



Quantifying the impact of no-tillage on soil redistribution in a cultivated catchment of Southern Brazil (1964–2016) with ^{137}Cs inventory measurements

Elizeu Jonas Didoné, Jean Paolo Gomes Minella, Fabio José Andres Schneider, Ana Lúcia Londero, Irene Lefevre, O. Evrard

► To cite this version:

Elizeu Jonas Didoné, Jean Paolo Gomes Minella, Fabio José Andres Schneider, Ana Lúcia Londero, Irene Lefevre, et al.. Quantifying the impact of no-tillage on soil redistribution in a cultivated catchment of Southern Brazil (1964–2016) with ^{137}Cs inventory measurements. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 2019, 284, pp.106588. 10.1016/j.agee.2019.106588 . cea-02610579

HAL Id: cea-02610579

<https://cea.hal.science/cea-02610579>

Submitted on 9 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Quantifying the impact of no-tillage on soil redistribution in a cultivated catchment of Southern Brazil (1964–2016) with ¹³⁷Cs inventory measurements

Elizeu Jonas Didoné¹ (*), Jean Paolo Gomes Minella¹, Fabio José Andres Schneider¹, Ana Lúcia Londero¹, Irène Lefèvre², Olivier Evrard²

¹Universidade Federal de Santa Maria (UFSM), Department of Soil Science, 1000 Avenue Roraima, Camobi, CEP 97105-900, Santa Maria, RS, Brazil

²Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement (LSCE/IPSL), UMR 8212 (CEA/CNRS/UVSQ), Université Paris-Saclay, Centre CEA Paris-Saclay, l'Orme des Merisiers, bât. 714, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France.

(*) Corresponding author:

Elizeu Jonas Didoné
Avenida Roraima n° 1000, Prédio 42, sala 3311^a, Santa Maria-RS-Brazil, CEP: 97105-900
Phone +55(55)999718525.

E-mail: didoneagroufsm@gmail.com

Abstract

No-tillage is a soil management practice that results in reduced soil losses when compared to conventional tillage systems. However, when this practice is overly simplified, it may lead, over the years, to higher levels of soil loss than expected. In this context, this study sought to compare the rates of long-term soil redistribution on three hillslopes used for grain production under different soil management on deep weathered soils (Ferralsols) in southern Brazil. Soil samples were collected along three transects in different hillslopes characterized by either no-tillage or conventional tillage. Cs-137 inventories were used to estimate the soil redistribution rates based on Mass Balance Model - 2. The results indicate that along the three slopes and during the last five decades, changes in soil management impacted the patterns of soil erosion in the landscape, showing the occurrence of significant soil loss in the upper and

backslope segments, and deposition in the lower parts of the three hillslopes studied. Even with no-tillage, erosion has continued to occur, although at lower rates when compared to conventional tillage. The use of the ^{137}Cs marker associated with the Mass Balance Model - 2 (MBM - 2) conversion model provided an effective tool for estimating soil redistribution rates under different management systems. Although the introduction of no-tillage in the last 28 years has reduced erosion rates, these processes remain significant and the implementation of additional runoff and/or erosion control practices is recommended in order to keep erosion rates at sustainable levels.

Keywords: Soil erosion; direct sowing; soil loss; agriculture; fallout radionuclides.

1 Introduction

No-tillage, which occurs in an area of more than 32 million hectares of agricultural land, is the main strategy for soil and water conservation in Brazil (Kassam et al., 2018). The gradual shift from conventional to no-tillage has improved soil management (Reicosky, 2015), through the reduction of soil and water losses due to erosion (Deuschle, et al., 2019) and positive modifications of chemical, physical and biological properties of the soil (Derpsch et al., 2014).

In Southern Brazil, no-tillage has been a good example of soil conservation practice (Cassol et al., 2003, Bertol et al., 2007 and Merten et al., 2015) given its efficiency in controlling soil erosion when compared to conventional tillage which causes greater soil disturbance. While under conventional tillage soil losses can exceed dozens of tons per hectare and per year, no-tillage is associated with much lower erosion rates comprised between 1-2 Mg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ (Cassol et al., 2003, Cogo et al., 2007). Intensive agriculture started in the 1960s in Southern Brazil, a period during which conventional tillage was systematically implemented generating high soil losses, reaching values up to 40 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹. These high erosion rates called attention to the need to implement conservation measures to reduce the degradation of soils and water bodies. In the 1990s, in the framework of the so-called ‘conservationist’ approach, the no-tillage

51 system became widespread along with other conservation measures such as contour farming all
52 of which aimed to reduce soil losses (Bertol, et al., 2004; Cogo, et al., 2007; Denardin et al.,
53 2008).

54 However, the efficiency of no-tillage to control soil losses does not guarantee the control
55 of runoff (Merten et al., 2015; Londero et al., 2018; Deuschle, et al., 2019) which can cause
56 concentrated erosion in thalwegs. In addition, excess runoff may deliver high amounts of
57 sediment, nutrients and pesticides to water bodies, leading to the degradation of riverine habitats
58 and water quality as demonstrated by Tiecher et al. (2018). Studies conducted on cultivated
59 hillslopes in Southern Brazil suggest that implementing of no-tillage as a single conservation
60 measure is insufficient to control runoff. Londero et al. (2018) showed that runoff coefficients
61 might be as high as 21% on fields where this practice is implemented. The simplification of
62 the agricultural production system has also likely contributed to the increase of sediment supply
63 to water bodies in this region (Didoné et al., 2017; Tiecher et al., 2018).

64 Traditional soil erosion assessment methods (i.e. plot monitoring) are associated with
65 several drawbacks, and there is a need for alternative and retrospective techniques. To this end,
66 several investigations have used radionuclides as tracers, in order to document soil
67 redistribution rates and spatial patterns across landscapes (Ritchie and McHenry, 1990, Walling
68 and Quine, 1995). The use of tracers avoids time-consuming and expensive operations required
69 for long-term monitoring (Ritchie and Ritchie, 2008; Li et al., 2011; Mabit et al., 2013).

70 Among these potential tracers, caesium-137 (^{137}Cs), which is an artificial radionuclide
71 produced during nuclear tests and accidents (Zapata, 2002), is characterized by a strong affinity
72 for fine soil particles and has therefore been widely used to quantify soil erosion and deposition
73 rates based on the measurement of its inventories in soil profiles (Davis, 1963; Ritchie and
74 McHenry, 1990; Oztas, 1993, Ritchie and Ritchie 2007). Although its use has been recently
75 debated in the literature (Mabit et al., 2013; Parsons and Foster, 2011), ^{137}Cs has been

increasingly used worldwide (Mabit et al., 2008, 2009; Chartin et al. 2013) to estimate the erosion and deposition rates since its emission into the environment (i.e., 1954-1963; Ritchie and McHenry, 1990; Walling and He, 1997; Zapata, 2002; Mabit *et al.*, 2008).

Most of the sedimentological and erosion studies using radionuclides have been conducted in the northern hemisphere (Walling and Quine, 1992; Zapata, 2002; Ritchie and Ritchie, 2008; Chartin et al, 2013). However, although less often, this technique has also been applied in the southern hemisphere, including in South America (e.g., Schuller et al. (2004, 2007). In Brazil, the feasibility of the ^{137}Cs tracer technique was verified for different soil types and land uses (e.g Schuch et al. (1994b), Bacchi et al. (2000), Andreollo et al. (2002), Antunes et al. (2010) and Minella et al. (2014)). However, these studies did not specifically consider the impact of soil management (no- and conventional tillage) on the long-term soil redistribution by erosion and deposition.

