



HAL
open science

Sediment fingerprinting in fluvial systems: review of tracers, sediment sources and mixing models

Arman Haddadchi, Darren S Ryder, O. Evrard, Jon Olley

► To cite this version:

Arman Haddadchi, Darren S Ryder, O. Evrard, Jon Olley. Sediment fingerprinting in fluvial systems: review of tracers, sediment sources and mixing models. *International Journal of Sediment Research*, 2013, 28 (4), pp.560-578. 10.1016/S1001-6279(14)60013-5 . cea-02615645

HAL Id: cea-02615645

<https://cea.hal.science/cea-02615645>

Submitted on 23 May 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.

Sediment Fingerprinting in Fluvial Systems: Review of Tracers, Sediment Sources and Mixing Models

Arman Haddadchi^{1*}, Darren S. Ryder², Olivier Evrard³, Jon Olley⁴

Abstract

Suspended sediments in fluvial systems originate from a myriad of diffuse and point sources, with the relative contribution from each source varying over time and space. The process of sediment fingerprinting focuses on developing methods that enable discrete sediment sources to be identified from a composite sample of suspended material. This review identifies existing methodological steps for sediment fingerprinting including fluvial and source sampling, and critically compares biogeochemical and physical tracers used in fingerprinting studies. Implications of applying different mixing models to the same source data are explored using data from 41 catchments across Europe, Africa, Australia, Asia, and North and South America. The application of seven commonly used mixing models to two case studies from the US (North Fork Broad River watershed) and France (Bléone watershed) with local and global (genetic algorithm) optimization methods identified all outputs remained in the acceptable range of error defined by the original authors. We propose future sediment fingerprinting studies use models that combine the best explanatory parameters provided by the modified Collins (using correction factors) and Hughes (relying on iterations involving all

¹ Ph.D., Griffith School of Environment, Australian Rivers Institute, Griffith University, Nathan, Qld 4111, Australia. *Corresponding author, Email: arman.haddadchi@gmail.com

² Assoc. Prof., School of Environmental and Rural Sciences, University of New England, NSW, Australia. Email: dryder2@une.edu.au

³ Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement (LSCE/IPSL) - Unité Mixte de Recherche 8212 (CEA, CNRS, UVSQ), 91198-Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France. Email: olivier.evrard@lscce.ipsl.fr

⁴ Professor, Australian Rivers Institute, Griffith University, Nathan, Qld 4111, Australia. Email: j.olley@griffith.edu.au

1
2
3
4 **1 Introduction**
5

6
7 The transport of sediment, and especially the fine sediment particles, can lead to a number of
8
9 detrimental impacts for stream environments. Suspended sediment loads can lead to a decrease in
10
11 water quality (Lartiges et al. 2001; Papanicolaou et al. 2003); a reduction of operational
12
13 capacities in water supply facilities (Morris et al. 1997); an alteration of channel morphology
14
15 (Wright et al. 1987); an increase in turbidity, restricting light penetration and thereby reducing
16
17 primary production (Wood et al. 1997); and the smothering of biotic habitats (Richards et al.
18
19 1994). Furthermore, fine sediment export may facilitate substantial transfers of carbon and
20
21 nutrients (Prosser et al. 2001).
22
23
24
25

26
27 Suspended sediments originate from different sources, with the relative contribution from each
28
29 source varying over time and space as a consequence of different erosional processes. Although
30
31 several approaches to identify sediment sources exist, many approaches rely on visual estimates
32
33 (Reid et al. 1996), modeling (Foster 1988), long-term field records (Gellis et al. 2005), or
34
35 traditional monitoring techniques. The latter employs an indirect approach and involves
36
37 measurements of erosion activity, including those based on erosion pins to measure the rates of
38
39 surface lowering (Slattery et al. 1995; Lawler et al. 1999); and erosion plots to document the
40
41 rates of soil loss from surface sources (Motha et al. 2002). Indirect approaches also face many
42
43 issues including: a) primary assumptions about the origin of sediment sources, b) difficulty in
44
45 recording erosion rates due to the spatial variability, and c) inability of these approaches to
46
47 estimate sediment delivery to the streams (Walling 2005). A thorough review of the direct and
48
49 indirect approaches to measure sediment mobilization can be found in Collins and Walling (2004).
50
51 Sediment fingerprinting methods provide a direct approach for quantifying sources of sediment
52
53 from individual river sections to watershed scale. The procedure involves characterizing the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 potential sediment sources by their diagnostic chemical and physical properties, and comparing
5
6 these to the properties of transported fluvial material.
7
8
9

10 Figure 1 identifies the process common to the majority of sediment fingerprinting studies, even
11
12 though the methods used for collecting samples (fluvial and source samples), preliminary
13
14 analyses, number and type of tracers, statistical parameters to verify different tracers, and models
15
16 to determine specific contribution from discrete sources may vary among techniques.
17
18
19

20
21 **(Figure 1.)**
22

23
24 This paper builds on reviews of sediment fingerprinting studies from (Collins et al. 2004),
25
26 Walling (2005) and Davis et al. (2009) by focusing on: 1) comparison of different fluvial
27
28 sampling methods used in sediment tracing studies and their applicability for different
29
30 hydrologic and morphologic river conditions; 2) describing the range of sediment properties used
31
32 to assign a fingerprint and the potential to quantitatively identify discrete sources of sediment; 3)
33
34 comparing the sources of suspended sediment from 41 watersheds around the globe; and 4)
35
36 comparing the variability in output from applying a common dataset from two case studies to
37
38 seven commonly used mixing models. This is the first study that compares the most prevalent
39
40 mixing models (including the application of genetic algorithms) to an actual dataset to quantify
41
42 variability in the output depending on the choice of mixing models.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **2 Fluvial and source soil sampling**
50

51
52 Sediment fingerprinting studies rely on the collection of different types of fluvial sediments and
53
54 may include river bed sediment (Olley et al. 2000; Dirszowsky 2004; Hughes et al. 2009; Evrard
55
56 et al. 2011), dam reservoir samples (Foster et al. 2007; Nosrati et al. 2011), floodplain surface
57
58 (Collins et al. 2010) and, most commonly, samples of suspended load (Mizugaki et al. 2008;
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Devereux et al. 2010; Mukundan et al. 2010). In some studies, soil samples were collected from
5
6 spatially explicit watershed sources: from the top 0.5 cm (Gellis et al. 2009), 2 cm (Walling et al.
7
8 1995; Hughes et al. 2009; Collins et al. 2010) or 5 cm (Gruszowski et al. 2003; Minella et al.
9
10 2004; Devereux et al. 2010) of the soil surface. Instead of collecting samples from different
11
12 source types, Motha et al. (2002) and Mizugaki et al. (2008) used a plot for each source type to
13
14 simulate erosion process inside the plots, and Olley and Caitcheon (2000) used deposited fine-
15
16 grained sediments as source samples to average out local source area heterogeneity. In a recent
17
18 study Wilkinson et al. (In press) found that the estimated contributions of spatial source areas
19
20 within the large study catchments had narrower confidence intervals when source areas were
21
22 defined using sediment from geologically distinct river tributaries, rather than using soil sampled
23
24 from geological units in the catchment, since tributary sediment had less-variable geochemistry
25
26 than catchment soils.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Three primary methods used to collect suspended in-stream sediment samples across watersheds
34
35 include point samples, time-integrated samples and automated collection of water samples.
36
37 Based on the type of instruments used, point sampling consists of two approaches; collecting
38
39 hundreds of liters of stream water and extracting suspended sediment with a continuous flow
40
41 centrifuge (e.g. Motha et al. 2003; Deverux et al. 2009); and in-situ dewatering techniques using
42
43 portable centrifuge or filtration systems (e.g., Horowitz et al. 1989). The advantage of the former
44
45 technique is that it prevents contamination by the successive samples collected.
46
47
48
49
50

