

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10251/186630>

This paper must be cited as:

Chen, Z.; Xu, T.; Gómez-Hernández, JJ.; Zanini, A. (2021). Contaminant Spill in a Sandbox with Non-Gaussian Conductivities: Simultaneous Identification by the Restart Normal-Score Ensemble Kalman Filter. *Mathematical Geosciences*. 53(7):1587-1615.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11004-021-09928-y>



The final publication is available at

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11004-021-09928-y>

Copyright Springer-Verlag

Additional Information

Contaminant Spill in a Sandbox with non-Gaussian Conductivities: Simultaneous Identification by the Restart Normal-Score Ensemble Kalman Filter

Zi Chen · Teng Xu · J. Jaime
Gómez-Hernández · Andrea Zanini

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract The joint identification of the parameters defining a contaminant source and the heterogeneous distribution of the hydraulic conductivities of the aquifer where the contamination took place is a difficult task. Previous studies have demonstrated the applicability of the restart normal-score ensemble Kalman filter (rNS-EnKF) in synthetic cases making use of sufficient hydraulic head and concentration data. This study shows an application of the same technique to a non-synthetic case under laboratory conditions and discusses the difficulties found on its application and the avenues taken to solve them. The method is first tested using a synthetic case that mimics the sandbox experiment to establish the minimum number of ensemble members and the best technique to prevent the filter collapsing. The synthetic case shows that among different techniques based on update damping and covariance inflation, the Bauser's covariance inflation method works best in preventing filter collapse. Its application to the sandbox data shows that the rNS-EnKF can benefit from Bauser's inflation to reduce the number of ensemble realizations substantially in comparison with a filter without inflation; yet, arriving

Zi Chen

Institute of Water and Environmental Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València,
Valencia, Spain
E-mail: dtpenguincz@gmail.com

Teng Xu(✉)

State Key Laboratory of Hydrology-Water Resources and Hydraulic Engineering, Hohai
University, Nanjing, China
E-mail: teng.xu@hhu.edu.cn

J. Jaime Gómez-Hernández

Institute of Water and Environmental Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València,
Valencia, Spain
E-mail: jgomez@upv.es

Andrea Zanini

Department of Engineering and Architecture, University of Parma, Parma, Italy
E-mail: andrea.zanini@unipr.it

to a good joint identification of both the contaminant source and the spatial heterogeneity of the conductivities.

Keywords inverse modeling · forensic hydrogeology · data assimilation · sandbox

1 Introduction

The motivation of this paper is to advance in the problem of the joint identification of a contaminant source in an aquifer together with the spatial distribution of hydraulic conductivities. The restart normal-score Ensemble Kalman filter (rNS-EnKF) has been tested in synthetic aquifers for the joint identification of a source parameters and conductivities and in a sandbox experiment for the identification of just the source parameters (Chen et al. 2018; Xu and Gómez-Hernández 2018). In both cases, the rNS-EnKF performed well; however, it could be argued that the synthetic case was far from reality, and that the sandbox experiment used a known homogeneous conductivity. For these reasons, a new sandbox experiment was designed, with a binary heterogeneous distribution of conductivity, and with the aim of testing the rNS-EnKF for the joint identification of the source and a spatially heterogeneous conductivity field.

In addition, previous experience on the application of the rNS-EnKF (Xu et al. 2013) showed the effect of filter collapse, a problem that can be tackled by the proper choice of number of ensemble realizations, covariance inflation, covariance localization or update damping. For this reason, the paper starts with the analysis of a synthetic field, resembling the new sandbox experiment, to determine the choice of number of realizations and the technique that prevents the filter to collapse and yields an acceptable identification of both source and conductivities within reasonable computer times. Once these choices are made, the sandbox experiment is directly addressed.

The importance of contaminant source identification, for instance in relation with the protection of wellhead capture zones (Feyen et al. 2003b,a), does not need to be stressed and it has been the subject of research for many years. The reader is referred to any of the review papers that can be found in the literature (e.g., Atmadja and Bagtzoglou 2001; Bagtzoglou and Atmadja 2005; Michalak and Kitanidis 2004; Sun et al. 2006). A very brief review, including some works that appeared after the mentioned review papers, follows.

Most contaminant source identification approaches can be classified into two main categories: optimization ones and probabilistic ones. In the optimization approaches, an objective function is built and the algorithm tries to minimize the discrepancies between simulated and measured concentrations using an optimization approach such as least-squares regression or maximum likelihood (e.g., Amirabdollahian and Datta 2014; Aral et al. 2001; Ayvaz 2016; Gorelick et al. 1983; Mirghani et al. 2009; Wagner 1992; Yeh et al. 2007). In the probabilistic approaches, the problem is cast in a stochastic framework

and the algorithm tries to maximize the posterior probabilities of the simulated concentrations conditioned on the observed values using techniques such as those based on minimum relative entropy or the use of adjoint states (e.g., Bagtzoglou et al. 1992; Butera et al. 2013; Koch and Nowak 2016; Neupauer and Wilson 1999; Woodbury and Ulrych 1996).

The main criticism to the approaches that can be found in the literature, and the reason why it is difficult to find applications of any of those techniques in practice, is that they have worked on synthetic cases, focusing on the identification of the contaminant source parameters and assuming that aquifer hydraulic conductivities are perfectly known. But the truth is that geological properties are quite heterogeneous, only sparsely known in reality, and very influential in how the aquifer behaves (e.g., Gómez-Hernández and Wen 1998; Knudby and Carrera 2005; Zinn and Harvey 2003). Only a few papers discuss the simultaneous identification of conductivity and the contaminant source, but, almost all of them are limited to either homogeneous aquifers or with a simplistic description of its heterogeneity (Datta et al. 2009; Mahar and Datta 2000; Wagner 1992). Only the works by Koch and Nowak (2016) and Xu and Gómez-Hernández (2018) address the problem of identifying heterogeneous conductivities; the former using a Bayesian methodology, and the later using the rNS-EnKF.

This paper builds on the previous work by Chen et al. (2018) and (Xu and Gómez-Hernández 2016, 2018) in which the capabilities of the rNS-EnKF, for the purpose of the identification of the parameters defining a point contaminant source and the aquifer hydraulic conductivities, had been shown in a synthetic case and in a laboratory experiment, and on the experience of the research team on addressing the problem of characterization of non-Gaussian conductivities (Capilla et al. 1999; Franssen and Gómez-Hernández 2002; Journel et al. 1993; Zhou et al. 2012a,b). The goal of this paper is to advance towards a practical application of the rNS-EnKF for contaminant source identification in an aquifer with sparse information about hydraulic conductivity heterogeneity. In comparison with previous papers, this paper works with data collected in a sandbox experiment, instead of with generated synthetic data, and the sandbox has a binary heterogeneous distribution (unknown to the algorithm), instead of a known homogeneous distribution. There is an additional important difference with respect to the work by Xu and Gómez-Hernández (2018), which is that no piezometric head data are available, and, therefore, the parameter identification will have to be solely based on concentration observations. This adds an additional complication to the performance of the rNS-EnKF since an important source of information for conductivity heterogeneity identification will be missing.