In this context, the Cs-137 inventory technique could be useful to demonstrate the potential mitigation of soil erosion after no-tillage was introduced in the 1990s, after 30 years of conventional tillage. Currently, there are few quantitative information on how the improvement of soil management may have led to a decrease in the long-term magnitude of erosion and deposition on cultivated hillslopes under these farming systems. In this context, this study seeks to compare the long-term soil redistribution by erosion in Ferralsols on three hillslopes under different soil conservation management methods in Southern Brazil in order to quantify the impact of no-till over the last several decades.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Study site and hillslope characteristics

The study was carried out on three agricultural hillslopes of Southern Brazil (Fig. 1), located in the Conceição River experimental catchment (Didoné et al., 2017). The geological bed-rock is basaltic overlaid with deep and highly weathered soils with Ferralsols being the

dominant soil type (FAO, 2014). These soils contain high amounts of clay (45-60%) composed by kaolinite and oxides. Despite the excellent physical structure of this soil type, it is highly sensitive to compaction (Reichert et al., 2016). According to Köppen's classification, the climate is of Cfa type, i.e. subtropical humid without dry season, with an average annual rainfall comprised between 1750 and 2000 mm and an average temperature of 18.6 °C. The catchment is predominantly cultivated with soybean using no-tillage as the main soil management practice, although runoff control and crop rotation are not implemented. Only low densities of biomass (i.e. the residues of previous crops) protect the soils against the erosive power of rainfall.

Figure 1 - Location of Conceição river catchment with the three hillslopes investigated in details.

In order to choose hillslopes representative of the agricultural systems present within the Conceição river catchment, a preliminary field investigation was carried out to determine hillslope features. Three hillslopes – with 12% gradient, minimum 90 m length, Ferralsols and contrasted soil management – were selected (Hillslope I, Hillslope II and Hillslope III). They are described in Table 1. All three slopes present similar geomorphological features (Fig. 2).

Figure 2 - Characteristics of the selected hillslopes and individual soil core sampling sites in the Conceição river catchment, Brazil: Hillslope I, Hillslope II and Hillslope III.

Land use information was obtained through interviews with farmers who have owned and worked these fields for over 40 years (Tab.1). This information was compiled for three main cultivation periods in the investigated region, i.e. (1) from 1960 to 1979, (2) from 1980 to 1999 and (3) from 2000 to 2016.

Each hillslope is representative of one of the three main farming systems used in Southern Brazil (conventional tillage (Hillslope I) and two different no-tillage conditions (Hillslopes II and III)) since cultivation was intensified in the 1960s. However, it is important

to emphasize that both Hillslopes II and III had been under conventional tillage in the past (1960- 1990s).

Table 1 - Main characteristics of the three hillslopes investigated

Despite these differences, Hillslope I is one of the few slopes still under conventional tillage in the region. It is noteworthy that Hillslope I is 2/3s shorter in length than Hillslopes II and III (Tab.1). Crop fields with either soybean or corn production under conventional tillage are not commonly found in areas with a similar relief and soil type as Hillslopes II and III. Despite the shorter length, the slope/length (LS factor) in the Hillslope I is lower than that of the other hillslopes, the deposition rates are high (toeslope) reflecting the system of cultivation in addition to being the highest slope (Fig. 1).

In the 1960s, with the onset of farming activities in the region, native forests were removed from Hillslopes I, II and II. Since then, Hillslope I has been kept under conventional tillage until present day. The main crops, cultivated over the last decades, are corn, millet, soybeans and winter pastures. In Hillslope II, the conventional tillage system with broad-based terraces was implemented between the 1960s and 1990s, and the main crops were grains (corn, wheat and soybean) and winter pastures. Subsequently, no-tillage was introduced and the terraces were gradually removed. The crops in the region remained the same, although soybean has been increasingly cultivated. In contrast, in Hillslope III, the native forest was replaced by pasture areas and, later, by cropland under conventional tillage which was implemented until the 1990s with terraces. Later, with the onset of no-tillage terraces were removed; however, from 2000 onwards, crop rotation was introduced and, consequently, a higher amount of biomass added through crop rotation which led to better soil cover and protection against erosion.

2.2 Soil sampling and Cs-137 analyses

Three samples from each of the three profiles (summit, backslope and toeslope) were collected and evaluated in order to characterize each hillslope (Schoeneberger and Wysocki, 2012). In this study, in order to limit the analytical costs and the logistical requirements, the technique was only tested on three slopes and on a limited number of soil profiles, although in future studies a larger number of slopes and points will potentially be analyzed. A local reference site under natural pasture without evidence of soil erosion and/or deposition was also selected.

Soil depth collected for the different profiles varied depending on their position in the landscape, and on the occurrence or the absence of soil redistribution at these locations. These samples were collected using a 1-meter long core tube (surface area of 33.2 cm²) inserted at a sufficient depth to include the full depth of soil containing ¹³⁷Cs. The soil profile was sampled up to 40 cm in the summit and backslope positions and 140 cm in toeslopes. The soil cores were sectioned into 3-cm increments, oven-dried at 102°C and sieved to 2 mm. Bulk density was systematically measured for each level. The soil profiles from the reference area were subdivided into 2-cm increments to provide in details ¹³⁷Cs activity variations within soil depth.

For each sample (n=150), approximately 70 g of material was sealed airtight in 60 mL polypropylene containers, and ¹³⁷Cs was measured at 662 keV for 85,000 to 200,000 seconds by gamma spectrometry using the low background GeHP detectors available at the *Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement* (Gif-sur-Yvette, France). Measured activities were decay-corrected to the sampling date. Counting efficiencies and reliability were checked using certified International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) standards (e.g., IAEA-444, 135, 375, RGU-1 and RGTh-1). Uncertainties on ¹³⁷Cs activities did not exceed 10%. As the peak of ¹³⁷Cs fallout was recorded in the southern hemisphere in 1963, which was used as the initial year for evaluating soil redistribution across the landscape (Correché et al., 2005; Bacchi et al., 2011 and Minella et al., 2014).

2.3 Conversion model

Models are applied to the sequence of ^{137}Cs measurements carried out along individual transects, so that estimates of deposition at individual points can be based on the ^{137}Cs content of sediment eroded from upslope areas, with the ^{137}Cs activity of eroded soil being inversely related to the erosion rate (Walling and He, 1997; Walling et al., 2002, 2011; Walling et al., 2014). The use of ^{137}Cs fallout measurements to estimate soil erosion and deposition rates is based on a comparison between ^{137}Cs inventories for individual sampling points and the local reference inventory. When ^{137}Cs inventories are lower than the local reference value, they correspond to erosion, whereas greater inventories indicate deposition. The model calculates the potential changes in the erosion/deposition rates between 1963 and 2016.

In this study, the ^{137}Cs measurements obtained for the sampling sites were used in the Mass-Balance Model 2 - MBM-2 (Walling et al., 2002, 2011) developed for cultivated soils. The model (Eq. 1) takes account of changes in the ^{137}Cs content of the soil profile over time in response to fallout input, such as, losses due to erosion, additions due to deposition and progressive incorporation of fresh soil from beneath the original plough horizon by tillage, as the soil depth is reduced by erosion, and radioactive decay.

$$\frac{d A(t)}{dt} = (1 - \Gamma)I (t) - \left(\lambda + P \frac{R}{d} \right) A (t) \quad (Eq. 1)$$

where: $A(t)$ = cumulative ^{137}Cs activity per unit area (Bq m^{-2}); R = erosion rate ($\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$); d = cumulative mass depth representing the average plough depth (kg m^{-2}); λ = decay constant for ^{137}Cs (yr^{-1}); $I(t)$ = annual ^{137}Cs deposition flux ($\text{Bq m}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$); Γ = percentage of the freshly deposited ^{137}Cs fallout removed by erosion before being integrated into the plough layer; P = particle size correction factor.

