Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 2491-2532, 2015
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/12/2491/2015/; doi:10.5194/bgd-12-2491-2015

Soil carbon and nitrogen erosion in forested catchments: implications for erosion-induced terrestrial carbon sequestration
Author responses

Please modify author affiliation for C.T. Hunsaker to indicate “Albany, CA”, or preferably, “Fresno, CA” [Pacific Southwest Research Station, US Forest Service, Fresno, CA, USA]

Response to: Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, comment C165–C174, 2015, Received and published February 12, 2015. www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/12/C165/2015/

Comments on the manuscript are followed by a response and pertinent changes

Comment: General comments “Overall, the discussion needs important restructuring and can be much more concise by focusing on the papers principal results, leaving out additional comments on issues not included in the results section (e.g. the whole discussion on roads). Moreover, at various points discussion is included and conclusions are drawn without providing data to support these. Either the data must be provided (if existent) or otherwise the issue must be removed from discussion and conclusions.”

Author response: Thank you for the thorough feedback and consideration for the manuscript. The abstract was rewritten (L2-22 in the revised manuscript) to more succinctly cover the study topic. In addition, the introduction and discussion have been revised for clarity and to ensure that we are now focusing on our study's principal results as suggested by the reviewer. We have also referenced (or added) data where need to justify the results and discussion.

Comment: It would be good to add some photographs of the catchments vegetation cover.

Author response: We agree with the reviewer's suggestion that it is useful to add photographs given the discussion of the differences in elevation, forested cover, and transport in montane forests. Hence, we have added representative pictures of the forest as Figure 3. Figures of the catchment elevation and size (previously Figure 2), and annual precipitation (previously Figure 3) were combined into one, Figure 2.

Comment: The statistical data analysis (section 2.4) as well as its results needs further elaboration explaining which relations were evaluated exactly and showing more results in a more concise manner.

Author response: We have revised section 2.4 (now section 2.5) and the results section for clarity. In the revised manuscript, section 2.5 now reads “Data are presented as mean ± standard error (n = 3), except where noted. Explanatory factors for C and N concentrations and the C:N ratio of sediment and soil were evaluated with a multivariate model to account for sampling year, catchment, sampling depth, and hillslope position. The strength of different model formats and interactions terms was evaluated using a stepwise regression run simultaneously in both directions, with the best model chosen according to the Akaike Information Criterion (Burnham and Anderson, 2002). The Tukey-Kramer HSD test ANOVA was used to test for significant differences between means of sediment mass, and C or N concentrations between sediment basins and collection years, and between hillslope position and transects for soils. For all statistical tests, an a priori α level of 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance. Statistical analyses were conducted using R 2.14.1 (http://www.r-project.org).” (L222-232).

Comment: Soils were sampled until 80cm depth, but results are only given for the upper 20 cm in Table 2. Why is that? What about results for greater depth?

Author response: Thank you for the input. Samples from 40-80 cm depth were sampled but never analyzed for all characteristics due to cost and time limitations; Soil values for samples 20-40 cm in depth have been added to Table 2. The methods have been modified to refer to data presented in the revised manuscript (L194-195).

Comment P2492L16: check units for sediments should not be kg N ha-1 but kg ha-1.

Author response: Thank you for the input. The revised manuscript now reads kg ha^{-1} (L9), as well as the units for total N transportation (kg N ha^{-1}, L11).

Comment P2494L3: please correct sentence.

Author response: The sentence had confusing wording, but it was actually removed entirely to streamline the introduction.

Comment P2494L1-8: Moreover, different erosion processes and transport distances also affect the possible breakdown of soil aggregates during transport, affecting protection of C and N (e.g. Nadeu et al., 2011; Boix-Fayos et al., 2015).

Author response: We agree that the type of erosion processes and transport distances can have important effects on protection of C and N. We have now included this information in the revised manuscript (L62-64).

Comment P2495L4: remove 'erosion' from 'eroded C and N erosion'

Author response: We acknowledge this was a valid correction, but the whole phrase was removed for clarity and to simplify the paragraph on the dynamics of C and N erosion (L62-75).

Comment P2495L5-11: what about different Carbon pools in forested versus agricultural settings, being more or less sensitive to oxidation?

Author response: While stabilization mechanisms are the focus of a different part of the project, we have expanded this section to address this valid point: "This same assumption may not be valid in forested ecosystems because upland forest soils typically have much higher concentrations of OM in surficial soils (as organic horizons or OM-rich mineral topsoil). Furthermore, C in forested soils or undisturbed grasslands is likely to have a larger unprotected (free, light) fraction compared to agricultural soils, where most of the C is typically associated with the soil mineral fraction (Berhe et al., 2012, Wang et al., 2014, Wiaux et al., 2013 Stacy, 2012). Hence, forested sites are likely to have substantially higher proportion of their eroded OM transported as unprotected, carbon-rich sediments that are free from any physical (aggregation) or chemical (bonding, complexation) association with soil minerals when compared to the better-studied agricultural soils." (L65-75).

Comment P2495L22-25: please correctly phrase the research questions either as a question or as an objective.

Author response: This was also mentioned by the other reviewer, and we think it is a justified change. The research questions were rephrased as part of a larger reorganization of the objectives and justification at the end of the introduction. The objectives were changed to questions (L111-115), and additional modifications were made to the section on the scope of this work (L96-119) including the inclusion of hypotheses.

Comment P2496L20-22: you already mentioned that a few lines before.

Author response: The repetition was removed, and consolidated earlier in the paragraph (L126-127).

Comment P2496L25: please define KREW.

Author response: The acronym was added at the first mention of the Kings River Experimental Watersheds (L123).

Comment P2497L7: What about texture in the Cagwin series?

Author response: Texture in the soil series description is not as clear as it is for Gerle or Shaver; It is not mentioned in the Taxonomic class, the typical pedon states "loamy coarse sand", and the range in characteristics gives "coarse sand, sand, loamy coarse sand, or loamy sand" in the control section. (https://soilseries.sc.egov.usda.gov/OSD_Docs/C/CAGWIN.html). The revised manuscript includes the loamy coarse sand from the soil series typical pedon (L154).

Comment P2497L14: how much is less than 78%

Author response: We have revised this section for clarity. In the revised manuscript, we have listed the dominant tree species and referred the reader to previous publications for more information on land cover (L142-148).

Comment P2497L21-..: all following is methodology and should not be under study site description.

Author response: Agreed and we separated methodology into a different section (L159).

Comment P2498L4: Figure 1 shows 21 sampling points (not 18)?

Author response: This disparity resulted during site selection and sampling. In the revised manuscript, we clarified: "Sites were selected to be comparable as possible; however, transect P2 had a non-representative, highly saturated meadow as the depositional location. Transect P2 was not evaluated in further analyses because other depositional locations were in the forest." (L180-182).

Comment P2498L15: how was slope calculated for these small depositional areas, less than 10m long, with a DEM resolution of 10m?

Author response: Slope was calculated using ArcGIS spatial tools that interpolate between raster points using the change in slope from point to point. The depositional areas are often narrow, especially along the streams where two slopes converge. This is evident in Figure 6, where steep slopes converging at a stream are denoted as continuous (though the slopes on either side of the stream are facing each other). The slope analysis, built from the 10 DEM, does gloss over small depositional areas in these cases. Larger depositional areas are apparent on the maps.

To further clarify, text was amended to: "These depositional areas cover a limited surface, sometimes only a few meters wide were slopes converge; the catchments are steep and have minimal flat surfaces near the creeks and drainages. To estimate slope at each sampling point, Spatial Analyst tools from the ArcGIS software ArcMap 10.0 (ESRI, Redlands, CA, USA) were used to calculate slope from a 10-m digital elevation model (DEM)." L188-192.

Comment P2499L1-7: can you say anything about the trapping efficiency of these boxes (see Verstraeten end Poesen 2000)? How much sediment passed the box and what was their C and N composition?

Author response: These sediment basins were constructed to fit the available space, instead of maximizing trapping efficiency. As part of the larger KREW project, sensors (Forest Technology Systems DTS-12) were installed in the streams. The sensors provide turbidity measurements which are used to estimate the suspended sediment concentration in the streams by correlation with grab samples (Hunsaker and Neary, 2012). However, there is unknown level of uncertainty with the reported numbers since the turbidity sensors were installed upstream of the sediment basins and no comparable sensors were installed downstream of the sediment catch basins. Trapping efficiency is briefly considered in the discussion (L412-415).

Comment P2500L23-24: so do we have a higher or a lower concentration of sand in sediments as compared to soils?

> ***Author response:*** The comparison was incorrectly stated as "sand vs. sand and silt", where it should have read "sand vs. *clay* and silt fractions". We have elaborated on this in the revised manuscript: "Sediments exported from all of the study catchments had statistically higher sand concentration, and lower clay concentrations, compared to surface soils in the source hillslope ($p < 0.001$; **Error! Reference source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.**)" (L290-292).

Comment P2501L4: how was water yield defined and measured? This was not explained under methods. Besides, reference should be to figure 4 not figure 2.

> ***Author response:*** Stream discharge was measured using a dual flume design with depth sensors; full experimental design and methods describe in the KREW study plan [Hunsaker et al., 2007. Kings River Experimental Watershed research study plan. Available at http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/water/kingsriver/documents/KREW_Study_Plan_Sep2007]. Annual water yield was integrated from average daily flow rates. This information was incorporated in the revised manuscript at L160-162. The figure reference was corrected (L237).

Comment P2501: the whole analysis of relation between water yield and sediment yield is potentially interesting, but does not seem to be relevant for your study and overall objectives. Leaving it out may give you a clearer message.

> ***Author response:*** The relationship between water yield and sediment yield is important, in that the total sediment mass changes, but sediment composition does not similarly change with changing precipitation (in answer to one of the main hypotheses). The discussion of outliers and obtaining the perfect fit did not serve the same purpose and was shortened (Section 3.1, L246-247). Figure 4 has been altered to also include sediment C concentration and C:N ratio.

Comment P2501L24-25: you already mentioned that at the beginning of the paragraph right?

> ***Author response:*** This was not a repetition but highlighted a particular aspect of the variability. It was rephrased slightly in the revised manuscript. (L239-240).

Comment P2502: the whole paragraph 3.3 is difficult to follow and would benefit from better structuring of the text.

> ***Author response:*** Sections 3.3 and 3.2 were reversed in the revised manuscript to provide for a better flow from the first section of the results.

Comment P2502L2: again: do we have a higher or a lower concentration of sand in sediments as compared to soils?

> ***Author response:*** The comparison was incorrectly stated as "sand vs. sand and silt", where it should have read "sand vs. *clay* and silt fractions". We have elaborated on this (and removed the repetition) in the revised manuscript: "Sediments exported from all of the study catchments had higher sand concentration, and lower clay concentrations, compared to surface mineral soils in the source hillslope ($p < 0.001$; Table 2 and Table 3). Silt concentration of WY 2009 sediment was higher ($p = 0.02$) than WY 2011 sediment but still lower ($p = 0.03$) than soil values. (L290-293).