In an initial attempt to apply the rNS-EnKF directly to the sandbox data, numerous problems were found related with computing running time, filter collapsing and filter divergence. For this reason, a decision was taken to analyze first a more controlled synthetic experiment mimicking the heterogeneous sandbox to decide on the number of realizations and the best technique to prevent the filter to collapse without comprising the results (in a reasonable time, with

a reasonable uncertainty). As a result, the paper contains two case studies, (i) the synthetic case, in which a sensitivity analysis is performed combining two numbers of realizations, two update damping schemes and two covariance inflation approaches, out of which the number of ensemble realizations and a filter collapse prevention technique are chosen; and (ii) the laboratory case, in which the rNS-EnKF is demonstrated using the findings from the synthetic case.

Filter collapsing is dealt with the use of covariance inflation. Several such techniques can be found in the literature (e.g., Anderson 2007; Li et al. 2009; Liang et al. 2012; Bauser et al. 2018; Hendricks Franssen and Kinzelbach 2008; Wang and Bishop 2003; Zheng 2009), of which the damping method, Wang's method and Bauser's method will be tested. These methods will be discussed in detail further on in the corresponding section.

The paper shows the power of concentration data for the joint identification of conductivities and contaminant source information in a sandbox experiment by the rNS-EnKF. After this introductory review, the paper continues with a review of the methodology and a description of the sandbox experiment and its numerical modeling, followed by the synthetic data analysis and the sandbox data analysis. The paper ends with the discussion of the results and some conclusions.

2 Methodology

2.1 Groundwater Flow and Solute Transport Equations

Water flow and contaminant transport in the sandbox are modeled using the corresponding governing equations for groundwater flow (Bear 1972) and contaminant transport (Zheng and Wang 1999):

$$S_s \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (K \nabla h) + w \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial (\theta C)}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (\theta D \cdot \nabla C) - \nabla \cdot (\theta v C) - q_s C_s \quad (2)$$

where S_s is specific storage [L^{-1}], h is hydraulic head [L], t is time [T], $\nabla \cdot$ is the divergence operator, ∇ is the gradient operator, K is hydraulic conductivity [LT^{-1}] and w represents distributed sources or sinks [T^{-1}]; θ is porosity; C is dissolved concentration [ML^{-3}]; D is the hydrodynamic dispersion tensor [L^2T^{-1}]; v is the flow velocity vector [LT^{-1}] derived from the solution of the flow equation, q_s represents volumetric flow rate per unit volume of aquifer associated with a fluid source or sink [T^{-1}] and C_s is the concentration of the source or sink [ML^{-3}].

The groundwater flow equation is numerically solved with MODFLOW (McDonald and Harbaugh 1988) and the contaminant transport equation with MT3DS (Zheng and Wang 1999).

2.2 The Ensemble Kalman Filter

The ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF) was developed by Evensen (1994) as an extension to the Kalman filter (KF). The main difference between the EnKF and the KF is that, in the KF, the state covariance matrix is propagated in time using an explicit expression based on a linear transition equation, while, in the EnKF, this covariance matrix is derived from the statistical analysis of an ensemble of state realizations obtained after the solution of the state equations in each realization of the ensemble. The advantage of the EnKF over the KF is for systems in which the state transition equation is not linear; in such a case, the linear transition equation used by the KF is only an approximation and the resulting covariance deteriorates in time; whereas, in the EnKF, since the covariance is directly calculated from actual state spatial distributions, its value is more accurate, with the only limitation that the covariance is computed from a finite ensemble of realizations (if the number of realizations is small, the resulting estimate may be also inaccurate).

Although the EnKF was initially developed to update only the state of the system as observations are gathered, it has been shown that it can be also used for the update of the parameters using what is called an augmented state that includes both state variables and the parameters that control them (e.g., Chen and Zhang 2006; Houtekamer and Mitchell 2001; Li et al. 2012a,c). In summary, the EnKF has been proven to be an efficient algorithm for parameter identification, for strongly non-linear state-transfer equations, (Hendricks Franssen and Kinzelbach 2009), and has received much attention in the last decades. Next, the algorithm is described for the case study at hand, that is, the identification of the parameters defining a contaminant source together with the identification of the conductivities in a sandbox experiment for which only concentration data are available.

First, build an augmented state vector S including the model parameters and the state variables:

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (X_s, Z_s, I_c, I_r, T_e)^T \\ (\ln K_1, \ln K_1, \dots, \ln K_N)^T \\ (C_1, C_1, \dots, C_N)^T \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where A stands for model parameters, B for state variables, and N is the number of grid cells. In our case, the model parameters are those describing the contaminant source, X_s, Z_s , which are the contaminant source coordinates in the horizontal and vertical directions, I_c , the injection concentration, I_r , the injection rate, and T_e , the end release time, plus the hydraulic log-conductivities, $\ln K$; and the state variables are the contaminant concentrations, C . The augmented state vector evolves in time, starting with an initial value at time 0, S_0 .

Second, forecast, using the groundwater flow and transport equations, the state vector S_t at time t based on the state variable B_{t-1} and the model parameters A_{t-1} obtained at time $t-1$:

$$S_t^f = \psi(A_{t-1}^a, B_{t-1}^a) \quad (4)$$

where the superscript f stands for forecasted values and a stands for updated values after assimilating the state observations; ψ represents the state-transfer function. (In the forecast step, the parameters \mathbf{A} remain unchanged—the transfer function is the identity function—and the state \mathbf{B} evolves according to the flow and transport equations.)

Next, assimilate the state observations. The discrepancy between forecasted states and observed ones is used to update the forecasted augmented state vector according to the following expression:

$$S_t^a = S_t^f + \mathbf{K}_t \left[y_t^{obs} + \varepsilon_i - \mathbf{H}S_t^f \right] \quad (5)$$

where y_t^{obs} are the observed concentrations at time step t , ε_i stands for an observation error with zero mean and covariance \mathbf{R}_t , \mathbf{H} is the observation matrix that extracts out of the whole augmented state vector the elements at which observations were taken, \mathbf{K}_t is the Kalman gain matrix:

$$\mathbf{K}_t = \mathbf{P}_t^f \mathbf{H}^T [\mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_t^f \mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R}_t]^{-1} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_t^f = \frac{1}{N_e - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_e} \{ [S_{i,t}^f - \overline{S}_t^f] [S_{i,t}^f - \overline{S}_t^f]^T \} \quad (7)$$

where \mathbf{P}_t^f is the experimental covariance computed from the ensemble of augmented forecasted states, and \overline{S}_t^f is the experimental ensemble mean. (Notice that because observations are sparse, the observation matrix is mostly made out of zeroes, and it is not necessary to compute all the elements in \mathbf{P}_t^f , but only those that are multiplied by the non-zero elements of \mathbf{H} in $\mathbf{P}_t^f \mathbf{H}^T$.)

