Agricultural intensification vs climate change: What drives long-term changes of sediment load?

ShengpingWang[1,2,3*], Peter Strauss[2], Carmen Krammer[2], Elmar Schmaltz[2], Borbala Szeles[3,4], Kepeng Song[1], Yifan Li[1], Günter Blöschl[3,4]

1. *College of Hydraulic and Hydro-Power Engineering, North China Electric Power University, Beijing, 102206, P.R.China*

2. *Institute for Land and Water Management Research, Federal Agency for Water Management, A-3252 Petzenkirchen, Austria*

3. *Institute of Hydraulic Engineering and Water Resources Management, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria*

4. *Vienna Doctoral Programme on Water Resource Systems, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria*

*Corresponding author: Shengping Wang

Email: wangshp418@126.com;Shengping_Wang@ncepu.edu.cn

Abstract: Climate change and agricultural intensification are expected to increase soil erosion and sediment production from arable land in many regions. However, so far, most studies were based on short-term monitoring and/or modeling, making it difficult to assess their reliability in terms of estimating long-term changes. We present the results from a unique data set consisting of measurements of sediment loads from a 60 ha catchment (the Hydrological Open Air Laboratory, HOAL, in Petzenkirchen, Austria) which was observed periodically over a time period spanning 72 years. Specifically, we compare Period I (1946-1954) and Period II (2002-2017) by fitting sediment rating curves for the growth and dormant seasons for each of the periods. The results suggest a significant increase in sediment loads from Period I to

Period II with an average of 5.8 ± 3.8 t·yr^{-1} to 60.0 ± 140.0 t·yr^{-1}. The sediment flux

changed mainly due to a shift of the sediment rating curves (SRC), given that the

mean daily discharge significantly decreased from 5.0 ± 14.5 l·s^{-1} for Period I to $3.8 \pm$

6.6 l·s^{-1} for Period II. The slopes of the SRC's for the growing season and the dormant

season of Period I were 0.3 and 0.8, respectively, whilst they were 1.6 and 1.7 for

Period II, respectively. Climate change, considered in terms of rainfall erosivity, was

not responsible for this shift, because erosivity decreased by 30.4% from the dormant

season of Period I to that of Period II, and no significant difference was found

between the growing seasons of Periods I and II. However, the change in sediment

flux can be explained by the changes in land use and land cover (LUCC) and the

change in land structure (i.e. organization of land parcels). At low and median

streamflow conditions, land structure in Period II (i.e. the parcel effect) had no

apparent influence on sediment yield. With increasing streamflow, it became more

important in controlling sediment yield, as a result of an enhanced sediment

connectivity in the landscape, leading to a dominant role at high flow conditions. The

increase in crops that make the landscape prone to erosion and the change of land uses

between Periods I and II led to an increase in sediment flux, although its relevance

was surpassed by the effect of parcel structure change at high flow conditions. We

conclude that land cover and land use change and land structure change should be

accounted for when assessing sediment flux changes. Especially during high flow

conditions, land structure change substantially altered sediment fluxes, which is most

relevant for long-term sediment loads and land degradation. Increased attention to

improving land structure is therefore needed in climate adaptation and agricultural

50   catchment management.

55   # Introduction

Soil erosion is a phenomenon of worldwide importance because of its environmental

and economic consequences (García-Ruiz, 2010; Prosdocimi et al., 2016). Climate

change, land use/cover changes (LUCC) and other anthropogenic activities are

commonly considered potential agents that drive variation of soil erosion rates

60   (Nearing et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2021). The impacts of climate change (e.g. Nearing

et al., 2004; Zhang and Nearing., 2005; Mullan, 2013; Palazon and Navas, 2016) and

of land use and cover change (e.g. Bochet et al., 2006; Korkanç et al., 2018; Nampak

et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019; Perović et al., 2018) on erosion have been studied in

recent years. As the two agents usually exert their influence on soil erosion

65   simultaneously, their relative contributions have also been increasingly investigated in

recent years (e.g. Bellin et al., 2013; Sun et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021). Combining

field investigations with model simulations, Zhang et al. (2021) quantitatively

evaluated the contributions of the decrease in annual rainfall erosivity, the decrease in

arable land and bare land, and the construction of silt trap dams to the reduction of

70   sediment load of a typical Loess watershed between 1987-2016, with the contribution

values being +29%, +40%, and +31%, respectively. Scholz et al.(2008) modelled how management practices on the local scale would affect soil erosion compared to climate change. They concluded that the conservational management practices would have a greater impact on reducing soil erosion rates than forecasted effects of climate change (i.e. the decrease in rainfall amounts in erosion sensitive months). Also, soil erosion accelerated by livestock grazing was found to be more important than climate change in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau (Li et al., 2019).

Previous studies provide valuable information on understanding how LUCC and climate change affect soil erosion and sediment load. However, it seems that most of the previous studies considered LUCC (a change in land use and/or types of crops) and landscape structure change (a change in parcel size and structure) together. The relevance of landscape structure changes alone has so far received less attention. However, land use policies, such as land consolidation, have changed agricultural practices to a large extent since 1945, the beginning of agricultural industrialization (e.g. Moravcová et al., 2017; Devaty et al., 2019), and in particular in countries where this process is relatively recent (Bouma et al., 1998; Moravcova et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2021).

Landscape structures usually influence erosion due to the boundary effects between land uses and land units (parcels) that differ in water and sediment trapping capacity (Baudry and Merriam, 1988; Merriam, 1990; Takken et al., 1999; Phillips et al., 2011). Van Oost et al. (2000) and Devaty et al. (2019) evaluated the role of landscape structure by accounting for its spatial connectivity using modelling approaches and

found that landscape structure is an essential factor when assessing the risk of soil erosion affected by land use changes. Both studies emphasized the potential impacts of land parcel structure changes on sediment production through altering hydrological and sediment connectivity. However, both studies relied on models, making connectivity assumptions in their studies. Instead of focusing on the spatial connectivity, others (e.g. Bakker et al., 2008; Sharma et al., 2011; Chevigny et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2021; Tang et al., 2021; Madarász et al., 2021) evaluated the effect of terrain, soil properties, lithology, management practices and other processes associated with landscape and/or land structure changes and highlighted their impact on sediment production. It has also been shown that the impact of landscape structure on erosion is more heterogeneous when different crops are grown, and the underlying lithology, soil properties and topography show substantial spatial variability across the catchment (David et al.,2014; Cantreul et al., 2020).

In our analysis, we evaluate the relative roles of climate change, LUCC and the change of land structure on sediment production. We define LUCC as a change in either type of land use (i.e. arable land, grassland, forest) or type of land cover (agricultural management, mainly by crops with different risk of soil erosion). We focus on understanding the respective role of LUCC and landscape structure change, based on long term observations that were usually not available in previous studies. We present the results from a unique data set consisting of measurements of sediment loads from a small agricultural catchment over a time window of 72 years. The study catchment is the 66 ha Hydrological Open Air Laboratory (HOAL) located in

115   Petzenkirchen (Blöschl et al., 2016), which, in addition to being exposed to climate

change, has experienced a significant change in land use and land cover as well as

parcel structure due to changes in land management policies during the past decades.

Both discharge and suspended sediment concentration have been monitored

periodically in the HOAL catchment from 1945 to 1954 and from 2000 to now. This

120   provides an opportunity to disentangle the impacts of land structure change, land

use/land cover change, and climate change based on long-term measurements.

Specifically, we aim at i) exploring how the sediment regime shifted between the

periods of 1945-1954 and 2002-2017; ii) analyzing whether climate change or LUCC

(or both) were responsible for any change in the sediment regime; and iii) identifying

125   the relevance of land structure change (i.e. land consolidation) on erosion control

compared to LUCC.

2. Methods

2.1 Catchment characteristics

The HOAL catchment is situated in Lower Austria's alpine forelands (48°9' N, 15°9' E)

130   with elevations ranging from 268 m to 323 m a.s.l. and a size of 66 ha (Figure 1). The

climate of the catchment belongs to the temperate, continental climate zone (Dfb)

according to Köppen-Geiger (Kottek et al., 2006). The mean annual precipitation is

746 mm (1946 - 2006), 62% of the rain falling between May and October. The mean

daily air temperature is 8.8°C (1946-2006). The dominant land use is arable land,

135   accounting for on average 82% of the catchment land use over the past few years.

Typical crops include winter wheat, corn and barley. Deciduous trees grow along the

stream (6%), 10% of the area is grassland, and 2% is paved. The subsurface of the catchment consists of tertiary marine sediments. Soils are classified into five types: calcic cambisols, vertic cambisols, gleyic cambisols, planosols and gleysols (IUSS Working Group WRB, 2015).