51 Time-integrated samplers based on a flow velocity reduction leading to the settling of particles
52
53 within a trap (Phillips et al. 2000) have been widely adopted in sediment tracing research
54
55 (Walling et al. 2008; Hatfield et al. 2009; Collins et al. 2010), These collect samples of
56
57 suspended sediment during flow events, and effectively trap a representative sample of sediment
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

with an effective particle size of $<63\mu\text{m}$ (Phillips et al. 2000; Russell et al. 2001); they sample through the hydrograph including the rising and falling limbs. Automated water samplers are the more costly method but allow the collection of instantaneous samples, and therefore a better temporal resolution for characterizing suspended sediment flux. Comparisons among sampling strategies are outlined in Table 1, identifying the only two methods that provide data necessary to calculate hysteresis effects are time-integrated and automatic water samplers. Hysteresis impacts on the variation of suspended sediment loading in the falling and rising limb of an event (Williams 1989). Samples from time-integrated and automated water samplers can be representative of the whole watershed area because of their temporal integration of transported sediment during events, but require a longer period of time (>10 days) to collect samples. Point samplers have the benefit of quantifying the effect of discharge on sediment contribution from different sources.

Table 1. Comparing different type of fluvial sampling methods

	Determine Hysteresis effect	Representative sample of whole watershed	Enough quantity of sample	Long sampling time	Instantaneous effect of flood events
Point samples	×	×	×*	×	✓
Time-Integrated samples	✓**	✓	✓	✓	×
Automated water samples	✓**	✓	✓	×	×
Bed load and Flood plain	×	✓	✓	×	×

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

samples					
Reservoir samples	×	×	✓	×	×

*in in-situ dewatering techniques enough quantity of samples can be collected

**These samplers partially alleviate the hysteresis problem but trapping efficiency of the samplers might also change during the hydrograph, the effect of which has not been quantified.

3 Fingerprint properties (Tracers)

A variety of chemical and physical tracer techniques have been used to investigate the sources of sediment and nutrients to river systems. These tracing techniques all involve measuring of one or more parameters that provide a 'fingerprint' to distinguish one source of sediment from another.

For a parameter to be useful in tracing the source of sediment it needs to be both measurable and conservative such that:

- A tracer signal should be able to distinguish between sediments derived from different source areas;
- For a given source of sediment, which does not change with respect to time, a sediment tracer signal must also be constant in time or vary in a predictable way;
- For a given source of sediment, which does not change with respect to distance along a transport path, a sediment tracer signal must also be constant along this path or vary in a predictable way.

Tracers used in sediment fingerprinting studies include sediment color (Grimshaw et al. 1980), color properties (Martínez-Carreras et al. 2010), plant pollen content (Brown 1985), major and trace elemental composition (Jenns et al. 2002; Miller et al. 2005), rare earth elements (Zhang et al. 2008), mineral magnetic characteristics (Hatfield et al. 2009), clay mineralogy (Motha et al. 2003), radionuclide characteristics (Vanden Bygaart et al. 2001; Estrany et al. 2010), organic

1
2
3
4 matter content (Peart 1993; Walling et al. 1999), carbon and nitrogen stable isotope ratios
5
6 (Papanicolaou et al. 2003; Rhoton et al. 2008), Compound Specific Stable Isotope (CSSI)
7
8 analysis (Blake et al. 2012) and Diffuse Reflectance Infrared Fourier Transform Spectroscopy
9
10 (DRIFTS) (Poulenard et al. 2009; Evrard et al. 2012).

11
12
13
14 An advantage of physical tracers including color, density and fine sediment dimensions is they
15
16 are readily identifiable and easily measurable characteristics (Davis et al. 2009). However, these
17
18 tracers can be non-conservative and may change during transport. Grimshaw and Lewin (1980)
19
20 and Peart (1993) successfully determined sediment origin using only color as a tracer, whereas
21
22 Vanden et al. (2001) unsuccessfully used density as the sole tracer of sediment source due to
23
24 large spatial variation in density values. More recently, Krein et al. (2003) demonstrated that
25
26 fractal dimension and particle color can provide a fast and easy approach to determine the origin
27
28 of sediments and the amount, location and process of sediment storage. Inorganic tracers have
29
30 been less successful for attributing specific soil-environmental processes than organic tracers
31
32 because of the large number of potential inorganic tracers and processes that may influence the
33
34 elemental composition of sediments during transport (Davis et al. 2009).
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Sediment geochemistry has been widely used to identify the spatial sources of sediments
42
43 delivered to waterways (Olley et al. 2000; Hardy et al. 2010; Weltje et al. 2011). Rock types,
44
45 through soil formation and weathering, have a profound influence on the geochemical properties
46
47 of their soils and accordingly the geochemical characteristics of their eroded sediments (Klages
48
49 et al. 1975; Olley et al. 2001). Different underlying parent rock materials frequently results in
50
51 spatial sources with distinct geochemical compositions (Olley et al. 2001; Motha et al. 2002;
52
53 Douglas et al. 2009). Sediments eroded from soils derived from a particular rock type often
54
55 maintain these distinct geochemical properties during sediment generation and transport
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 processes (Hughes et al. 2009). If sediments generated from parental rock types have
5
6 distinguishable major or trace elemental compositions then sources of transported sediment can
7
8 be determined (Collins et al. 1996; Collins et al. 1998; Caitcheon et al. 2001) by characterizing
9
10 and comparing the signature of suspended sediment samples and samples from the source areas
11
12 (Hughes et al. 2009).
13