2.2.1 The normal-score EnKF

The EnKF was further extended to deal with non-Gaussian variables. The EnKF was found to be very effective to deal with non-linear transfer functions, but it failed when the augmented state followed a non-Gaussian distribution (Zhou et al. 2014). Several approaches have been developed to address this issue: Gaussian mixture models, reparameterizations, iterative approaches, and Gaussian anamorphosis, also known as normal-score transform (e.g., Chang et al. 2010; Hendricks Franssen and Kinzelbach 2008; Sun et al. 2009; Zhou et al. 2011). In this paper, the normal-score approach is used, and more precisely, the normal-score EnKF (NS-EnKF) as described by Zhou et al. (2011) or Li et al. (2012b).

The NS-EnKF is based on transforming all parameters and variables into Gaussian variates, performing EnKF in the Gaussian space, and then, back-transforming the results into the original space. The normal-score transform is a univariate transform that ensures that the transformed variates follow a Gaussian distribution, but it does not ensure that higher-order moments will follow a multiGaussian distribution; yet, the results obtained with the NS-EnKF outperform those of EnKF for clearly non-Gaussian parameters.

2.2.2 The restart NS-EnKF

The EnKF was designed to update both parameters and state variables at each assimilation step. That is, the discrepancy between forecasted and observed variables is used to update the whole augmented state (see Eq. (5)). However, in general in the case of subsurface flow and transport, and in particular in the case at hand of contaminant source identification, the updated states could be inconsistent with the updated parameters, either because the mass conservation laws are not longer abided, or because the updated state is not coherent with the updated contaminant source location. For this reason, the forecast of the augmented state to the next observation time is not done based on the updated augmented state at the previous time state, but it is preferable to perform a forecast from time zero with the latest updated parameters (Camporese et al. 2011; Crestani et al. 2012). This approach is called, for this reason, the restart ensemble Kalman filter, or, in our case, the restart normal-score ensemble Kalman filter (rNS-EnKF).

The forecast function in Eq. (4) changes into:

$$S^f(t) = \psi[A_{t-1}^a, B_0] = \begin{pmatrix} A_{t-1}^a \\ B_t \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where B_0 stands for the initial contaminant concentration in the domain. The restart EnKF has been applied before, for instance, by Camporese et al. (2011) and Crestani et al. (2012)

2.2.3 Damping

One way to deal with filter collapsing is to use a damping factor α , between 0 and 1, at the update step (Hendricks Franssen and Kinzelbach 2008):

$$S_t^a = S_t^f + \alpha \mathbf{K}_t \left[y_t^{obs} + \varepsilon_i - \mathbf{H} S_t^f \right] \quad (9)$$

2.2.4 Inflation Methods

Another way to reduce filter collapsing is by covariance inflation. There are several covariance inflation approaches in the literature (Anderson 2007; Bauser et al. 2018; Liang et al. 2012; Wang and Bishop 2003). In this work, two different time-dependent multiplicative covariance inflation methods are used, the one proposed by Wang and Bishop (2003) and the one by Bauser et al. (2018). In both methods, the augmented state vector should be inflated, after the forecast, as follows:

$$S_{i,t}^{inf,f} = \sqrt{\lambda_t} (S_{i,t}^f - \overline{S_t^f}) + \overline{S_t^f} \quad (10)$$

where $S_{i,t}^{inf,f}$ is the inflated augmented state vector of realization i after forecast to t^{th} time step, and λ_t is the inflation factor, the computation of which depends on the approach used.

In the work by Wang and Bishop (2003), λ_t is given by:

$$\lambda_t = \frac{(\mathbf{R}_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} d_t)^T \mathbf{R}_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} d_t - n_b}{\text{trace}\{\mathbf{R}_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_t^f (\mathbf{R}_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H})^T\}} \quad (11)$$

where n_b is the number of observations, and d_t is a vector with the residuals between the observation data and the mean of the forecast data at observation locations:

$$d_t = y_t^{obs} - \mathbf{H} * \overline{S_t^f} \quad (12)$$

Then, the updated augmented state vector is calculated as:

$$S_{i,t}^a = S_{i,t}^{inf,f} + \lambda_t \mathbf{P}_t^f \mathbf{H}^T [\mathbf{H} \lambda_t \mathbf{P}_t^f \mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R}_t]^{-1} [y_t^{obs} + \varepsilon - \mathbf{H} S_{i,t}^{inf,f}] \quad (13)$$

Wang and Bishop (2003) already recognize that parameter λ_t could vary significantly in time, particularly at the early stages when concentrations are small everywhere. For this reason, following their recommendations, its value is restricted to be between 0.7 and 1.2.

In the work by Bauser et al. (2018), λ_t is treated as a state variable, which is used to inflate the model parameters. Because it is a state variable, it is forecasted and updated using the Kalman filter formulation as follows:

$$\lambda_t^f = \lambda_{t-1}^a \quad (14)$$

$$\lambda_t^a = \lambda_t^f + \mathbf{K}_{\lambda_t} [d_{\lambda_t} - h_{\lambda}(\lambda_t^f)] \quad (15)$$

where the superscripts f and a stand for forecasted and updated values, \mathbf{K}_{λ_t} is the Kalman gain, d_{λ_t} is the absolute value of d_t , and $h_{\lambda}(\lambda_t^f)$ represents the mean residual between observation data and forecasted mean at observation location. These values are obtained by:

$$\mathbf{K}_{\lambda_t} = \mathbf{P}_{\lambda_t}^f \mathbf{H}_{\lambda_t}^T [\mathbf{H}_{\lambda_t} \mathbf{P}_{\lambda_t}^f \mathbf{H}_{\lambda_t}^T + \mathbf{R}_{\lambda_t}]^{-1} \quad (16)$$

$$(h_{\lambda_t}(\lambda_t^f))_i = [(\mathbf{R}_{\lambda_t})_{ii}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (17)$$

The covariance of the inflation parameter, $\mathbf{P}_{\lambda_t}^f$, the observation matrix \mathbf{H}_{λ_t} and the inflation parameter observation error \mathbf{R}_{λ_t} can be obtained from the state covariance matrix \mathbf{P}_t^f , the observation matrix \mathbf{H} and the observation error covariance matrix \mathbf{R} of the augmented state vector \mathbf{S} by:

$$(\mathbf{P}_{\lambda_t}^f)_{ij} = \sigma_{\lambda}^2 |(\mathbf{P}_t^f)_{ij}| [(\mathbf{P}_t^f)_{ii} (\mathbf{P}_t^f)_{jj}]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (18)$$

$$(\mathbf{H}_{\lambda_t})_{ij} = [2[(\lambda_t^f)_j]^{\frac{1}{2}} (h_{\lambda_t}(\lambda_t^f))_i]^{-1} \sum_m (\mathbf{H})_{ij} (\mathbf{H})_{im} (\mathbf{P}_t^f)_{jm} [(\lambda_t^f)_m]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (19)$$

$$(\mathbf{R}_{\lambda_t})_{ij} = |(\mathbf{R})_{ij} + (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_t^{inf,f} \mathbf{H}^T)_{ij}| \quad (20)$$




Fig. 1 A flowchart of Bauser's method to update the inflation factors, λ_t^a .

where σ_λ stands for the uncertainty about the inflation factor, which, in this case, is set to one, the same value used by Bauser et al. (2018), $\mathbf{P}_t^{inf,f}$ stands for the inflated forecast error covariance matrix, which is given by:

$$\mathbf{P}_t^{inf,f} = (\sqrt{\lambda_t^f} \sqrt{\lambda_t^f}^T) \cdot \mathbf{P}_t^f \quad (21)$$

A workflow summarizing how to apply Bauser's inflation method is shown in Fig. 1.