Comment P2502L6-12: sorry, I can't follow this sentence. Please re-write and simplify.

> ***Author response:*** The sentence was rewritten and clarified in the revised manuscript: "Consistent with the coarser particles, sediment had lower specific surface area than for the soil. Of the three years evaluated, sediment from 2009 had the highest specific surface area (3.3 ± 1.0

m^2 g^{-1}; Table 2). Soil in the higher elevation B8 transect had a specific surface area of 8.5 ± 1.7 m^2 g^{-1}, while the lower elevation P4 transect had 10.3 ± 1.6 m^2 g^{-1} (**Error! Reference source not found.**)." (L296-299).

Comment P2503L24: You probably mean Figure 5 a and b?

Author response: In the revised manuscript, we have simplified this discussion, letting the figure convey the data. The figure is referenced once and a few points are highlighted (L259-261).

Comment P2503L26: Interesting result, but where can we see this (figure, Table..)?

Author response: As part of the broader effort to clarify this part of the study, we have expanded Figure 2 to show the relationship between stream discharge and sediment C and C:N ratios (the correlation with N is not shown). The appropriate references were added to L259 and 261.

Comment P2504L10: what do you mean by 'interactions between the variables'?

Author response: We have clarified in the revised manuscript: "This treats each sediment sample as independent but interactions between catchment and year could not be evaluated because there was insufficient replication." (L266-268).

Comment P2504L26-29: Is this referring to Figure 6?

Author response: No, it is meant to refer to Figure 5e, highlighting the outliers in C:N ratio. The sentence was revised for added clarity (L271-272).

Comment P2504L28: what does this mean exactly: 'For N, differences between each sediment year and the soil were even more pronounced'?

Author response: What was meant was that the difference between sediment and soil N concentrations was even greater than the difference between sediment and soil C concentrations. This has been simplified in the revised manuscript with a reliance on communicating data in the tables (L281-288).

Comment P2505L5-8: this is discussion, not a result.

Author response: This analysis was moved to the discussion in the revised manuscript (L394-395).

Comment P2505L17: I am not so convinced that climate comes out as an important factor. Your results do show that inter-annual differences in total annual precipitation is important, but no clear differences were found between higher and lower catchments, with more or less contribution from snow as compared to rainfall. So precipitation volume is important, no matter if it falls as rain or snow.

Author response: This is a good point. The discussion was clarified and is now more focused on stream discharge (data that was used in the analysis) and a distinction was made between the total precipitation amount, and precipitation form (L319-330).

Comment P2505L21: Where can we see the results of this analysis correlation analysis?

Author response: Catchment size, elevation, and elevation group were eliminated as part of the stepwise regression process referenced in the methods. The revised manuscript more clearly references the method (L261-263).

Comment P2505L23: Which subset? Please provide some more information.

Author response: The sediment basins were constructed over a period of years, and so early years only included data from a few of the basins. Timing of sediment collection was clarified in the revised manuscript in L327.

Comment P2505L25: I am not sure what you mean here by an ‘extreme sediment yield response’. There is a good correlation between water yield and sediment yield, but sediment yield values in your catchments are surely not extreme.

> ***Author response:*** This part of the discussion was rewritten to highlight outliers, instead of “extreme” “Some catchments, particularly P304, had high sediment export rates that were disproportionately high.” (L380-387)

Comment P2506L1: better than what?

> ***Author response:*** That sediment composition is better correlated with catchment characteristics than stream discharge; this addition was made in the manuscript. (L323-325).

Comment P2506L8: remove ‘sediment’. In fact, the entire sentence is unclear (Results from WY 2005–2011 supported. . .). Which hypothesis? Above you stated that the hypothesis was that catchment characteristics are more important. So what is your hypothesis? If you have one (or more) it would be good to include these in the introduction together with a better description of your objectives.

> ***Author response:*** The reviewer makes a good point here. The hypotheses were not clearly stated in the introduction. We added to the introduction, clarifying objectives and hypothesis for the work. Building from this, changes were made to this section of the manuscript to respond to your question (L323-325 and 341-351)

Comment P2506L16-18: what exactly do you mean by this? The catchments have high surface roughness and high spatial variability in processes? How do you know that? Your study did not assess spatial variability within catchments right?

> ***Author response:*** Our study did not assess spatial variability specifically. The vegetation cover in the catchments is variable, though there is generally an organic horizon that protects the soil surface. Because we did not specifically consider it, these points were removed as part of the larger restructuring of the discussion.

Comment P2506L27: what are ‘native surfaces’?

> ***Author response:*** Native surfaces in the context of the cited publication are roads with no gravel or pavement – graded roads with exposed but hardpacked dirt. The discussion of roads was mostly removed in favor of focusing on the discussion on hillslope erosion (L403).

Comment P2506L8: connectively = connectivity

> ***Author response:*** Yes, corrected in the revised manuscript (L401).

Comment P2506L5-10: what has the distance of the road to streams to do with the erosion rates on roads? The distance determines how well sediments originating from roads are connected to streams and to what extend their existence may be reflected in the catchment sediment yield, but it does not affect erosion on the road itself. In fact, the whole discussion here on the importance of roads, does not seem to be relevant for your study and is probably better removed.

> ***Author response:*** Discussion of surface roughness and road production was minimized as this particular study did not focus on geomorphology. Previous work in this area has noted the large discrepancy between sediment production on roads and the paucity of sediment hillslope sediment production; as a counterpoint, the comparison between road and hillslope sediment production rates are presented to show total sediment export is comparable to hillslope sediment production (remaining discussion L402-407)

Comment P2507L17: you are referring here to mean annual sediment yield? It may be that this catchment shows highest sediment yield since it also is the smallest catchment. Area specific sediment yield tends to be higher for smaller catchments due to less possibility for deposition losses during transport.

Author response: P304 (49 ha) is only slightly smaller in size than B201 (53 ha). Both have long, narrow geometries and yet P304 has a much larger sediment yield. Further discussion was presented by Hunsaker and Neary (2012). Discussion of this paper was rewritten (L380-387).

Comment P2507L25: 'core stones' = coarse stones? And, how would the presence of many stones cause high erosion rates? Usually, stone cover is associated with lower soil erosion rates (e.g. Poesen et al., 1994).

Author response: Core stones were meant as stones within the soil profile. Discussion of Hunsaker and Neary (2012) was poorly worded; the discussion in that paper does not disagree with your point. The section has been reworked (L382-387) to better present the prior work.

Comment P2508L1: where can we see the results of this comparison between sediment yields?

Author response: Sediment yields have been added as Table 1 in the revised manuscript.

Comment P2508L20-23: preferential erosion refers to the fact that preferentially the finer soil fraction is eroded that is also associated with higher C and N concentrations.

Author response: Yes, this was reworded in the revised manuscript to better express the point – transport of fine material with its associated OM from shallow soils resulted in OM-rich material at collection points (L396-400).

Comment P2508L8-15: do you have any information on sediment trapping efficiency of the boxes? That is quite crucial for the interpretation of your results.

Author response: We did not mean to convey that the sediment basins trapped transported sediment with a high efficiency. Though it would have been beneficial, the trapping efficiency of the sediment basins was not measured in the project due to labor and budget constraints. A note on the basin construction: to meet regulatory restrictions and be as benign as possible, the sediment basins were not engineered to the highest capture efficiency possible. The T003 sediment basin was constructed in the 1940s as a deep, cement-lined basin with a high downstream dam. The dams on the other seven streams, constructed for the KREW project, are less than 1 m high, and the sediment capture basins were constructed in the stream and adjacent banks without removing a lot of sediment. Basins were not expected to capture all fines, particularly in high flow years. However, Hunsaker and Neary (2012) report that silt constitutes as much as 16% of the dry sediment mass in P304. While it may not catch all, fine particles are still settling out in the basins. Trapping efficiency is discussed L408-422.

Comment P2510L1-2: please check grammar ('..or thinning due if these..').

Author response: We have removed the sentence because of the discussion on forest treatments, which was out of place in the scope of the study (regarding: other comments on this aspect).

Comment P2510L3-4: what exactly do you mean to say here?

Author response: Erosion mechanisms, and the resulting characteristics of mobilized sediment, are explored in the revised manuscript in L390-395. We have shortened the discussion and focused on sheet or surficial erosion processes, which we think dominate here.

Comment P2510L13: which data you found are you referring to?

Author response: The texture and specific surface area of the sediment mineral fraction are presented in Table 2. Discussion of the potential sediment sources is limited to L367-372.

Comment P2510L12-17: sorry, can't follow your argumentation here. Especially for the lower catchment group, no differences in ER between different transect positions were found. This makes it impossible to identify the source of sediments.

Author response: We acknowledge your point. In addition, differences in the ER ratios are partially influenced by the wide range in the soil values. The contribution of upland sediment sources was briefly pointed out in the revised manuscript (L370-372).

Comment P2510L27: indeed, finer particles may be transported further, but still in the Bull catchments, the ER compared to depositional sites is below 1, meaning that we have a lower C concentration in sediment than in soils there, so most C stays at the depositional site, and so either a relatively high fraction of source material originates from sources with low C contents, or there are important C losses by oxidation during transport and after deposition in the box.

Author response: Alternatively, lower C concentrations are the result of low trapping efficiency in the sediment basins; this and other possible explanations were streamlined L384-417. In addition, depositional locations in Bull Creek were the most variable of all sampled, with a range of 3-16.7% C; one site disproportionately influences the patterns in ER in this case.

Comment P2511L11: I don't see how we can have preferential detachment or transport of coarser fractions? In fact, the whole sentence L10-15 does not make much sense. Please revise.

Author response: The text was supposed to explain how preferential loss of fine and light fractions from the sediment basins would have appeared as coarser sediment in the sediment basins. This section was revised for clarity, see L396-407.

Comment P2511L15: what is a sediment basin approach?

Author response: The study approach used sediment settling basins designed for state permitting guidelines but not necessarily high trap efficiency. The concerns here relate to the trap efficiency and the possibility of preferential deposition in the basins, without the confirmation of measurements of suspended and bedload sediment. Section heading was removed as part of rewriting the discussion, but discussion of the trap efficiency is included L408-422.

Comment P2511L19: this suggests well known non linearity in the relation between discharge and sediment yield.-

Author response: The distinction between sediment yield and water yield responses was reduced, but discussion of each sediment yield in particular is in the first paragraph of the Discussion (L319-340).

Comment P2511L26-28: please revise this sentence; it does not seem to make much sense.

Author response: Discussion of event-based differences in the sediment composition was left at an acknowledgement that event-based sampling would have been useful for trap efficiency numbers but was not executed due to cost and time constraints (L415).

Comment P2512L2: the basins characteristics?

Author response: Here we were referencing"…the geometry of the sediment basins." A more refined discussion of the basin characteristics and trapping efficiency is included L412-415.