14
15 A number of inorganic tracers including rare earth elements (Ce, Eu, La, Lu, Sm, Tb, Yb), trace
16
17 elements (As, Ba, Co, Cr, Cs, Hf, Sc, Ta, Th, Zn Ag, Ba, Cd, Cu, Mn, Ni, Pb, Sb, Se, Tl, V),
18
19 major elements (Fe, K, Na, Al, Ca, Mg, Ti, CaO, Na₂O, K₂O, Al₂O₃, Fe₂O₃, P₂O₅, MgO, SiO₂,
20
21 TiO₂, Mn₂O₄), total inorganic carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, and a number of organic tracers
22
23 including total organic carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus and Loss on Ignition have been applied in
24
25 sediment fingerprinting studies . Major elements, particularly the relationship between Fe₂O₃ and
26
27 Al₂O₃, provide useful tracers for discriminating soils with different rock forming minerals (Dyer
28
29 et al. 1996). The Chemical Index of Alteration (CIA) as proposed by (McLennan 1993) is a
30
31 useful tracer to identify chemical variations resulting from weathering.
32
33

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Fallout radionuclide activities are commonly high in surface materials and low or non-existent in subsurface materials (Walling 2005; Caitcheon et al. 2012; Olley et al. 2012), making them useful in distinguish surface and subsurface materials. Furthermore, they frequently distinguish cultivated from uncultivated soils as radionuclides are generally mixed throughout the ploughed layer. In addition, radionuclide tracers are well-suited for use in heterogeneous watersheds since their concentrations are effectively independent of soil type and underlying geology (Walling 2005; Caitcheon et al. 2012; Olley et al. 2012). The most commonly used fallout radionuclides are ¹³⁷Cs, ²¹⁰Pb and ⁷Be.

1
2
3
4 ^{137}Cs , which has a half-life of 30.2 yr, is a product of nuclear weapons testing during the 1950s
5
6 and the 1960s (Loughran et al. 1995) and nuclear accidents (e.g., Chernobyl with significant
7
8 fallout in Europe; Fukushima with significant fallout in Japan). Global fallout of ^{137}Cs peaked in
9
10 the early 1960s and reached zero in the mid-1980s. The highest concentrations of ^{137}Cs are found
11
12 in undisturbed areas such as forests or where soils were translocated from undisturbed areas and
13
14 not diluted (Matissoff et al. 2002; Nagle et al. 2004).
15
16
17
18

19
20 Lead-210 (^{210}Pb) is a product of atmospheric decay of ^{222}Rn gas (fallout ^{210}Pb) and in situ decay
21
22 of ^{226}Ra , and has a half-life of 22.26 years (Wallbrink et al. 1996). Fallout ^{210}Pb in a soil or
23
24 sediment sample is the excess of ^{210}Pb activity over the ^{226}Ra supported component. This is
25
26 known as ‘unsupported’ or ‘excess’ ^{210}Pb ($^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$). Like ^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$ generally accumulates in
27
28 the top 10 cm of soil, but can differ with depth depending on local environmental factors. In
29
30 addition to fallout radionuclides, Radium-226 (^{226}Ra) is produced by in situ decay of the uranium
31
32 series. ^{226}Ra concentrations are more directly related to rock type (Walling et al. 1995), and can
33
34 be used as a geogenic radionuclide tracer.
35
36
37
38
39

40 Beryllium-7 is cosmogenic in origin through the spallation of nitrogen and oxygen atoms in the
41
42 upper atmosphere by cosmic rays. Beryllium-7 (^7Be) is useful to discriminate surface soils from
43
44 deeper layers as it is commonly concentrated in the upper 5 mm of the soil profile (Zapata 2003).
45
46 Unlike ^{210}Pb and ^{137}Cs , ^7Be can confirm the relative importance of recently mobilized surface
47
48 materials due to its very short half-life of 53 days.
49
50
51
52

53 Nitrogen and carbon stable isotopes have shown greater potential sensitivity for detecting
54
55 sediment sources than total elemental composition, and therefore a powerful tool for identifying
56
57 soil origin (Fox et al. 2008). The stable isotopic signature of nitrogen ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) is a soil property
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 proportional to the $^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N}$ isotopic ratio; similarly the carbon stable isotopic signature ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) is
5
6 proportional to the $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ isotopic ratio. The carbon to nitrogen atomic ratio C/N is the ratio of
7
8 total atomic carbon to nitrogen. The dependence of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, and C/N on vegetative cover and
9
10 management, support the argument that the biogeochemical signature of eroded-soil will reflect
11
12 specific erosion processes (Fox et al. 2007).
13
14
15

16
17 The mineral magnetic properties of soils that are related to the underlying geology and soil type
18
19 include low- and high- frequency magnetic susceptibility (χ_{lf} , χ_{hf}), frequency depended
20
21 susceptibility (χ_{fd}) anhysteretic remanent magnetization (ARM), isothermal remanent
22
23 magnetization (IRM), high-field remanent magnetization (HIRM), and saturated isothermal
24
25 remanent magnetization (SIRM). The advantages of using magnetic tracers to determine discrete
26
27 sediment sources are: a) the measurement methods are not time- and cost-intensive, b) their
28
29 potential to discriminate a sample using non-destructive techniques, and c) their high sensitivity
30
31 to subtle changes in a range of environmental settings (Maher 1998). The disadvantages of
32
33 magnetic properties is that they are highly particle size-dependent (Hatfield et al. 2009) and are
34
35 not linearly additive (Lees 1997).
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **4 Sources of sediment**

43
44 The development of fingerprinting techniques has enabled discrimination of diverse point and
45
46 diffuse sources of sediment, including forest roads (Madej 2001; Gruszowski et al. 2003; Minella
47
48 et al. 2008), graveled roads (Motha et al. 2004), arable lands (Walling et al. 1999; Walling et al.
49
50 2001), pasture lands (He et al. 1995; Collins et al. 1997a; Owens et al. 2000), forest floor
51
52 (Mizugaki et al. 2008), sub-surface areas (Russell et al. 2001; Walling et al. 2008), channel
53
54 banks (Slattery et al. 2000), landslides (Nelson et al. 2002), gully walls (Krause et al. 2003) and
55
56 urban sources (Carter et al. 2003).
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 Pastured lands (grassland topsoils) have been documented as one of the highest contributors to
5 suspended sediment transport in UK (He et al. 1995; Collins et al. 1997a; Owens et al. 2000;
6
7 Gruszowski et al. 2003; Collins et al. 2010) due to soil deformation and compaction as a result of
8
9 high livestock densities (Pietola et al. 2005). However, studies in France (Evrard et al. 2011),
10
11 Australia (Motha et al. 2002) and Iran (Nosrati et al. 2011) show low soil erosion potential from
12
13 pasturelands as a result of higher vegetative cover that retards both sediment detachment and
14
15 transport. Site-specific issues such as unvegetated surfaces during high precipitation, increased
16
17 slope, and reduced soil organic matter content can accelerate erosion processes from cultivated
18
19 fields.
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 The importance of roads as sites of sediment origin, deposition and transport has been widely
27
28 acknowledged (Wemple et al. 2001; Ramos-Scharrón et al. 2007; Sheridan et al. 2008), and their
29
30 contribution to sediment loads exacerbated by their connectivity within drainage systems (Croke
31
32 et al. 2001; Motha et al. 2004). A range of sediment tracers have been used to successfully
33
34 discriminate different types of roads as sediment sources including forest roads (Motha et al.
35
36 2002; Mizugaki et al. 2008), street residue (Devereux et al. 2010), farm tracks (Edwards et al.
37
38 2008; Collins et al. 2010), unpaved roads or unmetalled roads (Collins et al. 2010; Mukundan et
39
40 al. 2010) and paved roads or metalled roads (Gruszowski et al. 2003).
41
42
43
44