Finally, the updated augmented state vector is computed as:

$$S_{i,t}^a = S_{i,t}^{inf,f} + \mathbf{P}_t^{inf,f} \mathbf{H}^T [\mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_t^{inf,f} \mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R}_t]^{-1} [y_t^{obs} + \varepsilon - \mathbf{H} S_{i,t}^{inf,f}] \quad (22)$$

3 Sandbox Experiment

A contaminant experiment was carried out in a sandbox with sodium fluorescein as the tracer. The size of the sandbox is 120 cm by 14 cm by 70 cm. Two reservoirs with constant water levels at 62.5 cm and 60.6 cm with respect to the bottom of the sandbox are set at the upstream and downstream boundaries, respectively. (Notice that the experiment was performed with the upstream boundary on the right side of the sandbox, and all figures are represented in this way.) These two tanks define prescribed head boundaries, the bottom of the sandbox is impermeable and the top boundary is the phreatic surface. Between the upstream and downstream tanks, the area filled with sand has a size of 95 cm by 10 cm by 70 cm, which, for the purpose of modeling, is discretized into 95 columns, 1 row, and 70 layers of equal-sized cells of 1 cm by 10 cm by 1 cm. The sandbox is filled with glass beads of two different diameters, 1 mm and 4 mm, according to a spatial arrangement generated using a truncated Gaussian simulation (Journel and Isaaks 1984) with the first quartile as the truncation threshold, resulting in a large-bead proportion of 0.25. The spatial distribution of the glass beads in the sandbox can also be seen in Fig. 2. An injector is located at column 86, layer 40, at the position identified with




Fig. 2 Sketch of the experimental device (view from the camera side inside the darkroom). H_u and H_d stand for the constant head boundaries, the dashed rectangle corresponds to the area captured by the camera in which concentrations will be monitored, the red triangle is the release location, and the small square around the red dot indicates the release suspect location during the identification process. Units are in cm. Pairs of numbers in parenthesis refer to row and column pairs in the numerical model.

a red dot in the figure. The whole sandbox was placed in a darkroom with a blue light source that was used to excite the injected fluorescein. Pictures of the plume, as it evolved in time, were taken and luminosity values were converted into concentration after a calibration procedure following Citarella et al. (2015).

The hydraulic properties of the beads (Table 1) had been characterized before with the same sandbox equipment (e.g., Cupola et al. 2015; Citarella et al. 2015). The hydraulic conductivity of the large beads was estimated as 10.4 cm/s, and that of the small beads as 0.65 cm/s. The porosity is constant, independent of the bead size, and equal to 0.37. The longitudinal dispersivity within the large beads was estimated as 0.25 cm, and within the small beads as 0.106 cm. The ratio of transverse to longitudinal dispersivity is constant and equal to 0.45.

Although after processing the pictures the spatial distribution of concentration is fully known within the entire central area of the sandbox (dashed rectangle in Fig. 2), in order to mimic a potential sampling campaign in the field, only the concentrations observed at the twenty nine dots identified as observation points in the figure will be used for the purpose of identifying both the hydraulic conductivity and the contaminant source parameters. The

Table 1 Parameters used in the groundwater flow and transport models

Hydr. conduct., K 4 mm beads	10.4 cm/s
Hydr. conduct., K 1 mm beads	0.65 cm/s
Porosity, ϕ	0.37
Long. disp., α_L 4 mm beads	0.2 cm
Long. disp., α_L 1 mm beads	0.106 cm
TRVT, α_T/α_L	0.45

release lasted 1200 s, the fluorescein concentration was 20 mg/l and the injection rate 2.60 cm³/s. Observations were taken until after 3000 s from the beginning of the injection, every 30 s for a total of 100 observations at each observation point.

4 Definition of Scenarios and Ensemble Initialization

On a first attempt to apply the rNS-EnKF directly with the observed sandbox concentrations, some difficulties were found mostly related with the filter collapsing. These difficulties lead to perform a synthetic experiment prior to the application to the real data to analyze the impact of the number of ensemble realizations and the use of different approaches to prevent the filter to collapse. For this purpose, a reference set of synthetic concentrations was generated by solving, numerically, the flow and transport equations in a field with the same spatial distribution of conductivities as the sandbox, the same boundary conditions, and the same solute injection pulse. Then, 6 scenarios ($S1 - S6$) were analyzed with different ensemble sizes and different damping and inflation methods, more precisely, two ensemble sizes were tested (500 and 1000), two values for the damping coefficient (damping with a factor of 0.1 and with a factor of 0.5) and two covariance inflation methods (Wang's method and Bauser's method). After the analysis of the results using the synthetic reference, the conclusions was reached, as discussed below, that Bauer's inflation method was the best method to prevent filter collapse, thus two additional scenarios ($R1 - R2$) were run using the experimental data to test Bauer's inflation approach. The combination of ensemble sizes and inflation methods for the different scenarios is shown in Table 2.

The initial ensembles of log-conductivity realizations are the same for all scenarios (for the scenarios of 500 realizations only the first 500 of a total of 1000 realizations are retained). They are generated using a Gaussian random function with a mean equal to the weighted mean of the bead log-conductivities, 1.07 ln cm/s, and a variance equal to the variance of a binary Gaussian mixture of two facies with the means and proportions of the sandbox and an internal variance of one within each facies, i.e., 1.55 (ln cm/s)². The correlation range of the log-conductivities is isotropic and equal to 15 cm. Previous studies (Xu et al. 2013), in which no conditioning conductivity values had been used —as in this case—, have shown that the initial ensemble

Table 2 Definition of scenarios

Scenario	Inflation method	Ensemble size
Synthetic		
S1	no inflation	500
S2	no inflation	1000
S3	damping factor=0.1	500
S4	damping factor=0.5	500
S5	Wang's method	500
S6	Bauser's method	500
Experimental		
R1	no inflation	1000
R2	Bauser's method	500

Table 3 Suspect ranges of source parameters for the generation of the initial ensemble of realizations and their true values

Parameter	Actual Value	Suspect Range
X_s - x -coordinate of source (cm)	86	78 – 87
Z_s - z -coordinate of source (cm)	40	38 – 47
Ir (cm^3/s) - injection rate	2.60	2 – 3
Ic (mg/l) - injection concentration	20	5 – 25
Te (s) - final release time	1200	1050 – 1250

of log-conductivities is not as important as a sufficient number of observations of the state of the aquifer.