Comment P2512L16-18: I don't see how the following statement relates to your discussion on the importance of trapping efficiency: 'where the low C and N capture efficiency in the basins would be attributed to local deposition of particulate C and N within the catchment'.. Please explain or rephrase. Also, what follows (sorption. . .) does not connect to first part of the sentence.

Author response: This statement was rewritten as "It is likely that some C existing as free organic particles and C associated with very small mineral particles (that remain in suspension the longest) could be transported further and at least partially contribute to the inverse relationship discussed above. However, the loss of C as OM in dissolved and suspended sediment form is likely, at least partially compensated, by input of C from vegetation growing above the sediment basins."(L418-422).

Comment P2512L22: can we see the data to support this statement?

Author response: Reference to this has been removed since the study did not focus on event-based sampling.

Comment P2513L1-5: Yes, but the sediment yield values for your catchment are very low, so also total C and N exported is low. What may be important is that C and N stability in sediments with higher concentrations is different from stability and burial efficiency of sediments with lower concentrations. See also previous studies (e.g. Wang et al., 2014; Van Hemelryck et al., 2011; VandenBygaart et al., 2015) for more details on stability after deposition.

Author response: Stability is not the focus of this manuscript, but of another portion of this project in preparation for publication. The revised manuscript was reworked to focus on the data presented in this study, with a brief discussion of stabilization mechanisms during the discussion of the study's implications for the C balance (L424-433). Overall, we found the sediment yield is only a small portion of C storage in these ecosystems.

Comment P2513L17: remove 'slopped'

Author response: That would have been a good change, but the sentence was revised in the new version. Steep slopes are mentioned in the revised manuscript L375.

Comment P2514L2-4: on what information is this based? How do you know C replacement and C mineralization potential is high?

Author response: Our study did not evaluate these particulars, beyond published productivity for dense mixed-conifer forests. This discussion was hypothetical since we do not have a numerical basis for the potential C replacement. This discussion was removed in the simplified discussion.

Comment P2514L14: what are 'light carbonations materials' and where are the data to support this statement? We only saw data regarding total C and total N, but not regarding different C fractions.

Author response: Mispelled word (carbonaceous). Another part of this work, in preparation for publication, evaluated the relative contributions of aggregation and mineral bonding as OM stabilization mechanisms. We removed the parts discussing C fractions as these will be included in a future publication.

Comment P2514L18: If it's not addressed, leave it out.

Author response: Thank you for the feedback. The postulation was removed.

Comment P2514L21-25: while this is certainly true, it does not relate to any of your results. You did not discuss or provide data to highlight anything with respect to stability of C during transport or deposition.

Author response: A portion of this work to follow evaluated stabilization mechanisms, and it is briefly mentioned in the revised manuscript (L433-435).

Comment P2515L8-10: this may be true, but by looking at annual data, rather than events, based on your data you cannot say anything about the expected impacts of changes in rainfall distribution or intensity.

Author response: As mentioned in other responses, we did not evaluate event-based sediment or water yield, and the reference to this was limited to a brief call to explore event-based data at these sites (L433-435).

Comment P2515L11-12: as above, you did not evaluate the impacts of changes in land cover so you can't make conclusions about that either.

> ***Author response:*** It is true that we did not evaluate the impacts of land cover changes as a part of this portion of the study. However, as it is widely recognized that land cover changes have important implication for sediment mobilization, and this was one of the original motivations of the KREW study. These sediment sources will serve as a baseline for future years. In the revised manuscript, this is only alluded to in L105-106.

Comment Table 2: what about the transect in B203 as indicated on Figure 2?

> ***Author response:*** These values in Table 2 are not averages of all soil samples. Due to costs, only a subset of the soil samples were analyzed for texture – these are transects P4, and B8 (indicated on the table). An additional clarification was added to the Table 2 caption: "*Physical and biochemical characterizations of the soil material (air-dry < 2 mm) for a* ***subset of the sampled soil transects,*** *including* pH_{water} *(1:2 w/v), carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) concentrations, and particle size distribution.*"

Response to: Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, comment C505–C506, 2015; Received and published March 4, 2015 www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/12/C505/2015/

> Comments on the manuscript are followed by a response and pertinent changes

Comment 2494 L14-15: It is not clear what the mechanisms are that arte responsible for the apparent stability of buried organic matter. See VandenBygaart et al. 2015 cited in manuscript.

> ***Author response:*** We are not clear on the reference to this part of the manuscript – perhaps the line numbers were not correct? In any case, we have revised the text to clarify discussion on the important mechanisms responsible for apparent stability of buried organic matter (L31-36).

Comment 2494 L27-28 "...compared to agriculture and rangeland systems" This statement requires a citation.

> ***Author response:*** The differences between erosion in forested and in agricultural or rangeland ecosystems was expanded (L47-61).

Comment 2494 L1-3: This statement also needs a citation.

> ***Author response:*** This statement on surface roughness was removed from the text in lieu of the discussion on vegetative cover and organic matter coverage in forests (L50-54, 66-72).

Comment 2495 L21-25: Since you are stating the answering of questions the listed should be stated as questions with question marks.

> ***Author response:*** This was also mentioned by the other reviewer. The objectives were changed to questions (111-115), and additional modifications were made to the section for clarity (L96-119).

Comment 2497 L3: "in three of the low elevation Providence catchments"

> ***Author response:*** Corrected in the revised manuscript to simply "in the Providence catchments" (L151).

Comment 2500 L18-19: Should it be Table 1 referred to here or Table 3? L18-22: It is not clear where these data are demonstrated. Is it not Table 3?

> ***Author response:*** The relevant data are presented in Figure 4, and coefficients of variation for these groups are in Table 3. Both references were added to the Results text in the revised manuscript (L237).

Comment 2510 L3: should read "though these features are not common" Frequency implies a temporal context.

> ***Author response:*** Agreed. We have changed the text in this section in revised manuscript as suggested. (L402)

Comment 2510 L24 "Also could cite VandenBygaart et al. 2015 here.

> ***Author response:*** Reference added L433.

Comment 2512 L12: delete "materials. L13: "and that they are likely transported..."

> ***Author response:*** Found on page 2511: The discussion of erosion processes and the material they transport was simplified and rewritten. (L390-395 in the revised manuscript)

Comment 2512 L19 ""in flow for any given year (Fig. 4)."

> ***Author response:*** Figure reference added (L330), and removed reference to Figure 2.

Comment [same page] L18: ..., 2015), and sorption of..."

> ***Author response:*** Agreed that it needed clarification. The altered wording of the revised manuscript considers the balance of trapping efficiency in the basins and OM fates and now reads: "…However, considering the nature of soils and SOM in our study catchments, and the discharge events recorded, we can assume that most of the C laterally distributed from the hillslopes is likely trapped in the basins. It is likely that some C existing as free organic particles and C associated with very small mineral particles (that remain in suspension the longest) could be transported further and at least partially contribute to the inverse relationship discussed above. However, the loss of C as OM in dissolved and suspended sediment form is likely, at least partially compensated, by input of C from vegetation growing above the sediment basins." (L414-422)

Comment 2513 L8 "free light fraction OM". In cropland, our study found that buried C had a high proportion of light fraction SOM yet the rate of decomposition was still much lower than the surface soils, suggesting that perhaps the LF was also stabilized more than the LF at the surface. Also dating by 137Cs and 14C indicated that the LF had been stabilized for decades since its deposition.

> ***Author response:*** Additional results on stabilization mechanisms are in preparation for publication. We will take your points into consideration when evaluating that data. In this manuscript we limit the discussion to L433-435.

Comment 2415 L14 : do you mean "carbonaceous"?

> ***Author response:*** Yes, that is what was meant; based on input from another review, this section was removed. A separate portion of the study evaluated C fractions and stabilization mechanisms, but that was not part of the data presented here (L434).

Soil carbon and nitrogen erosion in forested catchments: implications for erosion-induced terrestrial carbon sequestration

Erin M. Stacy[1*], Stephen C. Hart[1,2], Carolyn T. Hunsaker[3], Dale W. Johnson[4], Asmeret Asefaw Berhe[1,2]

[1]Environmental Systems Graduate Group, University of California, Merced, CA, USA

[2]Life & Environmental Sciences and the Sierra Nevada Research Institute, University of California, Merced, CA, USA

[3]Pacific Southwest Research Station, US Forest Service, Albany, CA, USA

[4]Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Science, University of Nevada, Reno, USA

*Corresponding author:
Erin Stacy
Sierra Nevada Research Institute
University of California, Merced; SE1 208
5200 N Lake Road
Merced, CA 95348
estacy@ucmerced.edu

Keywords: soil erosion, export of carbon and nitrogen, spatial and temporal variability

ABSTRACT

Lateral movement of organic matter (OM) due to erosion is now considered an important flux term in terrestrial carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) budgets, yet most published studies on the role of erosion focus on agricultural or grassland ecosystems. To date, little information is available on the rate and nature of OM eroded from forest ecosystems. We present annual sediment composition and yield, for water years 2005-2011, from eight catchments in the southern part of the Sierra Nevada, California. Sediment was compared to soil at three different landform positions from the source slopes to determine if there is selective transport of organic matter or different mineral particle size classes. Sediment export varied from 0.4 to 177 kg ha^{-1}, while export of C in sediment was between 0.025 and 4.2 kg C ha^{-1} and export of N in sediment was between 0.001 and 0.04 kg N ha^{-1}. Sediment yield and composition showed high interannual variation. In our study catchments, erosion laterally mobilized OM-rich litter material and topsoil, some of which enters streams owing to the catchment topography where steep slopes border stream channels. Annual lateral sediment export was positively and strongly correlated with stream discharge, while C and N concentrations were both negatively correlated with stream discharge; hence, C:N ratios were not strongly correlated to sediment yield. Our results suggest that stream discharge, more than sediment source, is a primary factor controlling the magnitude of C and N export from upland forest catchments. The OM-rich nature of eroded sediment raises important questions about the fate of the eroded OM. If a large fraction of the SOM eroded from forest ecosystems is lost during transport or after deposition, the contribution of forest ecosystems to the erosion induced C sink is likely to be small (compared to croplands and grasslands).

1. INTRODUCTION

The processes of soil erosion and terrestrial sedimentation have been a focus of a growing number of studies because of their potential to induce a net terrestrial sink for atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO_2; Stallard, 1998; Berhe et al., 2007). Erosion can lead to terrestrial C sequestration if erosional loss of soil C from slopes is more than offset by stabilization of eroded C in depositional landform positions and (at least partial) replacement of eroded C by production of new photosynthate within the eroding catchment (Stallard, 1998; Harden et al., 1999; Berhe et al., 2007; Harden et al., 2008; Nadeu et al., 2012; Sanderman and Chappell, 2013).