2.2 Data availability

Both discharge (Q, l/s) and suspended sediment concentration (C, mg/l) have been measured at the catchment outlet periodically since the 1940s. A data set of discharge and sediment concentration was available for the period 1945-1954. After that, measurements were stopped and started again in 1990. Therefore, data records for the period 1946-1954 (Period I) and 2002-2017 (Period II) were used for this analysis. In Period II, the stream gauge was relocated. However, the difference in catchment size is very small (around 200 m^2). This is indicated by the different locations of the discharge gauge in Figure 1. Due to technological advances, the measurement method of both Q and C changed between the two periods. In Period I, discharge was registered by a Thompson weir and a paper chart recorder, while in Period II, it was registered by an H-Flume and a pressure transducer. Thus, high temporal resolution, one-minute data for discharge were available for both periods. Sediment concentrations were measured manually every 3-4 days in Period I, whilst an automatic method (i.e. equal-discharge-increment sampling) and additional manual sampling were applied in Period II. Daily precipitation and 5-min rainfall intensities were available for both periods, but for Period I, 5-min rainfall intensities were only available during the growing season.

7

160 We used parcel-based land use data from 1946 to 1949 and 2007 to 2012, representing

Period I and Period II land use, respectively. Land use categories were agricultural

land, including crop type, grassland, forest, roads and settlements (i.e. paved area).

We defined a parcel as a continuous area of land with a single crop type. Parcel

boundaries were specified according to the cadastral map and aerial photographs. In

165 Period II, these boundaries were also visually inspected. Figure 1 depicts the

geographic catchment location, and parcel structure and land use for a specific year in

each period.

170 **Figure 1 Geographical location of the HOAL catchment in Petzenkirchen in Austria and Europe (a) and Parcel structure and land use in the HOAL catchment for 2007 (b) and 1946 (c). Coordinates as EPSG: 31256 – MGI / Austria GK East (meters).**

175

2.3 Data analysis

2.3.1 Changes in rainfall erosivity and flow regime

The erosive potential of rainfall events was quantified by the R-factor of the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE), which is defined as the product of kinetic energy of a rainfall event and its maximum 30-min intensity, using the rainfall erosivity tool RIST (USDA-Staff, 2019) according to

$$EI_{30} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} E_i \cdot I_{30,i} \qquad (1)$$

where EI_{30} is the Annual R-factor (MJ· mm ha^{-1}·hr) calculated as the sum of single event R-factors, E_i is the total kinetic energy for a single event (MJ·m^{-2}), I_{30} is the maximum rainfall intensity in 30 minutes within a single event i (mm·h^{-1}), and m is the number of events per year.

We assumed erosivity density ED (i.e. EI_{30} divided by event precipitation) to be a particularly relevant climatic indicator of soil erosion process and catchment sediment yield, because it is calculated as a combination of rainfall kinetic energy and maximum rainfall intensity of rain events. These are commonly considered as the relevant parameters of rain to trigger soil erosion. We thus tested, whether the means of the monthly erosivity density (ED) are significantly different between Period I and Period II by using a t-test. Due to the absence of rainfall intensity measurements, we could not directly calculate ED for the months of the dormant season (November to March) of Period I. Instead, we calculated ED from a relationship between EI_{30} and monthly rainfall of Period II, assuming that the relationship was sufficiently temporally invariant over the investigated periods. Erosivity density is very low

during the dormant season. The mean ED was 0.66 ± 0.21 and 2.54 ± 2.43

MJ· ha^{-1}· hr^{-1} respectively for the dormant season and the growing season of Period I,

whilst it was 0.42 ± 0.11 and 1.87 ± 1.35 MJ ·ha^{-1} ·hr^{-1} respectively in Period II

(Figure 3a). Thus, the error arising from the use of this relationship is expected to be

small.

We also compared daily flow duration curves to understand whether hydrological

regime change has influenced flow transporting capacity and sediment regime change.

Following the definitions of Smakhtin (2001), we compared low flow ($Q_{70\%}$), high

flow ($Q_{10\%}$) and median flow rate ($Q_{50\%}$) quantiles for the two periods.

2.3.2 Sediment regime analysis

To analyze sediment regime, we first estimated sediment loads for the different

periods. After calculatiing SRCs for Period I and Period II, using the data pairs of Q

and C measurements, daily sediment load was estimated (see equation 2) by

combining the measured high resolution data (1 min) for Q with the derived SRC for

each period. For further analysis, the daily sediment load was aggregated either by

month or year.

$$Y = \sum Q_i \cdot \hat{C}_{i\_s} \cdot T_i / 1000000 \qquad (2)$$

where Y is the sediment load within a day (kg··day^{-1}), Q_i is the observed discharge at

time step i (l·s^{-1}); $\hat{C}_i$ is the estimated sediment concentration at time step i (mg·l^{-1}). T_i

(s) is the elapsed time between time step i and the next time step $i+1$. The statistical

differences of sediment loads either between seasons or between periods were

examined by a t-test.

220 Following a commonly used approach (Asselman, 2000; Warrick and Rubin, 2007;

Sheridan et al., 2011; Vaughan et al., 2017; Khaledian et al., 2017), the SRCs were

here assumed to follow a power-law function, which was fitted by least squares

regression:

$$C = a \cdot Q^b \qquad (3)$$

225 where C is sediment concentration (mg·l^{-1}), Q is discharge (l·s^{-1}), and a and b are

regression coefficients. The coefficient a is usually associated with easily transported

intensively weathered materials and may vary over seven orders of magnitude

(Syvitski et al., 2000). The parameter b represents the capacity of the stream to erode

and transport sediment, reflecting how sediment concentration is non-linearly related

230 to streamflow (Sheridan et al., 2011; Fan et al., 2012). It typically varies from 0.5 to

1.5 and rarely exceeds 2. Sometimes b is also regarded as a measure of the quantity of

newly available sediment sources (Vanmaercke et al., 2010; Guzman et al., 2013).

Considering that data records were registered with different intensity for Periods I and

II (see section 2.2), for the sake of consistency, we used monthly averages, as in other

235 studies (Syvitski and Alcott,1995; Sheridan et al., 2011; Hu et al., 2011), to construct

SRCs. We assumed that monthly averages could reflect a varied hydrological and/or

sediment response to seasonally prevailing weather characteristics such as dry periods

or convective storms (Sheridan et al., 2011).

We chose arithmetic means of the observations to represent the monthly Q and C

240 values. These monthly averages were pooled together and then grouped into growing

season of Period I (Period I_G), dormant season of Period I (Period I_D), growing

season of Period II (Period II_G), and dormant season of Period II (Period II_D),

respectively. For each of these four periods, we fitted SRC.

We analyzed the fitted SRC by two strategies to evaluate whether and how the

245 sediment regime changed between these periods. Besides directly comparing the

slopes of the four seasonal SRCs by ANCOVA analysis with the log-transformed

discharge as indipendent variable, we also fitted the SRC for each specific year's

season and plotted the regression coefficients a against their corresponding b to

evaluate a possible sediment regime shift during Periods I and II.

250 The latter framework was adapted from Thomas (1988), and also employed by

Asselman et al. (2000) and Fan et al. (2012) to examine differences in sediment

regimes between spatially different sites. Also, Sheridan et al. (2011) used the

framework to reveal post-fire temporal shifts of a sediment regime. Thomas (1988)

suggested that time-based sampling methods (either random sampling or systematic

255 sampling) preferentially use observations of relatively small discharges to fit a SRC.

