) Philip model.	68
Figure 4.1 (a) Study area, showing experimental field locations for double-ring infiltrometer on (b) agricultural field, and (c) Grassland.....	79
Figure 4.2 Comparative curves of (a) particle size distribution and (b) maximum dry density variation with moisture content for agricultural soil and grassland soil.....	81
Figure 4.3 Quantitative comparison curves of cumulative infiltration in the (a) afternoon (c) morning, and infiltration rate in the (b) afternoon (d) morning, for agricultural and grassland surfaces	85
Figure 4.4 Comparison of cumulative infiltration for the experiment in morning and afternoon session on agricultural surface.....	86
Figure 4.5 Comparative curves of cumulative infiltration for double-ring infiltrometer experiment in the morning (lower temperature range) and afternoon session (higher temperature range) on (a) flat surface, (b) gentle slope, and (c) moderate slope of grassland	87
Figure 4.6 Comparison of (a) infiltration rate in the afternoon, (b) cumulative infiltration in afternoon, (c) infiltration rate in the morning, and (d) cumulative infiltration in the morning, on a flat, gentle and moderate slope of grassland	88
Figure 4.7 Comparison of model-simulated and experimental cumulative infiltration values for grass and agricultural surfaces	93
Figure 4.8 Cross-section of agricultural soil sample (at 20 cm depth)	97

Figure 5.1 Equivalent diameter of maximum and minimum macropores adopted by various researchers.....	102
Figure 5.2 Location of experimental sites 1. Landfill (Okhla), 2. Grass area, 3. Bare surface (South Delhi) and 4. Agricultural area (Nazafgarh) in Delhi, Capital of India.	105
Figure 5.3 Dry density variation with increment in moisture content of all focused LULC and landfill.....	108
Figure 5.4 Comparison in porosity estimated by empirical model and calculated based on laboratory experiments.....	111
Figure 5.5 Schematic sketch of single macropore presence in the soil surface inclined at constant angle.....	112
Figure 5.6 Water content profile from micropores for Modified Green Ampt model and macropore position for Hagen Poiseuille equation.....	114
Figure 5.7 Lateral flow generation from two-domain soil system for small area.....	116
Figure 5.8 Comparative cumulative infiltration curves of focused landuses-landcovers for (a) flat (0° to 5°) surface in morning session, (b) flat surface in afternoon session, (c) gentle slope (6° to 15°) in morning session, (d) gentle slope in afternoon session, (e) moderate slope (16° to 25°) in morning slope and, (f) moderate slope in afternoon slope.....	122
Figure 5.9 Comparison of observed cumulative infiltration on landfill with calibrated General infiltration model, Kostiakov, Horton and Philip model for (a) flat surface and morning session (b) flat surface and afternoon session, and (c) moderate slope and morning session.....	125
Figure 5.10 Comparison of observed cumulative infiltration on agricultural landuse with calibrated General infiltration model, Kostiakov, Horton and Philip model for (a) flat surface and morning session (b) flat surface and afternoon session, and (c) flat surface and morning session (Post rainfall).....	127

Figure 5.11 Comparison of observed cumulative infiltration on bare surface landcover with calibrated General infiltration model, Kostiakov, Horton and Philip model for (a) flat surface during morning session (b) flat surface during afternoon session, (c) gentle slope during morning session, (d) gentle slope during afternoon session and, (e) moderate slope during morning session129

Figure 5.12 Comparison of observed cumulative infiltration on grass landcover with calibrated GIM, Kostiakov, Horton and Philip model for (a) flat surface and morning session (b) flat surface and afternoon session, (c) gentle slope and morning session, (d) gentle slope and afternoon session and, (e) moderate slope and morning session 130

Figure 5.13 Comparison of cumulative infiltration predicted by GIM and standard models' parameters estimated by arithmetic average approach on (a) landfill, (c) bare, (d) grass for moderate in afternoon session and (b) agricultural field for flat surface in afternoon session (Post rainfall) 133

Figure 5.14 Comparison of cumulative infiltration predicted by GIM and standard models' parameters estimated considering slope and temperature variation for (a) landfill, (c) bare, (d) grass for moderate in afternoon session and, (b) agricultural land use for flat surface in afternoon session (Post rainfall)..... 136

Figure 5.15 Comparison of observed and predicted cumulative infiltration by General infiltration Model (GIM), Kostiakov, Philip and Horton, for the afternoon session on moderate slope* (TS- Validation incorporating slope and temperature, *as per availability) 137

Figure 5.16 variation of infiltrated volume by macropores and total infiltration in (a) lower temperature range, (b) higher temperature range, for various landuses and land covers 138

Figure 6.1 Particle size distribution curve for the soil samples collected from landfill cover, agricultural land and bare surface 156

Figure 6.2 (a) Experimental setup of hillslope rainfall-runoff modelling, (b) Schematic diagram of the experimental setup	157
Figure 6.3 Cumulative runoff variation with the slope on landfill soil for total rainfall of 3.52 cm with an average intensity of 0.26 cm/min	165
Figure 6.4 Cumulative runoff variation with the slope on agricultural soil for total rainfall of 3.54 cm with an average intensity of 0.28 cm/min	166
Figure 6.5 Cumulative runoff variation with the slope on bare surface soil for total rainfall of 3.55 cm with an average intensity of 0.26 cm/min	167
Figure 6.6 Comparison of observed infiltration rate curves on the slope (a) 10°, (b) 20°, (c) 30° for Agricultural, landfill and bare surface soil samples	169
Figure 6.7 Comparison of experimental observation, ANN (10-neuron), Kostiakov, Modified Kostiakov and Horton infiltration rate on the slope (a) 10°, (b) 20°, (c) 30° for Agricultural land	170
Figure 6.8 Comparison of experimental observation, ANN (10-neuron), Kostiakov, Modified Kostiakov and Horton infiltration rate on the slope (a) 10°, (b) 20°, (c) 30° for bare surface	173
Figure 6.9 Comparison of experimental observation, ANN (10-neuron), Kostiakov, Modified Kostiakov and Horton model on the slope (a) 10°, (b) 20°, (c) 30° for landfill soil	175
Figure 6.10 Erosion patterns of (a) agricultural soil (b) landfill soil (c) bare surface soil, due to simulated precipitation on the inclined surface	179
Figure 6.11 Neural Network performance variation for different % of training data length.	182
Figure A.1 Simulated variation in cumulative infiltration through macropores with surface slope for bare surface in morning session	214
Figure A.2 Simulated variation in cumulative infiltration through macropores with surface slope for bare surface in afternoon session	214