Recent studies have identified major implications of erosion on soil organic matter (SOM stabilization, changes in composition, and input to the soil system. Identified stabilization mechanisms for this eroded organic matter (OM) deposited in low-lying landform positions include burial, aggregation, and sorption of OM on the surfaces of reactive soil minerals (Berhe et al., 2012a; Vandenbygaart et al., 2012), and changes in the biomolecular composition of OM during transport (Rumpel and Kogel-Knabner, 2011; Vandenbygaart et al., 2015). Removal of organic- and nutrient-rich topsoil material from eroding positions and its concomitant accumulation in depositional landform positions also has impacts for net primary productivity (NPP) in both locations (Yoo et al., 2005; Berhe et al., 2008; Parfitt et al., 2013). These factors – the balance of organic matter production, stabilization and loss across the landscape – are ecosystem-specific. Several studies have assessed the impact of erosion on C balances in agricultural lands (Van Oost et al., 2007; Quinton et al., 2010; Chappell et al., 2012; Vanderbygaart et al., 2012; Rumpel et al., 2014). Some ecosystems with less human influence have also been studied in this context (Yoo et al., 2006; Berhe et al., 2008; Boix-Fayos et al., 2009; Hancock et al., 2010; Nadeu et al., 2012), but there is currently little published data from minimally disturbed temperate forests.

Erosion processes in forested ecosystems, especially upland or steep catchments, have notable differences from agro-ecosystems. For instance, average sediment erosion rates are orders of magnitude higher for agricultural lands compared to forested lands (Pimentel and Kounang, 1998). Forest land erosion rates are lower in part due to greater live plant and litter cover of the mineral soil than in agro-ecosystems; as the vegetation cover reduces the energy of incoming precipitation. In landscapes that have experienced little anthropogenic disturbance, overland erosion transports material from the uppermost soil horizons, which often have a high proportion of undecomposed OM and high C concentrations. Such C enrichment in the transported material relative to the residual soil has been observed in croplands and rangelands; but increased incision into the landscape – through gullies, mass wasting or other processes – also erodes material from deeper layers with lower C concentrations in these managed ecosystems, resulting in relatively low C enrichments (Nadeu et al., 2011). The intensive cultural practices used frequently in agricultural, but less often in forestry, such as tilling or vegetation removal, disrupt soil stability and can increase erosion by orders of magnitude (e.g., Pimentel and Kounang, 1998; Van Oost et al., 2006).

Sediment exported from small, minimally disturbed low-order catchments can experience C oxidation during transport (Berhe, 2012) through the disruption of aggregates (Nadeu et al. 2011, Boix-Fayos et al. 2015), exposure to oxygen and new microbial decomposers, or other means. The oxidative C loss during erosion is typically assumed to be less than 20% in agro-ecosystems partly owing to the relatively low OM concentrations in these soils (Berhe et al., 2007). This same assumption may not be valid in forested ecosystems because upland forest soils typically have much higher concentrations of OM in surficial soils (as organic horizons or OM-rich mineral topsoil). Furthermore, C in forested soils or undisturbed grasslands is likely to have a larger unprotected (free, light) fraction compared to agricultural soils, where most of the C is typically associated with the soil mineral fraction (Berhe et al., 2012, Wang et al., 2014, Wiaux et al., 2013 Stacy, 2012). Hence, forested sites are likely to have substantially higher proportion of their eroded OM transported as unprotected, carbon-rich sediments that are free from any physical (aggregation) or chemical (bonding, complexation) association with soil minerals when compared to the better-studied agricultural soils.

Furthermore, determining the role of erosion on forested ecosystems is timely since even forested systems that previously did not experience much anthropogenic modification are expected to experience considerable changes in precipitation amount, timing, and nature with anticipated changes in climate. Anticipated changes in climate are expected to have important implications for sediment and OM erosion from forest ecosystems. In the Sierra Nevada mountains, large tracts of relatively undisturbed forest still exist. Even though some land has experienced intensive management for timber production (especially in historical periods), most has received relatively minor influences from human activity, including fire management, roads, and the water reservoir system. In these ecosystems, increasing temperatures associated with climate change are expected to alter the erosional process due to the anticipated shift in the nature of precipitation. A shift in the type of precipitation from snow to rain, and a higher number of rain-on-snow events, compared to even the last few decades (Bales et al., 2006, IPCC, 2007, Klos et al., 2014), are expected to provide greater force to detach, scour, and transport material from the soil overall (Boix-Fayos et al., 2009; Nadeu et al., 2011) with subsequent implications for amount of C transported. Higher erosive forces would also provide more energy to disrupt aggregates, exposing OM previously protected from decomposition to loss (Nadeu et al. 2011). The dearth of data on the effect of climate change on soil C erosion is complicated by the inherent variability of erosion events, such as episodic, large storm events or an extreme weather season, that make it challenging to create conceptual or numerical models that can easily scale up across time and space (Kirkby, 2010).

Here, we focus on determining the nature and magnitude of the sediment and associated OM exported out of forested upland catchments at mid-range scales (spatially and temporally) to further our understanding of how climate affects soil erosion processes in such ecosystems. We quantified the mass and composition of sediments exported from eight low-order catchments to determine the effect of soil erosion on C and N dynamics in these upland forest ecosystems. Our study catchments are located in the southern Sierra Nevada, at two contrasting elevation zones with differences in the proportion of precipitation falling as rain or snow. This work builds on previous publications on the sediment transport and composition from the same site (Eagan et al., 2007; Hunsaker and Neary, 2012), covering sediment transport for all water years (2005-2011) after the construction of all sediment basins and prior to planned forest management treatments (fire and thinning); implementation of those treatments began in 2012. In addition, we expand on the characterization of sediment composition with additional measurements and a comparison to soil samples from potential source locations. This work is part of a larger investigation at this site on changes in OM stabilization mechanisms due to erosion. Specifically, we addressed two critical questions:

(a) In forested catchments with minimal disturbance, how are rates of sediment yield related to interannual differences in precipitation?

(b) Is the chemical composition of eroded sediments better correlated to catchment characteristics (e.g., soil properties and slope geometry) or climate (e.g., precipitation form, water yield timing)?

We hypothesized that variation in sediment yield is directly related to stream discharge based on results from previous years. We also hypothesized that sediment chemical composition (in contrast to total yield) is better correlated with watershed characteristics than with precipitation amount or water yield timing.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION AND METHODS

2.1 Site Description

This study was conducted within the U.S. Forest Service Kings River Experimental Watersheds (KREW), located in the Sierra National Forest (37.012°N, 119.117°W; Figure 1). We used eight low-order catchments (48–227 ha in size), grouped within two elevation zones as the Providence and Bull catchments (Figure 2). The Providence catchments (1485–2115 m elevation) receive a mix of rain and snow (about 35-60% snow). Approximately 15 km to the southeast, the higher-elevation Bull catchments (2050–2490 m) receive the majority (75-90%) of precipitation as snow. Both elevation groups experience a Mediterranean-type climate with the majority of precipitation (rain or snow) falling in the winter. The lower-elevation Providence catchments are also being investigated as part of the Southern Sierra Critical Zone Observatory (CZO, www.criticalzone.org/sierra) project. Mean (± standard deviation) annual air temperature for water years 2004–2007 was 11.3 ± 0.8 °C and 7.8 ± 1.4 °C at the low and high elevation sites, respectively (Johnson et al., 2011). Annual precipitation during the years of this study (water years 2005–2011) was similar across elevations but varied more than two fold among years (750–2200 mm, Figure 2, see Hunsaker and Neary (2012) and Climate and Hydrology Database Projects [CLIMDB/HYDRODB], www.fsl.orst.edu/climhy).

Seven of the catchments have experienced common forest management practices such as timber harvest, tree planting, grazing, and road construction and maintenance. However, no activities other than occasional road grading and grazing have occurred in the past 15 years since KREW was established. One catchment (T003) is undisturbed and has never had timber harvest or road construction. No fire has been recorded in these catchments for 110 years.

Both the lower and higher elevation sites are characterized as Sierra mixed-conifer forests, with a more open canopy at Bull than Providence (Figure 3). Dominant tree species at Providence Creek site include sugar pine (*Pinus lambertiana*), ponderosa pine (*P. ponderosa*), incense-cedar (*Calocedrus decurrens*), white fir (*Abies concolor*), and black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*). At the higher elevation Bull Creek site, red fir (*A. magnifica*), sugar pine, and Jeffrey pine (*P. jeffreyi*) are more dominant. For more information on land cover see Bales et al. (2011) and Johnson et al. (2011).

Soil in the study area is derived from granite and granodiorite bedrock. Dominant soil series include Shaver, Cagwin, and Gerle-Cagwin. The Shaver series is most prominent (48–66% coverage) in the Providence catchments, while the higher elevation Bull catchments are dominated by the Cagwin series (67–98% coverage; Johnson et al., 2011). The Shaver series is in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Taxonomic family of coarse-loamy, mixed mesic Pachic Xerumbrepts. The Cagwin series is in the loamy coarse sand, mixed, frigid Dystric Xeropsamments family. The Gerle series is in the coarse-loamy, mixed, frigid Typic Xerumbrepts family. Johnson et al. (2011) give detailed information on chemical and physical variation of soil in the study catchments. The dominant aspect of these catchments is southwest (Bales et al., 2011).

2.2 Methods

Stream discharge was quantified using a pair of flumes on each stream (Hunsaker et al. 2007). Annual stream discharge presented here was integrated from average daily flow rates based on continuous 15 minute interval sampling. We characterized newly collected sediment samples from the catchments for water years 2009–2011 (Table 1) and sediment samples from water years 2005, 2007, and 2008 (Eagan et al., 2007; Hunsaker and Neary, 2012) that were collected and archived by the U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station in Fresno, CA (stored air-dry, at room temperature in the dark). There were no archived sediments preserved from water year 2006.

Sediment from each catchment was captured in basins that allow sediment particles to settle as stream water slows passing through the basin (Eagan et al., 2007). Constructed to fit the topography, basin dimensions vary in size but are about 2-3 m wide by 8-15 m long. Annual sediment loads were quantified at the end of the water year (WY; October 1 of the previous year through September 30) in August and September, when water flows were lowest. Streams were diverted underneath the basin lining for collection. Material in the sediment basins was emptied using buckets and shovels and weighed in the field using a hanging spring scale (capacity of 50 ± 0.5 kg). A representative sample (~20 kg) was returned to the U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station Fresno office. Subsamples (~2 kg) for WY 2009-2011 were transported in a cooler to UC Merced and stored at 4°C until further processing.