The plough depth varied over time depending on the changes in farming practices observed in the study area. Under conventional tillage, which was implemented in all hillslopes prior to the 1990's, the tillage depth was estimated at 20 cm. Under no-tillage, this depth was

estimated at 5 cm because of the soil disturbance caused by the sower. As highlighted by Walling et al. (2007), the model includes the time-variant fallout input and the fate of the recently deposited fallout before its incorporation into the plough layer by cultivation.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 ^{137}Cs inventories

The ^{137}Cs inventory at reference sites was $393 \pm 75 \text{ Bq m}^{-2}$, and 70% of this amount was found in the uppermost soil layer, i.e. down to 12 cm depth (Fig. 3). This confirms the limited disturbance of the soil profile at this location since the main fallout period and the relatively low migration of ^{137}Cs into soil depth, which is likely driven mainly by biological activities (Jagercikova et al., 2014, 2015).

The reference value obtained in our study remained very close to that of 398 Bq m^{-2} found by Minella et al. (2014) while investigating three reference sites in a nearby region (200 km) located at a similar latitude in Southern Brazil.

Figure 3 - Distribution of ^{137}Cs with depth at the reference site

The global pattern of bomb-derived ^{137}Cs fallout indicates that inputs ranged from about 160 to about $3,200 \text{ Bq m}^{-2}$ depending on the latitude (Davis, 1963; Ritchie and McHenry, 1990; Garcia Agudo, 1998). In the southern hemisphere, ^{137}Cs concentrations in reference areas may vary significantly. Schuller et al. (2004, 2007) found $525 \pm 12 \text{ Bq m}^{-2}$ in southern Chile, in a reference area with an average precipitation of $1,100 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$. Andreello et al. (2007) found values between 296 and 369 Bq m^{-2} in the Paraná State, Southern Brazil, with average annual rainfall of $1,615 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$. Schuch et al. (1994b) found reference values around 329 Bq m^{-2} in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, which is characterized by a mean rainfall of 1800 mm yr^{-1} .

The range of ^{137}Cs inventories in Hillslope I varied from 138 to 1400 Bq m^{-2} along the slope, indicating that sediment redistribution by erosion has been significant under this farming system. The pattern on Hillslope I is characteristic of a slope that has undergone severe erosion,

with lower ^{137}Cs inventories on the backslope and a high accumulation of ^{137}Cs in the toeslope position (1,400 Bq m²), which reflects that the farming system implemented on this hillslope led to significant deposition of material at the base of this slope. The increase in erosion (reflected by a reduction in ^{137}Cs inventories) along Hillslope I is due to the soil being exposed to erosive agents, which has favored the amplitude of these processes over the years. Moreover, the absence of crop residue on the surface has increased the ability of rainfall to disaggregate the soil, especially when it concentrated in the furrows oriented in the same direction as the main slope gradient (Cassol et al., 2003; Morgan, 2005).

Figure 4 shows the redistribution of the ^{137}Cs inventory along Hillslope I under conventional tillage.

Figure 4 - Distribution of ^{137}Cs inventories with depth in soil profiles collected on (A) the summit, at (B) the backslope and on the (C) toeslope of the Hillslope I.

Considering that Hillslope I underwent more soil degradation due to a much longer period under conventional tillage (60 years compared to 30 years for Hillslopes II and III), higher ^{137}Cs inventories at backslope position were expected on Hillslopes II and III when compared to Hillslope I. However, values found at the summit and backslope locations of Hillslope I were similar to those found in Hillslopes II and III.

The Hillslope II and III slope patterns also reflect the occurrence of erosion in the main slope and deposition on the toeslope, which was expected. However, despite the significant change in soil management that occurred over the last 30 years with the onset of no-tillage, there were no significant differences in the magnitude of ^{137}Cs inventories found in the summit or the backslope positions.

The major difference between these systems was found at the depositional sites. On the two slopes under no-tillage (Hillslope II and III), ^{137}Cs inventories were significantly lower than

in Hillslope I under conventional tillage while remaining higher than those found in the reference area, indicating the occurrence of deposition.

Although in Hillslope II, no-tillage was introduced in the 1990s, ^{137}Cs inventory was higher in the backslope position when compared to the other hillslopes indicating the occurrence of significant erosion. In addition, particularly high ^{137}Cs inventories were found in the toeslope. Figure 5 shows the distribution of ^{137}Cs inventories in Hillslope II.

Figure 5 - Distribution of ^{137}Cs inventories with depth in soil profiles collected on (A) the summit, at (B) the backslope and on the (C) toeslope of the Hillslope II.

The inventory of ^{137}C was only 76 Bq m² in the backslope of Hillslope III, indicating the occurrence of severe erosion (Figure 6).

Figure 6 - Distribution of ^{137}Cs inventories with depth in soil profiles collected on (A) the summit, at (B) the backslope and on the (C) toeslope of the Hillslope III.

The lowest inventory value of ^{137}Cs found in the backslope of Hillslope III can likely be explained by the occurrence of erosion before the implementation of no-tillage in the early 1990s, or by the lack of additional soil conservation measure implemented with no-tillage since this period.

Regarding the different slopes, the inventories of ^{137}Cs for the summit position of the slopes are of 234, 246 and 202 Bq m⁻² for Hillslopes I, II and III respectively. The difference between these values is small although significant, which may be explained by the low slope gradient (< 2%) and the large impact of tillage when this practice was generalized in the region (1960-90s). The mean ^{137}Cs inventory for the three Hillslopes (I, II and III) in eroding areas was 186, 249 and 139 Bq m⁻² respectively, while the mean values recorded in depositional Hillslopes (I, II and III) areas were 1400, 1124 and 447 Bq m⁻² respectively. These distinct ^{137}Cs inventory values indicate the occurrence of significant spatial redistribution of ^{137}Cs across those hillslopes under different management systems.

3.2 Model of conversion of ^{137}Cs inventories into redistribution rates

The results provided by the conversion model for the three slopes demonstrate the magnitude of the erosive processes under contrasting management practices during the last 55 years (1960-2016). The corresponding soil redistribution rates calculated with the MBM - 2 are provided in Table 2.

Table 2 - Results of the conversion of the cesium 137 inventories into soil redistribution rates for each transect.

The MBM-2 determined that mean erosion rates occurred with different intensities. It may be expected that the currently observed patterns of ^{137}Cs inventories mainly reflect the redistribution of soil across the landscape in the 1960s, when agriculture expanded in the region (Moreno, 1972; Bernardes, 1997). When evaluating the mean erosion rates in Hillslope I, an erosion value of $28 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ was observed at the summit position while a mean value of $57 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ was found at the backslope position. When analyzing the traditional studies of soil erosion losses using the Wischmeier & Smith plot methodology (1978) under the conditions prevailing in the study area (i.e., climate, topography, soil type and management), Cogo et al. (2003) found mean values of $13 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for sites with 8-12% slope, after two years of monitoring. Furthermore, Beutler et al. (2003) found soil losses of $6.1 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ under the same experimental conditions. Soil erosion was particularly severe for the hillslope under conventional tillage. According to Bertoni & Lombardi Neto (1993) and Bertol & Almeida (2000), the soil loss for similar clay soils are comprised between 13 and $15 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ under conventional tillage. Nowadays, this cultivation system has become very unusual in the study area, and its use is currently restricted to prepare the soil for annual pasture areas and the cultivation of subsistence crops (cassava, potato, vegetables, etc.)

