

## ***Interactive comment on “Projected changes in US erosivity” by M. Biasutti and R. Seager***

**M. Biasutti and R. Seager**

biasutti@ldeo.columbia.edu

Received and published: 13 May 2015

We thank Reviewer B for his/her comments. We hope to have satisfactorily responded to all.

Reviewer B’s main issue with the substance of our study is cited as follows: *[...] the uncertainty from climate models (using the 21 simulations) is rather superficially addressed in Figs. 10-12. We regret that we did not present a more fuller picture of the uncertainty due to climate models. No doubt, this stems from the fact that we are more familiar with that literature and took it too much for granted. We have now added one figure that goes some way into addressing this issue (the new figure is reproduced at the end of this response). We have also added more reference to the relevant literature. The new figure shows the projections in mean accumulation and in the modified Fournier index in the 21 models that were used in the downscaled dataset and in a*

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



much larger ensemble (38 CMIP5 models, some of them with several ensemble members). This analysis allows us to comment on the role of the downscaling technique (in some regions downscaling changes the sign of future anomalies) as well as on the role of model choice and ensemble size.

Particular comments:

*Title: Should be more specific (e.g. "Projected changes in US rainfall erosivity").*

Done!

*Tables: Many experiments are performed and the paper is not easy to read. A Table summarizing the experiments, the corresponding equations and Figures would be very helpful.*

We are sorry that you found navigation of our exposition difficult. We took your concern to heart, but preferred to guide the reader throughout the text, instead than with a table. What we have done is to introduce in Section 2.2 the 3 methods of estimating R as methods 1, 2, and 3 and afterwards we have added a reminder of what is what throughout Sections 2 and 3 and in all the figure captions.

*P. 1471, L. 26-27: In the end, are your results valid for crops only ? Please clarify.*

We have added a comment clarifying that our statement pertain only to the climatic changes, and that erosion will change differently in response to changes in rainfall erosivity, depending on all other factors, including the geography of the terrain and the vegetation cover. The full paragraph now reads:

While climate, vegetation, and soils can all be coupled in complex ways (for example, excessive heat and drought can kill the vegetation cover and induce more soil loss, even if rainfall erosivity declines; see Nearin et al. 2004), we can start to address the role of climate change on soil erosion by first isolating the changes in the erosivity of rainfall while setting aside the impacts of changes in vegetation, soil composition and topography, land

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



use and management. That is: while we address changes in the direct climatic driver of erosion, namely erosive rainfall, future changes in erosion will depend on local susceptibility, thus on geography, land use and management, and the health of the vegetation cover. Addressing erosion changes is beyond the scope of this work.

*P. 1476 (Section 2.1): The considered future period (2079?2099) is only given in the caption of Fig. 10. It should be mentioned here.*

Sorry. The paragraph now starts:

Climate change portrayed in this study as the difference from the historical period and the decades 2079?2099 simulated under a business-as-usual scenario (the representative concentration pathway RCP8.5).

*P. 1479, L. 28 ("625 grid points"): Not mentioned before. Why 625 grid points ?*

We regret the confusion: the high-resolution datasets are 1/24th of a degree, and so in each 1x1 degree, one would expect  $24 \times 24 = 576$  points. But the grids line up so that there are 25 vertex point on each side, making the set  $25 \times 25 = 625$  points. We have tried to clarify this by amending the manuscript to read:

For every 1 x 1 square, we take the mean 1970-2000 erosivity and daily time series for the period 1980-2000 (PRISM daily rainfall is not available prior to 1980) and use the 625 vertex points of the 4km-resolution datasets that are included in this subdomain to determine the coefficients  $a$  and  $b$  in the formula  $R \simeq \frac{a}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{d=1}^{365} P_d^b$ .

*P. 1488, L. 16-18: I am not convinced, because your analysis of the uncertainty from climate models is rather superficial. As mentioned above in our answer to the general comments, we have added a figure that address uncertainty ion rainfall projections in*

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



a more detailed way and we have expanded Section 3 to include better references to the literature and a clearer indication of where in the US the uncertainty in the climatic signal is less consequential than the uncertainty in the relationship between rainfall accumulation and erosivity. Confident that the new manuscript makes our case more solidly, we have edited this paragraph to clarify what we mean. It now reads:

Overall, we confirm that the general expectation of worsening erosivity under climate change is correct, but we suggest that previous estimates have been too confident for large swaths of the United States, especially in the South and in the interior. The pattern of erosivity change estimated in our study from CMIP5 changes in  $F$  is consistent with what was found by Segura et al. (2014) using just 3 models (with 3 scenario each) from the older CMIP3 archive. But the pattern changes when we estimate erosivity with a different method: when erosivity is estimated from daily rainfall values, the multi-model mean indicates a decrease in Texas and the southern Plains, while an increase in erosivity is simulated by a majority of models when the estimate is done using monthly precipitation. Within this region there are locations where the climate signal itself is not very robust (some climate models project wetting, others drying) but there are also locations where the climate models agree on the rainfall changes. There, uncertainty in the sign of the erosivity changes is solely a consequence of our poor knowledge of how best to link erosivity to rainfall accumulation. Thus we conclude that uncertainty in the method of estimation of  $R$  can be more consequential than uncertainty derived from the spread in climate simulations.

*Figures: Figure 3 is cited in the text after Fig. 4. Figures 6, 8, and 9 are not cited in the text. Are these figures useful? Uncommented figures should be removed.* Thanks for catching these problems! The early citation of Figure 4 was actually a typo: it should have been Figure 3a. As for the other figures, we discussed the biases without

C1475

## HESSD

12, C1472–C1477, 2015

[Interactive  
Comment](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



pointing explicitly to the figures where the biases were sown. We now guide the reader throughout the arguments in Section 2.5 pointing to the relevant panels in those figures. Overall, while we do have a lot of figures, we thought it was best to show how each method perform and to treat them all equally. So even if we discuss the results of one method more in detail because it is the first time that we bring up the analysis, we do want the reader to see for herself how other methods perform.

*Conclusions: To what extent could this work be performed in other places of the globe*  
We are not aware of suitable datasets that would allow a similar, regional assessment elsewhere. Therefore, we now conclude the paper with the following comment:

Outside the Unites States (and few scattered localities), the lack of high-frequency, high-resolution data and a worse uncertainty in the relationship between rainfall characteristics and erosion potential (van Dijk et al, 2002) combine to make the challenge even more formidable.

Please also find attached the new version of the manuscript (at degraded resolution for the sake of file size).

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/12/C1472/2015/hessd-12-C1472-2015-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 1469, 2015.

## HESD

12, C1472–C1477, 2015

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment



**Fig. 1.** New Figure (Figure 11 in current manuscript)

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