Sediment samples were compared to soil samples considered as potential sources, collected from 18 sampling points along representative transects for each elevation group of catchments (see Figure 1). Sites were selected to be comparable as possible; however, transect P2 had a non-representative, highly saturated meadow as the depositional location. Transect P2 was not evaluated in further analyses because other depositional locations were in the forest. Each transect was laid out along a hillslope toposequence and sampled at crest, backslope, and foot/toe-slope (hereafter characterized as "depositional") landform positions. Crest samples were taken at the top of a ridgeline, where the slope was < 5 degrees. Backslope samples were taken where the slope change was constant (slopes between 5 and 25°). Depositional samples were taken in areas where slopes were converging and curvature was minimal (i.e., below the footslope and as close to flat as possible). These depositional areas cover a limited surface, sometimes only a few meters wide were slopes converge; the catchments are steep and have minimal flat surfaces near the creeks and drainages. To estimate slope at each sampling point, Spatial Analyst tools from the ArcGIS software ArcMap 10.0 (ESRI, Redlands, CA, USA) were used to calculate slope from a 10-m digital elevation model (DEM). Soil samples from each of hillslope position were collected in August and September, 2011, using a hand auger with a 5 cm diameter bucket. Depths were separated into four layers: organic horizon, 0-10 cm, 10-20 cm, 20-40 cm. Soil samples were kept in a cooler on ice packs until returned to the laboratory, where they were transferred to a refrigerator and kept at 4°C until processing within three months. Soil sampling locations were selected to minimize variation in aspect and slope (factors that might influence overland transport and the energy of incoming precipitation). Soil across the catchments was previously characterized (Johnson et al., 2011; Johnson et al., 2012), providing a larger data set against which to compare the results of this study.

2.3 Physical Characterization of soil and sediment

Soil and sediment (air-dry, < 2 mm sieved samples) pH was measured in 1:2 (w:w) soil to water suspension using a combination electrode (Fisher Scientific Accumet Basic AB15 meter, Waltham, Massachusetts). Soils (0-20 cm) from two transects (selected for comparability based on distance to stream, aspect, and vegetation) were selected for particle size distribution and specific surface area at the Center for Environmental Physics and Mineralogy at the University of Arizona. Before analyses, organic matter was removed from the soil and sediment samples by mixing approximately 20 g of sample with 100 ml of sodium hypochlorite (6% NaOCl, adjusted to pH 9.5 with 1 M HCl) for 30 minutes at 60 °C. Subsequently, solutions were centrifuged at 1500 *g* for 15 minutes; then supernatant and floating organic particles were aspirated. This process was repeated twice. After OM removal, 100 ml of deionized water was added and the centrifuged; the supernatant was aspirated and discarded, and samples were dried at 40 °C. Particle size distribution was determined with laser diffraction and specific surface area with Brunauer Emmett Teller adsorption isotherms (Brunauer et al., 1938).

2.4 Characterization of C and N in sediment and soil

Total C and N were measured on the < 2 mm fraction following grinding (8000M Spex Mill, SPEX Sample Prep, Metuchen, NJ, USA) with a Costech ECS 4010 CHNSO Analyzer (Valencia, CA, USA). All values have been moisture-corrected and reported here on oven-dry (105 °C) weight basis, and as the mean of three analytical replicates ± standard error, except where noted.

2.5 Data Analysis

Data are presented as mean ± standard error (*n* = 3), except where noted. Explanatory factors for C and N concentrations and the C:N ratio of sediment and soil were evaluated with a multivariate model to account for sampling year, catchment, sampling depth, and hillslope position. The strength of different model formats and interactions terms was evaluated using a stepwise regression run simultaneously in both directions, with the best model chosen according to the Akaike Information Criterion (Burnham and Anderson, 2002). The Tukey-Kramer HSD test ANOVA was used to test for significant differences between means of sediment mass, and C or N concentrations between sediment basins and collection years, and between hillslope position and transects for soils. For all statistical tests, an a priori α level of 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance. Statistical analyses were conducted using R 2.14.2 (http://www.r-project.org).

3. RESULTS

3.1 Sediment yield and Organic Matter Export

Area-normalized sediment yield (hereafter referred to as sediment yield) in the eight catchments varied over several orders of magnitude. There were large differences among years and catchments (Figure 4, Table 1). Mean annual sediment yield across all catchments and years was 26.0 ± 6.1 kg ha^{-1}, but ranged from 0.4–177 kg ha^{-1}. The lowest mean sediment yield (8.9 ± 4.0 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded for the P303 catchment. The highest interannual variability in sediment yield was observed in catchments D102, B204, and T003. Sediment yield was positively correlated with total annual water yield (Figure 4). Across all catchments and years, there was a good correlation between water yield and sediment yield:

$$\log_{10}[S] = 1.87 * \log_{10}[W] - 0.307 \quad (1)$$

$$(R^2 = 0.62, p<0.0001, n=52)$$

where: S = Annual sediment yield (kg ha^{-1} y^{-1}) and W = Annual water yield (1000 m^3 ha^{-1} y^{-1}). The P304 catchment had very high export rates relative to the other catchments; excluding this catchment improved R^2 value to 0.72 ($p < 0.001$, $n = 45$).

In contrast to the sediment yield, C (Figure 4) and N (not shown) concentrations in the sediment were both negatively correlated with annual water yield ($R^2 = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$, $n = 45$ for C; and $R^2 = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$, $n = 45$ for N). As a result, the sediment C to N (C:N) mass ratio was only weakly correlated to water yield ($R^2 = 0.10$, $p = 0.019$, $n = 45$; Figure 4). Much of the organic matter collected in the sediment basins is recognizable (by the naked eye or under 25x magnification) as undecomposed organic matter. Further methods and results of the mass of transported sediment are available in Hunsaker and Neary (2012). The total export of particulate C in the < 2 mm fraction ranged from 0.17 to 46.9 kg C ha^{-1} while particulate N export was 0.008-1.7 kg N ha^{-1}.

3.2 C and N concentrations in sediment and soil

Sediment yield among both catchments and years was more variable (higher coefficients of variation) than the sediment C and N concentrations (Table 4). While sediment composition was less variable than sediment yield overall, C and N concentrations still showed statistically significant interannual and interbasin variation (Figure 5). Catchment size, catchment elevation group, and mean elevations were eliminated as significantly contributing variables in a stepwise regression model run simultaneously in both directions. In the sediment samples, C concentrations ranged from 15.5 to 190 g kg^{-1} and N from 0.50 to 7.10 g kg^{-1} (Table 2). In a multivariate general linear model, both year ($p < 0.001$) and source catchment ($p < 0.01$)

significantly influenced C and N concentrations (*n* = 45). This treats each sediment sample as independent but interactions between catchment and year could not be evaluated because there was insufficient replication. Sediment yield was inversely correlated with C and N concentrations (R^2 = 0.26 and 0.19, respectively; $p < 0.01$, n = 46). For seven catchments, the C:N ratio ranged from 20.4 to 36.8, with a mean of 27.1 (Figure 5f). The only significant difference among catchments was found in the upper elevation catchment, B201, which had comparatively higher N concentrations; B201 sediment constitutes the outliers in Figure 5e.

Mineral soils had similar C and N concentrations and C:N ratios at both sampling sites (Table 3). The low elevation Providence catchment had a wider range in C concentrations (9.0 to 98 g kg^{-1}) in the surface soil (0-10 cm), than the Bull catchment soils (18.0–63.0 g kg^{-1}, except for one depositional point that had a C concentration of 167 g kg^{-1}). The N concentrations in surface soil ranged from 0.5 to 3.5 g kg^{-1} in Providence, and 1.0 to 5.1 g kg^{-1} in Bull. Differences between the elevation groups were not statistically significant (ANOVA; $p > 0.40$) for either C or N soil concentrations. The greatest differences were between the organic and the mineral soil horizons. The C:N ratio of the organic horizon was statistically higher than the mineral soils (means 51 ± 3.9% and 25 ± 0.9%, respectively, $p < 0.0001$). There was no difference in either the C or N concentration, or the C:N ratio of the organic horizon between landform positions, transects, or catchments (data not shown). Depositional hillslope positions had significantly higher C and N concentrations than both the crest and backslope positions, which were similar (Table 3). Mineral soils in depositional locations had the most variation in composition among the soil samples analyzed. Sediment C concentrations in water years 2005, 2010, and 2011 were statistically similar to the soil range ($p > 0.95$), but in the other years, sediment C and N concentrations were much higher than soils ($p < 0.05$).

3.3 Physical and chemical characteristics of sediment and soil

Sediments exported from all of the study catchments had higher sand concentration, and lower clay concentrations, compared to surface mineral soils in the source hillslope ($p < 0.001$; Table 2 and Table 3). Silt concentration of WY 2009 sediment was higher ($p = 0.02$) than WY 2011 sediment but still lower ($p = 0.03$) than soil values. Soil texture classification was sandy-loam to loam and the particle size distribution was consistent across landform positions and mineral soil depths (Table 3). Consistent with the coarser particles, sediment had lower specific surface area than for the mineral soil. Of the three years evaluated, sediment from 2009 had the highest specific surface area (3.3 ± 1.0 m^2 g^{-1}; Table 2). Surface mineral soil in the higher elevation B8 transect had a specific surface area of 8.5 ± 1.7 m^2 g^{-1}, while the lower elevation P4 transect had 10.3 ± 1.6 m^2 g^{-1} (Table 3).

Soil pH declined with elevation, with higher pH values in the low-elevation Providence catchments than the Bull catchments ($p = 0.002$; Table 3), but there were no differences among mineral soil depths. Sediment from the lower catchments was also more acidic than the sediment from the upper catchments ($p = 0.03$), but the means were more similar than the respective source mineral soils. Sediment (WY 2009-2011) had significantly lower pH than the soils ($p = 0.01$).

3.4 C and N Enrichment ratios

Enrichment ratios of C and N (ER, the ratio of C or N concentration in the eroded sediment divided by their concentration in source soil in hillslopes) were highest during years with low precipitation and lowest during high precipitation years (Figure 6) for both the upper and lower elevation watersheds. During years of low precipitation, we observed selective transport of fine material that is high in OM concentration, characteristic of the organic and A horizons. Furthermore, calculated ERs for the crest, backslope or the depositional positions differed substantially in the high elevation Bull catchments, but not in lower elevation Providence catchments. The depositional positions in these catchments were highly varied and had points with very high C and N concentrations. For high water years 2010 and 211, Bull ER values were more similar between slope positions than in low WY 2007 and 2008. In the low-elevation Providence catchments, ERs were similar across hillslope positions for both C and N.

