

1 Does drought alter hydrological functions in forest soils?

2 An infiltration experiment

3
4 **K. F. Gimbel¹, H. Puhlmann², M. Weiler¹**

5
6 [1]{ Hydrology, Faculty of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg,
7 Germany }

8 [2]{ Forest Research Institute Baden-Württemberg, Freiburg, Germany }

9 Correspondence to: K. F. Gimbel (katharina.gimbel@hydrology.uni-freiburg.de)

10 11 **Abstract**

12 Climate change is expected to impact the water cycle and severely affect precipitation patterns
13 across central Europe and in other parts of the world, leading to more frequent and severe
14 droughts. Usually when projecting drought impacts on hydrological systems, it is assumed
15 that system properties, like soil properties, remain stable and will not be affected by drought
16 events. To study if this assumption is appropriate, we address the effects of drought on the
17 infiltration behavior of forest soils using dye tracer experiments on six sites in three regions
18 across Germany, which were forced into drought conditions. The sites cover clayey, loamy
19 and sandy textured soils. In each region, we compared a deciduous and a coniferous forest
20 stand to address differences between the main tree species. The results of the dye tracer
21 experiments show clear evidence for changes in infiltration behavior at the sites. The
22 infiltration changed at the clayey plots from regular and homogeneous flow to fast
23 preferential flow. Similar behavior was observed at the loamy plots, where large areas in the
24 upper layers remained dry, displaying signs of strong water repellency. This was confirmed
25 by water drop penetration times (WDPT) tests, which revealed, in all except one plot,
26 moderate to severe water repellency. Water repellency was also accountable for the change of
27 regular infiltration to fingered flow in the sandy soils. The results of this study suggest that
28 the “drought-history” or generally the climatic conditions in the past of a soil are more
29 important than the actual antecedent soil moisture status regarding hydrophobicity and

1 infiltration behavior; and also, that drought effects on infiltration need to be considered in
2 hydrological models to obtain realistic predictions concerning water quality and quantity in
3 runoff and groundwater recharge.

4

5 **1 Introduction**

6 Soils moderate how water moves through the vadose zone and govern the percolation of water
7 to groundwater and stream flow. Soils not only store water for plant growth, function as a
8 habitat for different biota and as transition zone to groundwater, but are also important –
9 especially the top layers – for sorption and degradation of contaminants and (agri-)chemicals
10 (Hendrickx and Flury 2001). The efficiency of this important ecosystem service for
11 groundwater and surface water protection depends on the behavior of pollutants in the soil
12 and the hydrological transport processes (Keesstra et al. 2012). How fast water passes the
13 vadose zone depends on its hydraulic soil properties and distribution such as pore volume
14 distribution, soil aggregation, water repellency and rooting pattern.

15 Due to climate change and increasing human intervention, the global water cycle is expected
16 to change with probably increasing summer dryness and winter wetness in many regions
17 across the world including Western and Central Europe (IPCC 2012, Prudhomme et al. 2014).
18 In addition, droughts are expected to be more frequent and severe in the future (Prudhomme
19 et al. 2014, Seneviratne et al. 2006). Drought conditions can alter the hydrological functions
20 of soils, and soil structure is responding to drought by shrinkage and fracturing of soil
21 aggregates. These soil shrinkage cracks channel the infiltrating water and by that foster the
22 bypassing of the soil matrix (Hendrickx and Flury 2001, Ritsema et al. 1997) and therefore
23 alter the infiltration patterns in soil. Thus, the infiltration and redistribution of water within
24 the soil changes and hence also the proportion of water reaching the groundwater (Hendrickx
25 and Flury 2001).

26 Soils under drought conditions are prone to become water repellent, depending on soil
27 properties and organic matter content (DeBano 1981 and 2000). Due to modifications of the
28 three-dimensional distribution and dynamics of soil moisture, water repellency has far
29 reaching consequences for infiltration processes (Doerr and Ritsema 2006). Water repellency
30 hinders infiltration and thus either increases overland flow (Doerr and Ritsema 2006) or
31 redirects the water into preferential flow paths and creates instable wetting fronts (fingered
32 preferential flow; Ritsema et al. 1993 and 2000, Dekker and Ritsema 2000).

1 To assess the impacts of drought, rainfall exclusion experiments are valuable and often
2 applied tools (e.g. English et al. 2005, Phillips et al. 2009, Da Costa et al. 2010, Kopittke et al.
3 2014), in addition to elevated CO₂ concentrations (e.g. Dermody et al. 2007), and night-time
4 warming (e.g. Albert et al. 2011, Selsted et al. 2012). While many studies focus on single
5 aspects of drought effects like plant growth and seedling activity (Meijer et al., 2011; Wu and
6 Chen, 2013) or on particular ecosystems like grassland (Suttle and Thomson, 2007; Bütof 5 et
7 al., 2012) and heather ecosystems (Albert et al., 2011; Selsted et al., 2012), only few studies
8 focus on forest ecosystems or take a closer look at drought impacts on soils where often only
9 soil moisture is observed to change and no variations in other soil properties are monitored
10 (Ozolinčius et 34 al., 2009; Albert et al., 2011; Glaser et al., 2013).

11 To study drought effects, often extreme short-time events equivalent to droughts with
12 occurrence probabilities of up to 100 or even 1000 years have been introduced to the
13 examined soils (e.g. Glaser et al. 2013). By introducing these extreme events, the question of
14 transferability of the results to natural systems in respect to the expected behavior under
15 predicted future drought conditions arises. Therefore, this study employs a moderate rainfall
16 reduction equivalent to an annual drought with a 40-year return period, in accordance to
17 climate predictions, thereby avoiding tentativeness due to an overreaction to an unnatural
18 extreme drought (Gimbel et al. 2015).

19 To monitor changes in soil hydraulic properties, the changes in infiltration patterns in the soil
20 after two years of prolonged drought were observed in three regions across Germany.
21 Infiltration patterns were chosen because they reflect the integrated changes of soil
22 hydrological functions and directly show how water moves in the soil under altered
23 conditions. In this paper, we present results of several dye tracer infiltration experiments
24 before and after two years of prolonged artificial drought. The objectives of this study are:
25 first, to investigate whether droughts predicted by climate projections affect the infiltration
26 behavior of forest soils, and second, whether changes in infiltration patterns can be attributed
27 to changes in the hydrologic properties of the soils. Three hypotheses will be tested: (1)
28 Induced drought alters infiltration patterns due to changes in soil hydraulic properties; e.g.
29 soil water repellency and forming of shrinkage cracks, leading to preferential flow paths and
30 faster infiltration. (2) The main tree species have an effect on the magnitude of the observed
31 response. (3) The drought will increase water repellency depending on tree species and soil
32 properties.

1

2 **2 Material and Methods**

3 **2.1 Study sites**

4 To identify the influence of drought on infiltration patterns of forest soils, six plots in three
5 different regions across Germany were selected. The plots were located in Schwäbische Alb
6 (South-West Germany), Hainich-Dün (Central Germany) and Schorfheide-Chorin (North-East
7 Germany) (Figure 1). All plots are part of the Biodiversity Exploratories framework that
8 incorporates, in total, 150 sites on grassland and 150 sites in forest (for more information on
9 the Biodiversity Exploratories, refer to Fischer et al. 2010). In each of the Exploratories, two
10 forest plots were selected, which are – within each Exploratory – similar with respect to
11 topography and soil texture type (Figure 2) but differ in tree species composition. In each site,
12 one plot with a coniferous and one with a deciduous main tree species was selected. At the
13 Schwäbische Alb and Hainich-Dün sites, beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) and spruce (*Picea abies*)
14 were chosen, in Schorfheide-Chorin beech and pine (*Pinus sylvestris*).

15 The Schwäbische Alb soils are shallow (25 to 35 cm) Leptosols on Jurassic shell limestone
16 with a high stone content (Figure 2, top). The mean annual temperature at this site is 6.5° C
17 and the mean annual precipitation amounts to 940 mm. The underlying geology of the
18 Hainich-Dün is Triassic limestone. The soils at this site are loamy Stagnosols with depths
19 between 45 and 65 cm. At the Hainich-Dün site the mean annual temperature is 7.2° C and
20 the mean annual precipitation is 533 mm. The Schorfheide-Chorin plots are located in a
21 young glacial landscape where the dominant geological substrate is glacial till covered by
22 glacio-fluvial and aeolian sands. The soils at this site are deep, sandy Cambisols. At the
23 Schorfheide-Chorin site, mean annual temperature is 8.5° C and the mean annual precipitation
24 amounts to 589 mm. All climate data are taken from nearby stations of the German weather
25 service (DWD, years 1950–2010).