This tendes to reduce the slope and increase the intercept of a SRC (see point C in

Figure 2b). In contrast, flow-based automatic sampling methods such as

equal-discharge-increment sampling preferentially use observations of relatively large

discharges. Thus, they tend to cause a reversed pattern of a and b (i.e. increase the

260 slope and decrease the intercept of SRC, see the point A in Figure 2b). However,

irrespective of sampling practices, the pairs of data points a against b will likely be

allocated along a straight line, if sediment transport regimes are similar. The reason

for the a-b pairs lying nearly on a straight line is mainly due to a mathematical

12

property. That is, the slopes could be expressed by a linear function of the intercepts

265 with the coordinates of the common point (Thomas, 1988). Therefore, for years with

similar means of log-Q and log-C, the SRCs will pass through one common point O

(Thomas, 1988; Syvitski et al.,2000; Desilets et al., 2007; Sheridan et al., 2011). This

common point O (Figure 2a) is usually interpreted to reflect time invariant catchment

characteristics, such as relief, drainage area, and drainage density, while the variation

270 of the slope of SRCs (Figure 2a) is interpreted to reflect temporally dynamic

characteristics, such as average or maximum discharge and sediment availability

(Asselman, 2000). The coefficients a are usually inversely linearly related to b

(Thomas, 1988, Syvitski et al., 2000 and Desilets et al., 2007), and each point is

representative of a period (or a catchment). If sediment transport regimes are similar

275 between periods (catchments), the points will be plotted on the same line (such as A,

B, C in Figure 2b), with points A of Figure 2b (upper-left-side) often exhibiting

steeper sediment rating curves than points C (lower-right side). As for different lines

in Figure 2b, the lower ones characterized by points A', B', and C' represent situations

with most of the annual sediment load being transported at relatively low flow

280 discharges. Whilst the higher ones characterized by A, B, and C represent situations

with suspended sediment being mainly transported at high streamflow. Compared to a

direct evaluation of rating curves, relating coefficient a to exponent b is more

conductive to revealing temporal evolution of sediment regime (Syvitski et al., 2000;

Desilets et al., 2007). The change in the relationship of coefficients a against b

285 between the periods was also examined by ANCOVA .

a)

b)

log(C) (mg.l⁻¹)

log(Q) (l.s⁻¹)

Exponent b

log(a)

Figure 2 Schematic showing a) how sediment rating curves (SRC) may rotate around a common point and b) how exponents *b* of the SRC relate to coefficients *a*. Lines A, B and C on the left are SRC of different periods (e.g. years) sharing a similar common point O. Once sediment regimes shift due to the changes in catchment characteristics (change in drainage density, drainage area, and topography) the common point O would change to point O', and the linear relationship between *a* and *b* of the SRC would exhibit a shift as well. The schematic is based on log *C* =log *a* + *b*·log *Q* (Equation 3).

To account for uncertainties of the fitted SRC during each period, we additionally established theoretical sediment rating curves (tSRC)

i) For each period (i.e. Period I_G, Period I_D, Period II_G, and Period II_D), we carried out random sampling of *log a* (n=500, package "sample" in R), assuming that the samples of the coefficient of log *a* follow normal distributions, which was examined with a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality (mean = 1.02, SD = 2.01, n=44, *p*<0.05);

14

ii) Given the set of the sampled 500 values of log a, we generated a set of values b according to the previously established linear relationship between log a and b;

iii) Given a set of specified Q values, we derived 500 tSRC for each period, corresponding to the paired log a and b samples;

310   iv) Using these tSRC we calculated the 50 percentile, the 5 percentile, and the 95 percentile for each period to estimate the uncertainties of the sediment rating curves. The tSRC of the periods were also used to quantify the effect of land consolidation, i.e. the change of parcels structure and sizes (Parcel_effect) and the effect of land use and land cover changes (LUCC_effect). Vegetation usually plays a minor role in the

315   dormant season due to the absence of a dense vegetation cover on arable land and little erosive rainfall (Madsen et al., 2014; Kundzewicz, 2012; Salesa and Cerda, 2020; Hou et al., 2020). Therefore, landscape structure in the dormant season was considered a dominant factor for water and sediment transfer across the land surface, and thus runoff production and sediment production (Sharma et al., 2011; Devátý et

320   al., 2019). Therefore, we hypothesized that the total change in sediment yield (Total_effect) resulted from land cover change (LUCC_effect), land structure change (Parcel_effect) and climate change (Climate_effect). Since the area of our catchment is only 0.66 km^2, no obvious change was found in the shape of the small stream for the two periods. Stream sediment resuspension is rather small (Eder et al., 2014),

325   therefore, the contribution of bank erosion was not taken into account. The effects of land cover and land structure change was quantitatively separated according to the seasonal differences in tSRC after determining the climate change effect. Specifically,

we assumed that the shift of sediment regime from Period I_D to Period II_G was

representative of the Total_effect (Equation 4), and the shift in sediment regime

330   between Period I_D and Period II_D was mainly due to land consolidation

(Parcel_effect) (Equation 5). The LUCC effect, thus, could be estimated according to

Equation (6) if the Climate_effect was insignificant (section 3.1). The contributions of

Parcel_effect and LUCC_effect to the Total_effect were estimated according to

Equations (7) and (8), respectively.

335

$$\text{Total\_effect} = tSRC_{50\%}(\text{Period II\_G}) - tSRC_{50\%}(\text{Period I\_D}) \qquad (4)$$

$$\text{Parcel\_effect} = tSRC_{50\%}(\text{Period II\_D}) - tSRC_{50\%}(\text{Period I\_D}) \qquad (5)$$

$$\text{LUCC\_effect} = \text{Total\_effect} - \text{Parcel\_effect} - \text{Climate\_effect} \qquad (6)$$

$$\text{Parcel\_effect (\%)} = \frac{\text{Parcel\_effect}}{\text{Total\_effect}} \times 100 \qquad (7)$$

340    $$\text{LUCC\_effect (\%)} = \frac{\text{LUCC\_effect}}{\text{Total\_effect}} \times 100 \qquad (8)$$

3. Results

3.1 Changes in climate and flow regime

Because climate change is often found responsible for hydrological change (e.g.,

345   Kelly et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2020), we compared erosivity density (ED) and

monthly precipitation (P) of the two periods to examine whether climate affected the

variation of the sediment regime in the catchment (Figure 3). The mean monthly ED

in the growing season were 2.37 ± 1.38 and 1.84 ± 0.86 MJ·ha^{-1}·hr^{-1} for Periods I and

II, respectively (Figure 3a). No significant difference (*p*>0.05) was found between the

350   two growing seasons. Mean monthly *ED* in the dormant seasons showed a significant

(*p*<0.05)

Figure 3 Monthly erosivity density a) and monthly precipitation b) for Periods I and II. The bars with a dashed outline represent the growing seasons (April to October), the bars with a solid outline the dormant seasons (November to March). The whiskers indicate the range between the minium and the maximum, the asterisks indicate the outliers.

decrease from the first to the second period (0.66 ± 0.21 and 0.42 ± 0.11 (MJ·ha^{-1}·hr^{-1}),

360　respectively). A t-test suggests that there was no significant ($p>0.05$) difference in

mean monthly P between the first and second periods in both the dormant and the

growing seasons (Figure 3b). The mean monthly P was 50 ± 33 and 76 ± 54 mm for

the dormant and growing season of Period I, and it was 53 ± 29 mm and 79 ± 47 mm

for the two seasons of Period II. The decrease in ED during the dormant season of

365　Period II and the insignificant change in monthly P suggest that climate change

between Period I and II was not responsible for an increased sediment load (see

section 3.3). It should be noted, that processes related to snow play a minor role in the

catchment because it is considered a lowland catchment, located in a region with very

small amounts of snowfall (about 10% of annual rainfall). Thus, a possible change in

370　the proportion of snowfall in precipitation during the winter season of Periods I and II

was not accounted for when addressing the impact of climate change on sediment

load.

Streamflow in Period I was higher than that of Period II, and the mean annual

streamflow was 188 and 146 mm yr^{-1} for Periods I and II, respectively. Daily flow

375　duration curves for both periods are displayed in Figure 4. A t-test suggests that they

are significantly different ($p<0.05$). The $Q_{70\%}$ low flow of the two periods was 2.7 and

2.4 l·s^{-1}, the $Q_{50\%}$ median flow was 4.0 and 3.1 l·s^{-1}, and the $Q_{10\%}$ high flow was 10.7

and 7.5 l.s^{-1}, for the two periods, respectively. The decreased flow regime of Period II,

which is probably in part due to an increased evapotranspiration over the past decades

380　(Duethmann and Blöschl, 2018), indicates that streamflow cannot account for the

observed increased sediment load of Period II. Otherwise an increased streamflow would be expected in Period II.

Figure 4 Mean daily flow duration curve for Periods I (solid line) and II (dashed line).

3.2 Change in land use and land organization

Table 1 shows how land use changed between the two periods. During Period I, cropland and grassland accounted for 73% to 82% (varying between years) and 14% to 22%, respectively. However, due to agricultural intensification, cropland increased to around 82% in Period II, at the expense of a decreasing share of grassland. Forest, including sparse forest, accounted for 1.8% area during Period I but increased considerably until Period II to around 11%. The increase in cropland and forest suggests higher rates of evaporation and transpiration, and consequently less streamflow, which is in line with the previously examined trends of of streamflow

dynamics. When further analyzing the land use classes of arable land, a substantial

change was found for the crop types too, with the crops of low risk for soil erosion

being replaced with crops that exhibit a high soil loss potential. This was particularly

400   true for maize. In addition, the diversity of crops decreased considerably (Table 2).