4. DISCUSSION

Our analyses of sediment transport rates and their composition from the KREW catchments showed a positive relationship between water yield and erosion exports for these catchments that have had experienced minimal disturbance for the past 15 years. In agreement with our hypothesis that sediment yield is closely related to interannual differences in precipitation, we found that total area-normalized annual sediment yield was strongly and positively correlated to annual stream discharge (a proxy for precipitation amount) more than watershed size, slope or soil characteristics. The range and magnitude of exported sediment was comparable to total sediment transport rates in water years 2001-2009 from a subset of these catchments (installed 2002-2004, with the first full set of archived sediments from 2005; Eagan et al., 2007; Hunsaker and Neary, 2012). The range of sediment yield was as much as an order of magnitude greater than the difference in water yield for any given year, supporting a non-linear response for this ecosystem (Figure 4). Annual sediment export rates observed in these watersheds are more variable than but comparable to average reported rates for “stable forest” ecosystems (4-50 kg ha^{-1} year^{-1}; Pimentel and Kounang, 1998), catchments with minimal human disturbance but significant bioturbation (15.6 kg ha^{-1}, Yoo et al., 2005) and catchments with mixed land use, including forest (60 kg ha^{-1}, Boix-Fayos et al., 2009). Agreement of our observed sediment yield with rates in a range of other ecosystems (even exceeding some) indicates that there are still erosive forces that mobilize sediment in non-flood years. However these catchments, with little anthropogenic disturbance during or in years prior to our study period, have contemporary sediment export rates far below the average erosion rate on a geologic time scale (750-1110 kg ha^{-1} year^{-1}) for the Southern Sierra Nevada (Riebe et al. 2004) suggesting a minimal climatic influence on the long-term sediment erosion rates (Riebe et al. 2001).

We hypothesized that the higher elevation Bull watersheds would have lower erosion rates than the low elevation Providence watersheds because of the greater proportion of the precipitation falling as snow at higher elevations, and the greater potential for rain-on-snow events at lower elevations in the Sierras (Bales et al., 2006; Hunsaker et al. 2012). However, we found no significant difference between elevation groups, suggesting that these differences in elevation are not significant drivers of sediment yield for the years we observed. These results suggest that higher elevations, where the rain-snow transition zone is predicted to occur as the climate warms (Klos et al. 2014) in the Sierra will likely not lead to increased short-term sediment erosion rates from these catchments. However, any associated changes in the intensity or amount of precipitation that would alter water yield will likely lead to changes in erosion rates (cf. Fig. 4).

We hypothesized that sediment chemical composition is correlated more with catchment characteristics such as soil composition and slope geometry, which could influence detachment and transport mechanisms, than with precipitation or water yield. However, we found sediment composition was far more consistent than sediment yield across catchments as well as years. The one catchment (B201) with an exceptionally low sediment C:N ratio, could be attributed to the meadow bordering the stream. Furthermore, we did not find consistent differences in composition of the eroded sediment between the lower and higher elevation catchments. Hence, we reject our hypothesis that sediment composition is dependent on catchment differences more than water yield. With relatively consistent C and N concentrations, these results suggest that the total amount of OM exported from the Sierra Nevada depends largely on total sediment yield. The average annual sediment yield resulted in the export of 0.2-4.4 kg C ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$, compared to the estimated C stock in these soils of between 80,000 and 111,000 kg C ha^{-1} in the top meter of soil (Johnson et al., 2011).

The soils in the two elevation watershed groups (i.e., Providence and Bull watersheds) were consistent, and perhaps too consistent to expect differences in sediment composition between the elevation groups based on lithology or soil composition. Few soil characteristics show an elevational pattern (Johnson et al., 2011); however, they were differences between the hillslope locations, particularly the depositional locations compared to the other locations. Given the differences among hillslope locations, contributions from upland sediment sources may lead to more variation in sediment composition than elevational differences in these and similar regions of the western Sierra Nevada.

Hillslope gradient, especially in areas adjacent to streams, plays a role in sediment yield (Litschert and MacDonald, 2009). The three catchments with the highest sediment yields (T003, P304 and D102) had steep (frequently greater than 25°) slopes near the stream, while other catchments have more moderate (< 15°) slopes in those areas (Figure 7). The steepest slopes adjacent to the stream in catchment D102 are made up of exposed bedrock, which may explain why the D102 catchment did not yield the highest sediment even though it has steep slopes adjacent to streams.

Two catchments, T003 and P304, had exceptionally high sediment yield. High sediment yield from the T003 catchment was especially surprising because this catchment has never been impacted by logging or roads (Hunsaker and Neary, 2012). Compared to companion catchments, T003 and P304 have long, narrow geometries and eroded soil travels shorter distance to travel to streams (Hunsaker and Neary, 2012). Several other factors, including low rock fraction in topsoil, and low proportion of exposed granite, and ongoing down-cutting of channels in P304 have previously been suggested to explain the P304 sediment response (for more in depth discussion on these factors see Hunsaker and Neary 2012, Eagan et al. 2007, Martin 2009).

Multiple reasons may explain the inverse relationship between C and N concentrations and sediment yield, including preferential transport, differences in the source of the material, or sampling basin capture efficiency. Water-based surface erosion processes (for example sheet erosion) preferentially mobilize fine particles with their associated OM over mineral soils from deeper in the soil profile, resulting in C and/or N enrichment in eroded sediments (Nadeu et al., 2012). We found enrichment of OM in sediment compared to soils in years with low precipitation for both elevation groups (cf. Figure 6) supporting preferential transport of surficial organic material to streams during these periods.

Another possible reason for the inverse relationship between C and N concentrations and sediment yield is that erosive processes detach and transport OM-poor material from different sources or deeper in the soil profile than in low precipitation years. Erosion processes that impact deeper layers (including gullies, mass wasting or bank erosion) mobilize material with lower OM concentrations as well as water-stable aggregates (Nadeu et al., 2012). However, geomorphic features which increase connectivity in the catchments (e.g., gullies or convex hillslopes) are present but not common in our study catchments (Stafford, 2011). Stafford (2011) reported that water-driven surface erosion from or near roads (OM-poor sources) in these catchments to be orders of magnitude higher than erosion on vegetated hillslopes. In two of five years, hillslope sediment fences captured no measureable sediment; however in other years (2005, 2006 and 2008), mean hillslope sediment erosion rates ranged from 6-32.9 kg ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$ (Stafford, 2011), which is comparable to sediment exported from these catchments.

Changes in the trapping efficiency of the sediment basins with changes in water yield is another possibility for the inverse relationship between C and N concentrations and sediment yield. For instance, lower efficiency of capture of low density, high C and N concentration material (e.g., free organics) during high discharges would lead to low C and N concentrations in captured sediment in these high water yield years. In a review of several studies, Verstraeten and Poesen (2000) found trapping efficiency rates of sediment mass in individual events can be as low as 50%, especially in high discharge events. The trapping efficiency of the sediment basins was not measured in this project due to labor and budget constraints. However, considering the nature of soils and SOM in our study catchments, and the discharge events recorded, we can assume that most of the C laterally distributed from the hillslopes is likely trapped in the basins. It is likely that some C existing as free organic particles and C associated with very small mineral particles (that remain in suspension the longest) could be transported further and at least partially contribute to the inverse relationship discussed above. However, the loss of C as OM in dissolved and suspended sediment form is likely, at least partially compensated, by input of C from vegetation growing above the sediment basins.

Implications for predicting fate of eroded OM in upland forest ecosystems

The process of soil OM erosion in upland forest ecosystems, and its contribution to the erosion-induced C sink, is fundamentally different than those in cultivated and grassland ecosystems. These montane Sierra Nevada catchments have higher surficial concentrations of C and N (Dahlgren et al., 1997; Johnson et al., 1997) and steeper slopes (cf. Fig. 7) than agroecosystems (Quine and Van Oost, 2007; Van Oost et al., 2007; Berhe et al., 2007), which could contribute to export of OM-rich material without allowing for significant decomposition during transport. If deposited within the source or adjacent catchments, the OM can be protected through various mechanisms with burial (Berhe and Kleber, 2013) or through chemical associations that OM forms with soil minerals during or after transport, leading to stabilization of the eroded OM (VandenBygaart et al., 2012, 2015). In the KREW catchments, there is potential for C loss during transport as well as stabilization through various mechanisms compared to other non-montane ecosystems (Stacy, 2012). Furthermore, the OM-rich nature of eroded sediment raises important questions about the fate of the eroded OM during and after erosional transport. If a large fraction of the SOM eroded from forest ecosystems is lost during transport or after deposition, the contribution of forest ecosystems to the erosion induced C sink is likely to be small (compared to croplands and grasslands). At least under contemporary rates of erosion, we didn't find evidence that erosion in these forest ecosystems can constitute a significant C sink, nor do we expect this to change with climatic change unless water yield also increases. The ultimate fate of this eroded C and N and its contribution towards erosion-induced C sequestration will depend on how far the material is transported and rates of OM decomposition after deposition (Berhe and Kleber, 2013; Berhe et al., 2012b).

5. CONCLUSION

Overall, our findings show that there was no consistent, statistically significant difference in erosion rates of sediment, C or N from rain- versus snow-dominated headwater catchments in the southern Sierra Nevada. Water yield does not strongly moderate sediment C and N concentrations, but it is a major driver of total C- and N-export from these catchments because of the correlation with sediment yield. Enrichment in OM supports the contribution of surficial sources and the dominance of sheet erosion over other erosional processes. Differences in enrichment ratios of C and N in eroding sediments may be driven by higher rates of sediment mobilization during wetter years or preferential loss from the sediment basins during high stream discharge. Further sampling on the sub-annual to event scale, along with quantification of the trap efficiency will help improve quantification of sediment and associated OM export rates for such upland forest catchments. Based on our results, we conclude that changes in the amount of precipitation but not the timing or precipitation form will have important implications for both the nature and amount of OM that is eroded from forested ecosystems, and to whether erosion in forested catchments can induce a significant sink for atmospheric CO_2.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was conducted in the Kings River Experimental Watersheds (KREW), which was established and is managed for US Forest Service Pacific Research Station. The KREW study was implemented using funds from the National Fire Plan of the USDA Forest Service. Additional funding for this work was provided from the US Forest Service, the Southern Sierra Critical Zone Observatory Project from the National Science Foundation (EAR-0725097). NSF award to AAB, SCH and DJ (EAR-1147977), and a Graduate Research Council grant from the University of California, Merced. We thank Matthew McClintock, members of the Berhe and Hart labs at UC Merced, researchers within the Southern Sierra Critical Zone Observatory (SSCZO), and the US Forest Service crews from the Pacific Southwest Research Station for assistance in the field and in lab portions of this work.

6. REFERENCES

Bales, R. C., Molotch, N. P., Painter, T. H., Dettinger, M. D., Rice, R., and Dozier, J.: Mountain hydrology of the western United States, Water Resour. Res., 42, doi: 10.1029/2005WR004387, 2006.

Bales, R.C., Hopmans, J.W., O'Geen, A.T., Meadows, M., Hartsough, P. C., Kirchner, P., ... & Beaudette, D.: Soil moisture response to snowmelt and rainfall in a Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forest, Vadose Zone J., 10, 786-799, 2011.

Berhe, A. A., Harte, J., Harden, J. W., and Torn, M. S.: The Significance of Erosion-Induced Terrestrial Carbon Sink, BioScience, 57, 337-346, 2007.

Berhe, A. A., Harden, J. W., Torn, M. S., and Harte, J.: Linking soil organic matter dynamics and erosion-induced terrestrial carbon sequestration at different landform positions, J. Geophys. Res., 113, G4, doi:10.1029/2008jg000751, 2008.