45
46 The relative importance of channel banks as sediment sources to drainage systems will vary
47
48 among watersheds due to geology and sediment type, hydrology, channel morphology and
49
50 dimensions, and riparian land-use pressures (Collins et al. 2010). In south-eastern Australian,
51
52 channel sources have been documented to contribute up to 90% of the total sediment yield (Olley
53
54 et al. 1993; Wallbrink et al. 1998; Wasson et al. 1998; Caitcheon et al. 2012; Olley et al. 2012).
55
56
57 In the UK, Walling (2005) suggested channel banks typically contributed 50% of transported
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 sediment load. In contrast, channel bank sources to suspended load have also been found to be
5
6 minimal (e.g. Chapman et al. 2001; Russell et al. 2001; Walling et al. 2001), highlighting the
7
8 importance of local conditions in regulating channel bank contributions.
9

10
11 A number of fingerprinting studies have developed methods to successfully discriminate
12
13 geological sources of sediment rather than sources originating from different land-uses. For
14
15 example, Walling and Woodward (1995) categorized the River Calm watershed (UK) into three
16
17 dominant rock types including; Cretaceous/Eocene with 20% contribution, Triassic with 42%
18
19 and Permian with 26.5%. In Australia, Olley and Caitcheon (2000) found sediments in the
20
21 Darling- Barwon watershed were mostly derived from sedimentary and granitic bed rock areas
22
23 and less (<5%) from basalt-derived component of cultivated areas, and Wilkinson et al. (2012)
24
25 measured sediment source contribution from surface and sub-surface soils of Granitoid, Mafic
26
27 and sedimentary rock in 5 river locations and concluded that most of the fine sediment loss in the
28
29 study area was derived from subsurface soil sources. Similarly, Evrard et al. (2011), Poulenard et
30
31 al. (2012) and Navratil et al. (2012) successfully compared the contribution of four geological
32
33 sources to river bed sediment and suspended sediment respectively, within the Bléone watershed
34
35 (France).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 To summarize the range of tracing techniques, their applicability and success in discriminating
45
46 among sources, Table 2 presents data from twenty five published sediment fingerprinting studies
47
48 covering 47 watersheds from Europe, Africa, Australia, Asia, and North and South America.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2. The range of tracing techniques, their applicability and success in discriminating among sources from twenty published sediment fingerprinting studies.

Study	Physical tracers	Organic	Inorganic	Radionuclide	Magnetic tracers	Best tracers	Description of location and sediment sources	Most contributed area (percent of contribution)
Walling et al. (1993)		C, N		¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb	χ ARM, SIRM, IRM		Jackmoor Brook Basin (UK) six sources: two groups of pastures, three groups of cultivated areas, channel banks	Cultivated areas (57.5%), Pasture surfaces (23.6%), Channel banks (18.9%).
							River Dart Basin four sources: pasture, two groups of cultivated fields, channel banks	Pasture surfaces (48.2%), Cultivated areas (30.8%), Channel bank (21%),
Walling et al. (1995)		C, N		¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb _{ex} , ²²⁶ Ra	χ _s ARM, SIRM, IRM		River Culm Basin (UK) seven source types: Cretaceous/Eocene pasture, Cretaceous/Eocene cultivated, Triassic pasture, Triassic cultivated, Permian pasture, Permian cultivated, and channel banks	Triassic cultivated (29.5 %), Permian cultivated (19.7), Channel banks (12%)
Slattery et al. (1995)					χ _{lf} , χ _{hf} SIRM, IRM		North Oxfordshire watershed (UK) three sources: Cultivated areas, channel banks, combined surficial soil/channel bank areas	Cultivated areas (38%), Channel banks (34%), combined surficial soil/channel bank areas (28%)
Collins 1997		C, N, P _{tot}	Fe _{pyr} , Fe _{dit} , Al _{pyr} , Al _{dit} , Mn _{pyr} , Fe _{tot} , Al _{tot} , Mn _{tot} , Fe _{oxa} , Mn _{oxa} , Al _{oxa} , Cu, Zn, Pb, Cr, Co, Ni, Na, Mg, Ca, K,	¹³⁷ Cs		Ca, Co, Na, Fe _{dit} , Mn _{oxa} , Ni	The Exe Basin (UK) four sources: woodland, pasture areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	The Exe basin: Pasture areas (71.7%), Cultivated areas (20.4%), Channel banks (5.3%), Woodland (2.6%).
						Fe _{oxa} , Ca, C	The Severn Basin (UK) four sources: woodland, pasture areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	The Severn basin: Pasture areas (65.3%), Cultivated areas (25.4%), Channel banks (7.5%), Woodland (1.8%).
Collins 1997	Absolute particle size	C, N, P _{tot}	Fe _{pyr} , Fe _{dit} , Mn _{pyr} , Mn _{dit} , Al _{pyr} , Al _{dit} , Fe _{tot} , Mn _{tot} , Al _{tot} , Fe _{oxa} , Mn _{oxa} , Al _{oxa} , Cu, Zn, Pb, Cr, Co, Ni, Na, Mg, Ca, K	¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb		Ni, Co, K, P _{tot} , N	The Dart Basin (UK) four sources: woodland, pasture areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	Pasture areas (78%), Cultivated areas (14%), woodland (4.5%), channel banks (3.5%)
						N, Cu, ¹³⁷ Cs	The Plynlimon Basin (Uk) three sources: forest areas, pasture areas, channel banks	Pasture areas (66%), Forest areas (25%), Channel banks (9%)