Figure A.4 Simulated variation in cumulative infiltration through macropores with surface slope for grassland	215
Figure A.5 Simulated variation in cumulative infiltration through macropores with surface slope for landfill cover in morning session.....	215
Figure A.6 Simulated variation in cumulative infiltration through macropores with surface slope for landfill cover in afternoon session	216
Figure A.7 Simulated variation of cumulative infiltration through macropores for morning and afternoon sessions on agricultural land.....	216

LIST OF NOMENCLATURE

Nomenclature	Description
f_t	Infiltration rate at time t
a, a_1	Multiplying constant parameter
b, b_1	Exponent parameter
f_c	Steady-state infiltration rate
t	Time/ duration
f_o	Initial infiltration rate
k	Decay coefficient
p	Rainfall intensity
t_p	Time when rainfall intensity equals to infiltration rate
Δt	Time interval
S_o	Storage potential of the soil
F_t	Cumulative infiltration at time t
GI	Growth index of crop maturity
y	Surface connected porosity index
S_a	Available storage in the surface layer
t_c	Time scale parameter
n	Total porosity
m	Exponent depending on LULC and cropping conditions
S	Sorptivity
t_o	Time to ponding
SR	Potential maximum retention parameter
k_{sat}	Saturated hydraulic conductivity
ψ	The suction head due to capillary attraction
θ_d	Moisture difference between saturated state and initial state
S_p	Total pressure heads
n_e	Effective porosity ($\theta_{sat} - \theta_i$)
γ	Slope angle of the surface
z	Vertical depth of permeable soil layer
D	Diffusivity
k	Hydraulic conductivity
θ	Moisture content
S	Sorptivity
A	Constant addition parameter
q_i	Volumetric inflow into macropore
i_{mat}	Infiltration rate into the soil matrix
n_{mac}	Macropore density per unit area
h	Pressure head
Γ_{RWU}	Sink/source denoting root water uptake
Γ_{BF}	Water exchange between soil matrix and biopores

Γ_{DF}	Drainage flow
E	Objective function for minimum error
O(i)	Observed values at time step 'i'
S(i)	Simulated values at time step 'i'
\bar{O}	Mean value of observed data
\bar{S}	Mean value of simulated data
h_t & h_{t-1}	The water level at time t and t-1
T	Temperature
J	Number of observations
La	Land use coefficient
SL	Slope
FD	Field density
x	Slope coefficient
y	Field density coefficient
w	Temperature coefficient
P	Precipitation
R	runoff
\bar{T}	Weightage average temperature
V	Normalized variable
v_i	Variable value on i^{th} position
v_{min}	Minimum value of variable v
v_{max}	Maximum value of variable v
N	Number of neurons in hidden layer
A	Model constant
B	Model constant
δ	Lag in time
T_a	Air temperature
T_w	Water temperature
μ	Dynamic viscosity
A	1.98404×10^{-6} Pa-sec
B	1825.85 °C
ν_T	Kinematic viscosity at temperature T
ρ_T	Density of water at temperature T
k_T	Hydraulic conductivity at temperature T
Sa	% of sand
H_1 & H_2	Water level elevation inside the ring on the inclined surface
L	Length of macropore
ΔP	Pressure head gradient
Δx	Variable length of macropore
q_t	Water flow rate
g	Gravitational acceleration
r_{min}	Equivalent radius of minimum sized macropore

q_{m1}	Water flow rate from a minimum sized macropore in a single time step
ν	Kinematic viscosity
τ	Tortuosity
q_{m2}	Flow rate entering in soil due to the largest size of macropores
r_{max}	Largest size of macropores
S_f	Frictional slope
η	Manning coefficient representing the soil material surface
F_{mic}	Cumulative infiltration through micropores
θ_{sat}	Saturated water content ($n-\theta_r$)
θ_r	Residual water content
H	Depth normal to inclined the soil surface
Ψ	Wetting front matric potential
z	Depth normal to the surface
L_h	Length of hillslope
k_{sat}	Saturated hydraulic conductivity presented as a function of temperature
W_1	Weight assigned to water flow rate from a minimum sized macropore
W_2	Weight assigned to water flow rate from a maximum sized macropore
W_3	Weight assigned to cumulative infiltration through micropores
q_T	Total lateral flow volume
q_{mic}	Lateral flow volumes from micropores
q_{mac}	Lateral flow volumes from macropores
$V(t)$	The total volume received by the micropore domain (including seepage from macropore walls)
q_{m1}	Inflow in minimum sized macropores
q_{m2}	Inflow in maximised sized macropores
R_t	Moisture retention
$k_h(T)$	Lateral hydraulic conductivity function of water temperature T oc
L_f	Amount of water transacted to the micropore domain
P	Precipitation
r	Runoff
$P \& Q$	Parameters of power equation