26 The experiments of this study are part of the interdisciplinary project ‘Global Change Effects
27 on Forest Understorey: Interactions between Drought and Land-use Intensity’ (Gimbel et al.
28 2015). The artificial imposed drought was created by a 10 m x 10 m roofed subplot, covered
29 with transparent panels. In addition, a control plot with the same technical equipment, but
30 without the roofing was installed. The distance between the roofed and the control plots range
31 between 15 m and 30 m. The control and roofed plots include a central adult overstorey tree,

1 which are similar in age, size, and canopy structure. To provide sufficient exchange with
2 ambient air (avoiding a 'greenhouse effect'), all four sides of the roof are open. To collect
3 water from the roof, rain gutters are mounted alongside the timber construction. The roof is
4 designed to reduce precipitation between 11 and 100 % - 11 % already intercepted by the
5 roofing construction and rain gutters itself. The incoming precipitation was reduced between
6 March and November to the level equivalent to an annual drought with a return period of 40
7 years. The resulting annual target precipitation inputs under the roofs were 700 mm (26 %
8 reduction) for Schwäbische Alb, 355 mm (33 % reduction) at the Hainich-Dün, and 395 mm
9 (27 % reduction) at the Schorfheide-Chorin site. For a more detailed description of the whole
10 experimental drought setting and of the study plots see Gimbel et al. (2015).

11 **2.2 Soil moisture measurements**

12 To observe the impact of reduced precipitation input on soil moisture, soil moisture probes
13 were installed on the drought and on the control subplots of every site. The probes (5TM and
14 5TE, Decagon Devices Inc.) were inserted in 5 cm, 15 cm and 30 cm depths in three
15 replicates on the plots at 2, 3, and 4 m distance from the central trees. The accuracy according
16 to the technical data sheets of the 5TE and 5TM probes is $\pm 15\%$ of the measured value for
17 the volumetric water content. The readings of every probe are logged at 15 min intervals. For
18 better comparability among the sites, the mean values of the three replicates of every depth
19 per control and drought plot were cumulated and normalized to the maximum cumulated
20 value of the control plot.

21 **2.3 Soil water repellency**

22 Hydrophobicity in soil was measured with the water drop penetration time (WDPT) test (e.g.,
23 Bisdom et al. 1993). This test determines how long water repellency persists on a porous
24 surface. The tests were performed immediately before the dye tracer experiments in 2013, in
25 the drought and control profiles of the deciduous plots and in the drought profiles of the
26 coniferous plots. For the WDPT tests, a water droplet is placed on a planar soil surface with a
27 pipette and the time is taken until the water drop is completely taken up by the soil. The
28 observation was stopped after exceeding a time of 3600 seconds. Depending on the profile
29 depths, WDPT tests were performed in several depths of the profile, covering the main soil
30 horization. In each depth, five sampling locations were used to traverse the profile, and the
31 tests were repeated three times per location, resulting in 15 WDPTs per depth (Figure 3b).

1 The mean and maximum values of the WDPT test were classified after Bisdom et al. (1993)
2 (Table 1).

3 **2.4 Dye tracer experiments**

4 The dye tracer experiments were conducted in August 2011 before installation of the roofs
5 and in August 2013 after two years of drought. For each experiment, an area of 80 x 120 cm
6 was prepared by cutting smaller vegetation (grasses, herbaceous plants, and small tree
7 offshoots), covering the surroundings with a thin plastic sheet, and dividing the area into three
8 sub-areas with a size of 80 x 40 cm each (Figure 3 a). The experimental area was kept shaded
9 and sheltered from rain in all weather conditions to minimize evaporation and uncontrolled
10 water input during the experiments. Brilliant Blue FCF was diluted in water of local origin to
11 a concentration of 4 g/l and was sprayed with a backpack nozzle sprayer for even distribution
12 (Bachmair et al, 2009). For an overall application amount of 20, 40 and 60 mm, each sub-area
13 was sprinkled with an intensity of 20 mm/h. The applied rainfall intensity of 20 mm/h reflects
14 a heavy rainfall event in all regions, therefore the sprinkling amounts simulate one, two, and
15 three hours of heavy rainfall. After sprinkling, the experimental area was covered with plastic
16 sheets to prevent evaporation and further water input through eventual rain.

17 The next day (after waiting at least 12 hours), three vertical soil profiles per sub-area were
18 prepared. Keeping a 10 cm buffer stripe at the beginning and between the individual sub-
19 areas, every sub-area was divided in three sections, spaced 10 cm from each other (Figure
20 3 a). To obtain the dye pattern, the surface of the excavated soil profiles was smoothed with a
21 spatula and loose particles were removed with a brush, avoiding smearing. Stones were left in
22 place and shaped into relief when needed. Roots were trimmed. Pictures were taken from each
23 profile with a standard digital compact camera with a resolution of 10 megapixels
24 (3648 x 2736 pixel). The single profiles were photographed with a ruler frame and a grey
25 scale under even illumination and different illumination settings (Weiler and Flühler, 2004).
26 The picture with the best image quality from each profile was used for further processing.

27 **2.5 Image processing and data analysis**

28 To objectively compare the flow pattern of the different profiles, we used the image analysis
29 procedure developed by Weiler and Flühler (2004). We provide a short description of the
30 process here, for more detailed information, refer to Weiler (2001) and Weiler and Flühler

1 (2004). The image processing consists of three main steps. In the first step, geometric
2 distortion of the image is corrected by establishing a relationship between the image pixel
3 location and the true location on the soil profile. During this step, the image is also scaled
4 such that, one pixel corresponds to a square of $1 \times 1 \text{ mm}^2$. In the second step, the spectral
5 composition changes in daylight are balanced to ensure inter-picture comparability. This is
6 done by a color adjustment of the image using the photographed grey scale. In the third step,
7 the images are classified into stained and unstained areas. Applying a semi-supervised
8 classification technique, a binary image of stained versus unstained areas is obtained. In
9 contrast to the work of Weiler and Flühler (2004), we did not use the information of different
10 dye tracer concentrations, due to the high heterogeneity of the background color. In this step,
11 objects like stones and vegetation are manually digitized, too. All calculations were done with
12 the programming language IDL (Interactive Data Language, Exelis Inc.).

13 **2.6 Dye pattern analysis**

14 To obtain objective measures to compare the dye patterns of the different profiles and sites,
15 we derived three depth related variables of the binary images: (1) volume density, (2) surface
16 density and (3) stained path width as basis for further delineation of flow processes. The
17 volume density (VD) is similar to the frequently used dye coverage. It is defined as stained
18 volume divided by the reference space and is originating from the methods of stereology,
19 which relates a three-dimensional parameter to two-dimensional measurements (Weibel
20 1979). Surface density (SD) is defined as surface area of an object divided by the volume of
21 the reference space. Surface density provides information on the size and number of features:
22 a high SD is caused by a large number of small objects, whereas a low SD indicates less but
23 larger objects (Weiler 2001). The stained path width (SPW) is derived by measuring the width
24 of every stained object at a certain depth. The SPW of every depth were classified into three
25 classes of $< 20 \text{ mm}$, $20 - 200 \text{ mm}$, and $> 200 \text{ mm}$ (Weiler and Flühler 2004). The sum of the
26 three SPW classes per depth corresponds to the VD of the regarding depth. Using the
27 frequency distribution of the SPW of every depth, the dye pattern can be related to distinct
28 flow processes. For example, macropore flow with low interaction can be identified by long
29 and narrow stains, whereas macropore flow with mixed interaction shows a broader
30 distribution of shapes (Weiler and Flühler 2004). The classification introduced by Weiler and
31 Flühler (2004) was used to distinguish five flow processes, depending on the proportion of
32 stains in each SPW class: two types of matrix flow ((1) homogeneous and (2) heterogeneous)

1 and three types of macropore flow ((3) low, (4) mixed and (5) high interaction with matrix),
2 where interaction is understood as the lateral water flow from macropores into the
3 surrounding soil matrix (Weiler and Naef 2003). To assess the differences in the VD values
4 between the treatments (pre-drought, control, drought), the Kruskal-Wallis test and the
5 Nemenyi post-hoc test were applied, using R (version 3.2.3, The R Foundation for
6 Statistical Computing, 2015) and the package “PMCMR” (version 4.1 by Thorsten Pohlert)
7 within. Differences between treatments were supposed significant, when p-values are ≤ 0.01 .