The erosion rates at the summit positions on Hillslopes II and III were 25 and $38 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$, respectively, while at the backslope they reached 18 and $87 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$. Cogo et al. (2003)

and Beutler et al. (2003) determined soil losses varying between 0.8-1.2 Mg ha⁻¹yr⁻¹ in a period of five years under similar farming conditions. Bertol et al. (2007) quantified that no-tillage may lead to a reduction of 57% in water losses and 88% in soil losses, when compared to conventional tillage, because it provides a denser soil cover. The tolerable soil loss for Ferralsols in Southern Brazil is estimated between 12-15 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (Eltz et al., 1984; Bertol and Almeida, 2000; Cogo et al., 2003).

Estimates of soil redistribution rates obtained by sampling individual points on the transects of the three Hillslopes (I, II, III) indicated that annual erosion rates for summit and backslope erosion sites were 30 and 54 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ respectively, with a mean deposition value of 111 Mg ha⁻¹ y⁻¹ in the toeslope. In contrast, when we compare only Hillslopes II and III, the erosion average values are practically the same for the summit and backslope positions (31 and 52 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹), although the mean rate found in the toeslope is reduced to 66 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹.

When comparing erosion values determined based on the ¹³⁷Cs inventory method with those reported in erosion studies based on the monitoring of standard erosion plots under natural rainfall (77 m²), the values presented in Table 2 can be considered to be high. Values of 1 to 15 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ were commonly observed for fields planted with annual crops under no-tillage and conventional tillage, respectively, on slopes with gradients comprised between 8-12% (Cogo et al., 2003; Beutler et al., 2003). However, the average value determined in the current research based on ¹³⁷Cs inventories was 54 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (Tab. 2), which is up to one order of magnitude higher than the values commonly observed in similar conditions during classical field monitoring. This may be due to the longer slope lengths evaluated in this study when compared to traditional plot studies and the longer period over which the rates derived from ¹³⁷Cs inventories were calculated, including a period of conventional tillage.

While the standard plots are generally a few meters long and show a rectilinear curvature, our study considered the entire hillslopes with complex curvature, which could, as

shown by our findings, enhance soil erosion. These variable conditions explain why a wider range of erosion rates may be found, mainly in the backslope position with much higher erosion levels than those reported in the traditional plot monitoring studies. In addition, Morais & Cogo (2001) and Barbosa et al. (2012) concluded that the positive impact of denser covers of crop residues to slow down runoff under no-tillage may be less significant over long hillslopes, when the flow accumulates.

In contrast, the erosion rates found on the summit of the three investigated slopes remained in the same order of magnitude as those obtained in plot studies conducted in Southern Brazil under conventional tillage. Of note, there is no significant difference in the mean erosion rates for Hillslopes II and III which have been under no-tillage since 1990s, when compared to those found for Hillslope I which has remained under conventional tillage during this period.

These observed patterns reflect mainly the soil redistribution that started in the 1960s, when intensive agriculture expanded in the region. Furthermore, in addition to water erosion, tillage erosion removed progressively the upper layers of the soil in convexities (i.e. summit and backslope positions), with redistribution of material along the concave positions of the landscape (i.e. toeslope).

According to Moore et al. (1993) and Wilson & Gallant (1996), the shape of the slope affects soil erosion and influences the amount and the intensity of runoff. While convex slopes increase the intensity of flow, detachment and transport capacity, flow speed decreases in concave slopes where deposition may occur (Morgan, 2005). This can be observed for the three studied slopes, especially in Hillslopes II and III, where the longer length increased erosion, and prevented deposition. Moore and Burch (1986) showed that the shape of the slope can be even more important than its length, while Govers et al. (1994) concluded that erosion on convex slopes may be greater than in more uniform slopes. This is illustrated on Hillslope I

which, despite its shorter slope length, shows higher erosion / deposition rates than the other slopes investigated in the current research.

This demonstrates that conservation measures such as no-tillage, without additional measures are not sufficient to control soil erosion and redistribution of sediment along the slopes. The absence of additional conservation measures (mechanical / vegetative) may have accelerated the soil redistribution along the slopes. Hillslopes II and III were cultivated under conventional tillage for 30 years before the no-till introduction in 1990s (Tab. 1). Soil compaction has accelerated runoff in particularly sensitive sections of the hillslopes, increasing the connectivity of runoff and sediment across the landscape and their increased supply to the rivers (Le Gall et al., 2017, Tiecher et al., 2018). Although Ferralsols are more resistant to erosion than other soil types, they are sensitive to soil compaction. Accordingly, under no-tillage and with a low biomass cover of the soil, they may be exposed to accelerated erosion.

The soil redistribution rates determined from the ^{137}Cs inventories calculated in this study correspond to the mean annual erosion rates for the last 55 years, although they may necessarily reflect variations in these erosion rates associated with the main changes in land use and soil management throughout time.

An average loss of 3 mm yr^{-1} between 1963-1990 was found for the three slopes. Studies from a wide range of environments and geological settings showed that soil erosion rates under conventional agricultural practices almost systematically exceeded 0.1 mm yr^{-1} , with mean values $>1 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ (Montgomery 2007). From 1990 onwards, losses were considered to be constant for Hillslope I, while soil losses on Hillslopes II and III were reduced to 2.6 and 0.5 mm yr^{-1} , respectively, as a result of a more sustainable management. Van Oost et al. (2007) estimated based on a compilation of ^{137}Cs inventory measurements that the global erosion rates ranged from 0.4 to 2.3 mm yr^{-1} , and the values found in our study, therefore, remain in the same order of magnitude.

Cumulative soil erosion until 1990 was estimated for the three slopes investigated in this study to an average of 84 mm. After the 1990s, cumulative soil losses under no-tillage for Hillslope II were estimated to 71 mm, compared to 19 mm for Hillslope III under simplified tillage and 74 mm for Hillslope I under the conventional system. Current agricultural techniques (Hillslope I) generate higher rates of erosion when compared to mechanized systems under no-tillage (Govers et al., 1996; Van Oost et al., 2006).

The interaction of sediment sources, their transfer and deposition in the landscape is highly complex. However, the use of no-tillage in association with additional mechanical measures (terracing and contour farming) has fallen in disuse, and only no-tillage has remained the main conservation system. According to Tiecher et al., (2014), cropland was the main source of sediment delivered to the rivers in the investigated region, and Didoné et al., (2015) modelled that approximately 18% of the sediments produced in the cultivated areas were delivered to the rivers, with the remaining 82% being redistributed on the hillslopes mainly at the base of the slopes.

4 Future challenges

4.1 Recommendations for soil conservation in Southern Brazil

Although no-till is currently the main cultivation system in the region, the current research demonstrates that soil continues to be eroded and massively transported to lower landscape locations. Accordingly, additional soil conservation measures should be implemented in association with no-tillage to improve infiltration and, consequently, reduce soil losses and the deleterious impacts that they generate in river systems. Additional soil conservation measures such as contour farming, strip cropping and terracing should be associated with no-tillage.