Similarly, the initial ensembles of source locations and pulses are the same for all scenarios. They are generated within suspect ranges that are defined using uniform distributions. The suspect source location (X_s, Z_s), in cm, ranges in $U[78, 86] \times U[38, 47]$ (see Fig. 2), the suspect injection rate ranges in $U[2, 3] \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$, the suspect injection concentration ranges in $U[5, 25] \text{ mg/l}$ and the suspect final release time ranges in $U[1050, 1250] \text{ s}$ (see Table 3). These parameters are generated independently among them and of the log-conductivities. These ranges are used exclusively for the generation of the initial ensembles; afterwards, the updated parameter values are not restricted by any bounds.

5 Performance Evaluation

The rNS-EnKF is applied to each scenario assimilating the observed concentrations at the points indicated in Fig. 2 at each time step. No log-conductivity or piezometric head data are observed at any time. After assimilating the con-

centration data at the end of each time step, the filter provides an ensemble of updated parameters, which are analyzed in different ways:

1. Computing the ensemble mean and variance of the contaminant source parameters at the end of each time step. The ensemble mean can be interpreted as a parameter estimate and the variance as a measure of the estimation uncertainty,
2. Visually analyzing the spatial variability of the cell ensemble mean and ensemble variance of log-conductivities with respect to the reference log-conductivity spatial distribution,
3. Computing the root mean-squared error (RMSE), the ensemble spread (ES), and the ratio RMSE/SE of log-conductivities as given by

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\ln K_i^{ref} - \overline{\ln K_i})^2}, \quad (23)$$

$$\text{ES} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_{\ln K_i}^2}, \quad (24)$$

with n being the number of cells over which the averages are computed, $\ln K_i^{ref}$ is the reference log-conductivity value at cell i , $\overline{\ln K_i}$ is the average of the ensemble of log-conductivity realizations at cell i , and $\sigma_{\ln K_i}^2$ is the variance. The RMSE measures how accurate is the ensemble average as an estimate of the reference field, and the ES measures the uncertainty associated with such an estimate. The ratio RMSE/ES is a measure of filter inbreeding, which may cause the filter to collapse, and should, ideally, be close to one (e.g., Liang et al. 2011; Xu et al. 2013).

6 Results

As mentioned above, two analyses have been performed, a preliminary one using synthetic data to decide on the number of realizations and on a method to prevent filter collapse, followed by a specific analysis of the data collected at the sandbox experiment.

6.1 Analysis of the Synthetic Data

The synthetic analysis is performed on six scenarios with combinations between two numbers of realizations and five alternatives to prevent filter collapse as given in Table 2. Recall that the reference for the synthetic case comes from a numerical simulation of flow and transport with the same characteristics as the sandbox experiment.

Figs. 3 and 4 focus on the source parameters, they provide the ensemble mean and the ensemble variance, respectively, of all five source parameters,

after the update at each time step for all six scenarios. The ranges of the ensemble variances were very different for each parameter and for this reason the results are displayed after standardization by the ensemble variances of the initial ensembles. It is hard to argue which is the scenario that performs best. Scenario *S3*, the one with a damping factor of 0.1, can be discarded since it is the one that ends with the highest variances for most of the parameters. Scenario *S5*, the one with Wang’s inflation method, should also be discarded because it collapses the ensemble after a few time steps as shown by the rapid decrease of the ensemble variance to zero for almost all parameters. Scenario *S2*, with no inflation, but 1000 realizations –double than the rest of the scenarios– performs well in that it provides an estimate close to the true values and the variance decreases in time consistently and similarly to the rest of the scenarios. Scenario *S1*, with no inflation and 500 realizations shows some filter collapse, which does not happen as quickly as for *S5* but ends with similar magnitudes for the ensemble variances. Scenario *S4*, with a damping factor of 0.5, does a good job in the estimation of the source parameters, except for *Ic* but the final uncertainties are the largest after *S3* for most of the parameters. Finally, scenario *S6*, with Bauser’s inflation method, could be considered as the one with the best performance, since it provides very good estimates for all parameters, except for *Ir*, and it has low final uncertainties without filter collapse. All methods estimate the vertical position *Zs* of the release point lower in the sandbox than its real position, this behavior can be produced by local velocity variations induced by the proximity of the injection to the boundary between two cells with different glass bead diameters which are not resolved by the observations.

Fig. 5 shows the ensemble mean and Fig. 6 the ensemble variance of the initial $\ln K$ realizations and of the updated ones computed at the 90th time step for all synthetic scenarios. The ensemble mean and ensemble variance of the initial $\ln K$ are almost homogeneous and equal to their prior values since no conditional data of $\ln K$ is employed. After assimilating all concentration data during 90 time steps, the ensemble mean of the updated $\ln K$ conductivities can capture the main patterns of variability of the glass bead distribution with a substantial reduction of the ensemble variance in most of the sandbox. A comparison among the different scenarios shows that, again, *S3* performs worst, with the worst estimation of $\ln K$ and the largest estimation variances and *S5* shows filter collapse at most locations. Of the remaining scenarios, *S2* and *S6* give the best results, with *S2* being slightly better in $\ln K$ pattern estimation thanks to the larger number of ensemble members. For a more quantitative evaluation of the identification of $\ln K$, Fig. 7 shows how the three statistics RMSE, ES and RMSE/ES evolve in time as the data assimilation proceeds. The best performance would be for the lowest values of RMSE and ES and the closest-to-one RMSE/ES ratio. The two best scenarios are *S2* and *S6*, with *S6* having the RMSE/ES ratio closest to one.

Taking into consideration the performance of the rNS-EnKF for the different synthetic scenarios, the two scenarios that will be analyzed with the experimental data are the non-inflation method with 1000 realizations, referred




Fig. 3 Time evolution of the ensemble means of the updated contaminant source parameters for all the synthetic scenarios ($S1 - S6$)

to as $R1$, and the Bauser's inflation method with 500 realizations, referred to as $R2$.

6.2 Analysis of the Sandbox Data

The difficulties found on the first attempt to apply the rNS-EnKF to the sandbox data must be due to observation errors in the concentrations. According to earlier work (Chen et al. 2018), an underestimation of the observation error will force the filter to fit the concentrations too closely producing biased estimates of the parameters, and an overestimation of the observation error will allow too loose a fit producing estimates with large uncertainty. Since the same sandbox equipment as Cupola et al. (2015) and Chen et al. (2018) is used, the same observation error distribution with a mean of 0 mg/l and a standard deviation of 1 mg/l is retained for this analysis.

Figs. 8 and 9 show the evolution of the ensemble mean and the ensemble variance, respectively, of the contaminant source parameters for the two sandbox scenarios ($R1, R2$). Both approaches perform well with mean estimates




Fig. 4 Time evolution of ensemble variances of the updated contaminant source parameters for all synthetic scenarios ($S1 - S6$). Each variance plot has been standardized by the variance of the initial ensemble.

close to the true values and estimation variances that go down close to zero for all parameters. It seems that the injection concentration and the injection rate are more difficult to identify, they have the largest estimation error and the largest estimation variance; however, if the mass loading rate is computed, that is the product of the injection rate times the injection concentration, its mean and variance is similar to those of the other contaminant parameters. This result seems to indicate that there may be some indetermination in the identification of parameters Ic and Ir that disappears when the subject of identification is its product. Disregarding parameters Ic and Ir , it can be concluded that both scenarios perform equally and, therefore, that Bauser's inflation method can make up for the reduction from 1000 realizations to 500 realizations with similar performance.