This shift towards agricultural uniformity likely acts as a land structure effect. A loss

of heterogeneity of crop types increases the probability that different fields are

managed with the same crop. Then even smaller fields may behave similarly to larger

fields in terms of sediment production.

405

Besides the change in land use, the parcel structure of the catchment has also changed

(Table 1). This change was related to a land consolidation plan issued in 1955 in

Austria (Deváty et al., 2019) and a massive trend to agricultural industrialization that

evolved after 1945 (mainly referring to the massive application of advanced

410   machinery and fertilization technologies that started in the 1950s). During Period I,

arable land was fragmented across many small parcels, with a mean parcel size

between 0.5 - 0.6 ha and a resulting parcel density (number of parcels per ha area)

between 1.7 - 2.0 ha^{-1} in different years. In Period II, these values increased

considerably to mean parcel sizes between 1.7 - 2.7 ha and parcel densities between

415   0.3 - 0.6 ha^{-1}. Similarly, the mean parcel size and parcel density of grassland during

Period I were 0.13 - 0.17 ha and 5.2 - 7.2 ha^{-1}. It changed to 1.06 ha and 0.9 ha^{-1} in

Period II. As parcel structures are identified to influence sediment loads mainly due to

the boundary effects (e.g. Baudry and Merriam, 1988;Takken et al., 1999; Phillips et

al., 2011), the substantial decrease in parcel density of the catchment in Period II, was

420   expected to affect sediment load as well.

Table 1 Parcel and land use statistics for Periods I and II. Land use for the years 1946 to 1949 represents Period I, land use for the years 2007 to 2012 represents Period II; *N* is the number of parcels for a given land use, density is the number of parcels per ha, mean size represents the mean area of parcels with a particular land use.

	Parcel Structure							
	Period I				Period II			
Land use	Parcel number (N)	Density ($1 \cdot ha^{-1}$)	Mean size (ha)	Area (%)	Parcel number (N)	Density ($1 \cdot ha^{-1}$)	Mean size (ha)	Area (%)
Arable land	70-111*	1.7-2.0	0.5-0.6	73-82	21-33	0.3-0.6	1.7-2.7	81-82
Grassland	70-81	5.2-7.2	0.1-0.2	14-22	6	0.9	1.1	3-4
Forest	1	-	1.2	1.8	7	1	1.0	10.5-11
Paved area	17	12.9	0.1	2	17	7.3	0.1	2.4

* The number of parcels varied with the specific year of a period

Table 2 Crop statistics of arable land for Periods I and II; Crop statistics for the years 1946 to 1949 represent Period I, crop statistics for the years 2007 to 2012 represent Period II; Erosion risk for a particular crop is classified as high or low according to the classification of management in the RUSLE. The statistical values represent the ranges of the area for each crop during Periods I or II.

Crop	Period I		Period II		Erosion risk
	Area (ha)	Area (%)	Area (ha)	Area (%)	
Meadow	9-15	18-30	0.8	2	low
Alfalfa	11-18	22-33	-	-	low
Wheat	5-14	9-26	3-35	5-66	low
Rye	3-13	5-24			low
Beets	2-12	3-22	-	-	high
Oats	2-10	4-18	2	4	low
Barley	0.3-8	5-15	2-29	5-55	low
Potatoes	3-7	6-14	-	-	high
Maize	0.3-0.8	0.6-1.1	6.3-34	12-63	high
Rape	-	-	0.7-23	1-43	low
Sunflower	-	-	0.2-2	0.3-4	high

435

3.3 Change in sediment transport regime

3.3.1 Direct comparison of the fitted SRCs

Figure 5 shows the fitted sediment rating curves ($p<0.05$) for both periods. A t-test suggests that the slopes of the regression lines are significantly ($p<0.05$) different

440 between the dormant seasons or growing seasons. Although rainfall erosivity of Period II_G was similar to that of Period I_G (Figure 3a) and streamflow of Period II was generally lower than that of Period I (Figure 4), the fitted SRC of Period II_G was steeper than that of Period I_G (Figure 5a), with the coefficients b being 0.3 and 1.6 for Period I_G and Period II_G, respectively (Table 3). The fitted SRC of Period

445 II_D demonstrated a faster response of sediment concentration to increasing flow compared to that of Period I_D (Figure 5b), the coefficients b being 0.8 and 1.7 for Period I_D and Period II_D, respectively. However, the rainfall *ED* in Period II_D was generally lower than that of Period I_D (Figure 3a). This suggests a lower probability of a substantial increase in sediment availability. These results indicate

450 that neither changes in rainfall erosivity nor the hydrological regime could explain the increase in sediment dynamics.

Figure 5 Sediment rating curves for a) the growing seasons and b) the dormant seasons in the two time periods. Each point represents a monthly mean observation.

Table 3 Parameter values for the coefficients of the SRC for different periods and seasons according to Equation (3).

Period	Coefficient		r^2
	a	b	
Period I_G	16.7	0.3	0.11
Period I_D	4.9	0.8	0.42
Period II_G	5.4	1.6	0.45
Period II_D	1.2	1.7	0.64

3.3.2 Relationship between coefficient *a* and *b*

The changing steepness of a fitted SRC does not necessarily imply a change in the sediment regime as the slopes of fitted SRC are sometimes affected by catchment size or the distribution of samples (Asselman, 2000). To minimize possible interference of other factors in identifying variations or shifts of the SRC, we investigated the relationship between coefficients *a* and *b* of the SRC. Figure 6 shows the coefficients log *(a)* plotted against *b* for the four investigated time frames. Interestingly, the data points of both Periods I and II, for the growing season are more concentrated in the lower right part of the graphs (Figure 6a). A different pattern of log (*a*) against *b* was

470　found for the dormant season (Figure 6b), i.e. the data points of Period I concentrated

　　　in the lower right area (blue points). But the points were more concentrated in the

　　　upper left area for Period II.

Figure 6 Relationship between coefficients *a* and *b* for a) growing season and b)
475　**dormant season of Period I (blue) and Period II (red), respectively. log (*a*) in**
　　　x-axis represents the decadal logarithm. The arrows represent the shift of the
　　　sediment regime between Period I and Period II (see text below). All regressions
　　　are significant at p<0.05.

480　According to Asselman (2000), a shift of sediment regime means an alteration of

　　　either soil erodibility and/or erosive power of the river. In Figure 6, we found that the

　　　regression lines of Periods I to II are different. The intercepts of the regression lines

　　　are significantly different ($p<0.05$) for the growing seasons (Figure 6a).The slopes of

　　　the regression lines for Periods I and II were -1.60 and -0.94 in the growing season

485　(Figure 6a), and -1.58 and -0.80 in the dormant season, respectively (Figure 6b). The

　　　upward shift of the line at log (*a*) larger than around 0.6 suggests that in Period II,

most of the sediment was transported at relatively high flow rates. Since climate

change was not responsible for the increased hydrological regime (see section 3.1),

we mainly attribute this shift to the increase in hydrological connectivity, such as flow

490   path density and flow length, and a change in land use and land cover statistics.


Figure 7 Theoretical sediment rating curves (tSRC) for the growing seasons (a) and the dormant seasons (b) of Period I and II. Solid lines denote the 50 percentile of the tSRC for each period (i.e. tSRC$_{50\%}$). The grey area denotes the
495   **range of the predicted tSRC composed of 5 and 95 percentiles (i.e. tSRC$_{5\%}$ and tSRC$_{95\%}$). $Q_{30\%}$ and $Q_{70\%}$ represent the flow conditions of 3.9 l·s^{-1} and 2.0 l·s^{-1}, respectively.**

500   Figure 7 displays the theoretical sediment rating curves (tSRC) with their

uncertainties for the different periods and seasons. At a given Q higher than

approximately $Q_{70\%}$, sediment concentrations in Period II_G were higher than those in

Period I_G (Figure 7a), whereas for flow rates below this value sediment

concentrations were not different. The increased sediment concentrations in Period

505   II_G are in line with the observations of the sediment load of Period II_G (6.3±32.5 t

per month) which is largely enhanced compared to that of Period I_G (0.4±0.9 ton

25

per month), see Table 4. Sediment concentrations were less different between the dormant seasons of Period I and Period II at flow rates lower than $Q_{30\%}$ (Figure 7b), which is also reflected by the insignificant ($p>0.05$) difference in sediment loads

510 between Period I_D and Period II_D (being 0.6 ± 1.1 and 3.2 ± 14.0 t per month, respectively). However, an ANCOVA suggests that the derived $tSRC_{50\%}$ were significantly different ($p<0.05$) between the two periods, both in the growing seasons and dormant seasons. This enables us to estimate LUCC_effect and Parcel_effect according to the derived tSRCs.