1
2
3

Study	Physical tracers	Organic	Inorganic	Radionuclide	Magnetic tracers	Best tracers	Description of location and sediment sources	Most contributed area (percent of contribution)
Wallbrink, Murray et al. (1998)				^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$		^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$	Murrumbidgee River (Australia) uncultivated areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	Uncultivated areas (78%), Cultivated areas (22%)
Walling et al. (1999)		C, N, P, P_{tot}	Al, Ca, Cr, Cu, Fe, K, Mg, Mn, Na, Ni, Pb, Sr, Zn, total P	^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$, ^{226}Ra	χ , SIRM	N, Total P, Sr, Ni, Zn ^{226}Ra , ^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$, Fe, Al	Swale River (UK) four sources: woodland, uncultivated areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	Uncultivated areas (42%), Cultivated areas (30%), Channel banks (28%)
							Ure River four sources: woodland, uncultivated areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	Uncultivated areas (45%), Channel banks (37%), Cultivated areas (17%)
							Nidd River four sources: woodland, uncultivated areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	Uncultivated areas (75%), Channel banks (15%)
							Ouse River four sources: woodland, uncultivated areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	Cultivated areas (38%), Channel banks (37%), Uncultivated areas (24.6%)
							Wharfe River four sources: woodland, uncultivated areas, cultivated areas, channel banks	Uncultivated areas (69.5%), Channel banks (22.5%)
Nicholls (2001)		C, N	Al, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Ni, K, Sr, Na, Zn	^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$, ^{226}Ra		^{226}Ra , Fe, Cr, C, ^{137}Cs , K, N	Upper Torridge watershed (UK) four sources: channel banks, cultivated area, pasture land, woodland	Pasture land (47%), Cultivated area (28%), Channel Banks (23%)
Russell et al. (2001)		C, N	Al, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Ni, K, Sr, Na, Zn, As	^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$, ^{226}Ra	χ_{lf} , χ_{fd} , ARM, SIRM, IRM	Land use: Al_p , Fe, Mg, Mn, ^{137}Cs , K, χ_{lf} , ARM, SIRM	Belmont watershed (UK) five sources: pasture areas, arable areas, hopyards, channel banks, field drains	Field drains (55.3%), Arable areas (17.5%), Hopyard (12%), Channel banks (11%)
						Soil type: Al_p , SIRM, ARM, ^{137}Cs , X_{lf} , Pb, Mg, K, Fe, Mn	Belmont watershed (UK) five sources: Bromyard, Middleton, Compton, channel banks, field drains	Field drains (54.5%), Bromyard (12.9%), Channel banks (11.9%), Middleton (11.8%)
						Land use: ^{137}Cs , As, N, ARM, SIRM, Pb, χ_{lf} , C	Jubilee watershed (UK) five sources: pasture areas, arable areas, hopyards, channel banks, field drains	Field drains (47.8%), Arable areas (30.1%), Channel banks (12%), Hopyards (7%)
						Soil type: K, Mg, As, Mn, ^{137}Cs , χ_{lf} , ARM, SIRM	Jubilee watershed (UK) four sources: Bromyard, Middleton, channel banks, field drains	Field drains (54.7%), Middleton (30.5%), Channel banks (11.1%)
Walling et al. (2001)		C, N	Al, As, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Mn, Ni, Pb, Sb, Sn, Sr, Zn, Ca, K Mg, Na, Al_{dit} , Fe_{dit} , Mn_{dit}	^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$		Ni, K, Cu, Cr, Ca, Total of $\text{Al}_{\text{pyrophosphate}}$ and Al_{dit} , Mn_{dit} , Al_{dit}	Kaleya River Basin (Zambia) four sources: communal cultivation areas,	Cultivated areas (66%), Bush grazing areas (17%), Channel banks and

45
46
47
48
49

1
2
3

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Physical tracers	Organic	Inorganic	Radionuclide	Magnetic tracers	Best tracers	Description of location and sediment sources	Most contributed area (percent of contribution)
17 18 19 20 21 22			Al _{pyr} , Fe _{pyr} , Mn _{pyr} , P _{tot}	²²⁶ Ra		Sr, ¹³⁷ Cs, Co, P _{tot}	commercial cultivation areas, channel banks and gullies, bush grazing areas	gullies (17%)
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32			P, Fe, Al, Na, K, Mg, Ca, Cd, Cu, Ni, Mn, Zn	¹³⁷ Cs	χ _{lf} , χ _{hf} , χ _{fd} , χ _{fd%} , χ _{ARM} , S _{ratio} , ARM, IRM ₁₀₀ , IRM ₈₈₀ , HIRM	χ _{hf} , χ _{ARM} , IRM ₈₈₀ , Fe, Al, Na, Cu, ¹³⁷ Cs	River Leadon watershed (UK) five sources: arable areas, grassland areas, sub-soils, channel banks, road sources	Sub-soils (35%), Road sources (30%), Grassland topsoils (13.8%), Arable topsoils (13.6%), Channel banks (8%)
33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42			Al ₂ O ₃ /Fe ₂ O ₃ , Al ₂ O ₃ /(100-SiO ₂), CIA	¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb _{ex}	IRM ₈₅₀ /χ	Al ₂ O ₃ /Fe ₂ O ₃ , Al ₂ O ₃ /(100-SiO ₂), CIA, ¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb _{ex}	East Tarago watershed (Australia) four sources: gravel-surfaced roads, grouped lands (un-graveled roads, pasture and cultivated lands on basalt-derived soils), cultivated lands on granite-derived soils, and forest	Gravel-surfaced roads (41%), Grouped lands (18%), Cultivated lands on granite-derived soils (13%) and Forest(14%)
43 44 45 46 47 48 49		C _{tot}	N _{tot} , P _{tot} , K _{tot} , Ca _{tot} , Na _{tot} , Mg _{tot} , Cu _{tot} , Pb _{tot} , Cr _{tot} , Co _{tot} , Zn _{tot} , Ni _{tot} , Fe _{tot} , Mn _{tot} , Al _{tot} , Fe _{dit} , Fe _{oxa} , Mn _{dit} , Al _{dit} , Al _{oxa}			Fe _{tot} , Fe _{oxa} , Al _{oxa} , Mn _{tot} , Ca, P	Lajeado Ferreira River (Brazil) three sources: field areas, pasture areas, unpaved roads	Pasture areas (77.9%), Unpaved roads (21.3%)
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61				¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb _{ex}			Two watersheds of Tsuzura River (Japan): Hinoki 156 watershed four sources: forest floor, landslide scar, truck trail, channel bank; b) Hinoki 155 watershed two sources: forest floor, landslide.	Hinoki 156 watershed: Forest Floor (46%) Hinoki 155 watershed: Forest Floor (70%)
62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72		P, N, C/N, C _{tot} , δ ¹³ C, δ ¹⁵ N		²¹⁰ Pb _{ex}		N, Total C, δ ¹³ C, δ ¹⁵ N, ²¹⁰ Pb _{ex}	Pokomoke River (US) four sources: channel banks, ditch Bed, crop area, forest area	Ditch bed (62%), Crop area (20%), Stream and Ditch banks (14%)
73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84		P, N, C/N, C _{tot} , δ ¹³ C, δ ¹⁵ N		²¹⁰ Pb _{ex}		Total C, C/N, δ ¹⁵ N, δ ¹³ C	Mattawoman Creek (US) four source: banks, construction sites, crop lands, forest area	Forest (34%), Banks (28%), Crop land (19%), Construction sites (19%)
85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96		C, P, N, C/N, δ ¹³ C, δ ¹⁵ N		²¹⁰ Pb _{ex} , ¹³⁷ Cs		Organic C, δ ¹³ C, P	Little Connestoga Creek (US) three sources: channel banks, construction sites, crop land	Cultivated areas (61%), Channel banks (39%)
97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108		C _{tot} , N _{tot} , P _{tot} , S _{tot}	Be, Mg, Al, K, Ca, Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, Zn, As, Pb, U	¹³⁷ Cs		¹³⁷ Cs, δ ¹⁵ N, Cr and U	North Fork Broad River (US) three sources: channel banks, construction sites and unpaved roads, pastures	Channel banks (60%), Construction sites and unpaved roads (23 to 30%), Pastures (10 to 15%)