A strategy combining the installation of measures at the source and that of physical barriers along the main flow pathways in the catchment with the use of terracing and/or strip-

cropping for example may lead to an effective increase of productivity and a reduction of water losses and sediment/nutrients/pesticides delivery to rivers in this region. Furthermore, it is necessary to investigate the connectivity achieved by landscape features between the agricultural areas (slopes) and the water bodies considering the different systems that compose the landscape (roads, tracks, pastures, sunken lanes, field drains, ditches, banks, culverts and permeable field boundaries). The impact of connectivity between the areas seems to be even more important than the local erosion rates (Boardman et al., 2019).

4.2 Recommendations for future research

Although the ^{137}Cs inventory method was shown to have a high potential in determining sediment redistribution rates along hillslopes in southern Brazil, this technique should be applied on a larger scale and in contrasted environments to quantify soil redistribution rates across wider regions. So far, this technique has been applied to individual hillslopes, transects or local catchments (Porto et al., 2014; Minella et al., 2014). Proposing upscaling methods to implement similar techniques at the large catchment scale while minimizing logistical and analytical constraints would be very useful.

5. Conclusions

Despite the logistical and analytical constraints that limit the number of samples that may be analyzed, the ^{137}Cs inventory method provides one of the few methods available to reconstruct soil redistribution during the last several decades. This is particularly useful in Southern Brazil, where different management systems have been implemented since the intensification of agriculture in the 1960s, which coincides with the main radiocesium fallout period.

Although conventional tillage was the management of choice for a 55 year period, the introduction of no-tillage in the last 28 years has reduced erosion rates, although erosion processes remain significant nowadays. Accordingly, the adoption of additional practices is

urgently required to reduce these losses and keep them at sustainable levels. Future studies are needed to quantify soil loss in agricultural slopes, under different management systems in South America.

Acknowledgements

Financial support for this study was provided by the CAPES-COFECUB Franco-Brazilian collaboration programme (project Te870-15) and the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), Brazil.

6. References

- Andrello, A. C.; Appoloni, C. R.; Nascimento Filho, V. F, 2007. Assessment of Soil Erosion by ^{137}Cs Technique in Native Forests in Londrina City, Parana, Brazil. *Brazilian Archives of Biology and Technology*, Curitiba, 50, 1051-1060. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1516-89132007000700016>
- Andrello, A. C., Appoloni, C. R., Guimarães, M. F. (2004). Soil erosion determination in a watershed from northern Parana (Brazil) using Cs-137. *Brazilian Archives of Biology and Technology*, 47, 659-667. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1516-89132004000400020>
- Andrello, A.C.; Appoloni, C.R. & Nascimento Filho, V.F., 2002. Distribuição vertical de Cs-137 em solos de mata virgem da Região de Londrina (Paraná). *R. Bras. Pesq. Desenvol.*, 4, 1546-1549. http://www.uel.br/grupos/gfna/E08_382.PDF
- Antunes, P.D.; Sampaio, E.V. de S.B.; Ferreira-Junior, A.V.; Galindo, I.C.L. e Salcedo, I.H., 2010. Distribuição de ^{137}Cs em três solos representativos do estado de Pernambuco. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência dos Solos*, 34, 935-943. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-06832010000300035>
- Bacchi, O.O.S., Sparovek, G., Copper, M., Ranieri, S.B.L., Correchel, V., 2011. Assessing the impacts of riparian zones on sediment retention in Brazilian sugarcane fields by the caesium-137 technique and WEPP modeling. In: *Proceedings of the Impact of Soil*

Conservation Measures on Erosion Control and Soil Quality. IAEA-TECDOC-1665, IAEA, Vienna, pp. 225-240. <http://www.iaea.org/books>, ISBN 978-92-0-113410-3.

Bacchi, O.O.S.; Reichard, K.; Sparovek, G. & Ranieri, S.B.L., 2000. Soil erosion evaluation in a small watershed in Brazil through ^{137}Cs fallout redistribution analysis and conventional models. *Acta Geol. Hispan*, 35, 251-259. <http://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/ActaGeologica/article/view/4771>

Balota, E L. Manejo e qualidade biológica do solo. Londrina: Macenas, 2017. 287 p.

Bernardes, N. Bases geográficas do povoamento do RS. Ijuí: Ed. Unijuí, 1997. 135p.

Barbosa, F.T.; Bertol, I.; Werner, R.S.; Ramos, J.C. & Ramos, R.R. 2012. Comprimento crítico de declive relacionado à erosão hídrica, em três tipos e doses de resíduos em duas direções de semeadura direta. *R. Bras. Ci. Solo*, 36:1279-1290

Bertol, I.; Engel, F.L.; Mafra, A.L.; Bertol, O.B. & Ritter, S.R., 2007. Phosphorus, potassium and organic carbon concentrations in runoff water and sediments under different soil tillage systems during soybean growth. *Soil Tillage Res.*, 94, 142-150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2006.07.008>

Bertol, I.; Albuquerque, J.A.; Leite, D.; Amaral, A.J.; Zoldan Júnior, W. (2004). Propriedades físicas do solo sob preparo convencional e semeadura direta em rotação e sucessão de culturas, comparadas às do campo nativo. *R. Bras. Ci. Solo*, 28: 155-163.

Bertol, I.; Almeida, J.A, 2000. Tolerância de perda de solo por erosão para os principais solos do Estado de Santa Catarina. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo*, 24, 657-668. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-06832000000300018>

Bertol, I. (1994). Perdas de nutrientes por erosão hídrica em diferentes sistemas de manejo de solo sob rotação de culturas. *Univ. Des.*, 2:174-184.

Bertoni, J & Lombardi Neto, F. (1993) Conservação do solo. São Paulo, Ícone. 3a. Edição. ISBN8527401436

473 Beutler, J.F.; Bertol, I.; Veiga, M. & Wildner, L.P. 2003. Perdas de solo e água num Latossolo
 474 Vermelho aluminoférrico submetido a diferentes sistemas de preparo e cultivo sob chuva
 475 natural. R. Bras. Ci. Solo, 27:509-517.

476 Boardman J, Vandaele K, Evans R, Foster IDL. Off- site impacts of soil erosion and runoff:
 477 Why connectivity is more important than erosion rates. Soil Use Manage. 2019;00:1–12.
 478 <https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12496>

479 Cardoso, D. P.; Carvalho, G. J.; Silva, M. L. N.; Freitas, D. A. F.; Avanzi, J. C. 2013. Atributos
 480 fitotécnicos de plantas de cobertura para a proteção do solo. Revista Verde, v. 8, n. 1, p. 19-
 481 24.

482 Cassol, E. A.; Lima, V. S., 2003. Erosão em entressulcos sob diferentes tipos de preparo e
 483 manejo do solo. Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira, Brasília, 38, 117-124.
 484 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-204X2003000100016>.

485 Chartin, C.; Evrard, O.; Onda, Y.; Patin, J.; Lefèvre, I.; Otlé, C.; Ayrault, S.; Lepage, H.;
 486 Bontéa, P., 2013. Tracking the early dispersion of contaminated sediment along rivers
 487 draining the Fukushima radioactive pollution plume. Anthropocene L., 23-34.
 488 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2013.07.001>

489 Cogo, N.; Levien, R.; Schwarz, R. A., 2003. Perdas de solo e água por erosão hídrica
 490 influenciadas por métodos de preparo, classes de declive e níveis de fertilidade do solo.
 491 Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo, 27, 743-753. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-06832003000400019)
 492 [06832003000400019](http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-06832003000400019).