Fig. 10 shows the ensemble mean and variance of $\ln K$ for scenarios $R1$ and $R2$ at the 90th time step. Fig. 11 shows the ensemble mean of the absolute differences between the reference and updated $\ln K$ maps at the 90th time step. Both scenarios capture the main patterns of variability of $\ln K$ and the ensemble variance is substantially reduced in the areas of low conductivity.




Fig. 5 Ensemble mean of the initial $\ln K$ realizations and the updated $\ln K$ realizations of all synthetic scenarios ($S1 - S6$) at the 90th time step

Comparing the two scenarios, variance reduction is larger for scenario $R2$ and the absolute deviations between reference and estimated conductivities are smaller for $R2$, implying again that Bauser's inflation method is a valuable approach to reduce ensemble size and achieve similar (or better) results as when a larger ensemble is used. Fig. 7 shows the evolution in time of the $\ln K$ RMSE, ES and RMSE/ES ratio for scenarios $R1$ and $R2$. Again, scenario $R2$ performs remarkably well as compared to scenario $R1$, with a similar RMSE, smaller ES and a ratio RMSE/ES not too far from one.

Fig. 13 shows the evolution of the contaminant plume in the sandbox at the 10th, 40th, 60th and 90th time steps. Figs. 14 and 15 show the ensemble mean of the contaminant plumes for scenarios $R1$ and $R2$, respectively, at the same time steps as in Fig. 13 computed with all the parameters updated at the 90th




Fig. 6 Ensemble variance of the initial $\ln K$ realizations and the updated $\ln K$ realizations of all synthetic scenarios ($S1 - S6$) at the 90th time step

time step. The comparison of the simulated plumes with the observed ones is very favorable, demonstrating that the estimated parameters are conditioned on the observed concentrations, and that they are capable of giving a good prediction of contaminant movement.

7 Discussion and Conclusions

Xu and Gómez-Hernández (2018) showed the capabilities of the the restart normal-score ensemble Kalman filter (rNS-EnKF) for the simultaneous identification of source parameters and hydraulic conductivities in synthetic aquifers. This work presents the first attempt to apply it to a non-synthetic exercise.




Fig. 7 Time evolution of $\ln K$ RMSE, ES and the ratio of RMSE to ES for all synthetic scenarios (S1 – S6)

An aquifer is mimicked by a laboratory sandbox in which geometry, initial and boundary conditions are known. The first finding was that it was not straightforward to apply the approach to the collected data; working under laboratory conditions does not preclude measurement and other errors, what prevented the filter to work properly on first attempts. The filter would collapse, even for large ensemble sizes, what led to an analysis of a synthetic case using solute concentrations generated by a numerical model, thus getting rid of model or measurement errors. In this synthetic exercise, six scenarios were compared showing the importance of a good selection of an approach to prevent filter collapse. Of the four alternative approaches, Bauser's covariance inflation method appeared as the most appropriate, allowing to reduce the ensemble size from 1000 members (without inflation) to 500 (with inflation) to yield similar results. In these synthetic scenarios, it could be observed also that the horizontal coordinate of the source was well identified, but that the vertical one was estimated a little bit downwards from the original position. The explanation must be due to the closeness of the source to a boundary between the large glass beads and the small ones. The synthetic results also showed that it is difficult to identify a binary conductivity field starting from a continuous distribution of log-conductivities, yet, the two main zones of high and low conductivities are well captured in the different scenarios, with the scenario having 1000 realizations performing best, followed by the scenario with 500 realizations and using Bauser's covariance inflation method.

The application of Bauser's inflation and 500 realization to the data observed in the sandbox was compared with a non-inflated filter and 1000 realizations, with comparable results. The identification of the source parameters is good in both cases, even for the vertical coordinate of the injection. A better

identification of the source vertical position in the sandbox than in the synthetic exercises could be explained by the larger measurement error variance used in the sandbox observations than in the synthetic scenarios. A larger measurement error gives the filter more flexibility to update the parameters to fit the observations while resulting in a larger variance on the ensemble of final parameters. It was also evident that the estimation of both injection rate and injection concentration were biased; a further analysis showed that there is a degree of indetermination in the estimation of these two parameters since the parameter that really matters is their product, the mass loading rate. The mass loading rate is well estimated with no bias and little uncertainty. As in the synthetic case, the estimation of a binary conductivity field by a continuous one is almost impossible, but the final ensemble of log-conductivities displays enough spatial heterogeneity to distinguish two main areas of high and low conductivities, and, more importantly, the solution of the mass transport equation in the final conductivity fields yields a contaminant plume that moves in space and time in a very similar pattern as the one observed in the sandbox.

It is important to notice that, in the sandbox experiment, the only available data was concentration data; no observations of either conductivities or piezometric heads were available. In a practical case, both conductivity and piezometric head data could also be assimilated resulting in an improved estimation of all parameters being identified.

In conclusion, the rNS-EnKF has been demonstrated to work for the joint identification of a contaminant source and conductivities beyond the synthetic exercises where it had been tested previously. The demonstration is still far from field conditions, where boundary and initial conditions, forcing terms or geometry are not necessarily known, but the sandbox exercise included a binary heterogeneous conductivity spatial distribution, which is always difficult to identify. Further work should focus on the application of the rNS-EnKF to a field case.

Acknowledgements Financial support to carry out this work was received from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness through project CGL2014-59841-P, and from the Spanish Ministry of Education through project PRX17/00150. Teng Xu also acknowledges the financial support from the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (B200201015). And the authors would like to thank Università degli Studi di Parma for providing the experimental equipment. Part of the work was performed during a stay of the third author at the University of Parma under the TeachinParma initiative, co-funded by Fondazione Cariparma and University of Parma.

References

- Amirabdollahian M, Datta B (2014) Identification of pollutant source characteristics under uncertainty in contaminated water resources systems using adaptive simulated annealing and fuzzy logic. *International Journal of GEOMATE* 6(1):757–762, URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84905716722-1&partnerID=40&md5=91129a0e4f770564d31f687722e3a100>