1
2
3

Study	Physical tracers	Organic	Inorganic	Radionuclide	Magnetic tracers	Best tracers	Description of location and sediment sources	Most contributed area (percent of contribution)					
								Pasture areas	Cultivated areas	Farm tracks	Channel banks		
(Collins et al. 2010)			Al, As, Ba, Bi, Cd, Ce, Co, Cr, Cs, Cu, Dy, Er, Fe, Ga, Gd, Ge, Hf, Ho, K, La, Li, Mg, Mn, Mo, Na, Nd, Ni, Pb, Pd, Pr, Rb, Sb, Sc, Sm, Sn, Sr, Tb, Ti, Tl, V, Y, Yb, Zn, Zr, P			South House Sub-catchment: Tb, P, Ge, Tl, Ga, Eu, Ba Little Puddle Sub-catchment: Tb, Ga, Ba, Ge, Mn, Sm, Bi. Briantspuddle: Tb, Pd, Y, Ge, FeGa, Ti, Hf, Mn, Cr, Li.	South House, Little Puddle, Briants Puddle sub-catchments (UK) four source: pasture areas, cultivated areas, farm tracks, channel banks		Pasture areas	Cultivated areas	Farm tracks	Channel banks	
								South House	46	7	1	46	
								Little Puddle	45	16	12	27	
								Briants puddle	44	6	10	40	
(Collins et al. 2010)			Al, As, Ba, Bi, Cd, Ce, Co, Cr, Cs, Cu, Dy, Er, Eu, Fe, Ga, Gd, Ge, Hf, Ho, In, K, La, Li, Mg, Mn, Mo, Na, Nd, Ni, Pb, Pd, Pr, Rb, Sb, Sc, Sm, Sn, Sr, Tb, Ti, Tl, U, V, Y, Yb, Zn, Zr			Brue : Sb, Ti, Fe, As, Mn, V, Ce, Ge Cary : Sb, Ti, Fe, Na, Bi, Zn, In, V, Y, Pd, Cr, Sr Halse Water: Sb, Ti, Cd, Pd, Yb, Co, As, K, Ba Isle : Sb, In, Ti, Fe, Na, Sn, Cu, Cr Tone: Sr, Tl, Sb, Hf, Ti, Ni, Pd, La, Sc, Al, Zr, Yb, Mg, Rb, Na, Sn Upper Parrett: Sb, Ti, Zn, Al, K, Sr, Mg Yeo: Sb, Ti, Na, Fe, Sn, Cu, Al, V, Bi, Co	River Brue, River Cary, River Halse, River Isle, River Tone, Upper Parrett River, Yeo River (UK) five sources: pasture areas, cultivated areas, channel banks/subsurface sources, road verge, sewage treatment works (STW)		Pasture areas	Cultivated areas	Channel banks	Road verges	STW
								Brue	67	21	10	1	1
								Cary	38	6	43	11	2
								Halse	29	57	12	11	1
								Isle	44	12	30	11	3
								Tone	51	13	22	13	1
								Parrett	60	17	18	3	2
								Yeo	10	30	29	29	2

45
46
47
48
49

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Study	Physical tracers	Organic	Inorganic	Radionuclide	Magnetic tracers	Best tracers	Description of location and sediment sources	Most contributed area (percent of contribution)
(Devereux et al. 2010)		C _{tot} , S _{tot}	SiO ₂ , Al ₂ O ₃ , Fe ₂ O ₃ , MgO, CaO, Na ₂ O, K ₂ O, TiO ₂ , P ₂ O ₅ , MnO, Cr ₂ O ₃ , Ni, Sc, Ba, Be, Co, Cs, Ga, Hf, Nb, Rb, Sn, Sr, Ta, Th, U, V, W, Zr, Y, La, Ce, Pr, Nd, Sm, Eu, Gd, Tb, Dy, Ho, Er, Tm, Yb, Lu, Mo, Cu, Pb, Zn, Ni, As, Cd, Sb, Bi, Ag, Au, Hg, Tl, Sc	¹³⁷ Cs, ⁴⁰ K		Ho, Sr, W	Northeast Branch Anacostia River watershed (US) three sources: channel banks, streets, upland areas	Channel banks (58%), Streets (13%), Upland areas (30%)
(Kouhpeima et al. 2010)	Clay mineral; Smaktite, Colorite, Illite, Kaolinite	C,N,P	Na, Mg, Ca, K, Cr, Co		χ _{lf} , χ _{fd}	Amrovan watershed: C, P, Kaolinite, K.	Amrovan watershed (Iran) three geological formations: Quaternary, Hezardareh, Upper Red, and gully erosion	Upper red formation (36%), Hezar dareh formation (28%), Gully erosion (21%)
						Royan watershed: Cholorite, χ _{fd} , N, C	Royan watershed five geological formations: Upper Red, Karaj, Lar, Shemshak, Quaternary, and gully erosion	Quaternary units (32%), Karaj formation (33%), Gully erosion (27%)
(Nosrati et al. 2011)		C _{tot} , N _{tot}	Al, B, Ba, Bi, Ca, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Ga, K, Li, Mg, Mn, Mo, Na, Ni, P, Pb, Se, Sr, Te, Tl, Zn. Biochemical tracers: ureas, alkaline phosphatase, β-glucosidase, dehydrogenase			Dehydrogenase, B, Total C, Sr, Co, Tl	Hive watershed (Iran) three sources: rangeland areas, orchard areas, channel banks	Streambanks (70%), Pasture areas (19%), Orchard areas (11%)
(Wilkinson, Hancock et al., 2012)		C _{tot}	Al, As, Ba, Ca, Cl, Co, Cr, Cu, Dy, Er, Eu, Fe, Ga, Gd, Ge, Hf, Ho, K, La, Mn, Mo, Na, Nd, Ni, P, Pb, Rb, Sc, Se, Si XRF 0.025 P P P Sm, S, Sr, Tb, Th, Ti, Tl, Tm, U, V, Y, Yb, Zn, Zr.	¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb ⁷ Be ²²⁸ Ra		¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb, C _{tot}	Burdekin River Australia Primarily Surface erosion, channel bank erosion	Surface erosion (17%), channel bank erosion (83%)
(Collins et al. 2012)			Al, As, Ba, Bi, Cd, Ce, Co, Cr, Cs, Cu, Dy, Er, Eu, Fe, Ga, Gd, Ge, Hf, Ho, K, La, Li, Mg, Mn, Mo, Na, Nd, Ni, Pb, Pd, Pr, Rb, Sb, Sc, Sm, Sn, Sr, Tb, Ti, Tl, U, V, Y, Yb, Zn, Zr.			Mg, U, Pd, Y, As, Pr, Cu, Sr	River Axe watershed (UK) four sources: pasture areas, cultivated areas, channel banks/subsurface sources, road verges.	Pasture areas (38%), road verges (37%), channel banks/subsurface sources (22%), cultivated areas (3%)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Study	Physical tracers	Organic	Inorganic	Radionuclide	Magnetic tracers	Best tracers	Description of location and sediment sources	Most contributed area (percent of contribution)
Gaitcheon, Olley et al., (2012)				¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb		¹³⁷ Cs	Daly River (Australia) two sources: Surface erosion, Channel banks erosion	Surface erosion (1%), Channel bank erosion (99%)
							Mitchell River (Australia) Surface erosion, channel bank erosion	Surface erosion (3%), Channel bank erosion (97%)
Olley, Burton et al (2012)				¹³⁷ Cs, ²¹⁰ Pb		¹³⁷ Cs	Brisbane River Tributaries (Australia) Surface erosion, channel bank erosion	Surface erosion (10%), channel bank erosion (90%)