493 Cogo, N. P.; Portela, J. C.; Amaral, A. J.; Trein, C. R.; Gilles, L.; Bagatini T.; Chagas, J. P.
 494 (2007). Erosão e escoamento superficial em semeadura direta efetuada com máquina provida
 495 de hastes sulcadoras, influenciados pela direção de semeadura e pela cobertura superficial
 496 do solo. In: Congresso Brasileiro de Ciência do Solo, 31, 2007, Gramado. Resumos.
 497 Gramado: SBCS, 2007. CD-Rom

498 Correchel, V.; Bacchi, O.O.S.; Reichardt, K. & Maria, I.C., 2005. Random and systematic
 499 spatial variability of ¹³⁷Cs inventories at reference sites in south-central Brazil. *Sci. Agric.*,
 500 62:173-178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-90162005000200013>.
 501 Davis JJ (1963) Cesium and its relationship to potassium in ecology. In: Schultz V, Klement
 502 AW Jr (eds) *Radioecology*. Reinhold, New York, pp. 539 - 556.
 503 Denardin, J.E.; Faganello, A. & Santi, A. Falhas na implementação do sistema plantio direto
 504 levam a degradação do solo. *R. Plantio Direto*, 18:33-34, 2008.
 505 Derpsch R, Franzluebbbers AJ, Duiker SW, Reicosky DC, Koeller K, Friedrich T, Sturny WG,
 506 Sá JCM, Weiss K (2014). Why do we need to standardize no-tillage research? *Soil Tillage*
 507 *Res* 137:16–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2013.10.002>
 508 Deuschle, D.; Minella; J. P.G.; Hörbe, T. A.N.; Londero, A.L.; Schneider, F. J.A. (2019).
 509 Erosion and hydrological response in no-tillage subjected to crop rotation intensification in
 510 southern Brazil. *Geoderma*, 340:157-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2019.01.010>.
 511 De Vente J, Poesen J, Arabkhedri M, Verstraeten G (2007) The sediment delivery problem
 512 revisited. *Prog Phys Geog* 31 (2) 155–178.
 513 Didoné, E.J., Minella, J.P.G., Evrard, O., 2017. Measuring and modelling soil erosion
 514 and sediment yields in a large cultivated catchment under no-till of Southern Brazil. *Soil*
 515 *Tillage Res.* 174, 24-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2017.05.011>
 516 Didoné, E. J.; Minela, J. P. G.; Merten, G. H., 2015. Quantifying soil erosion and sediment
 517 yield in a catchment in southern Brazil and implications for land conservation. *J. Soils*
 518 *Sediments* 11, 2334-2346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11368-015-1160-0>
 519 Eltz, FLF; Cassol, EA; Guerra, M & Abrão, PUR (1984). Perdas de solo e água por erosão em
 520 diferentes sistemas de manejo e coberturas vegetais em solo São Pedro (Podzólico
 521 Vermelho-Amarelo) sob chuva natural. *R. Bras. Ci. Solo*, 8:245-249.

522 FAO/IAEA. 2017. Use of ¹³⁷Cs for soil erosion assessment. Fulajtar, E., Mabit, L., Renschler,
 523 C.S., Lee Zhi Yi, A., Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
 524 64 p. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i8211e.pdf>
 525 FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). IUSS Working Group WRB.
 526 2015. World Reference Base for Soil Resources 2014, update 2015. International soil
 527 classification system for naming soils and creating legends for soil maps. World Soil
 528 Resources Reports No. 106. FAO, Rome.
 529 Florsheim, J. L., Pellerin, B. A., Oh, N. H., Ohara, N., Bachand, P.A. M., Bachand, S. M.,
 530 Bergamaschi, B. A., Hernes, P. J., and Kavvas, M. L.:(2011). From deposition to erosion:
 531 Spatial and temporal variability of sediment sources, storage, and transport in a small
 532 agricultural watershed, *Geomorphology*, 132, 272-286.
 533 Fryirs, K. (Dis) Connectivity in catchment sediment cascades: a fresh look at the sediment
 534 delivery problem. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, v. 38, p. 30-46, 2013.
 535 García Agudo, E., 1998. Global distribution of Cs-137 inputs for soil erosion and sedimentation
 536 studies. In: *Use of Caesium-137 in the Study of Soil Erosion and Sedimentation*. IAEA
 537 TECDOC 1028. 117-121.
 538 Giménez R. , Casali J., Grande I., Díez J., Campo M. Álvarez-Mozos J., Goñi M., 2012. Factors
 539 controlling sediment export in a small agricultural watershed in Navarre (Spain) *Agric.*
 540 *Water Manag.* 110,1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2012.03.007>
 541 Govers, G., Quine, T.A., Desmet, P.J.J., Walling, D.E., 1996. The relative contribution of soil
 542 tillage and overland flow erosion to soil redistribution on agricultural land. *Earth Surf.*
 543 *Process. Landforms* 21, 929-946. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1096-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1096-9837(199610)21:10<929::AID-ESP631>3.0.CO;2-C)
 544 [9837\(199610\)21:10<929::AID-ESP631>3.0.CO;2-C](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1096-9837(199610)21:10<929::AID-ESP631>3.0.CO;2-C)
 545 Govers, G., Vandaele, K., Desmet, P.J.J., Poesen, J. and Bunte, K. 1994. The role of soil tillage
 546 in soil redistribution on hillslopes. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 45: 469-478.

547 Jagercikova, M.; Cornu, S.; Le Bas, C.; Evrard, O., 2015. Vertical distributions of ^{137}Cs in
 548 soils:a meta-analysis. *J. Soils Sediments* (2015) 15:81-95. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11368-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11368-014-0982-5)
 549 014-0982-5

550 Jagercikova, M.; Evrard, O.; Balesdent, J.; Lefe`vre, I.; Cornu, S., 2014. Modeling the
 551 migration of fallout radionuclides to quantify the contemporary transfer of fine particles in
 552 Luvisol profiles under different land uses and farming practices. *Soil & Tillage Research*
 553 140:82-97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2014.02.013>

554 Kassam, A., Friedrich, T., Derpsch, R., 2018. Global Spread of Conservation Agriculture.
 555 *International Journal of Environmental Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207233>.

556 Kimaro, D.N., Deckers, J.A., Poesen, J., Kilasara, M. and Msanya, B.M. 2005: Short and
 557 medium term assessment of tillage erosion in the Uluguru Mountains, Tanzania. *Soil and*
 558 *Tillage Research* 81, 97-108.

559 Le Gall, M., Evrard, O., Dapoigny, A., Tiecher, T., Zafar, M., Minella, J.P.G., Laceby, J.P.,
 560 Ayrault, S., 2017. Tracing sediment sources in a subtropical agricultural catchment of
 561 Southern Brazil cultivated with conventional and conservation farming practices. *L. Degrad.*
 562 *Dev.* 28, 1426-1436. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.2662>

563 Li S, Lobb DA, Kachanoski RG, McConkey BG (2011) Comparing the use of the traditional
 564 and repeated-sampling-approach of the Cs^{137} technique in soil erosion estimation.
 565 *Geoderma* 160:324-335.

566 Londero, A.L; Minella, G.P.G; Deuschle, D.; Schneider, F.J.A.; Boeni, M.; Merten, G.H.
 567 (2018). Impact of broad-based terraces on water and sediment losses in no-till (paired zero-
 568 order) catchments in southern Brazil. *J. Soils Sediments*, 18:1159-1175.
 569 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11368-017-1894-y>

570 Mabit, L., Meusburger, K., Fulajtar, E., Alewell, C., 2013. The usefulness of ^{137}Cs as a tracer
 571 for soil erosion assessment: A critical reply to Parsons and Foster (2011). *Earth-Science*
 572 *Reviews* 127, 300-307.