8

9 **3 Results**

10 **3.1 Soil moisture**

11 Figure 4 shows the normalized cumulated sums of the soil moisture measurements of the
12 control and the drought plots over the course of two years. All plots developed a soil moisture
13 deficit compared to the control plots in the upper 5 cm of the soil, as shown by the black line
14 below the 1:1 line. The water deficit is also transduced to the 15 cm and 30 cm depths in both
15 Schwäbische Alb plots and in the coniferous plot of Hainich-Dün, but is generally less
16 pronounced. The plots at the Schorfheide-Chorin site show no deficit (deciduous plot) or even
17 a small plus in soil moisture (coniferous plot) compared to the control plot. The sandy soils of
18 Schorfheide-Chorin are already very dry without drought treatment. The reverse moisture
19 effect might be caused by effects associated with the installation and placement of the probes
20 (e.g. preferential flow along probe cables, concentration of throughfall – although installations
21 were performed with great care), or root effects, for example hydraulic redistribution.
22 However, we did not find any signs for hydraulic redistribution in the data. The deciduous
23 plot of the Hainich-Dün site experienced major probe failures due to animal damage during
24 the summer month of 2012 and again in 2013. Therefore, only the data taken during the
25 winter month could be used for the comparison. For this reason, the data do not cover the
26 months with the highest expected soil moisture deficits.

27 **3.2 Soil water repellency**

28 Figure 5 shows the results of the WDPT test in 2013. All drought treated plots at all sites –
29 coniferous and deciduous – exhibit water repellency (WDPT data from control plot under
30 coniferous not available). All control plot soils are wettable (WDPT class 1) or feature at least

1 lower water repellency than the drought treated plots. The coniferous plots under drought of
2 Hainich-Dün and Schwäbische Alb showed higher WDPTs than the deciduous plots. This is
3 valid for both mean and maximum values. The Schorfheide-Chorin deciduous plot showed
4 higher water repellency than the coniferous plot. In all soil profiles, water repellency is
5 highest in the topsoil and diminishes at a depth of about 20 cm. However, in the Schorfheide-
6 Chorin deciduous plot, water repellency is present up to a depth of 50 – 60 cm. When present,
7 strong to severe water repellency is dominant in the measured drought treated plots. Only the
8 Hainich-Dün deciduous plot soil is classified as wettable in average and the Schorfheide-
9 Chorin coniferous plot as slightly water repellent. Highest values in mean and maximum
10 water repellency were found in the coniferous plots Hainich-Dün (mean 941 s; max 3600 s) in
11 about 10 – 15 cm depth and in the Schwäbische Alb (mean 990 s; max 2340 s) in the topsoil
12 (Figure 5).

13 **3.3 Dye tracer experiments and dye pattern analysis**

14 **3.3.1 Comparison between pre-drought pattern and control pattern**

15 Differences between pre-drought and control plots (without drought treatment) reflect
16 differences in soil structure, texture and moisture due to a distance of 20 - 40 m between the
17 drought and reference plot, but may also include time dependent changes of the soil
18 characteristics, which are independent from the drought treatment. To ensure validity of the
19 dye pattern analyses, it is necessary to assure comparability among the plots. To exclude time
20 dependent changes as reasons for differences in pre-drought and drought treated dye patterns,
21 the pre-drought pattern were checked against the pattern of the control plots. Figure 6
22 compares the pre-drought pattern and the control pattern of the deciduous plots. In addition,
23 Figure 7 provides boxplots of VD for different depths of the pre-drought and the control
24 profiles for direct comparison.

25 The Schwäbische Alb pre-drought plot (Figure 6, top left) shows high VD in the top 10 cm in
26 all profiles. The 40 mm and 60 mm sprinkling volume profiles show a high SPW in the top
27 5 to 10 cm. On the control plot (Figure 6, top right) also large areas of the profiles top 10 cm
28 are stained, but the VD and SPW are not as high as the pre-drought profiles. This is especially
29 evident in the VD boxplots of the upper 0 – 10 cm (Figure 7, top). All Schwäbische Alb
30 profiles have high stone contents, in some cases exceeding 50 % of the profile width (Figure
31 6). Below 10 cm depth, the control plot profiles are almost completely stained. This pattern is

1 similar to the pre-drought profiles. In general, the patterns of the control profiles are similar in
2 VD, SPW values, and distribution to the 20 mm pre-drought profile. The 60 mm control
3 profile is reflecting the high VD and SPW values in top layers, which are characteristic of the
4 40 mm and 60 mm pre-drought profiles.

5 The Hainich-Dün pre-drought profiles (Figure 6, center left) show low to medium SPW in all
6 depths. VD values are high in the top 5 cm in all profiles and between 10 cm to 30 cm in the
7 40 mm and 60 mm sprinkling amount profiles. The 20 mm profile displays only small VD
8 values below 10 cm depth. All profiles have a medium to high stone content (30 – 60 %)
9 below 30 cm depth. The control plot profiles (Figure 6, center right) are very similar in VD
10 and SPW to the pre-drought profile pattern, but with generally lower VD in the 60 mm
11 sprinkling amount profile (Figure 7, center right). Except for the 20 mm profile, which
12 displays no stones, the control plot profiles have a medium to high stone content below 25 cm
13 depth. In all profiles, large areas of the profile stayed unstained. However, although having a
14 low VD in top layer, the 60 mm control plot profile is not following the pronounced drop in
15 VD between 5 cm and 10 cm depths and the subsequent rise between 15 cm and 25 cm, which
16 is characteristic for all other profiles (pre-drought and control). These distinct differences are
17 apparent in the boxplots (Figure 7)

18 In the Schorfheide-Chorin pre-drought profiles (Figure 6, bottom left), high VD and SPW
19 values are present. The highest VD and SPW values can be found in the 60 mm sprinkling
20 amount profile. Below 10 cm depth, the 20 mm pre-drought profile displays only small to
21 medium SPW and – in comparison to the 40 mm and 60 mm profiles – small VD values. The
22 control plot profiles (Figure 6, bottom right), show in general high VD and SPW values, but
23 have lower values in the top 10 cm than the pre-drought profiles (Figure 6 bottom right and
24 Figure 7, bottom). This is more apparent in the 20 mm and 40 mm profiles (Figure 7). In the
25 pre-drought and control plot, infiltration reached down to depths over 70 cm and no stones are
26 present.

27 To summarize, the comparison between the pre-drought and control plots showed a broad
28 agreement. Differences, that need to be accounted for, are the lower VD in the profile top
29 layers, especially at the Schwäbische Alb and Schorfheide-Chorin site. These differences
30 might be due to spatial heterogeneities, e.g. slight differing in soil layer boundary depths,
31 given the distance between the control and the pre-drought plots (15 m to 30 m). In addition,
32 the initial conditions (soil moisture) were also slightly different possibly resulting in the

1 observed differences. Choosing 10 cm steps for statistical comparison of the VD may in
2 addition introduce differences, if soil layer boundary depths differ. Therefore, not only the
3 VD, but also the SPW and the determined flow processes need to be taken into account for
4 comparison. However, the pre-drought and drought experiment were performed in close
5 vicinity (1 m). In the Hainich-Dün, the drop and rise of VD in all profiles points to a soil layer
6 boundary effect on infiltration. This is not time dependent and present in both pre-drought and
7 control profiles, therefore the comparability between the pre-drought and drought pattern is
8 not affected.

9 **3.3.2 Comparison between pre-drought pattern and drought pattern**

10 As can be seen in Figure 8, all plots show marked differences between pre- and after-drought
11 infiltration patterns. The clayey and loamy sites (Schwäbische Alb and Hainich-Dün) develop
12 unstained (=unwetted) areas in the topsoil layers. This is more pronounced in the coniferous
13 plots, where unstained areas are already visible in the pre-drought infiltration pattern. Figure 9
14 compares VD in boxplot for different depths of the drought and pre-drought profiles including
15 the statistical significance.

16

17 *Schwäbische Alb coniferous plot*

18 At the Schwäbische Alb site, medium to low volume densities (VD) were found on the pre-
19 drought coniferous plot throughout the whole profile for the 20 mm and 40 mm sprinkling
20 depth and high VD for 60 mm sprinkling depth (Figure 8, top left). The drought 40 mm and
21 60 mm profiles are lower in VD in the top layers (0 – 10 cm), than the pre-drought profiles
22 (Figure 8 and 9, top left); the 40 mm profile is displaying even unstained areas (no VD). The
23 20 mm pre-drought profile is already very low in VD, therefore the differences to the after
24 drought profile is not distinct (Figure 8, top left). The drought coniferous plot shows a rise of
25 VD culminating around 20 cm depth (Figure 8, top) for all sprinkling amounts (20 mm,
26 40 mm and 60 mm). Below 20 cm depth, the 20 mm and 40 mm profiles show (Figure 9, top
27 left) higher VD in the after drought profiles than in the pre-drought profiles, whereas the
28 60 mm profile show the same extent of VD in the drought and in the pre-drought profile.