IRM₈₅₀ = Isothermal remanent magnetization at 850 mT, χ_{lf} = Low frequency magnetic susceptibility, χ_{fd} = Frequency dependent

magnetic susceptibility, tot= total, dit= dithionite, oxa= oxalate, pyr=pyrophosphate

1
2
3
4 Common themes that emerge from the review presented in Table 2 are:
5
6

- 7 - Sub-soils, either from rill and gully systems or artificial drainage ditches make a
8 substantial contribution in UK and US watersheds (e.g., 48% and 55% for Jubilee and
9 Belmont Catchment in Russell et al. 2001; 35% for River Leadon in Gruszowski et al.
10 2003; 62% for Pokomoke River in Gellis et al. 2009).
11
12
- 13 - Channel banks are a consistent source of suspended sediment (e.g., Northeast Branch
14 Anacostia River watershed in Devereux et al. 2010; Southern Piedmont stream watershed
15 in Mukundan et al. 2010; Hive Watershed in Nosrati et al. 2011). Channel and gully
16 erosion dominates in Australia catchments (Wallbrink et al. 1998; Caitcheon et al. 2012;
17 Olley et al. 2012; Wilkinson et al. In press).
18
19
- 20 - Upland sub-surface sources (construction sites and roads) can supply a disproportionately
21 high amount of sediment to drainage systems. (e.g., Devereux et al. 2010; Mukundan et
22 al. 2010).
23
24
- 25 - Magnetic tracers are used in 8 out of 20 studies, and in 6 of these studies they were
26 identified as among the best tracers to differentiate source material. These tracers are
27 used only in studies with a high sub-soil contribution (e.g. Russel et al., 2001; Gruzowski
28 et al., 2001) and not in catchments where the main sediment supply is surface soils (e.g.
29 Walling et al., 1999; Motha et al., 2004).
30
31
- 32 - Caesium-137 (^{137}Cs), Radium-226 (^{226}Ra) and excess Lead-210 ($^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$) are used as
33 sediment tracers in 16, 6 and 13 studies, respectively. These radionuclide tracers were
34 found to be the best tracers to discriminate sediment sources in 12 studies for ^{137}Cs , 2
35 studies for ^{226}Ra and 5 studies for $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$. Fallout radionuclide tracers were able to
36 discriminate sediment sources among different land uses and geologic units. For instance,
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 ^{137}Cs was selected to discriminate sub-soil versus surface soil sources in (Walling et al.
5
6
7 1999; Nicholls 2001; Mukundan et al. 2010; Caitcheon et al. 2012)

- 8
9
10 - In catchments with a high sub-soil contribution (e.g. Nosrati et al., 2011; Devereux et al.,
11
12 2010) organic tracers were not selected as best tracers, with the exception of Wilkinson
13
14 Hancock et al., 2012.
15
16 - The use of N, C, P, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ to discriminate between sources among land uses was
17
18 succe^{ss}ful despite their potentially unconservative behavior (e.g. $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$) during
19
20 transport.
21
22 - Achieving discrimination among land use source^s based on chemical elements such as
23
24 REE or metals is poorly studied, and should be urgently addressed in future
25
26 fingerprinting studies.
27
28
29
30
31

32 Figure 2 summarizes the data from Table 2 and indicates that sub-surface erosion accounts for
33
34 between 2 to 76%, and typically 15 to 30% of suspended loads. A composite of sources
35
36 originating from surface erosion processes are the dominant contributor of sediment to drainage
37
38 systems in all watersheds with values of 70 to 85% commonly estimated (Figure 2). Although
39
40 the contribution from sub surface erosion (particularly channel banks), changes among systems
41
42 (as discussed in section 4), their importance as eroded material (sources) and its vicinity to
43
44 storage (sinks) in catchment budget system makes this the most difficult source to quantify in
45
46 catchment-scale sediment fingerprinting (see Parsons 2012).
47
48
49
50
51

52 **(Figure 2.)**
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **5 Mixing models**
5
6

7 In geochemical tracing studies the relative contribution of source material to suspended sediment
8
9 is usually estimated using a multivariate mixing model. The literature describes many different
10
11 mathematical forms of mixing models (e.g., Collins et al. 1997a; Rowan et al. 2000; Motha et al.
12
13 2003; Evrard et al. 2011). In all mixing models, the objective is to determine the source
14
15 component proportions (x) in the suspended sediment samples by minimizing the errors (Table
16
17 3).
18
19

20
21
22 The relative contribution of each source category must satisfy the following constraints:
23

- 24 a- The fraction of source contributions must lie between 0 and 1:
- 25
- 26 b- the percentage source contributions must sum to unity:
27
28
- 29

30 **Table 3.** Commonly used mixing models and their modifications. To make the parameters of
31 each model more comparable, all parameters have been given consistent symbols.
32

33 Study	34 Model	35 Ref.
36 Slattery		(Slattery et al. 2000; Gruszowski et al. 2003)
37 Collins		(Collins et al. 1997a; Olley et al. 2000; Mukundan et al. 2010; Nosrati et al. 2011)
38 Motha	_____	(Motha et al. 2003; Motha et al. 2004)
39 Hughes	_____	(Hughes et al. 2009)
40 Modified Collins		(Collins et al. 2010; Collins et al. 2010)
41 Landwehr	_____	(Devereux et al. 2010)
42 Modified Landwehr	_____	(Gellis et al. 2009)

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59 Where:

1
2
3
4 = concentration of fingerprint property (i) in sediment samples; = concentration of
5 fingerprint property (i) in source category (j); = percentage contribution from source category
6 (j); = particle size correction factor for source category (j); = organic matter content
7 correction factor for source category (j); = tracer discriminatory weighting or tracer specific
8 weighting; = weighting representing the within-source variability of fingerprint property (i)
9 in source category (j); = variance of the measured values of tracer i in source area j; =
10 the total number of samples for an individual source; n = number of fingerprint properties; m =
11 number of sediment source categories.
12
13
14