573 Mabit, L., Benmansour, M., Walling, D.E., 2008. Comparative advantages and limitations of
 574 fallout radionuclides (^{137}Cs , ^{210}Pb and ^7Be) to assess soil erosion and sedimentation. *Journal*
 575 *of Environmental Radioactivity*, 99 (12), 1799 - 1807. [10.1016/j.jenvrad.2008.08.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2008.08.009)

576 Mabit, L., Klik, A., Benmansour, M., Toloza, A., Geisler, A., Gerstmann, U.C., 2009.
 577 Assessment of erosion and deposition rates within an Austrian agricultural watershed by
 578 combining ^{137}Cs , ^{210}Pb and conventional measurements. *Geoderma*, 150, 231-239.

579 Merten GH, Araújo AG, Biscaia RCM, Barbosa GMC, Conte O. 2015. No-till surface runoff
 580 and soil losses in southern Brazil. *Soil and Tillage Research* 152, 85-93.
 581 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2015.03.014>

582 Minella JPG, Walling DE, Merten GH. 2014. Establishing a sediment budget for a small
 583 agricultural catchment in Southern Brazil, to support the development of effective sediment
 584 management strategies. *Journal of Hydrology* 519: 2189 - 2201.
 585 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.10.013>

586 Moore, I. D., P. E. Gessler, G. A. Nielsen, and G. A. Peterson (1993). Soil attribute prediction
 587 using terrain analysis, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 57, 443-452.

588 Moore, I.D. & Burch, G.J. Modeling erosion and deposition: Topographic effects. *Trans. Am.*
 589 *Soc. Agric. Eng.*, 29:1624-1640, 1986.

590 Montgomery, D.R., 2007. Soil erosion and agricultural sustainability. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.*
 591 *S. A.* 104, 13268–13272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0611508104>

592 Morais, L.F.B. & Cogo, N.P. 2001. Comentários críticos de rampa para diferentes manejos
 593 de resíduos culturais em sistema de semeadura direta em um Argissolo Vermelho na
 594 Depressão Central-RS. *R. Bras. Ci. Solo*, 25:1.041-1.051

595 Moreno, R.J. Uso da terra, vegetação original e atual do Rio Grande do Sul. Boletim Geográfico
 596 do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, n. 15, p. 45-51, 1972.

597 Morgan, R. P. C. Soil erosion and conservation / R. P. C. Morgan. 3rd ed. ISBN 1-4051-1781-
 598 8

599 Parsons, A.J., Foster, I.D.L., 2011. What can we learn about soil erosion from the use of ^{137}Cs ?
 600 Earth-Science Reviews 108, 101-113.

601 Phillips, J.D., Slattery, M.C., Musselman, Z.A., 2004. Dam-to-delta sediment inputs and
 602 storage in the lower trinity river, Texas. Geomorphology 62, 17-34.

603 Porto, P.; Walling, D.E.; Alewell, C.; Callegari, G.; Mabit, L.; Mallimo, N.; Meusbürger K.;
 604 Zehring, M., 2014. Use of ^{137}Cs re-sampling technique to investigate temporal changes in
 605 soil erosion and sediment mobilisation for a small forested catchment in southern Italy. J.
 606 Environmental Radioactivity. 10.1016/j.jenvrad.2014.08.007

607 Reichert, J.M., V.T. da Rosa, E.S. Vogelmann, D.P. da Rosa, R. Horn, D.J. Reinert, et al. 2016.
 608 Conceptual framework for capacity and intensity physical soil properties affected by short
 609 and long-term (14 years) continuous no-tillage and controlled traffic. Soil Tillage Res.
 610 158:123-136. doi:10.1016/j.still.2015.11.010

611 Reicosky, D.C., 2015. Conservation tillage is not conservation agriculture. J. Soil Water
 612 Conserv. 70, 103A-108A. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2489/jswc.70.5.103A>

613 Ritchie, J. C., & McHenry, J. R. (1990). Application of radioactive fallout ^{137}Cs for measuring
 614 soil erosion and sediment accumulation rates and patterns: a review. Journal of Environ.
 615 Qual., 19, 215-233. <http://www.nal.usda.gov/>

616 Ritchie JC, Ritchie CA (2007) Bibliography of publications of ^{137}Cs studies related to erosion
 617 and sediment deposition, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/Main/docs.htm?docid=15237>

618 Schuller, P; Walling, DE; Sepúlveda, A; Castillo, A; Pino, I., 2007. Changes in soil erosion
 619 associated with the shift from conventional tillage to a no-tillage system, documented using

620 ^{137}Cs measurements. Soil & Tillage Research 94:183-192.
 621 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2006.07.014>

622 Schuller, P; Walling, DE; Sepúlveda, A; Trumper, RE; Rouanet, JL; Pino, I; Castillo, A., 2004.
 623 Use of ^{137}Cs measurements to estimate changes in soil erosion rates associated with changes
 624 in soil management practices on cultivated land. Applied Radiation and Isotopes 60:759-
 625 766. 10.1016/j.apradiso.2003.11.087

626 Schuch, L.A., Nordemann, D.J.R., Barreto, W.O., Cardoso, A., Zago, A., (1994a). Natural and
 627 artificial radionuclides in soils from Parana State, Brazil. J. Radioanal. Nucl. Chem. 177 (1),
 628 39-49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02132409>

629 Schuch, L.A., Nordemann, D.J.R., Zago, A., Dallpai, D.L., Godoy, J.M., Pecequik, B., (1994b).
 630 Correlation of natural and artificial radionuclides in soils with pedological, climatological
 631 and geographic parameters. J. Radioanal. Nucl. Chem. 177 (1), 101-106.
 632 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02132414>

633 Soler, M., Latron, J., and Gallart, F. 2008. Relationships between suspended sediment
 634 concentrations and discharge in two small research basins in a mountainous Mediterranean
 635 area (Vallcebre, Eastern Pyrenees), Geomorphology, 98, 143–152.

636 Sommer, M.; Gerke, H.H.; Deumlich, D. (2008). Modelling soil landscape genesis - A “time
 637 split” approach for hummocky agricultural landscapes. Geoderma, 145, 480-493.

638 Tiecher, T.; Minella J. P. G.; Evrard, O.; Caner L.; Merten, G. H.; Capoane, V.; Didoné, E. J.;
 639 dos Santos, D. R., 2018. Fingerprinting sediment sources in a large agricultural catchment
 640 under no-tillage in Southern Brazil (Conceição River). Land Degrad Dev. 29:939-951.
 641 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.2917>

642 Tiecher, T., Minella, J.P.G., Miguel, P., Alvarez, J.W.R., Pellegrini, A., Capoane, V., Ciotti,
 643 L.H., Schaefer, G.L., Santos, D.R. dos, 2014. Contribuição das fontes de sedimentos em uma

644 bacia hidrográfica agrícola sob plantio direto. Rev. Bras. Ciência do Solo 38, 639-649.

645 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-06832014000200028>.