Berhe, A. A.: Decomposition of organic substrates at eroding vs. depositional landform positions, Plant Soil, doi:10.1007/s11104-011-0902-z, 2012.

Berhe, A. A., Harden, J., Torn, M., Kleber, M., Burton, S., and Harte, J.: Persistence of Soil Organic Matter in Eroding vs. Depositional Landform Positions, J. Geophys. Res., 117, G02019, doi:10.1029/2011JG001790, 2012a.

Berhe, A. A., Suttle, K. B., Burton, S. D., and Banfield, J. F.: Contingency in the Direction and Mechanics of Soil Organic Matter Responses to Increased Rainfall, Plant Soil, 358, 371-383. doi:310.1007/s11104-11012-11156-11100, 2012b.

Berhe, A. A., and Kleber, M.: Erosion, deposition, and the persistence of soil organic matter: mechanistic considerations and problems with terminology, Earth Surf. Proc. Land., doi:10.1002/esp.3408, 2013.

Berhe, A. A., Torn, M. S., and Harden, J. W.: Soil nitrogen storage and stabilization in eroding landscapes, In Revision.

Boix-Fayos, C., de Vente, J., Albaladejo, J., and Martínez-Mena, M.: Soil carbon erosion and stock as affected by land use changes at the catchment scale in Mediterranean ecosystems, Agr. Ecosyst. Environ., 133, 75-85, 2009.

Boix-Fayos, C., Nadeu, E., Quiñonero, J.M., Martínez-Mena, M, Almagro, M., and de Vente, J.: Sediment flow paths and associated organic carbon dynamics across a Mediterranean catchment, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19, 1209-1223, doi:10.5194/hess-19-1209-2015, 2015.

Brunauer, S., Emmett, P. H., and Teller, E.: Adsorption of gases in multimolecular layers, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 60, 309-319, 1938.

Burnham, K. P., and Anderson, D. R.: Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach Springer-Verlag, ISBN 0-387-95364-7, 2002.

Coats, R.: Nutrient and sediment transport in streams of the Lake Tahoe Basin: a 30-year retrospective, Proceedings of the Sierra Nevada Science Symposium: Science for Management and Conservation, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, General Technical Report PSW-GTR-193, 143-147, 2004.

Chappell, A., Sanderman, J., Thomas, M., Read, A., Leslie, C.: The dynamics of soil redistribution and the implications for soil organic carbon accounting in agricultural south-eastern Australia, Glob. Change Biol., 18, 2081-2088, 2012.

Dahlgren, R., Boettinger, J., Huntington, G., and Amundson, R.: Soil development along an elevational transect in the western Sierra Nevada, California, Geoderma, 78, 207-236, 1997.

Eagan, S. M., Hunsaker, C. T., Dolanc, C. R., Lynch, M. E., and Johnson, C. R.: Discharge and Sediment Loads at the Kings River Experimental Forest in the Southern Sierra Nevada of California, in: Advancing the Fundamental Sciences: Proceedings of the Forest Service National Earth Sciences Conference, San Diego, CA, 18-22 October 2004, PNW-GTR-689, Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station., edited by: Furniss, M., Clifton, C., and Ronnenberg, K., 2007.

Hancock, G.R., Hillslope and catchment scale soil organic carbon concentration: An assessment of the role of geomorphology and soil erosion in an undisturbed environment, Geoderma, 155, 36-45, 2010.

Harden, J. W., Sharpe, J. M., Parton, W. J., Ojima, D. S., Fries, T. L., Huntington, T. G., and Dabney, S. M.: Dynamic replacement and loss of soil carbon on eroding cropland, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 13, 885-901, 1999.

Harden, J. W., Berhe, A. A., Torn, M., Harte, J., Liu, S., and Stallard, R. F.: Soil Erosion: Data Say C Sink, Science, 320, 178-179, doi:10.1126/science.320.5873.178, 2008.

Hunsaker, C. T. , Adair, J., Auman, J., Weidich, K., and Whitaker, T. Kings River Experimental Watershed research study plan. Available at http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/water/kingsriver/documents/miscellaneous/KREW_Study_Plan_Sep2007.pdf (verified 28 April 2015), 2007.

Hunsaker, C. T., and Neary, D. G.: Sediment loads and erosion in forest headwater streams of the Sierra Nevada, California, in: Revisiting Experimental Catchment Studies in Forest Hydrology. Proceedings of a Workshop held during the XXV IUGG General Assembly in Melbourne, June-July 2011. IAHS Publ. 353, 2012.

Hunsaker, C. T., Whitaker, T. W., and Bales, R. C.: Snowmelt Runoff and Water Yield Along Elevation and Temperature Gradients in California's Southern Sierra Nevada, J. Am. Water Resour. As., 48, doi:10.1111/j.1752-1688.2012.00641.x, 2012.

IPCC: Climate change: The physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007.

Johnson, D., Susfalk, R., and Dahlgren, R.: Nutrient fluxes in forests of the eastern Sierra Nevada mountains, United States of America, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 11, 673-681, 1997.

Johnson, D., Hunsaker, C., Glass, D., and Rau, B.: Carbon and nutrient contents in soils from the Kings River Experimental Watersheds, Sierra Nevada Mountains, California, Geoderma, 160, 490-502, 2011.

Johnson, D. W., Hunsaker, C. T., and D.E. Todd Jr.: Spatial variations in forest soils at two scales: Comparisons of King's River Watersheds, California and Walker Branch Watershed, Tennessee, Biogeomon 2012: The 7th International Symposium on Ecosystem Behavior, Northport, ME, USA, 2012,

Kirkby, M. J.: Distance, time and scale in soil erosion processes, Earth Surf. Proc. Land., 35, 1621-1623, 10.1002/esp.2063, 2010.

Klos, P.Z., Link, T.E., Abatzoglou, J.T.: Extent of the rain-snow transition zone in the western US under historic and projected climate, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41, 4560-4568, 2014.

Litschert, S., and MacDonald, L.: Frequency and characteristics of sediment delivery pathways from forest harvest units to streams, Forest Ecol. Manag., 259, 143-150, 2009.

Martin, S. E.: Comparison of in-stream sediment sources and assessment of a bank migration model for headwater catchments in the Central Sierra Nevada, California, M.Sc., Environmental Systems, University of California, Merced, 2009.

Nadeu, E., de Vente, J., Martínez-Mena, M., and Boix-Fayos, C.: Exploring particle size distribution and organic carbon pools mobilized by different erosion processes at the catchment scale, J. Soils Sediments, 11, 667-678, 2011.

Nadeu, E., Berhe, A. A., De Vente, J., and Boix-Fayos, C.: Erosion, deposition and replacement of soil organic carbon in Mediterranean catchments: a geomorphological, isotopic and land use change approach, Biogeosciences, 9, 1099-1111, doi:1010.5194/bg-1099-1099-2012, 2012.

Nolan, K. M., and Hill, B. R.: Suspended-sediment budgets for four drainage basins tributary to Lake Tahoe, California and Nevada, 1984-87, US Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey, 1991.

Parfitt, R. L., Baisden, W. T., Ross, C. W., and Rosser, B. J.: Influence of Erosion and Deposition on Carbon and Nitrogen Accumulation in Resampled Steepland Soils Under Pasture in New Zealand, Geoderma, 19, 154-159, 2013.

Pimentel, D., and Kounang, N.: Ecology of soil erosion in ecosystems, Ecosystems, 1, 416-426, 1998.

Quine, T. A., and Van Oost, K.: Quantifying carbon sequestration as a result of soil erosion and deposition: retrospective assessment using caesium-137 and carbon inventories, Glob. Change Biol., 13, 2610-2625, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01457.x, 2007.

Quinton, J.N., Govers, G., Van Oost, K., and Bardgett, R.D.: The impact of agricultural soil erosion on biogeochemical cycling, Nat. Geosci., 3, 311-314, 2010.

Riebe, C.S., Kirchner, J.W., Granger, D.E., and Finkel, R.C.: Strong tectonic and weak climatic control of long-term chemical weathering rates, Geology, 29, 511-514, 2001.

Riebe, C.S., Kirchner, J.W., and Finkel, R.C.: Erosional and climatic effects on long-term chemical weathering rates in granitic landscapes spanning diverse climate regimes, Earth Planet. Sc. Lett., 224, 547-562, 2004.

Rumpel, C. and Kogel-Knabner, I.: Deep soil organic matter–a key but poorly understood component of terrestrial C cycle, Plant and Soil, 338, 143-158, 2011.

Rumpel, C., Chaplot, V., Ciais, P., Chabbi, A., Bouahom, B., and Valentin, C.: Composition changes of eroded carbon at different spatial scales in a tropical watershed suggest enrichment of degraded material during transport, Biogeosciences, 11, 3299-3305, 2014.

Sanderman, J., and Chappell, A.: Uncertainty in soil carbon accounting due to unrecognized soil erosion, Glob. Change Biol., 19, 264-272, 2013.

Stacy, E. M.: Composition and stabilization mechanisms of organic matter in soils and sediments eroded from granitic, low-order catchments in the Sierra Nevada, California, M.Sc., Environmental Systems, University of California, Merced, 2012.

Stafford, A. K.: Sediment Production and Delivery From Hillslopes and Forest Roads in the Southern Sierra Nevada, California, M.Sc., Department of Forest, Rangeland, and Watershed Stewardship, Colorado State University, 197 pp., 2011.

Stallard, R.: Terrestrial sedimentation and the carbon cycle: Coupling weathering and erosion to carbon burial, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 12, 231-257, 1998.

Van Oost, K., Quine, T., Govers, G., De Gryze, S., Six, J., Harden, J., Ritchie, J., McCarty, G., Heckrath, G., and Kosmas, C.: The impact of agricultural soil erosion on the global carbon cycle, Science, 318, 626-629, 2007.

Vandenbygaart, A.J., Kroetsch, D., Gregorich, E.G., and Lobb, D.: Soil C erosion and burial in cropland. Glob. Change Biol. 18, 1441-1452, 2012.

Vandenbygaart, A.J., Gregorich, E.G., and Helgason, B.L.: Cropland C erosion and burial: Is buried soil organic matter biodegradable? Geoderma, 239, 240-249, 2015.

Verstraeten, G., and Poesen, J.: Estimating trap efficiency of small reservoirs and ponds: methods and implications for the assessment of sediment yield, Pror. Phys. Geog., 24, 219-251, 2000.

Wang, Z., Van Oost, K., Lang, A., Quine, T., Clymans, W., Merckx, R., et al.: The fate of buried organic carbon in colluvial soils: a long-term perspective, Biogeosciences, 11, 873–883, doi:10.5194/bg-11-873-2014, 2014.

Wiaux, F., Cornelis, J. T., Cao, W., Vanclooster, M., and Van Oost, K.: Combined effect of geomorphic and pedogenic processes on the distribution of soil organic carbon quality along an eroding hillslope on loess soil, Geoderma, 216, 36-47, doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2013.10.013, 2013.