515 **Table 4 Monthly mean sediment loads and associated standard deviations of different periods**

Period	Growing season (t month^{-1})	Dormant season (t month^{-1})
Period_I	0.4 ± 0.9	0.6 ± 1.1
Period_II	6.3 ± 32.5	3.2 ± 14.0

Note: Estimates based on equation (2)

3.4 Parcel_effect versus LUCC_effect

520 Figure 8 demonstrates the dynamic contributions of land structure (Parcel_effect) and LUCC changes (LUCC_effect) on sediment concentrations with increasing flow. Land structure change and the increase in cropland as well as a shift to crops with high risk of erosion explain the increase in sediment yield. However, the extent of their contributions to this increase differ. Generally, with higher flow rates, the contribution

525 of the LUCC_effect gradually decreased, whilst the contribution of the Parcel_effect increased. The Parcel_effect accounted for more than 50% of the Total_effect after the flow rate exceeded 20 l·s^{-1}approximately (i.e. $Q_{2\%}$) (Figure 8), exhibiting a dominant role in sediment production. This opposite trend of the relative contributions of the LUCC_effect and the Parcel_effect suggests that, even though land structure change

26

530 and LUCC both have unbeneficial effects on erosion control, their hydrological

consequences may be different. Land structure change probably explaines much of the

variation of sediment load at high flow conditions.

Unlike the situation during high flow rates, the Total_effect showed an almost zero

value at flow rates less than approximately 2 l·s^{-1} (i.e. $Q_{70\%}$), suggesting no difference

535 in sediment load between Periods I and II at low flow conditions. The increase in

sediment concentration at flow rates of 2 l.s^{-1} up to around 20 l.s^{-1} seemed to be

mainly caused by the changes in LUCC of Period II, as the contribution from the

LUCC_effect was consistently higher than that of the Parcel_effect.

One may note that forest land cover increased considerably from Period I to Period II.

540 We hypothesize that even though a beneficial effect of forest increase (up to a total of

11% of the catchment) may have appeared in Period II, it was easily offset by the

negative effect of crop land changes, particularly the increase in row crops that are in

general at a high risk of erosion. This contributed substantially to sediment yield

compared with other land uses and other crop types (Kijowska‑Strugała et al., 2018).

545

Figure 8 Contribution of Parcel_effect and LUCC_effect to the Total_effect across various flow rates. Total_effect (Equation 4) is displayed in terms of suspended sediment concentration. Parcel_effect and LUCC_effect was estimated by Equations (5) and (6), respectively; their contribution to the Total_effect was estimated by Equations (7) and (8), respectively.

4. Discussion

555   The industrial intensification of agriculture implemented during the last 70 years has

raised considerable concerns regarding erosion and sediment loading of rivers (e.g.

Bakker et al., 2008; Chevigny et al., 2014). However, with global climate warming,

the different contributions of LUCC, land policy adjustments (i.e. land structure

changes), and climate change affecting sediment load remain not well understood.

560   This paper aims at evaluating the relative roles of climate change, LUCC, and land

structure changes for sediment production, particularly at different flow rates.

4.1 Change in sediment load between two time periods

We found that the sediment load increased almost six fold from Period I to Period II. This finding is supported by estimates of the management factor (C-Factor) and the

565 slope and slope length factor (SL-Factor) of the RUSLE for Period I and Period II (Fiener et al., 2020). The C-Factor integrates changes in land use and crop statistics, thus it directly corresponds to changes of LUCC. The SL-Factor integrates parcel slopes and parcel sizes. Considering that the slopes in the HOAL did not change between the two periods, the SL-Factor may be used as direct indicator for changes in

570 land structure. While the mean C-Factor of the HOAL catchment increased from 0.16 in Period I to 0.33 in Period II, the SL-Factor increased from 0.76 to 0.96. Added together, the changed values for these two factors increased the theoretical soil loss within the catchment by over 150%. This value is smaller than the changes observed, however it should be noted, that the RUSLE has not been designed to account for

575 sediment loads of catchments but to estimate field scale soil loss within catchments. This may explain the observed differences to a certain extent.

4.2 Potential interference of different sampling methods

Due to technical advancement over the long investigation period, different sampling methods, i.e. grab sampling and automatic equal-discharge-increment sampling, were

580 used in this study for Periods I and II. This may affect both rating curve estimation and sediment load estimation (Harmel et al., 2010; Thomas, 1988).

To test a potential influence that may result from the different sampling frequencies in the two periods, we resampled the data set of Period II. We randomly selected

repeated subsamples (n=10) of the *Q-C* observations of Period II with equal sample

585 size to that of Period I. With each of the resampled datasets, we calculated SRCs.

Combined with the flow data, the derived 10 SRCs were then used to calculate a mean

annual sediment load. Comparing the mean annual sediment load from the resampling

(62.4 ± 10.2 t· yr^{-1}) to that of the original data set (60.0 ± 140.0 t· yr^{-1}) resulted in an

insignificant difference, suggesting that the different sampling strategies of Periods I

590 and II did not affect the results.

Further support to the validity of our results is provided by Groten and Johnson

(2019), who suggested that for sediment with very fine textural composition, the bias

of different sampling strategies might be small. In our study catchment, the topsoil of

the catchment is very fine textured consisting of 75% silty loam, 20% silty clay loam,

595 and 5% silt according to the USDA soil classification (Picciafuoco et al., 2019).

4.3 Dynamic relevance of land consolidation in controlling sediment load

Climate change in terms of both monthly erosivity density (*ED)* and precipitation (*P*)

was not responsible for the increase in sediment load, instead it could be explained by

600 LUCC and land structure changes. This finding is particularly important in regions,

where a strong intensification of agricultural management took place during the last

decades. The relative contributions of LUCC and land structure changes varied with

streamflow. For flow conditions below around 5 l.s^{-1}(i.e. Q_{20}%), land structure change

had no apparent adverse effect on erosion, but with increasing flow, the contribution

605   to sediment load increased continuously, leading to a dominant role at high flow rates.

This finding is partially in line with David et al. (2014) and Cantreul et al. (2020).

They reported that landscape structure was less important for soil erosion than LUCC

during normal flow conditions. However, they did not investigate whether the effect

of landscape structure showed a dynamic behavior with increasing flow. In contrast,

610   the LUCC_effect, i.e. the increase of crops with high erosion risk and the change in

land use, continuously affected sediment load with gradually decreasing importance at

high flow conditions. Similar results were reported by Vaughan et al. (2017), who

showed that sediment concentration at low and median flow conditions was

considerably associated with a change in catchment characteristics, primarily land use

615   and land cover. Although the role of LUCC was dominating for flow conditions less

than Q_{20}%, it's contribution to the total annual sediment load was small. More than

75% of the total sediment load was transported during a small number of events (25

events in Period I, 8 events in Period II) and all events had flow rates above 15

l.s^{-1}(approximately at $Q_{13\%}$ in Period I or $Q_{4\%}$ in Period II, respectively), which

620   underlines the importance of land structure for sediment loading.

The dynamic relevance of LUCC and land structure changes in sediment production is

associated with the processes and mechanisms controlling overland flow as a

transporting agent for sediment (e.g. Sun et al., 2013; El Kateb et al., 2013; Nearing et

al., 2017; Silasari et al., 2017; Kijowska‐Strugała et al., 2018). A change in types of

625   land use and used crops (LUCC) implies alterations of surface characteristics, such as

above ground structure morphology, litter cover, organic matter components, root

network (Gyssels et al., 2005; Wei et al., 2007; Moghadam et al., 2015; Patin et al., 2018) and soil properties (Costa et al., 2003; Moghadam et al., 2015). These properties influence the protective role of vegetation in soil detachment, the flow

630   capacity to transport sediment particles, and runoff flow paths to the stream channels (Van Rompaey et al., 2002; Lana-Renault et al., 2011; Sun et al., 2018). The protective effects tend not to linearly increase with increasing surface runoff. Accelerated discharge and stronger scouring effects of upslope discharge might impair the protective role of vegetation (e.g. Zhang et al., 2011; Santos et al.,2017; Bagagiolo

635   et al., 2018; Yao et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2019). Vegetation usually exhibits a smaller interception capability at high rainfall intensity, resulting in an enhanced splash erosion and availability of mobile soil particles (Cayuela et al., 2018; Magliano. et al., 2019; Nytch et al., 2019). However, the decreasing contribution of the LUCC_effect does not directly imply an absolute decrease of the magnitude of the LUCC_effect.