646 Walling, D.E., Zhang, Y., He, Q., (2014). Conversion models and related software. In:

647 Guidelines for Using Fallout Radionuclides to Assess Erosion and Effectiveness of Soil

648 Conservation Strategies. International Atomic Energy Agency Publication, pp. 125-148.

649 IAEA-TECDOC-CD-1741, ISBN:978-92-0-155814-5.

650 Walling, D. E., Zhang, Y., and He, Q., 2011. Models for deriving estimates of erosion and

651 deposition rates from fallout radionuclide (caesium-137, excess lead-210, and beryllium-7)

652 measurements and the development of user friendly software for model implementation, in:

653 Impact of Soil Conservation Measures on Erosion Control and Soil Quality, 11-33.

654 https://inis.iaea.org/search/search.aspx?orig_q=RN:43009303

655 Walling, D.E., Zhang, Y., He, Q., 2007. Models for Converting Measurements of

656 Environmental Radionuclide Inventories (^{137}Cs , Excess ^{210}Pb and ^7Be to Estimates of Soil

657 Erosion and Deposition Rates (Including Software for Model Implementation). Department

658 of Geography, University of Exeter, Exeter. EX4 4RJ UK.

659 Walling, D. E. and He, Q. (1997). Models for converting ^{137}Cs measurements to estimating of

660 soil redistribution rates on cultivates and uncultivated soils. Paper presented at Coordinated

661 Research Programmes on Soil Erosion (D1.50.05) and Sedimentation (F3.10.01), May 1997,

662 Vienna, Austria.

663 Walling, D.E., Quine, T.A., "Use of fallout radionuclide measurements in soil erosion

664 investigations", Nuclear Techniques in Soil-Plant Studies for Sustainable Agriculture and

665 Environmental Preservation (Proc. Symp. Vienna, 1994), IAEA Publication STI/PUB/947

666 International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, (1995) 597-619.

- Walling, D.E.; Quine, T.A., 1992. The use of caesium-137 measurements in soil erosion surveys. In: Erosion and sediment transport monitoring programmes in river basins, Oslo, 1992. Proceedings. Oslo: IAHS.
- Walling, D. E. (1983). The sediment delivery problem. *J. Hydrol.* 65, 209-237.
- Wilson, J.P. & Gallant, J.C. 1996. EROS: A grid-based program for estimating spatially-distributed erosion indices. *Computers and Geosciences* 22:707-712.
- Wischmeier, W.D. & Smith, D.D. Predicting rainfall erosion losses: a guide to conservation planning. Washington, USDA, 1978. 58p. (Agriculture Handbook, 537).
- Van Muysen, W., Van Oost, K. and Govers, G. 2006: Soil translocation resulting from multiple passes of tillage under normal field operating conditions. *Soil and Tillage Research*, Volume 87, 2:218-230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2005.04.011>
- Van Oost K, Quine TA, Govers G, Gryze SD, Six J, Harden JW, Ritchie JC, McCarty GW, Heckrath G, Kosmas C, Giraldez JV, Marques da Silva JR, Merckx R (2007) The impact of agricultural soil erosion on the global carbon cycle. *Science* 318(5850):626–629. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1145724>
- Van Oost, K., Govers, G., De Alba, S., Quine, T.A., 2006. Tillage erosion: a review of controlling factors and implications for soil quality. *Prog. Phys. Geogr.* 30 (4), 443 -466. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0309133306pp487ra>
- Vieira, M.J.; Cogo, N.P.; Cassol, E.A. 1978. Perdas por erosão em diferentes sistemas de preparo do solo para a cultura da soja (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) em condições de chuva simulada. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo*, v.2, p.209-214.
- Zapata, F. (2002). Handbook for the assessment of soil erosion and sedimentation using environmental radionuclides. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers. ISBN: 978-0-306-48054-6.

691 Zheng JJ, He XB, Walling D, Zhang XB, Flanagan D, Qi YQ (2007). Assessing soil erosion
692 rates on manually-tilled hillslopes in the Sichuan hilly basin using Cs-137 and Pb-210(ex)
693 measurements. *Pedosphere* 17:273–283

694 Young, R. A., and Mutchler, C. K., Soil Movement on Irregular Slopes. *Water Resources*
695 *Research*, Vol. 5, 1969, pp. 1084-1089.

Table 1 - Main characteristics of the three hillslopes investigated

		Hillslope (I)	Hillslope (II)	Hillslope (III)
		*B/B/B	*B/M/M	*B/B/G
Soil type		Ferralsols	Ferralsols	Ferralsols
Slope length (m)		100	260	260
LS Factor (Desmet & Govers, 1996)		1.6	2.0	2.1
Average declivity		13.8%	11.4%	11.8%
1st period (1960-1979)	1960s	Native forest with progressive deforestation and intensification of agriculture under conventional tillage since late 1960s.	Native forest with progressive deforestation for agriculture under conventional tillage since early 1960s.	Native pasture for extensive cattle raising with the presence of low vegetation, gully erosion and low natural soil fertility. Increased use for grain production since 1960s.
	1970s	Conventional Tillage	Conventional Tillage	grassland with high soil degradation (diffusive and concentrated erosion)
2nd period (1980-1999)	1980s	Conventional Tillage	Conventional Tillage	Conventional Tillage
	1990s	Conventional Tillage	No-tillage with terraces until	No-tillage with terraces

1990

3rd period (2000-2016)	2000s-2016	Conventional Tillage	No-tillage system	No-tillage with crop rotation without terraces
-----------------------------------	------------	-------------------------	-------------------	--

*Quality of soil management during the 1st period, 2nd period and 3rd period (B: Bad with high erosion;
M: Average with medium erosion and G: Good with low erosion).

Table 2 - Results of the conversion of the cesium 137 inventories into soil redistribution rates for each hillslope transect.

	Depth	¹³⁷ Cs	Slope	Density	Redistribution rate
	(cm)	(Bq.m ⁻²)	(%)	(g.cm ³)	(Mg ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)
					MBM - 2
Reference site					
Ref	42	393±75	~ 0	1.33	-
Hillslope I					
*Summit	18	234 ±28		1.48	-28 ±7
*Backslope	24	138 ±35	13.8	1.41	-57 ±15
*Toeslope	54	1400 ±84		1.15	201 ±2
Hillslope II					
Summit	21	246 ±31		1.40	-25 ±8
Backslope	21	253 ±80	11.4	1.33	-18 ±16
Toeslope	109	1124 ±136		1.48	120 ±12
Hillslope III					
Summit	21	202 ±36		1.47	-38 ±10
Backslope	21	76 ± 31	11.8	1.43	-87 ±34
Toeslope	80	447 ±79		1.46	13 ±12

MBM - 2 =Mass Balance Model - 2. *(References) - Schoeneberger and Wysocki (2012).

Figure Captions

Figure 1 - Location of Conceição river catchment where three hillslopes studied.

Figure 2 - Characteristics of the selected hillslopessects and individual soil core sampling sites in Conceição river catchment, Brazil: Hillslope I, Hillslope II and Hillslope III.

Figure 3 - Distribution of ^{137}Cs with depth at the reference site

Figure 4 - Distribution of ^{137}Cs inventories in slope I with depth in soil profiles collected on (A) the summit, at (B) backslope and on the (C) toeslope of the hillslope (Hillslope I).

Figure 5 - Distribution of ^{137}Cs inventories with depth in soil profiles collected on (A) the summit, at (B) backslope and on the (C) toeslope of the hillslope (Hillslope II).

Figure 6 - Distribution of ^{137}Cs inventories with depth in soil profiles collected on (A) the summit, at (B) backslope and on the (C) toeslope of the hillslope (Hillslope III).

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 6
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





^{137}Cs technique for
evaluation of erosion
and deposition rates