Yoo, K., Amundson, R., Heimsath, A., and Dietrich, W.: Erosion of upland hillslope soil organic carbon: Coupling field measurements with a sediment transport model, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 19, GB3003, doi:10.1029/2004GB002271, 2005.

Yoo, K., Amundson, R., Heimsath, A.M., and Dietrich, W.E.: Spatial patterns of soil organic carbon on hillslopes: Integrating geomorphic processes and the biological C cycle, Geoderma 130, 47-65, 2006.

7. FIGURES



Figure 1. Map of the Kings River Experimental Watershed and Southern Sierra Critical Zone Observatory showing soil sampling points (green circles, at depositional, backslope, and crest hillslope positions from left to right along transects) and sediment sampling basins (black triangles).



Figure 2. Elevation range and size of the catchments (left) and annual precipitation from four meteorological stations (right) during the years of study. Roughly half of the precipitation at the lower-elevation Providence catchments falls as rain, while the Bull catchments (high elevation) receive > 75% of precipitation as snow.

Figure 3. Forests at Providence (left) and Bull (right) catchments. At both sites, vegetation cover is variable, with occasional clearings, meadows, and exposed bedrock.



Figure 4. (Top) Annual sediment yield is directly correlated with annual water yield. (Middle) Sediment carbon (C) and nitrogen (N; not shown) concentrations in years have an inverse relationship to water yield. (Bottom) The C to N mass ratio is weakly correlated with water yield. Data presented for WY 2005, and 2007-2011 (Sediment basins constructed over the period 2002-2004, samples were not preserved for testing from WY 2006).



Figure 5. Carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) concentrations and carbon to nitrogen (C:N) mass ratios of < 2 mm material collected in sediment basins within the Providence (low-elevation) and Bull (high-elevation) catchments between water years 2005 to 2011. Left panels (a, c. and e) show interannual variation in these variables, while right panels (b, d, and f) show interbasin variation (Providence catchments highlighted by shading). The bold line in the boxplot marks the median, and boxes mark the interquartile range, with the full range indicated by the fences save for outliers more than 1.5 times the box width from the box edge, marked by a circle. Different means as determined by ANOVA using Tukey HSD test ($\alpha = 0.05$) are designated by letters. Archive samples for 2006 were not available for testing (NA = not available).



Figure 6. Enrichment ratios for carbon (ER_C) and nitrogen (ER_N) in material (< 2 mm) collected from sediment basins at the outlet of each catchment over the water years 2005-2011. Different symbols represent enrichment ratios calculated using average surface mineral soil (0 – 10 cm) values for the three hillslope positions studied in Providence (low elevation) and Bull (high-elevation) catchments. Sediment basins were installed over the years 2002-2004 and archived samples were not preserved for many sediment basins in 2006 or before 2005.



Figure 7. Slopes in the eight catchments are moderately steep as shown by a weighted scale (< 1° dark green; 1-5° medium green; 5-15° chartreuse; 15-25° light orange; 25-45° dark orange; > 45° red). Flat areas in crest and depositional locations are very small. Slope values calculated from a 10-m digital elevation model. Mean annual sediment export is given for water years 2005-2011.

8. TABLES

Table 1. Annual sediment yield per hectare for water years 2005-2011, including mineral material, and coarse and fine organic matter (coarse, > 2 mm, organics are comprised of material pinecones and conifer needles, and accounts for ~ 4-20% of fraction; remaining fine organics (< 2 mm) account for 4-30% of total). These values do not include large woody debris, longer than 30 cm and with a diameter greater than 2 cm.

		Sediment yield per hectare						
Catchment	Size (ha)	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
D102	120.8	47.9	61.3	1.0	13.7	0.9	14.3	NA
P301	99.2	32.8	24.5	0.4	0.7	0.8	4.5	27.1
P303	132.3	NA	NA	0.5	1.3	0.6	2.3	40.0
P304	48.7	177.3	169.9	7.1	42.7	5.4	36.8	165.0
B201	53.0	64.6	35.4	2.5	3.9	6.5	12.4	20.6
B203	138.4	59.9	32.9	1.4	1.3	2.8	18.3	9.0
B204	166.9	37.7	14.4	0.5	1.7	2.7	16.6	10.7
T003	222.7	136.2	59.6	1.9	4.3	6.9	19.3	14.8

Table 2. Physical and chemical characterization of the sediment material (< 2 mm), including pH_{water} (1:2 w/v), carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) concentrations, and particle size distribution (clay < 2 μm, silt 2 - 50 μm, and sand 50 - 2000 μm). Some samples were not measured due to lack of material (indicated by no data or *nd*).

Catchment and water year	pH_w [a]	C ($g\ kg^{-1}$)[b]	N ($g\ kg^{-1}$)[c]	C:N ratio	Clay ($g\ kg^{-1}$)[d]	Silt ($g\ kg^{-1}$)[d]	Sand ($g\ kg^{-1}$)[d]	SSA ($m^2\ g^{-1}$) [d]
D102								
WY 2009	5.8*	146.1	6.5	22.5	nd*	nd	nd	nd
WY 2010	5.9	55.1	1.9	29.7	69	247	685	1.53
WY 2011								
P301								
WY 2009	5.5	144.0	6.7	21.4	74	385	541	2.87
WY 2010	5.5	90.2	2.8	32.4	79	298	623	2.41
WY 2011	5.8	28.4	1.0	27.4	51	215	734	2.42
P303								
WY 2009	5.0	183.3	7.1	25.7	60	343	597	1.80
WY 2010	5.5	125.3	4.1	30.7	83	331	587	2.27
WY 2011	5.8	21.3	0.8	26.6	53	209	738	3.49
P304								
WY 2009	5.1	85.9	3.8	22.9	135	383	482	7.60
WY 2010	5.7	35.8	1.1	32.0	110	297	594	5.11
WY 2011	5.9	15.5	0.7	23.2	72	246	682	3.53
B201								
WY 2009	4.8	51.4	2.9	17.4	150	315	536	6.42
WY 2010	5.4	31.9	1.4	22.0	123	289	588	5.07
WY 2011	5.4	23.5	1.3	18.0	112	287	602	3.65
B203								
WY 2009	4.7	58.4	2.2	26.8	58	245	698	1.05
WY 2010	5.5	16.4	0.5	32.5	69	198	734	1.77
WY 2011	5.4	27.5	0.9	29.3	56	212	732	1.13

B204								
WY 2009	5.0	64.3	2.5	25.3	58	233	709	1.99
WY 2010	5.4	24.7	0.70	36.7	70	246	685	2.18
WY 2011	5.3	48.6	1.4	33.8	69	246	685	2.28
T003								
WY 2009	5.4	107.8	4.4	24.6	53	322	625	1.51
WY 2010	5.6	78.1	2.3	34.6	68	304	629	1.99
WY 2011	5.5	119.5	4.3	27.6	76	339	585	2.46

a – standard error ≤ 0.06 for replicates; b – standard error ≤ 0.03 for analytical (n ≥ 3) replicates; c – standard error ≤ 0.8 for analytical (n ≥ 3) replicates; d – n=3 analytical replicates. * Due to the limited mass of archived material, the pH value for D102 from WY2009 is given from an analysis as $\mathrm{pH}_{\mathrm{water}}$ with 1:2.5 soil weight to water volume.

Table 3. Mineral soil physical and chemical characterizations (air-dry < 2 mm) for a subset of the soil transects (the two sent out for physical analysis), including $\mathrm{pH_{water}}$ (1:2 w/v), carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) concentrations, C to N (C:N) mass ratio, particle size distribution, and specific surface analysis (SSA).

Catchment and hillslope positions	Depth (cm)	$\mathrm{pH_w}^a$	C ($\mathrm{g\ kg^{-1}}$)[b]	N ($\mathrm{g\ kg^{-1}}$)[c]	C:N ratio	Clay ($\mathrm{g\ kg^{-1}}$)	Silt ($\mathrm{g\ kg^{-1}}$)	Sand ($\mathrm{g\ kg^{-1}}$)	SSA ($\mathrm{m^2\ g^{-1}}$)
P303 transect P4									
Crest	0-10	6.2	54.0	2.6	20.9	117	365	518	6.96
	10-20	5.4	35.6	1.6	21.6	106	371	523	9.27
	20-39		24.5	1.1	25.8	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*
Backslope	0-10	6.3	85.4	3.4	25.1	122	375	503	11.99
	10-20	6.5	32.2	1.4	22.8	106	371	524	17.09
	20-40		16.8	0.6	26.2	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*
Depositional	0-10	6.5	9.7	0.5	19.2	163	378	459	7.12
	10-20	6.1	33.3	1.2	26.8	162	374	464	9.17
	20-40		6.2	0.2	26.0	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*
B204 transect B8									
Crest	0-10	5.4	46.4	1.7	27.2	183	357	460	11.52
	10-20	5.3	18.4	0.7	27.1	184	368	449	14.15
	20-40		10.0	0.4	27.3	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*
Backslope	0-10	5.1	31.9	1.1	28.8	145	381	474	8.61
	10-20	5.1	27.5	0.8	35.7	159	368	473	9.74
	20-28		19.4	0.6	34.1	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*
Depositional	0-10	nd*	167.8	5.2	32.4	113	378	509	3.68
	10-20		133.7	3.4	39.2	114	395	491	3.46
	20-40		162.3	4.0	40.7	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*

a – standard error ≤ 0.06 for analytical replicates ; b – standard error ≤ 0.02 for analytical replicates; c – standard error ≤ 0.7 for analytical replicates; d – n=3 analytical replicates. *Some samples were not measured due to lack of material or prioritizing samples for analysis (indicated by *nd* for no data).

Table 4. Coefficients of variation (standard deviation relative to the mean, expressed in %) for sediment yield, carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) concentrations, and carbon to nitrogen (C:N) mass ratios averaged across years for each catchment, and averaged across catchments for each water year within the Kings River Experimental Watershed. Archive samples from 2006 were not available for sampling (indicated by no data or *nd*)

Averaged across all years for each catchment

Catchment	Sediment Yield	%C	%N	C:N
D102	109.4	36.0	44.5	13.5
P301	111.5	61.7	67.7	16.3
P303	195.1	74.9	71.4	11.8
P304	93.0	62.6	67.4	14.6
B201	107.7	42.1	46.5	10.9
B203	121.3	67.1	72.7	9.0
B204	107.9	80.1	99.6	22.8
T003	140.8	37.1	45.2	14.5

Averaged across all catchments for each water year

Year	Sediment Yield	%C	%N	C:N
2005	69.5	40.9	46.8	22.3
2006	92.8	*nd*	*nd*	*nd*
2007	115.8	36.6	36.8	13.1
2008	165.5	46.4	44.2	14.0
2009	78.1	46.0	44.3	12.7
2010	68.0	66.0	64.7	13.8
2011	135.9	89.4	84.9	18.6