640   The absolute change in sediment concentration resulting from LUCC reveals an increasing trend as flow rates increase. Thus, the contribution of the LUCC_effect stands for the relevance of LUCC in erosion control compared to the change due to land structure. The magnitude of the LUCC_effect probably depends mainly on where within the catchment the LUCC is changed and how the proportional area of various

645   land uses changes. We will address this topic in future analyses.

Unlike land cover and land use change, landscape structure is usually combined with other catchment properties, such as slope characteristics and soil properties (Gascuel-Odoux et al., 2011) and additional erosion and transport factors (Verstraeten

et al., 2000). These factors exert a more complicated influence on erosion. For example, the effect of landscape structure on soil erosion may be identified on moderate slopes, while on steep slopes it may be concealed by on-site severe soil erosion (Chevigny et al., 2014). However, the key process for erosion control is the fact that landscape elements and their structural position (i.e. parcel structure, field boundaries, hedges and similar) alter hydrological connectivity between land and water. This is particularly true when the land cover on both sides of boundaries is different (Van Oost et al., 2000). Reducing parcel size and heterogeneity increases hydrological connectivity significantly and results in a substantial off-site damage effect, irrespective of on-site erosion of the investigated land use (Boardman et al., 2018; Deváty et al., 2019). During low and median flow conditions, surface runoff and sediment may arrive to a lesser extent at field boundaries due to efficient interception effects of the vegetation cover. This may explain the identified dynamic relevance of land structure change in sediment load found here.

5 Conclusions

Climate change, land use and land cover change, and other human-associated activities are widely regarded as potential agents driving hydrological change. Understanding the relevance of each of these agents in the hydrological cycle is critical for implementing adaptive catchment management measures and addressing climate change. Although very significant climate change influences in the last decades have been identified for certain components of the hydrological cycle we

found that climate change expressed in changes in rainfall erosivity and precipitation cannot explain the increased sediment production between 1946-1954 and 2002-2017 in the investigated catchment. Instead, both LUCC and land structure change played important, dynamic roles in erosion and sediment production.

675   The relevance of land use and land cover change versus land structure change varied dynamically with changing flow conditions. The reduction in parcel density undoubtedly increased sediment load, particularly at higher flows due to the decreased capacity of trapping sediment particles between parcels and increasing flow lengths inside parcels. Unfavorable land use or land cover change increased sediment load at

680   most flow conditions, although the relevance of this process decreased at high or very high flow rates. Therefore, when addressing soil conservation measures at the catchment scale, the distribution of fields, land structure, and vegetation cover should be simultaneously considered. Such a strategy would be conducive to deal with the risk of soil erosions at different flow rates. Land use policy adjustments resulting from

685   technological development have been vital to deal with food security issues in the past. However, now we experience the negative influence of these adjustments on the hydrological cycle. Therefore, rather than focusing on climate change solely, we need to pay increased attention to anthropic management activities to counteract their negative impact on hydrological change effectively.

690

Author contributions

Shengping Wang has led the data analysis, drafted the manuscript, and revised the manuscript; Peter Strauss was responsible for the project design, oversaw the whole analysis, and conducted manuscript revision as the project leader; Carmen Krammer

695 was responsible for data collection and data preparation; Elmar Schmaltz has contributed to figure drawing and manuscript revision; Borbala Szeles has helped with data analysis and manuscript revision; Kepeng Song and Yifan Li helped with data processing; and Günter Blöschl oversaw and critically reflected on the manuscript writing as the senior scientist.

700

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

705 ## Disclaimer

Publisher's note: Copernicus Publications remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

715

References

Asselman, N. E. M.:Fitting and interpretation of sediment rating curves, Journal of Hydrology, 234(3-4), 228-248,https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(00)00253-5, 2000.

Awal, R., Sapkota, P., Chitrakar, S., Thapa, B. S., Neopane, H. P., & Thapa, B.: A General Review

720 on Methods of Sediment Sampling and Mineral Content Analysis, Journal of Physics: Conference

Series, 1266(1), https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1266/1/012005, 2019

Bagagiolo, G., Biddoccu, M., Rabino, D., Cavallo, E.: Effects of rows arrangement, soil management, and rainfall characteristics on water and soil losses in Italian sloping vineyards, Environmental Research, 166, 690-704, 2018

725   Bakker, M., Govers, G., van Doorn, A., Quetier, F., Chouvardas, D., Rounsevell, M.: The response of soil erosion and sediment export to land-use change in four areas of Europe: The importance of landscape pattern, Geomorphology, 98, 213-226, 2008.

Baudry, J. and Merriam, H.G.: Connectivity in landscape ecology,in: Proc. 2nd Intern. Semin. of IALE, Muenster 1987. Muensterische Geographische Arbeiten 29, 23-28, 1988

730   Bellin, N., Vanacker, V., De Baets, S.: Anthropogenic and climatic impact on Holocene sediment dynamicsin SE Spain: A review, Quaternary International, 308-309,112-129, 2013

Bochet, E., Poesen, J., Rubio, J.L.: Runoff and soil loss under individual plants of a semi-arid Mediterranean shrubland: influence of plant morphology and rainfall intensity, Earth Surf. Process. Landforms, 31, 536-549, 2006.

735   Bouma, J., Varallyay, G., Batjes, N.H.: Principal land use changes anticipated in Europe. Agr. Ecosyst. Environ., 67 (2-3), 103-119, 1998.

Blöschl, G., Blaschke, A. P., Broer, M., Bucher, C., Carr, G., Chen, X., Eder, A., Exner-Kittridge, M., Farnleitner, A., Flores-Orozco, A., Haas, P., Hogan, P., KazemiAmiri, A., Oismüller, M., Parajka, J., Silasari, R., Stadler, P., Strauss, P., Vreugdenhil, M., Wagner, W., and Zessner, M.: The
740   Hydrological Open Air Laboratory (HOAL) in Petzenkirchen: a hypothesis-driven observatory, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 20, 227-255, doi:10.5194/hess-20-227-2016, 2016.

Cantreul, V., Pineux, N., Swerts, G., Bielders, C., Degré, A.: Performance of the LandSoil expert-based model to map erosion and sedimentation: application to a cultivated catchment in central Belgium,Earth Surf. Process. Landforms,DOI: 10.1002/esp.4808, 2020

745   Cayuela, C., Llorens, P., Sanchez-Costa, E.,Levia, D.F，Latron, J.:Effect of biotic and abioticfactors on inter- and intra-eventvariability in stemflow rates in oak and pine stands in a Mediterraneanmountain area, Journal of Hydrology, 560: 396-406, 2018.

Chevigny, E., Quiquerez, A., Petit, C., Curmi, P.:Lithology, landscape structure and management practice changes: Key factors patterning vineyard soil erosion at metre-scale spatial resolution,
750   CATENA, 121, 354-364, 2014.

Costa, M.H., Botta, A., Cardille, J.A.: Effects of large scale changes in land cover on the discharge

of the Tocantins River, Southeastern Amazonia, Journal of Hydrology, 283, 206-217, 2003.

David, M., Follain, S., Ciampalini, R., Le Bissonnais, Y., Couturier, A., Walter, C.:Simulation of medium-term soil redistributions for different land use and landscape design scenarios within a vineyard landscape in Mediterranean France, Geomorphology, 214, 10-21, 2014.

Desilets, S.L.E., Nijssen, B., Ekwurzel, B., Ferre, T.P.A.: Post-wildfire changes in suspended sediment rating curves: Sabino Canyon, Arizona,Hydrol. Process., 21,1413-1423, 2007

Devátý, J., Dostál, T., Hösl, R., Krása, J., Strauss, P.:Effects of historical land use and land pattern changes on soil erosion - Case studies from Lower Austria and Central Bohemia, Land Use Policy, 82, 674-685,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.11.058, 2019

Duethmann, D., and Blöschl, G.:Why has catchment evaporation increased in the past 40 years? A data-based study in Austria. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 22, 5143-5158,https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-5143-2018, 2018.