29 The stained path ways (SPW) of the Schwäbische Alb coniferous pre-drought profiles are
30 small to medium in the 20 mm and 40 mm profiles and high in the 60 mm profile (Figure 8,
31 top left). After drought, low to medium SPW are dominant in the 20 mm and 60 mm profiles;

1 high SPW values are occurring in the 40 mm profile below 20 cm. The flow processes
2 identified in this depth as matrix flow, are caused by local saturation due to low K_s (Figure 8,
3 top left). The dominating flow types in the pre-drought profiles are identified as macropore
4 flow, with low, mixed and high interaction depending on soil layer and infiltration volume.
5 Dominating flow types in the drought plot are macropore flow with low, medium and high
6 interaction.

7

8 *Schwäbische Alb deciduous plot*

9 The Schwäbische Alb deciduous plot shows in the 40 mm and 60 mm pre-drought profiles
10 high SPW and in all infiltrating volumes high VD in the top layer (0 – 10 cm; Figure 8 and
11 Figure 9, top right). Medium to high VD are maintained throughout the whole 40 mm and
12 60 mm profiles, and to lesser extend in the 20 mm profile. The drought profiles show lower
13 VD in the top 10 cm, compared to the pre-drought profiles (Figure 9, top right). Below 20 –
14 25 cm depths, the 20 cm and 40 cm drought profiles show higher VD than the pre-drought
15 profiles. However, the drought profiles are more similar in shape to the VD pattern of the
16 control than to the pre-drought profiles (Figure 6, top). Also, the stone contents in the three
17 pre-drought profiles are higher than in the drought profiles (Figure 8, top right).

18 The dominating flow types in the Schwäbische Alb deciduous pre-drought profiles are
19 identified as macropore flow with low, mixed, and high interaction, and as matrix flow,
20 depending on soil layer and infiltration volume (Figure 8, top right). The flow processes
21 identified in the top layers of the 40 mm and 60 mm pre-drought profiles as matrix flow are
22 caused by local saturation due to low K_s . The dominating flow types of the drought deciduous
23 profiles are identified as macropore flow with low, mixed, and high interaction (Figure 8, top
24 right).

25

26 *Hainich-Dün coniferous plot*

27 The Hainich-Dün coniferous pre-drought profiles show low VD for all sprinkling amounts,
28 especially in the topsoil between 4 cm and 22 cm (Figure 8, center left). The 20 mm and
29 40 mm pre-drought profiles show unstained areas (no VD). The small VD values are even
30 more pronounced in the drought profiles (Figure 8 and Figure 9, center left), in which all
31 profiles exhibit unstained areas. Below the unstained layer, the VD rises to a maximum in 15

1 to 20 cm depth and drops again around 30 cm depth. The 20 mm and 60 mm drought profiles
2 show throughout all depths low VD (Figure 8, center left).

3 In all Hainich-Dün coniferous pre-drought profiles, no large SPW occur and flow types are
4 classified as macropore flow with low, mixed and high interaction. This applies also for the
5 20 mm and 60 mm drought profiles. In contrast, the 40 mm drought profile exhibits high SPW
6 between 15 cm and 25 cm depth. Therefore, the flow types in this depths are identified as
7 matrix flow (Figure 8, center left). The main flow types in the coniferous drought profiles are
8 macropore flow with low, mixed and high interaction. The pre-drought profiles are dominated
9 by macropore flow with low and mixed interaction. In both, pre-drought and drought profiles,
10 the stone content is comparable (Figure 8, center left).

11

12 *Hainich-Dün deciduous plot*

13 The Hainich-Dün deciduous drought profiles exhibit smaller VD in the top 5 cm compared to
14 the pre-drought profiles (Figure 8 and Figure 9, center right). Unstained areas are present in
15 the top 5 – 10 cm of the 20 mm drought profile. The 40 mm and 60 mm pre-drought profiles
16 show high VD values between 10 cm and 25 cm. High VD values are also present in the
17 drought profiles, maintaining high values throughout the whole profile. While no high SPW
18 values are found in the pre-drought profiles, high SPW values can be found in the 40 mm
19 drought profile between 10 cm and 30 cm and in the 60 mm drought profile between 10 cm
20 and 40 cm (Figure 8 and Figure 9, center right). The flow types of the deciduous pre-drought
21 profiles are classified as macropore flow with low, mixed, and high interaction. The drought
22 profiles are also classified as macropore flow with low, mixed, and high interaction and,
23 where high SPW values occur, as matrix flow (homogeneous and heterogeneous) (Figure 8,
24 center right). The stone contents of the pre-drought and drought profiles are increasing with
25 depth below 25 – 30 cm; the drought profiles are exhibiting a slightly higher stone content
26 than the pre-drought profiles (Figure 8).

27

28 *Schorfheide-Chorin coniferous plot*

29 The pre-drought pattern of the Schorfheide-Chorin site show high SPW and VD in the top
30 layers (0 - 10 cm depth) decreasing with depth (Figure 8, bottom left). While the 20 mm and
31 40 mm pre-drought profiles show a maximum infiltration depth of about 45 cm and 30 cm,

1 respectively, the 60 mm pre-drought profile is stained below 70 cm, exhibiting medium VD
2 values (Figure 8, bottom left). High SPW values are found in the 20 mm pre-drought profile
3 up to a depth of 15 cm and in the 40 mm and 60 mm profiles up to 10 cm and 30 cm,
4 respectively. The drought profiles of the coniferous plots show far lower VD values in the top
5 layers compared to the pre-drought profiles (Figure 8 and Figure 9, bottom left). The 40 mm
6 drought profile is exhibiting even an unstained layer in about 5 cm depth. High SPW values
7 can be found in the 40 mm and 60 mm drought profile, not in the top layers, but between
8 20 cm and 25 cm depth (40 mm profile), and between 10 cm and 25 cm depth (60 mm profile)
9 (Figure 8, bottom left). This is reflected in the flow type classification. Whereas matrix flow
10 is dominating the top layers in pre-drought profiles (at least the top 10 cm), matrix flow is
11 occurring below 10 cm depth in the 40 mm and 60 mm drought profiles (Figure 8, bottom
12 left).

13

14 *Schorfheide-Chorin deciduous plot*

15 The Schorfheide-Chorin deciduous pre-drought and drought patterns do not exhibit much
16 differences in shape and in VD values in the 20 mm and 40 mm profiles (Figure 8, bottom
17 right). The largest differences in VD can be found in the top 10 cm of the 20 mm profiles and
18 in the 60 mm profile (Figure 9, bottom right). In addition, the 20 mm drought profile exhibits
19 an unstained layer around 40 cm depth (Figure 8, bottom right). The difference between pre-
20 drought and drought is more evident in the SPW values: Whereas high SPW values are found
21 in the 40 mm and 60 mm pre-drought profiles in the top and bottom half of the profile, high
22 SPW values are found in the drought profile in the bottom half, plus a small layer of two
23 centimeter of high SPW around 10 cm depth in the 40 mm profile (Figure 8, bottom right). In
24 the Schorfheide-Chorin deciduous pre-drought profiles, flow types of the 40 mm and 60 mm
25 are dominated by matrix flow (Figure 8, bottom right). However, all profiles in the pre-
26 drought plots have, a proportion of macropore flow. In the drought profiles, matrix flow is
27 only occurring in bottom half of the 40 mm and 60 mm profiles.

28

29 To summarize, compared with pre-drought infiltration pattern, the drought pattern of all plots
30 reveal differences in infiltration processes. For example, over 90% of the depths ranges show
31 significant differences in VD between the drought and pre-drought site. Clayey and loamy
32 soils behave similarly, developing unwetted soil layers. High SPW values in 20 to 30 cm

1 depth of the drought pattern indicate local saturation. In sandy soils, the change from high
2 SPW values of the pre-drought pattern to medium and low in the drought pattern exhibit a
3 change from front-like to a more scattered infiltration. In general, the effects were more
4 pronounced at the coniferous plots. These findings correspond well with the results of the
5 WDPT tests: In the clayey and loamy soils (except Hainich-Dün deciduous plot), the
6 unstained topsoil layers are coinciding with the high WDPTs (Figure 5). Coniferous plot
7 Hainich-Dün stays unwetted up to a depth of about 15 to 20 cm and Schwäbische Alb plots to
8 a depth of about 10 cm, which is corresponding to the depths where the highest WDPT values
9 were observed (Hainich-Dün: WDPT class 4; Schwäbische Alb: WDPT classes 4 and 3,
10 respectively). In the sandy soils of the Schorfheide-Chorin profiles, low SPW values
11 correspond to high WDPTs (class 2 and 3). Below the water repellent zone, SPW values are
12 increasing again (Figure 5, bottom).