- Anderson JL (2007) An adaptive covariance inflation error correction algorithm for ensemble filters. *Tellus, Series A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography* 59(2):210–224, DOI 10.1111/j.1600-0870.2006.00216.x
- Aral MM, Guan J, Maslia ML (2001) Identification of Contaminant Source Location and Release History in Aquifers. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* 6(3):225–234, DOI 10.1061/(ASCE)1084-0699(2001)6:3(225)
- Atmadja J, Bagtzoglou AC (2001) State of the Art Report on Mathematical Methods for Groundwater Pollution Source Identification. *Environmental Forensics* 2(3):205–214, DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/enfo.2001.0055>, URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1527592201900552>
- Ayvaz MT (2016) A hybrid simulation-optimization approach for solving the areal groundwater pollution source identification problems. *Journal of Hydrology* 538:161–176, DOI 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.04.008, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.04.008>
- Bagtzoglou AC, Atmadja J (2005) Mathematical Methods for Hydrologic Inversion: The Case of Pollution Source Identification. *Water Pollution* 5:65–96, DOI 10.1007/b11442, URL <http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/b11442>
- Bagtzoglou AC, Dougherty DE, Tompson AFB (1992) Application of particle methods to reliable identification of groundwater pollution sources. *Water Resources Management* 6(1):15–23, DOI 10.1007/BF00872184
- Bauser HH, Berg D, Klein O, Roth K (2018) Inflation method for ensemble Kalman filter in soil hydrology. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 22(9):4921–4934, DOI 10.5194/hess-22-4921-2018
- Bear J (1972) *Dynamics of Fluids in Porous Media*. American Elsevier
- Butera I, Tanda MG, Zanini A (2013) Simultaneous identification of the pollutant release history and the source location in groundwater by means of a geostatistical approach. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment* 27(5):1269–1280, DOI 10.1007/s00477-012-0662-1
- Camporese M, Cassiani G, Deiana R, Salandin P (2011) Assessment of local hydraulic properties from electrical resistivity tomography monitoring of a three-dimensional synthetic tracer test experiment. *Water Resources Research* 47(12):1–15, DOI 10.1029/2011WR010528
- Capilla JE, Rodrigo J, Gómez-Hernández JJ (1999) Simulation of non-gaussian transmissivity fields honoring piezometric data and integrating soft and secondary information. *Mathematical Geology* 31(7):907–927
- Chang H, Zhang D, Lu Z (2010) History matching of facies distribution with the EnKF and level set parameterization. *Journal of Computational Physics* 229(20):8011–8030, DOI 10.1016/j.jcp.2010.07.005, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2010.07.005>
- Chen Y, Zhang D (2006) Data assimilation for transient flow in geologic formations via ensemble Kalman filter. *Advances in Water Resources* 29(8):1107–1122, DOI 10.1016/j.advwatres.2005.09.007
- Chen Z, Gómez-Hernández JJ, Xu T, Zanini A (2018) Joint identification of contaminant source and aquifer geometry in a sandbox experiment with the restart ensemble kalman filter. *Journal of hydrology* 564:1074–1084
- Citarella D, Cupola F, Tanda MG, Zanini A (2015) Evaluation of dispersivity coefficients by means of a laboratory image analysis. *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology* 172:10–23, DOI 10.1016/j.jconhyd.2014.11.001, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2014.11.001>
- Crestani E, Camporese M, Baú D, Salandin P (2012) Ensemble Kalman filter versus ensemble smoother for assessing hydraulic conductivity via tracer test data assimilation. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions* 9(11):13083–13115, DOI 10.5194/hessd-9-13083-2012, URL <http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/9/13083/2012/>
- Cupola F, Tanda MG, Zanini A (2015) Laboratory sandbox validation of pollutant source location methods. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment* 29(1):169–182, DOI 10.1007/s00477-014-0869-4
- Datta B, Chakrabarty D, Dhar A (2009) Simultaneous identification of unknown groundwater pollution sources and estimation of aquifer parameters. *Journal of Hydrology* 376(1-2):48–57, DOI 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.07.014, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/>

- j.jhydro1.2009.07.014
- Evensen G (1994) Sequential data assimilation with a nonlinear quasi-geostrophic model using Monte Carlo methods to forecast error statistics. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 99(C5):10143, DOI 10.1029/94JC00572, URL <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/B9780702034251000532><http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/94JC00572>
- Feyen L, Gómez-Hernández J, Ribeiro Jr P, Beven KJ, De Smedt F (2003a) A bayesian approach to stochastic capture zone delineation incorporating tracer arrival times, conductivity measurements, and hydraulic head observations. *Water resources research* 39(5)
- Feyen L, Ribeiro Jr P, Gomez-Hernandez J, Beven KJ, De Smedt F (2003b) Bayesian methodology for stochastic capture zone delineation incorporating transmissivity measurements and hydraulic head observations. *Journal of hydrology* 271(1-4):156–170
- Franssen HH, Gómez-Hernández J (2002) 3d inverse modelling of groundwater flow at a fractured site using a stochastic continuum model with multiple statistical populations. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment* 16(2):155–174
- Gómez-Hernández JJ, Wen XH (1998) To be or not to be multi-Gaussian? A reflection on stochastic hydrogeology. *Advances in Water Resources* 21(1):47–61, DOI 10.1016/S0309-1708(96)00031-0
- Gorelick SM, Evans B, Remson I (1983) Identifying sources of groundwater pollution: An optimization approach. *Water Resources Research* 19(3):779–790, DOI 10.1029/WR019i003p00779
- Hendricks Franssen HJ, Kinzelbach W (2008) Real-time groundwater flow modeling with the Ensemble Kalman Filter: Joint estimation of states and parameters and the filter inbreeding problem. *Water Resources Research* 44(9):1–21, DOI 10.1029/2007WR006505
- Hendricks Franssen HJ, Kinzelbach W (2009) Ensemble kalman filtering versus sequential self-calibration for inverse modelling of dynamic groundwater flow systems. *Journal of Hydrology* 365(3-4):261–274
- Houtekamer PL, Mitchell HL (2001) A Sequential Ensemble Kalman Filter for Atmospheric Data Assimilation. DOI 10.1175/1520-0493(2001)129<0123:ASEKFF>2.0.CO;2, 0203058
- Journel A, Isaaks E (1984) Conditional indicator simulation: application to a saskatchewan uranium deposit. *Journal of the International Association for Mathematical Geology* 16(7):685–718
- Journel AG, Gomez-Hernandez JJ, et al. (1993) Stochastic imaging of the wilmington clastic sequence. *SPE formation Evaluation* 8(01):33–40
- Knudby C, Carrera J (2005) On the relationship between indicators of geostatistical, flow and transport connectivity. *Advances in Water Resources* 28(4):405–421, DOI 10.1016/j.advwatres.2004.09.001
- Koch J, Nowak W (2016) Identification of contaminant source architectures - A statistical inversion that emulates multiphase physics in a computationally practicable manner. *Water Resources Research* 52(2):1009–1025, DOI 10.1002/2015WR017894, 2014WR016527
- Li H, Kalnay E, Miyoshi T (2009) Simultaneous estimation of covariance inflation and observation errors within an ensemble Kalman filter. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 135(639):523–533, DOI 10.1002/qj.371, URL <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/qj.371>
- Li L, Zhou H, Gómez-Hernández JJ, Hendricks Franssen HJ (2012a) Jointly mapping hydraulic conductivity and porosity by assimilating concentration data via ensemble Kalman filter. *Journal of Hydrology* 428-429:152–169, DOI 10.1016/j.jhydro1.2012.01.037, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydro1.2012.01.037>
- Li L, Zhou H, Hendricks Franssen HJ, Gómez-Hernández JJ (2012b) Groundwater flow inverse modeling in non-MultiGaussian media: Performance assessment of the normal-score Ensemble Kalman Filter. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 16(2):573–590, DOI 10.5194/hess-16-573-2012
- Li L, Zhou H, Hendricks Franssen HJ, Gómez-Hernández JJ (2012c) Modeling transient groundwater flow by coupling ensemble kalman filtering and upscaling. *Water Resources Research* 48(1)
- Liang X, Zheng X, Zhang S, Wu G, Dai Y, Li Y (2011) Maximum likelihood estimation of inflation factors on error covariance matrices for ensemble kalman filter assimilation. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 138(662):263–273