Eder, A., Exner-Kittridge, M., Strauss, P., Blöschl, G.:Re-suspension of bed sediment in a small stream – results from two flushing experiments,Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 18, 1043–1052, 2014

El Kateb, H., Zhang, H.F., Zhang, P.C., Mosandl, R.: Soil erosion and surface runoff on different vegetation covers and slope gradients: A field experiment in Southern Shaanxi Province, China, CATENA, 105,1-10, 2013

Fan, X., Shi, C., Zhou, Y., Shao, W. : Sediment rating curves in the Ningxia-Inner Mongolia reaches of the upper Yellow River and their implications, Quaternary International, 282, 152-162,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2012.04.044, 2012

Fiener, P., Dostal, T., Krasa, J., Schmaltz, E., Strauss, P., and Wilken, F.: Operational USLE-Based Modelling of Soil Erosion in Czech Republic, Austria, and Bavaria – Differences in Model Adaptation, Parametrization, and Data Availability, Applied Sciences, 10, 3647, 1-18, Doi:10.3390/app10103647, 2020.

García-Ruiz, J. M.:The effects of land uses on soil erosion in Spain?: A review, CATENA, 81(1), 1-11, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2010.01.001, 2010.

Gascuel-Odoux, C., Aurousseau, P., Doray, T., Squividant, H., Macary, F., Uny, D., Grimaldi, C. :Incorporating landscape features to obtain an object-oriented landscape drainage network representing the connectivity of surface flow pathways over rural catchments, Hydrological Processes, 25(23), 3625-3636, 2011.

Groten, J. T., & Johnson, G. D.:Comparability of river suspended-sediment sampling and laboratoryanalysismethods,Scientific Investigations Report, 1–23, 2018.

785 Guzman, C. D., Tilahun, S. A., Zegeye, A. D., Steenhuis, T. S.: Suspended sediment concentration-discharge relationships in the (sub-) humid Ethiopian highlands, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 17(3), 1067-1077,https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-17-1067-2013, 2013.

Gyssels, G., Poesen, J., Bochet, E., Li, Y.:Impact of plant roots on the resistance of soils to erosion by water: a review, Prog. Phys. Geogr., 29, 189-217, 2005.

790 Harmel, R. D., Slade, R. M., & Haney, R. L.: Impact of Sampling Techniques on Measured Stormwater Quality Data for Small Streams, Journal of Environmental Quality, 39(5), 1734–1742,https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2009.0498, 2010.

Haslinger, K., Hofstätter, M., Kroisleitner, C., Schöner, W., Laaha, G., Holawe, F., &Blöschl, G. :Disentangling Drivers of Meteorological Droughts in the European Greater Alpine Region
795 During the Last Two Centuries, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 124(23), 12404–12425. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD029527, 2019.

Hou, J., Zhu, H., Fu, B., Lu, Y., Zhou, J.:Functional traits explain seasonal variation effects of plant communities on soil erosion in semiarid grasslands in the Loess Plateau of China, CATENA, 194, 104743,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2020.104743, 2020.

800 Hu, B., Wang, H., Yang, Z., & Sun, X.:Temporal and spatial variations of sediment rating curves in the Changjiang (Yangtze River) basin and their implications,Quaternary International, 230(1–2), 34–43,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2009.08.018, 2011.

IUSS Working Group WRB, World Reference Base for Soil Resources 2014, update 2015International soil classification system for naming soils and creating legends for soil maps,
805 World Soil Resources Reports No. 106. FAO, Rome, 2015.

Kelly, C.N., Mc Guire, K.J., Miniat, C.F., Vose, J.M.: Streamflow response to increasing precipitation extremes altered by forest management. Geophys. Res. Lett. 43(8), 3727–3736,https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL068058, 2016.

Khaledian, H., Faghih, H., Amini, A.: Classifications of runoff and sediment data to improve the
810 rating curve method. Journal of Agricultural Engineering, 48(3), 147-153,https://doi.org/10.4081/jae.2017.641, 2017.

Kijowska‑Strugata, M., Bucała‑Hrabia, A., Demczuk, P.: Long-term impact of land use changes on soil erosion in an agricultural catchment (in the Western Polish Carpathians), Land

Degrad. Dev., 29,1871-1884, 2018.

815   Korkanç, S. Y.: Effects of the land use/cover on the surface runoff and soil loss in the
        Niğde-Akkaya Dam Watershed, Turkey, CATENA,
        163:233–243,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2017.12.023, 2018.

        Kottek, M., Grieser J., Beck, C., Rudolf, B., Rubel, F.: World Map of the Köppen-Geiger climate
        classification updated. Meteorol. Z., 15, 259-263. DOI: 10.1127/0941-2948/2006/0130, 2006.

820   Kundzewicz, Z.W. (Ed.): Changes in Flood Risk in Europe. IAHS Special Publication 10, 516 pp,
        2012.

        Lana-Renault, N., Latron, J., Karssenberg, D., Serrano-Muela, P., Reguees, D., Bierkens, M. F.
        P. :Differences in stream flow in relation to changes in land cover: A comparative study in two
        sub-Mediterranean mountain catchments, Journal of Hydrology, 411(3-4), 366-378, 2011.

825   Li, S., Bing, Z., Jin, G.:Spatially explicit mapping of soil conservation service in monetary units
        due to land use/cover change for the three gorges reservoir area, China. Remote Sensing, 11(4),
        6-8,https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11040468, 2019.

        Li, Y., Li, J.J., Are, K. S., Huang, Z.G.,Yu, H. Q., Zhang, Q.W.: Livestock grazing significantly
        accelerates soil erosion more than climate change in Qinghai-Tibet Plateau: Evidenced from
830   137Cs and 210Pbex measurements, Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 285,
        doi:10.1016/j.agee.2019.106643, 2019.

        Madarász, B., Jakab, G., Szalai, Z., Juhos, K., Kotroczó, Z., Tóth, A., Ladányi, M.: Long-term
        effects of conservation tillage on soil erosion in Central Europe: A random forest-based approach,
        Soil and Tillage Research, 209,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2021.104959, 2021.

835   Madsen, H., Lawrence, D., Lang, M., Martinkova, M., Kjeldsen, T. R.: Review of trend analysis
        and climate change projections of extreme precipitation and floods in Europe, Journal of
        Hydrology, 519, 3634–3650,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.11.003, 2014.

        Magliano, Patricio N., Whitworth-Hulse, Juan, I., Florio, Eva L.,Aguirre，E.C.,Blanco, L.J.:
        Interception loss, throughfall and stemflow by Larreadivaricata: The role of rainfall characteristics
840   and plant morphological attributes, Ecological Research, 34(6), 753-764, 2019.

        Merriam, G.: Ecological processes in the time and space farmland mosaics,in: Changing
        Landscapes: An Ecological Perspective. 286 pp. Edited by S. Zonneveld and R.T.T. Forman,
        Springer-Verlag, New-York, pp. 121-126, 1990.

        Moghadam, B., Jabarifar, M., Bagheri, M., Shahbazi, E.: Effects of land use change on soil splash

845   erosion in the semi-arid region of Iran,Geoderma, 241-242, 210-220, 2015.

Moravcová, J., Koupilová, M., Pavlíček, T., Zemek, F., Kvítek, T., Pečenka, J.: Analysis of land consolidation projects and their impact on land use change, landscape structure, and agricultural land resource protection: case studies of Pilsen-South and Pilsen-North (Czech Republic), Landscape and Ecological Engineering, 13(1), 1-13,https://doi.org/10.1007/s11355-015-0286-y, 850   2017.

Mullan, Donall.: Soil erosion under the impacts of future climate change: Assessing the statistical significance of future changes and the potential on-site and off-site problems, CATENA, 109, 234-246, 2013.

Nampak, H., Pradhan, B., MojaddadiRizeei, H., Park, H. J.: Assessment of land cover and land use 855   change impact on soil loss in a tropical catchment by using multitemporal SPOT-5 satellite images and Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation model, Land Degradation and Development, 29(10), 3440-3455,https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3112, 2018.

Nearing, M. A., Pruski, F. F., O'Neal, M. R.: Expected climate change impacts on soil erosion rates: A review, Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, 59 (1), 43-50, 2004.

860   Nearing, M. A., Xie, Y., Liu, B., Ye, Y.: Natural and anthropogenic rates of soil erosion, International Soil and Water Conservation Research, 5, 77-84,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswcr.2017.04.001, 2017.

Nytch, C. J., Melendez-Ackerman, E. J., Perez, M., Ortiz-ZayasJ.R.:Rainfall interception by six urban trees in San Juan, Puerto Rico, Urban Ecosystems, 22(1), 103-115, 2019.

865   Palazon, L, Navas, A.: Land use sediment production response under different climatic conditions in an alpine–prealpine catchment, CATENA, 137, 244-255, 2016.

Patin, J., Mouche, E., Ribolzi, O., Sengtahevanghoung, O., Latsachak, K.O., Soulileuth, B., Chaplot, V., Valentin, C.: Effect of land use on interrill erosion in a montane catchment of Northern Laos: An analysis based on a pluri-annual runoff and soil loss database, Journal of 870   Hydrology, 563, 480-494, 2018.