13

14 **4 Discussion**

15 **4.1 Infiltration patterns and influence of main tree species**

16 The comparison of pre-drought infiltration patterns of the drought plots with patterns of the
17 control plots (without drought treatment) showed broad agreements. All control plot profiles
18 are comparable to the pre-drought plot profiles, including differences that can be addressed to
19 small scale heterogeneities of soil properties. When interpreting the patterns, the differences
20 in VD in the top layers of all plots need to be taken into account. When doing this, at all sites,
21 the dye experiments before and during drought conditions can be directly compared.

22 In this study, it was hypothesized that the induced drought alters infiltration patterns due to
23 changes in soil hydraulic properties (e.g., soil water repellency and forming of shrinkage
24 cracks) and the main tree species is having an effect on the magnitude of the response. The
25 results of the infiltration experiment show a clear evidence for changes in infiltration pattern
26 as well as the importance of tree species on infiltration pattern: Schwäbische Alb plots have
27 clayey soils with a high stone content, and show, in pre-drought and control plots, a slow and
28 even infiltration. The drought-treated plots developed large areas with small volume densities
29 and SPWs in the topsoil, while for deeper layers, broad stains (large SPW) were observed
30 which cover the profiles for the most part (high VD). This is typical for preferential flow that
31 follows the shrinkage cracks of clayey soils or biopores of roots or soil fauna (Dekker and

1 Ritsema 2000, Hendrickx and Flury 2001, Hardie et al. 2011). Water infiltrates quickly to
2 deeper layers, bypassing a large proportion of the soil matrix. In deeper soil layers where the
3 cracks or biopores end, local saturation occurs, and lateral redistribution into the soil matrix
4 due to the now lower infiltration capacity and velocity can be observed. This also explains the
5 similar pattern in the loamy Hainich-Dün soils.

6 A trend to more preferential flow was also observed in the Hainich-Dün plots, where the
7 dense and loamy soils are also prone to shrinkage. Furthermore, in the Hainich-Dün drought
8 profiles unstained (i.e., unwetted) areas in the topsoil layers were observed. This is more
9 pronounced in the coniferous plot, where unstained areas were already visible in the pre-
10 drought experiment. Preferential flow does not only originate from cracks and biopores, but
11 also from textural boundaries and instable wetting fronts (Doerr and Ritsema. 2006, Hendrickx
12 and Flury 2001). Unstable wetting fronts can occur due to air entrapment or hydrophobicity,
13 which effectively hinders infiltration and redirects the water to structural and textural
14 preferential flow paths (Doerr and Ritsema 2006). The unwetted topsoil layers of the Hainich-
15 Dün coniferous plots can be explained by the combination of severe water repellency and
16 shrinkage cracks acting as effective bypasses.

17 In contrast to the other sites, Schorfheide-Chorin soils are sandy and highly permeable with
18 low stone content. In both Schorfheide-Chorin plots, the infiltration patterns changed from a
19 regular front-like stable infiltration to unstable, more scattered and fingered infiltration
20 patterns. Following the conceptualization of unstable flow in water repellent soils by Ritsema
21 et al. (1993, 2000), water flows, after entering the soil, through preferential pathways through
22 the water repellent layer and distributes laterally in the divergence layer underneath. In fact,
23 such flow patterns were pronounced in the Schorfheide-Chorin deciduous drought plot:
24 medium VD and SPW up to a depth of 50 - 60 cm and larger SPW in the layer beneath. This
25 fits with the results of the WDPT tests, which show a slight to strong water repellency in the
26 top 50 - 60 cm of the profile.

27 In general, drought induced major changes on the infiltration behavior of the examined soils.
28 Clayey and loamy soils developed preferential flow. In these soils, the bypassing of the top
29 10 cm – 20 cm is fostered by water repellency, leading to unwetted topsoil layers. Sandy soils
30 developed fingered infiltration patterns, due to the forming of a water repellent layer. In all
31 three sites, the effects of the drought treatment were more pronounced in soils with coniferous
32 main tree species than with deciduous main tree species.

1

2 **4.2 Water repellency**

3 In this study, it was hypothesized that the artificial induced drought will increase soil water
4 repellency depending on the main tree species and soil properties. The highest water
5 repellency was found in the coniferous plots of Schwäbische Alb and Hainich-Dün. Soils
6 under coniferous trees often feature acidic soil conditions, which promote water repellency
7 (Orfánus et al. 2014). In a study by Orfánus et al. (2014) liming practices and associated rise
8 of pH-values significantly reduced water repellency of former pine forest soils. Jost et al.
9 (2004) explained the difference in recharge under a beech and a spruce forest stand, with the
10 higher hydrophobicity, and therefore the hindering of infiltration, combined with higher
11 surface runoff of the spruce stand. This is in contrast to the findings of Buczko et al. (2006),
12 who found the highest proportion of water repellent soils in pure beech stands compared to
13 pure pine and mixed stands on sandy soils. However, in our study the sandy Schorfheide-
14 Chorin plots showed higher mean WDPTs in the deciduous (beech) plot, than on the
15 coniferous (pine) plot.

16 The soil texture can also influence the water repellency: A study of Gonzalez-Penalozza et al.
17 (2013) suggests that water repellency is related to soil particle size. They induced water
18 repellency by using different concentrations of stearic acid on samples of fine, medium, and
19 coarse sand. Water repellency was extreme in coarse textured samples. The authors explained
20 that by the lower specific surface compared to fine textured samples and therefore smaller
21 area that has to be covered by water repellent agents. We could not observe this effect in our
22 sandy soils. The coarser textured coniferous plot was less water repellent than the finer
23 textured deciduous Schorfheide-Chorin plot. However, water repellency can originate from a
24 broad range of factors. The degree of water repellency of a soil also depends on the amount
25 and type of organic matter that is incorporated in it (DeBano 1981, Bisdom et al. 1993,
26 Buczko et al. 2006, Vogelmann et al. 2013), the age and type of forest and litter type (Neris et
27 al. 2013).

28 Several studies detected a significant impact of spruce litter on infiltration processes, either by
29 hydrophobicity (Schume et al. 2004) or interception (Neris et al. 2013). Schume et al. (2004)
30 found that spruce litter can intercept up to 5 mm of precipitation and Neris et al. (2013) found
31 infiltration rates of 20 mm/h compared to that of 50mm/h of deciduous stands, doubling the

1 runoff of the sites. In this study, we did not record the interception of the litter layer, which
2 may have altered the total amount of water infiltrating into the soil. However, a natural litter
3 layer is always present and intercepts precipitation (e.g. Gerrits et al. 2010). By keeping the
4 natural litter layer in our experimental setup, our test results include the two influencing
5 factors of the systems natural response in the infiltration pattern: The redistribution of
6 incoming precipitation by the litter layer, leading to more spatial heterogeneous water input in
7 the soil, compared to a soil with removed or hydrophilic litter layer. The measured infiltration
8 pattern is a result of both factors, giving a more natural representation than a separate
9 observation of litter layer and soil response.

10 Furthermore, the plants of the forest understory can also influence hydrophobicity of the soil;
11 plants are covered with a cuticle composed of hydrophobic liquids, embedded in a polyester
12 matrix and wax crystalloids (Holloway 1994, Barthlott and Neinhuis 1997). Water repellent
13 plant coatings can be found in all plant life forms with a clear dominance in among herbs
14 (Neinhuis and Barthlott 1997, Dekker and Ritsema 2000). It is even discussed that
15 hydrophobic exudates might be a strategy for plants, microorganisms and fungi, to suppress
16 germination and growth of competing vegetation by reducing evaporation and nutrient
17 leaching (Doerr et al. 2007).

18 Hydrophobicity is dependent on the moisture status of the soil, which is defined by Doerr and
19 Thomas (2003) as critical moisture or transition zone. Vogelmann et al. (2013) found a
20 critical water threshold of 0.36 to 0.57 cm³ cm⁻³ beyond which hydrophobic soils become
21 hydrophilic, varying as a function of soil organic matter content. In contrast to the findings of
22 Doerr and Thomas (2003), we found very similar water contents in drought treated and
23 control soils, but very different hydrophobicity conditions. This indicates that the “drought-
24 history” or generally the climatic condition in the past of a soil is more important than the
25 actual antecedent soil moisture status regarding hydrophobicity and infiltration behavior.