- Liang X, Zheng X, Zhang S, Wu G, Dai Y, Li Y (2012) Maximum likelihood estimation of inflation factors on error covariance matrices for ensemble Kalman filter assimilation. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 138(662):263–273, DOI 10.1002/qj.912
- Mahar PS, Datta B (2000) Identification of Pollution Sources in Transient Groundwater Systems. *Water Resources Management* 14(3):209–227, DOI 10.1023/A:1026527901213, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1026527901213>
- McDonald JM, Harbaugh AW (1988) A modular three-dimensional finite-difference flow model. *Techniques of Water Resources Investigations of the US Geological Survey*, Book 6 p 586, DOI 10.1016/0022-1694(86)90106-X, URL <https://hwbdocuments.env.nm.gov/LosAlamosNationalLabs/General/14686.PDF>
- Michalak AM, Kitanidis PK (2004) Estimation of historical groundwater contaminant distribution using the adjoint state method applied to geostatistical inverse modeling. *Water Resources Research* 40(8), DOI 10.1029/2004WR003214
- Mirghani BY, Mahinthakumar KG, Tryby ME, Ranjithan RS, Zechman EM (2009) A parallel evolutionary strategy based simulation-optimization approach for solving groundwater source identification problems. *Advances in Water Resources* 32(9):1373–1385, DOI 10.1016/j.advwatres.2009.06.001, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2009.06.001>
- Neupauer RM, Wilson JL (1999) Adjoint method for obtaining backward-in-time location and travel time probabilities of a conservative groundwater contaminant. *Water Resources Research* 35(11):3389–3398, DOI 10.1029/1999WR900190
- Sun AY, Painter SL, Wittmeyer GW (2006) A constrained robust least squares approach for contaminant release history identification. *Water Resources Research* 42(4):1–13, DOI 10.1029/2005WR004312
- Sun AY, Morris AP, Mohanty S (2009) Sequential updating of multimodal hydrogeologic parameter fields using localization and clustering techniques. *Water Resources Research* 45(7):1–15, DOI 10.1029/2008WR007443
- Wagner BJ (1992) Simultaneous parameter estimation and contaminant source characterization for coupled groundwater flow and contaminant transport modelling. *Journal of Hydrology* 135(1-4):275–303, DOI 10.1016/0022-1694(92)90092-A
- Wang X, Bishop CH (2003) A Comparison of Breeding and Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter Ensemble Forecast Schemes. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 60(9):1140–1158, DOI 10.1175/1520-0469(2003)060<1140:ACOBAE>2.0.CO;2
- Woodbury AD, Urych TJ (1996) Minimum relative entropy inversion: Theory and application to recovering the release history of a groundwater contaminant. *Water Resources Research* 32(9):2671–2681
- Xu T, Gómez-Hernández JJ (2016) Joint identification of contaminant source location, initial release time, and initial solute concentration in an aquifer via ensemble Kalman filtering. *Water Resources Research* DOI 10.1002/2014WR016618. Received
- Xu T, Gómez-Hernández JJ (2018) Simultaneous identification of a contaminant source and hydraulic conductivity via the restart normal-score ensemble Kalman filter. *Advances in Water Resources* 112(July 2017):106–123, DOI 10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.12.011, URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.12.011>
- Xu T, Gómez-Hernández JJ, Zhou H, Li L (2013) The power of transient piezometric head data in inverse modeling: An application of the localized normal-score EnKF with covariance inflation in a heterogeneous bimodal hydraulic conductivity field. *Advances in Water Resources* 54:100–118, DOI 10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.01.006, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.01.006>
- Yeh HD, Chang TH, Lin YC (2007) Groundwater contaminant source identification by a hybrid heuristic approach. *Water Resources Research* 43(9):1–16, DOI 10.1029/2005WR004731
- Zheng C, Wang PP (1999) MT3DMS: A Modular Three-Dimensional Multispecies Transport Model (December):219
- Zheng X (2009) An adaptive estimation of forecast error covariance parameters for Kalman filtering data assimilation. *Advances in Atmospheric Sciences* 26(1):154–160, DOI 10.1007/s00376-009-0154-5

- Zhou H, Gómez-Hernández JJ, Hendricks Franssen HJ, Li L (2011) An approach to handling non-Gaussianity of parameters and state variables in ensemble Kalman filtering. *Advances in Water Resources* 34(7):844–864, DOI 10.1016/j.advwatres.2011.04.014, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2011.04.014>
- Zhou H, Gómez-Hernández JJ, Li L (2012a) A pattern-search-based inverse method. *Water Resources Research* 48(3)
- Zhou H, Li L, Franssen HJH, Gómez-Hernández JJ (2012b) Pattern recognition in a bimodal aquifer using the normal-score ensemble kalman filter. *Mathematical Geosciences* 44(2):169–185
- Zhou H, Gómez-Hernández JJ, Li L (2014) Inverse methods in hydrogeology: Evolution and recent trends. *Advances in Water Resources* 63:22–37, DOI 10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.10.014, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.10.014>
- Zinn B, Harvey CF (2003) When good statistical models of aquifer heterogeneity go bad: A comparison of flow, dispersion, and mass transfer in connected and multivariate Gaussian hydraulic conductivity fields. *Water Resources Research* 39(3):137–147, DOI 10.1029/2001WR001146, URL <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2001WR001146>




Fig. 8 Time evolution of the ensemble means of the updated contaminant source parameters for the two sandbox scenario ($R1, R2$). Also shown the mass loading rate $Ic \cdot Ir$.




Fig. 9 Time evolution of the ensemble variances of the updated contaminant source parameters for the two sandbox scenario ($R1$, $R2$). Also shown the mass loading rate $I_c \cdot I_r$. Notice that each ensemble variance has been normalized by their values at time zero.




Fig. 10 Ensemble mean (top row) and ensemble variance (bottom row) of updated $\ln K$ of scenarios $R1$ and $R2$ at the 90th time step




Fig. 11 Ensemble mean of the absolute deviation between reference and updated $\ln K$ in scenarios $R1$ and $R2$ at the 90th time step




Fig. 12 Time evolution of $\ln K$ RMSE, ES and the ratio of RMSE to ES for scenarios $R1$ and $R2$




Fig. 13 Reference contaminant plume evolution at the 10th, 40th, 60th and 90th time steps in the sandbox. Red triangle denotes the real injector.




Fig. 14 Ensemble mean of contaminant plume evolution of scenario *R1* at the 10th, 40th, 60th and 90th time steps with all parameters updated after the 90th time step. Red triangle denotes the real injector.




Fig. 15 Ensemble mean of contaminant plume evolution of scenario *R2* at the 10th, 40th, 60th and 90th time steps with all parameters updated after the 90th time step. Red triangle denotes the real injector.