Perović, V., Jakšić, D., Jaramaz, D., Koković, N., Čakmak, D., Mitrović, M., Pavlović, P.:Spatio-temporal analysis of land use/land cover change and its effects on soil erosion (Case study in the Oplenac wine-producing area, Serbia), Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 190 (11),https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-018-7025-4, 2018.

875   Phillips, R. W., Spence, C., & Pomeroy, J. W.: Connectivity and runoff dynamics in heterogeneous

basins, Hydrological Processes, 25(19), 3061-3075,https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.8123, 2011.

Picciafuoco, T., Morbidelli, R., Flammini, A., Saltalippi, C., Corradini, C., Strauss, P., &Blöschl, G.: A Pedotransfer Function for Field-Scale Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity of a Small Watershed,Vadose Zone Journal, 18(1), 1–15,https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2019.02.0018, 2019

880   Prosdocimi, M., Cerdà, A., Tarolli, P.:Soil water erosion on Mediterranean vineyards: A review, CATENA, 141, 1-21,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2016.02.010, 2016.

Salesa, D., &Cerdà, A.:Soilerosion on mountain trails as a consequence of recreationalactivities. A comprehensivereview of the scientificliterature, Journal of Environmental Management, 271,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110990, 2020.

885   Santos, J.C.N., de Andrade, E.M., Medeiros, P.H.A., Guerreiro, M.J.S., Palacio, H.A.D.: Effect of Rainfall Characteristics on Runoff and Water Erosion for Different Land Uses in a Tropical Semiarid Region, Water Resources Management, 31(1),173-185, 2017.

Scholz, G., Quinton, J.N., Strauss, P.:Soil erosion from sugar beet in Central Europe in response to climate change induced seasonal precipitation variations,CATENA, 72, 91 –

890   105,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2007.04.005, 2008.

Sharma, A., Tiwari, K. N., Bhadoria, P. B. S.: Effect of land use land cover change on soil erosion potential in an agricultural watershed, Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 173(1-4), 789-801,https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-010-1423-6, 2011.

Sheridan, G. J., Lane, P. N. J., Sherwin, C. B., Noske, P. J.: Post-fire changes in sediment rating

895   curves in a wet Eucalyptus forest in SE Australia, Journal of Hydrology, 409(1-2), 183-195,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.08.016, 2011.

Silasari, R., Parajka, J., Ressl, C., Strauss, P., and Blöschl. G.: Potential of time-lapse photography for identifying saturation area dynamics on agricultural hillslopes, Hydrological Processes, 31, 3610–3627, doi: 10.1002/hyp.11272, 2017.

900   Smakhtin, V.U.: Low flow hydrology: a review, Journal of Hydrology, 240 (3-4), 147-186, 2001.

Syvitski, J.P., Morehead, M.D., Bahr, D.B., Mulder, T.: Estimating fluvial sediment transport: the rating parameters, Water Resour. Res., 36 (9), 2747-2760, 2000.

Sun, D., Yang, H., Guan, D., Yang, M., Wu, J.B., Yuan, F.H., Jin, C.J., Wang, A.Z., Zhang, Y.S.:The effects of land use change on soil infiltration capacity in China: A meta-analysis, Science

905   of the Total Environment, 626, 1394-1401, 2018.

Sun, P.C., Wu, Y.P., Wei, X.H., Sivakumar, B., Qiu, L.J., Mu, X.M., Chen, J., Gao, J.E.:

Quantifying the contributions of climate variation, land use change, and engineering measures for dramatic reduction in streamflow and sediment in a typical loess watershed, China, Ecological engineering, 142,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2019.105611, 2020.

910   Sun, W.Y., Shao, Q.Q., Liu, J.Y.: Soil erosion and its response to the changes of precipitation and vegetation cover on the Loess Plateau, JOURNAL OF GEOGRAPHICAL SCIENCES, 23(6),1091-1106, 2013.

Syvitski, J.P.M., Alcott, J.M.: RIVER3: simulation of water and sediment river discharge from climate and drainage basin variables,Comput.Geosci., 21, 89-151, 1995.

915   Takken, I., Beuselinck, L., Nachtergaele, J., Govers, G., Poesen, J., Degraer, G.:Spatial evaluation of a physically-based distributed erosion model (LISEM),CATENA, 37, 431-447, 1999.

Tang, C., Liu, Y., Li, Z., Guo, L., Xu, A., Zhao, J.: Effectiveness of vegetation cover pattern on regulating soil erosion and runoff generation in red soil environment, southern China, Ecological Indicators, 129, 107956,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107956, 2021.

920   Thomas, R. B.: Monitoring baseline suspended sediment in forested basins: the effects of sampling on suspended sediment rating curves, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 33,5- 10, 1988.

USDA-Staff. 2019. Rainfall intensity summarisation tool (RIST) in: https://www.ars.usda.gov/southeast-area/oxford-ms/national-sedimentation-laboratory/watershed-physical-processes-research/research/rist (Accessed in January, 2020)

925   Van Oost, K., Govers, G., Desmet, P.: Evaluating the effects of changes in landscape structure on soil erosion by water and tillage, Landscape Ecology, 15(6), 577-589,https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008198215674, 2000.

Vaughan, A. A., Belmont, P., Hawkins, C. P., Wilcock, P. : Near-Channel Versus Watershed Controls on Sediment Rating Curves, Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 122(10),
930   1901-1923,https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JF004180, 2017.

Vanmaercke, M., Zenebe, A., Poesen, J., Nyssen, J., Vertstraeten, G., and Deckers, J.:Sediment dynamics and the role of flash floods in sediment export from medium-sized catchments: a case study from the semi-arid tropical highlands in northern Ethiopia, J. Soil. Sediment., 10, 611-627, 2010.

935   Van Rompaey, A.J.J., Verstraeten, G., van Oost, K., Govers, G., Poesen, J.: Modelling mean annual sediment yield using a distributed approach, Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 26,1221-1236, 2002.

Wang, J., Shi, X., Li, Z., Zhang, Y., Liu, Y., Peng, Y.:Responses of runoff and soil erosion to planting pattern, row direction, and straw mulching on sloped farmland in the corn belt of

940   northeast China, Agricultural Water Management, 253(December 2020), 106935,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2021.106935, 2021

Wang, L.J., Zhang, G.H., Wang, X., Li, X.Y.:Hydraulics of overland flow influenced by litter incorporation under extreme rainfall, Hydrological Processes, 33(5), 737-747, 2019.

Wang, S.P., McVicar, Tim R., Zhang, Z.Q., Brunner, T., Strauss, P. : Globally partitioning the

945   simultaneous impacts of climate-induced and human-induced changes on catchment streamflow: A review and meta-analysis, Journal of Hydrology,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125387, 2020.

Warrick, J.A., Rubin, D. M.:Suspended-sediment rating curve response to surbanization and wildfire, Santa Ana River, California, Journal of Geophysical Research, 112, F02018,

950   doi:10.1029/2006JF000662, 2007.

Wei, W., Chen, L., Fu, B., Huang, Z., Wu, D., Gui, L.:The effect of land uses and rainfall regimes on runoff and soil erosion in the semi-arid loess hilly area, China, Journal of Hydrology, 335, 247-258, 2007.

Yao, J.J., Cheng, J.H., Zhou, Z.D., Sun, L., Zhang, H.J.: Effects of herbaceous vegetation coverage

955   and rainfall intensity on splash characteristics in northern China,CATENA, 167, 411-421, 2018.

Zhang, G.H., Liu, G.B., Wang, G.L., Wang, Y.X.:Effects of vegetation cover and rainfall intensity on sediment-associated nitrogen and phosphorus losses and particle size composition on the Loess Plateau, Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, 66(3),192-200, 2011.

Zhang, X.A., She, D., L., Hou, M., T., Wang, G.B., Liu, Y.: Understanding the influencing factors

960   (precipitation variation, land use changes and check dams) and mechanisms controlling changes in the sediment load of a typical Loess watershed, China, Ecological Engineering, 163,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2021.106198, 2021.

Zhang, X.C., Nearing, M.A.: Impact of climate change on soil erosion, runoff, and wheat productivity in central Oklahoma,CATENA, 61,185-195, 2005.

965   Zhang, Y., Xu, C., & Xia, M.: Can land consolidation reduce the soil erosion of agricultural land in hilly areas? Evidence from Lishui district, Nanjing city, Land, 10(5),https://doi.org/10.3390/land10050502, 2021.