26 In our rainfall exclusion experiment drought stress was not intense enough to induce mortality
27 or strong changes in above-ground biomass of a particular species (Gimbel et al. 2015).
28 Nevertheless, drought and water repellency may promote the die-off of fine roots, which
29 thereupon contribute to the total organic matter in the soil. The amount of soil organic matter
30 and its composition has a strong influence on the strength of water repellency (e.g.
31 Vogelmann et al. 2013, Bisdom et al. 1993, DeBano 1981). Therefore, the die-off of fine
32 roots may lead to a self-reinforcing circle of water repellency.

1 Soil organic matter can form micro- and macro-aggregates by acting as binding agent between
2 soil components (e.g. Tisdall and Oades 1982, Annabi et al. 2011) or by covering soil
3 particles (e.g., Vogelmann et al. 2013 a). Vogelmann et al. (2013 b) concluded in their study,
4 that water repellency leads to slower wetting of soil aggregates. Therefore, cohesive forces
5 hold up longer, which increases the resistance to disaggregation and thus, indirectly aiding in
6 maintaining soil structure. Terrestrial fungi are also in the focus of research concerning soil
7 water repellency and aggregation (e.g. Tisdall and Oades 1982, Rillig and Mummey 2006,
8 Chau et al. 2012). Zheng et al. (2014) found in three of nine species of ectomycorrhizal fungi
9 associated with *Pinus sylvestris* seedlings increased soil water repellency and in six of nine
10 species an increase of water stable aggregation. In our study, only the coniferous plot in
11 Schorfheide-Chorin has *Pinus sylvestris* as main tree species. In fact, the plot showed slight
12 (mean values) to strong (maximum values) water repellency in the top 20 cm. Nevertheless,
13 the WDPT values of the deciduous plot in this area indicated stronger water repellency (in
14 mean and maximum values).

15 All of our experimental plots showed clear response to the drought treatment, irrespective of
16 their soil type and vegetation cover. Especially the fast bypassing of the topsoil layer and the
17 developing of unstained and hence not wetted areas may bear consequences in the upcoming
18 climate change. Sorption and degradation of contaminants is strongest in the topsoil and
19 decrease with soil depth (Hendrickx and Flury 2001). Thus, bypassing of the topsoil soil
20 matrix foster early arrival times and high concentrations of contaminants in the groundwater,
21 which was shown by several tracer field studies (e.g. Hendrickx and Flury 2001, Ritsema et
22 al. 1997, Hardie et al. 2011). Once formed, dry zones persist further wetting and additional
23 water infiltrates through already existing preferential pathways, further stabilizing established
24 flow paths (Dekker and Ritsema 2000; Hagedorn and Bundt 2002). Under present climate
25 conditions, soil water repellency is already a widespread phenomenon (Buczko et al. 2006).
26 For the predicted climate conditions, where droughts will be more common, an even higher
27 level of hydrophobicity is to be expected, according to the findings of our rainfall reduction
28 experiments.

29

30 **5 Conclusions**

31 Two years of rainfall reduction equivalent to an annual drought with a 40 year return interval
32 was sufficient to change the soil properties and hence the infiltration pathways of six forest

1 soils independent of soil type and tree species. All drought treated soils, except one,
2 developed slight to severe water repellency. Main tree species had a particular effect on
3 hydrophobicity, but is only accounting for minor differences in infiltration pattern. The
4 “drought-history” or generally the climatic condition in the past had more effect on the
5 observed hydrophobicity and infiltration behavior than the actual antecedent soil moisture
6 conditions of the soils. The results of this study suggest that drought effects on infiltration
7 processes need to be considered in hydrological models to obtain realistic predictions
8 regarding water quality and quantity in runoff and groundwater recharge.

9

10 **Acknowledgements**

11 The authors thank Emil Blattmann, Delon Wagner and Lukas Neuhaus for their technical
12 assistance. Field support by Stefan Seeger, Frank Lehmann, Christoph Ries and Ruth Magh is
13 gratefully acknowledged. The work has been funded by the DFG Priority Program 1374
14 "Infrastructure-Biodiversity-Exploratories" (DFG-Refno. WE4598/3-1, GE1090/11-1, and
15 BR1698/16-1). We thank the managers of the three exploratories, Swen Renner, Sonja
16 Gockel, Andreas Hemp, Martin Gorke and Simone Pfeiffer for their work in maintaining the
17 plot and project infrastructure, and Markus Fischer, the late Elisabeth Kalko, Eduard
18 Linsenmair, Dominik Hessenmöller, Jens Nieschulze, Daniel Prati, Ingo Schöning, François
19 Buscot, Ernst-Detlef Schulze and Wolfgang W. Weisser for their role in setting up the
20 Biodiversity Exploratories project. Field work permits were issued by the responsible state
21 environmental offices of Baden-Württemberg, Thüringen, and Brandenburg (according to §
22 72 BbgNatSchG). The article processing charge was funded by the German Research
23 Foundation (DFG) and the Albert Ludwigs University Freiburg in the funding programme
24 Open Access Publishing.

25

1 **References**

- 2 Albert, K. R., Ro-Poulsen, H., Mikkelsen, T. N., Michelsen, A., van der Linden, L., and
3 Beier, C.: Effects of elevated CO₂, warming and drought episodes on plant carbon uptake in a
4 temperate heath ecosystem are controlled by soil water status, *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 34,
5 1207–1222, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2011.02320.x, 2011.
- 6 Annabi, M., Y. Le Bissonnais, M. Le Villio-Poitrenaud, and S. Houot. Improvement of soil
7 aggregate stability by repeated applications of organic amendments to a cultivated silty loam
8 soil. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 144(1):382–389.
9 doi:10.1016/j.agee.2011.07.005, 2011.
- 10 Bachmair, S., Weiler, M., and Nützmann, G.: Controls of land use and soil structure on water
11 movement: Lessons for pollutant transfer through the unsaturated zone, *Journal of Hydrology*,
12 369, 241–252, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.02.031, 2009.
- 13 Barthlott, W. and Neinhuis, C.: Purity of the sacred lotus, or escape from contamination in
14 biological surfaces, *Planta*, 202, 1–8, doi:10.1007/s004250050096, 1997
- 15 Bisdorf, E., Dekker, L. W., and Schoute, J.: Water repellency of sieve fractions from sandy
16 soils and relationships with organic material and soil structure, *Geoderma*, 56, 105–118,
17 doi:10.1016/0016-7061(93)90103-R, 1993.
- 18 Buczko, U., Bens, O., and Hüttel, R. F.: Water infiltration and hydrophobicity in forest soils of
19 a pine–beech transformation chronosequence, *Journal of Hydrology*, 331, 383–395,
20 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2006.05.023, 2006.
- 21 Bütof, A., von Riedmatten, Lars R., Dormann, C. F., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Welk, E., and
22 Brühlheide, H.: The responses of grassland plants to experimentally simulated climate change
23 depend on land use and region, *Glob Change Biol*, 18, 127–137, doi:10.1111/j.1365-
24 2486.2011.02539.x, 2012.
- 25 Chau, H.W., Y.K. Goh, V. Vujanovic, and B.C. Si: Wetting properties of fungi mycelium
26 alter soil infiltration and soil water repellency in a γ -sterilized wettable and repellent soil.
27 *Fungal Biology* 116(12):1212–1218. doi:10.1016/j.funbio.2012.10.004, 2012
- 28 da Costa, A. C. L., Galbraith, D., Almeida, S., Portela, Bruno Takeshi Tanaka, da Costa, M.,
29 de Athaydes Silva Junior, João, Braga, A. P., de Gonçalves, Paulo H. L., de Oliveira, Alex
30 AR, Fisher, R., Phillips, O. L., Metcalfe, D. B., Levy, P., and Meir, P.: Effect of 7 yr of

1 experimental drought on vegetation dynamics and biomass storage of an eastern Amazonian
2 rainforest, *New Phytologist*, 187, 579–591, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03309.x, 2010.

3 DeBano, L.F.: Water repellent soils: a state-of-the-art. USDA For. Serv. Gen.Tech. Rep.
4 PSW-46, pp. 21, 1981

5 DeBano, L. 2000. Water repellency in soils: a historical overview. *Journal of Hydrology* 231-
6 232:4–32. doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(00)00180-3.

7 Dekker, L. and Ritsema, C. J.: Wetting patterns and moisture variability in water repellent
8 Dutch soils, *Journal of Hydrology*, 231-232, 148–164, doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(00)00191-8,
9 2000.

10 Dermody, O., Weltzin, J. F., Engel, E. C., Allen, P., and Norby, R. J.: How do elevated
11 [CO₂], warming, and reduced precipitation interact to affect soil moisture and LAI in an old
12 field ecosystem?, *Plant Soil*, 301, 255–266, doi:10.1007/s11104-007-9443-x, 2007.

13 Doerr, S.H., Thomas, A.D., Soil moisture: a controlling factor in water repellency? In:
14 Ritsema, C.J., Dekker, L.W. (Eds.), *Soil Water Repellency: Occurrence, Consequences and*
15 *Amelioration*. Elsevier Science, pp. 137–149., 2003

16 Doerr, S. H. and Ritsema, C. J.: Water Movement in Hydrophobic Soils, in: *Encyclopedia of*
17 *Hydrological Sciences*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2006.

18 Doerr, S. H., Ritsema, C. J., Dekker, L. W., Scott, D. F., and Carter, D.: Water repellence of
19 soils: new insights and emerging research needs, *Hydrol. Process.*, 21, 2223–2228,
20 doi:10.1002/hyp.6762, 2007.

21 English, N.B., Weltzin, J.F., Fravolini, A., Thomas, L., and Williams, D.G.: The influence of
22 soil texture and vegetation on soil moisture under rainout shelters in a semi-desert grassland.
23 *Journal of arid environments*, 63(1), 324-343, doi:10.1016/j.jaridenv. 2005.03.013, 2005.

24 FAO, 2006. *Guidelines for Soil Description*, 4th edition. Food and Agriculture Organization
25 of the United Nations, Rome.

26 Federer, C. A., Vörösmarty, C., and Fekete, B.: Sensitivity of Annual Evaporation to Soil and
27 Root Properties in Two Models of Contrasting Complexity, *J. Hydrometeor*, 4, 1276–1290,
28 doi:10.1175/1525-7541(2003)004<1276:SOAETS>2.0.CO;2, 2003.

29 Fischer, Markus.; Bossdorf, O.; Gockel, S.; Hänsel, F.; Hemp, A.; Hessenmöller, D.; Korte,
30 G.; Nieschulze, J.; Pfeiffer, S.; Prati, D.R.S.; Schöning, I.; Schumacher, U.; Wells, K.;

1 Buscot, F.; Kalko, E.K.V.; Linsenmair, K.E.; Schulze, E.-D.; Weisser, W.W.: Implementing
2 large-scale and long-term functional biodiversity research: The Biodiversity Exploratories.
3 *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 11, 6, 473–485, doi:10.1016/j.baae.2010.07.009, 2010

4 Gerrits, A. M. J., L. Pfister, and Savenije, H. H. G. 2010. Spatial and temporal variability of
5 canopy and forest floor interception in a beech forest. *Hydrol. Process.* 24(21):3011–3025.
6 doi:10.1002/hyp.7712.

7 Gimbel, K. F.; Felsmann, K.; Baudis, M.; Puhmann, H.; Gessler, A.; Bruelheide, H.;
8 Kayler, Z.; Ellerbrock, R. H.; Ulrich, A.; Welk, E.; Weiler, M.: Drought in forest understory
9 ecosystems – a novel rainfall reduction experiment. *Biogeosciences*, 12, 961–975,
10 doi:10.5194/bg-12-961-2015, 2015

11 Glaser, B., Jentsch, A., Kreyling, J., and Beierkuhnlein, C.: Soil-moisture change caused by
12 experimental extreme summer drought is similar to natural inter-annual variation in a loamy
13 sand in Central Europe, *Z. Pflanzenernähr. Bodenk.*, 176, 27–34,
14 doi:10.1002/jpln.201200188, 2013.

15 González-Peñaloza, F. A., Zavala, L. M., Jordán, A., Bellinfante, N., Bárcenas-Moreno, G.,
16 Mataix-Solera, J., Granged, A. J., Granja-Martins, F. M., and Neto-Paixão, H. M.: Water
17 repellency as conditioned by particle size and drying in hydrophobized sand, *Geoderma*, 209-
18 210, 31–40, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2013.05.022, 2013.

19 Hagedorn, F., and M. Bundt. 2002. The age of preferential flow paths. *Geoderma* 108(1-
20 2):119–132. doi:10.1016/S0016-7061(02)00129-5

21 Hammel, K., Kennel, M., 2001. Charakterisierung und Analyse der Wasserverfügbarkeit und
22 des Wasserhaushalts von Waldstandorten in Bayern mit dem Simulationsmodell BROOK90,
23 *Forstliche Forschungsberichte München* 185.

24 Hardie, M. A., Cotching, W. E., Doyle, R. B., Holz, G., Lisson, S., and Mattern, K.: Effect of
25 antecedent soil moisture on preferential flow in a texture-contrast soil, *Journal of Hydrology*,
26 398, 191–201, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.12.008, 2011.

27 Hendrickx, J. M. H. and Flury, M.: Uniform and preferential flow mechanisms in the vadose
28 zone, *Conceptual models of flow and transport in the fractured vadose zone*, 149–187, 2001.

29 Holloway, P.J., 1994. Plant cuticles: physiochemical characteristics and biosynthesis. In:
30 Percy, K.E. (Ed.). *Air Pollution and the Leaf Cuticle*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 1–13.

1 Jost, G., Schume, H., and Hager, H.: Factors controlling soil water-recharge in a mixed
2 European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.)?Norway spruce [*Picea abies* (L.) Karst.] stand, *Eur J*
3 *Forest Res*, doi:10.1007/s10342-004-0033-7, 2004.

4 Keesstra, S. D., Geissen, V., Mosse, K., Piirainen, S., Scudiero, E., Leistra, M., and van
5 Schaik, L.: Soil as a filter for groundwater quality, *Current Opinion in Environmental*
6 *Sustainability*, 4, 507–516, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2012.10.007, 2012.

7 Kopittke, G. R., Tietema, A., Loon, E. E., and Asscheman, D.: Fourteen Annually Repeated
8 Droughts Suppressed Autotrophic Soil Respiration and Resulted in an Ecosystem Change,
9 *Ecosystems*, 17, 242–257, doi:10.1007/s10021-013-9720-x, 2014.

10 Meijer, S. S., Holmgren, M., and Van der Putten, W. H.: Effects of plant-soil feedback on tree
11 seedling growth under arid conditions, *Journal of Plant Ecology*, 4, 193–200,
12 doi:10.1093/jpe/rtr011, 2011.

13 Neinhuis, C. and Barthlott, W.: Characterization and Distribution of Water-repellent, Self-
14 cleaning Plant Surfaces, *Annals of Botany*, 79, 667–677, doi:10.1006/anbo.1997.0400, 1997.

15 Neris, J., Tejedor, M., Rodríguez, M., Fuentes, J., and Jiménez, C.: Effect of forest floor
16 characteristics on water repellency, infiltration, runoff and soil loss in Andisols of Tenerife
17 (Canary Islands, Spain), *CATENA*, 108, 50–57, doi:10.1016/j.catena.2012.04.011, 2013.

18 Orfánus, T., Dlapa, P., Fodor, N., Rajkai, K., Sándor, R., and Nováková, K.: How severe and
19 subcritical water repellency determines the seasonal infiltration in natural and cultivated
20 sandy soils, *Soil and Tillage Research*, 135, 49–59, doi:10.1016/j.still.2013.09.005, 2014.

21 Ozolinčius, R., Stakėnas, V., Varnagirytė-Kabašinskienė, I., and Buožytė, R.: Artificial
22 Drought in Scots Pine Stands: Effects on Soil, Ground Vegetation and Tree Condition,
23 *Annales Botanici Fennici*, 46, 299–307, doi:10.5735/085.046.0406, 2009.

24 Phillips, O. L., Aragao, L. E. O. C., Lewis, S. L., Fisher, J. B., Lloyd, J., Lopez-Gonzalez, G.,
25 Malhi, Y., Monteagudo, A., Peacock, J., Quesada, C. A., van der Heijden, G., Almeida, S.,
26 Amaral, I., Arroyo, L., Aymard, G., Baker, T. R., Banki, O., Blanc, L., Bonal, D., Brando, P.,
27 Chave, J., de Oliveira, A. C. A., Cardozo, N. D., Czimczik, C. I., Feldpausch, T. R., Freitas,
28 M. A., Gloor, E., Higuchi, N., Jimenez, E., Lloyd, G., Meir, P., Mendoza, C., Morel, A.,
29 Neill, D. A., Nepstad, D., Patino, S., Penuela, M. C., Prieto, A., Ramirez, F., Schwarz, M.,
30 Silva, J., Silveira, M., Thomas, A. S., Steege, H. T., Stropp, J., Vasquez, R., Zelazowski, P.,
31 Davila, E. A., Andelman, S., Andrade, A., Chao, K.-J., Erwin, T., Di Fiore, A., C., E. H.,

1 Keeling, H., Killeen, T. J., Laurance, W. F., Cruz, A. P., Pitman, N. C. A., Vargas, P. N.,
2 Ramirez-Angulo, H., Rudas, A., Salamao, R., Silva, N., Terborgh, J., and Torres-Lezama, A.:
3 Drought Sensitivity of the Amazon Rainforest, *Science*, 323, 1344–1347,
4 doi:10.1126/science.1164033, 2009.

5 Prudhomme, C., Giuntoli, I., Robinson, E. L., Clark, D. B., Arnell, N. W., Dankers, R.,
6 Fekete, B. M., Franssen, W., Gerten, D., Gosling, S. N., Hagemann, S., Hannah, D. M., Kim,
7 H., Masaki, Y., Satoh, Y., Stacke, T., Wada, Y., and Wisser, D.: Hydrological droughts in the
8 21st century, hotspots and uncertainties from a global multimodel ensemble experiment,
9 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111, 3262–3267,
10 doi:10.1073/pnas.1222473110, 2014.

11 Puhlmann H, von Wilpert K. Test und Entwicklung von Pedotransferfunktionen für
12 Wasserretention und hydraulische Leitfähigkeit von Waldböden. *Waldökol Landschaftsforsch*
13 *Naturschutz*. 12: 61–71.

14 Rillig, M. C. and Mummey, D. L.: Mycorrhizas and soil structure. *New Phytologist* 171,
15 41e53, 2006

16 Ritsema, C. J., Dekker, L. W., Hendrickx, J. M. H., and Hamminga, W.: Preferential flow
17 mechanism in a water repellent sandy soil, *Water Resour. Res.*, 29, 2183–2193,
18 doi:10.1029/93WR00394, 1993.

19 Ritsema, C. J., Dekker, L. W., van den Elsen, E. G. M., Oostindiel, K., Steenhuis, T. S., and
20 Nieber, J. L.: Recurring fingered flow pathways in a water repellent sandy field soil, *Hydrol.*
21 *Earth Syst. Sci.*, 1, 777–786, doi:10.5194/hess-1-777-1997, 1997.

22 Ritsema, C. and Dekker, L.: Preferential flow in water repellent sandy soils: principles and
23 modeling implications, *Journal of Hydrology*, 231-232, 308–319, doi:10.1016/S0022-
24 1694(00)00203-1, 2000.

25 Schume, H., Jost, G., and Hager, H.: Soil water depletion and recharge patterns in mixed and
26 pure forest stands of European beech and Norway spruce, *Journal of Hydrology*, 289, 258–
27 274, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.11.036, 2004.

28 Selsted, M. B., Linden, L., Ibrom, A., Michelsen, A., Larsen, K. S., Pedersen, J. K.,
29 Mikkelsen, T. N., Pilegaard, K., Beier, C., and Ambus, P.: Soil respiration is stimulated by
30 elevated CO₂ and reduced by summer drought: three years of measurements in a multifactor

1 ecosystem manipulation experiment in a temperate heathland (CLIMAITE), *Glob Change*
2 *Biol*, 18, 1216–1230, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02634.x, 2012.

3 Seneviratne, S.I., Luethi, D., Litschi, M., and Schaer, C.: Land-atmosphere coupling and
4 climate change in Europe, *Nature*, 443, 205-209, doi:10.1038/nature05095, 2006

5 Suttle, B. K. and Thomsen, M. A.: Climate change and grassland restoration in California:
6 Lessons from six years of rainfall manipulation in a North Coast grassland, *Madroño*, 54,
7 225–233, doi:10.3120/0024-9637(2007)54[225:CCAGRI]2.0.CO;2, 2007.

8 Tisdall, J. M. and Oades, J. M.: Organic matter and water-stable aggregates in soils. *Journal*
9 *of Soil Science* 33, 141e163, 1982

10 Vogelmann, E. S., Reichert, J. M., Prevedello, J., Consensa, C., Oliveira, A., Awe, G. O., and
11 Mataix-Solera, J.: Threshold water content beyond which hydrophobic soils become
12 hydrophilic: The role of soil texture and organic matter content, *Geoderma*, 209-210, 177–
13 187, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2013.06.019, 2013 a.

14 Vogelmann, E.S., J.M. Reichert, J. Prevedello, G.O. Awe, and J. Mataix-Solera.:Can
15 occurrence of soil hydrophobicity promote the increase of aggregates stability? *CATENA*
16 110:24–31. doi:10.1016/j.catena.2013.06.009, 2013 b.

17 Weibel, E. R.: In: *Stereological Methods. Practical Methods for Biological Morphometry*,
18 vol.1 Academia Press, London, 1979.

19 Weiler, M: *Mechanics Controlling Macropore flow during Infiltration – dye Tracer*
20 *Experiments and Simulations*. ETH, Zürich, Switzerland. 151 pp, 2001.

21 Weiler, M., Naef, F.: An experimental tracer study of the role of macropores in infiltration in
22 grassland soils. *Hydrological Processes* 17, 477–493, 2003

23 Weiler, M. and Flühler, H.: Inferring flow types from dye patterns in macroporous soils,
24 *Geoderma*, 120, 137–153, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2003.08.014, 2004.

25 World reference base for soil resources, 2006: A framework for international classification,
26 correlation and communication. 2006 ed. World soil resources reports 103. Food and
27 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

28 Wu, C. and Chen, J. M.: Diverse responses of vegetation production to interannual summer
29 drought in North America, *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and*
30 *Geoinformation*, 21, 1–6, doi:10.1016/j.jag.2012.08.001, 2013.


1 Zheng, W., E.K. Morris, and M.C. Rillig.: Ectomycorrhizal fungi in association with *Pinus*
2 *sylvestris* seedlings promote soil aggregation and soil water repellency. *Soil Biology and*
3 *Biochemistry* 78:326–331. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.07.015, 2014.
4

1 *Table 1: Classification of water repellency by WDPT time, after Bisdorn et al. (1993)*

WDPT in s	Classification	Class
< 5	wettable	1
5 – 60	slightly water repellent	2
60 – 600	strongly water repellent	3
600 – 3600	severely water repellent	4
> 3600	extremely water repellent	5


2

3



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6


Figure 1: Location of the study sites (red squares) within Germany (light blue); South-West: Schwäbische Alb; center: Hainich-Dün; North-East: Schorfheide-Chorin.



1
2
3
4
5
6

Figure 2: Soil horizons, texture, and rock fractions of the six experimental plots. Soil type classification according to the World reference base for soil (FAO 2006).

1




2

3 Figure 3: Scheme for profile excavation (a) and WDPT experiment (b). The 20 mm, 40 mm,
4 and 60 mm in (a) denote the applied sprinkling volumes. For the WDPT experiment (b), five
5 sampling locations (boxes) were used traversing the profile. On every sampling location, the
6 tests were repeated three times.

7

8

1




2

3 Figure 4: Normalized cumulated sums of soil moisture of the drought versus the control
4 subplots of the investigated soils. The computations begin with the start of the rainfall
5 reduction and end at the date of the dye tracer experiment 2013.

6

7




1

2


3 Figure 5: Mean and maximum water drop penetration times (WDPTs) of the control (green)
 4 and drought (red) plots. Orange lines and numbers refer to the WDPT classes after Bisdorn et
 5 al. (1993) (see Table 2).

6

1 Figure 6: Comparison between stained path width (SPW) of pre-drought (2011) and control
2 (2013) plot. Blue shades indicate the SPW classes. The sum of SPW is the volume density
3 (VD) per depth. Grey and black indicate the VD of stones.
4




- 1 Figure 7: VD boxplots of the drought and the pre-drought pattern. Depth ranges are omitted,
- 2 where one of the profile is shorter than the other. Statistically significant ($p\text{-value} \leq 0.01$)
- 3 differences between the treatments are marked with an asterisk.
- 4



1

2

1 Figure 8: Comparison between before drought (2011) and after drought (2013) stained path
2 widths (SPW) and flow processes for coniferous and deciduous stand plots. The sum of SPW
3 is the volume density (VD) per depth. Grey and black indicate the VD of stones.
4



1
2
3
4
5

Figure 9: VD boxplots of the drought and the pre-drought pattern. Depth ranges are omitted, where one of the profile is shorter than the other. Statistically significant ($p\text{-value} \leq 0.01$) differences between the treatments are marked with an asterisk.