15 The modified Collins model algorithm (Collins et al. 2010) uses the same approach as the
16 original version (Collins et al. 1997b) to optimize the estimates of the relative contributions from
17 the potential sediment sources, but it includes additional property weightings and a different
18 definition for the parameter. In the modified model, a weighting () was incorporated to
19 reflect the within-source variability of individual tracer properties and ensure that the fingerprint
20 property values for a particular source characterized by the smallest standard deviation exerted
21 the greatest influence upon the optimized solutions (Collins et al. 2010). The parameter in
22 Collins (1997) is a tracer-specific weighting that can be calculated from the inverse of the root of
23 the variance for each tracer in all sources. The parameter in the modified Collins is a tracer
24 discriminatory weighting based on the percentage of the source classified correctly using
25 discriminant function analysis.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The Hughes mixing model (Hughes et al. 2009) is modified from Olley and Caitcheon (2000).
44 This model applies a Monte Carlo approach based on replicate samples (not their mean) and runs
45 random iterations to obtain the lowest error. Fundamental differences are evident between the
46 Collins and Hughes models. Firstly, the Collins method uses mean value for each tracer
47 parameter pertaining to each specific source type, whereas the Hughes method uses all individual
48 source samples in the Monte Carlo procedure. Second, correction factors (e.g., particle size) are
49 applied only in the Collins method. The Landwehr model, used by Devereux et al. (2010),
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 provides a more statistically powerful model as it uses a normalized standard deviation from
5
6 multiple sources rather than directly relating the values of individual variables. A modified
7
8 version of the Landwehr model, used by Gellis et al. (2009), model provides additional statistical
9
10 power by adding a term that divides the variance term in the denominator by m_j (the number of
11
12 samples in a source area). This is particularly useful when using commonly found elemental
13
14 tracers that occur in very low concentrations.
15
16
17
18
19

20 **5.1 Genetic algorithms and mixing models**

21
22 It has been suggested that local optimization tools (e.g. Excel solver) are not appropriate to
23
24 represent global solutions (Collins et al. 2010; Collins et al. 2012). In sediment fingerprinting
25
26 studies, these methods are not able to find the best optimum sediment contribution minimizing
27
28 mixing model errors. To overcome this problem, (Collins et al. 2012) proposed a revised
29
30 modeling approach comparing the results of both local and global (genetic algorithm)
31
32 optimization tools to determine the uncertainties with the following goodness of fit (GOF)
33
34 equation:
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Genetic algorithms (GA) were developed as a stochastic search technique based on biological
45
46 processes of natural selection and the survival of the fittest. The advantages of GA as one of the
47
48 most powerful optimization methods are its applicability to non-convex, highly non-linear and
49
50 complex problems (Goldberg 1989), its ability to generate more than one optimum solution, and
51
52 its independency from restrictive assumptions.
53
54

55 Advantages and differences of global optimization (Genetic Algorithms) compared to local
56
57 optimization methods can be listed as follows: a) unlike local methods, the GA uses the objective
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 itself, not the derivative information; b) the inherent random property of GA helps avoid local
5
6 optima; c) when there are multiple solution points, it is impossible for local optimization
7
8 methods to find the solution because they cannot jump over to a global solution; and d) through
9
10 numerous variables global optimization is possible. Collins et al. (2010) compared the
11
12 performance of both local and global (genetic algorithm) optimization techniques, demonstrating
13
14 that GA based on random initial values minimized the objective functions compared to local
15
16 searching techniques.
17
18
19

20
21 To explore the output differences from the application of GA to the datasets in this study, we
22
23 used the GAtool in MATLAB to compute sediment contribution of mixing models as objective
24
25 functions. GA parameters were set up as follows: population size = 50, cross over ratio = 0.5,
26
27 mutation rate = 0.1, number of iterations = 10,000 and the use of a single point cross over
28
29 function along with a uniform selection procedure. Chromosome set-ups were computed based
30
31 on the number of sources (i.e. three and four sources for North Fork Broad River catchment and
32
33 Bléone catchments, respectively). As described in Collins et al. (2012) different values can be
34
35 extracted from iterations of GAs including mean and median of all iterations using (i)
36
37 conventional random repeat sampling as applied in this study or (ii) Latin hypercube sampling
38
39 (LHS) method.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **5.2 Comparison of mixing models**

47
48 In this section, we use data from two sediment fingerprinting case studies in the North Fork
49
50 Broad River (NFBR, USA) watershed (Mukundan et al. 2010) and Bléone River watershed in
51
52 France (Evrard et al. 2011) to compare differences in relative contribution of sediment sources
53
54 generated by applying the seven mixing models listed in Table 3. There are some fundamental
55
56 differences between these two studies; fluvial sampling sites in the NFBR watershed were
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

located at the end of the system, whereas sampling sites in the Bléone watershed were distributed as a continuum along the Bléone River and Bès River, resulting in sampling location as an important parameter. Sampling design was also influenced by differing objectives; discriminating sediment sources based on land-use in the NFBR watershed, whereas in the Bléone watershed the objective was to discriminate geologic soil types.

5.2.1 North Fork Broad River watershed

North Fork Broad River (NFBR) is located in the Piedmont region of Georgia (USA) and drains an area of 182 km². A total of 99 soil samples from three different land-uses were collected, consisting of 37 samples from potentially erodible bank faces; 32 samples from construction sites and unpaved roads; and 30 samples from pasture areas. Sediment samples were also collected from six different storm events (see Figure 3). Mukundan et al. (2010) analyzed 21 tracers including 15 trace elements (Be, Mg, Al, K, Ca, Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, Zn, As, Pb, and U), four total organic and inorganic elements (C, N, O, and S), stable isotope of N ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$), and a radionuclide isotope (^{137}Cs). Using discriminant function analysis (DFA) and removing non-conservative tracers based on their concentrations in stream sediment, four sediment fingerprint properties (^{137}Cs , $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, Cr, U) were selected as inputs into the mixing models (Table 4).

Table 4. Mean and standard deviation of the optimum fingerprint properties and their trace discriminatory weighting from DFA in NFBR watershed.

Fingerprint property selected	Mean	Standard Deviation	Wilks' Lambda	% source type samples classified correctly	Tracer Discriminatory weighting
$\delta^{15}\text{N}$	4.67 (‰)	4.7	0.444	65.7	1.5
Cr	54.21 (mg kg ⁻¹)	51.5	0.336	57.6	1.3
^{137}Cs	9.75 (Bq kg ⁻¹)	17.3	0.291	49.5	1.1
U	4.1 (mg kg ⁻¹)	2.8	0.289	43.3	1.0

1
2
3
4 **(Figure 3.)**
5

6
7 One of the aims of this review is to compare the variability in outputs from applying a common
8 dataset to seven widely used mixing models. Figure 3 provides clear evidence that the
9 application of different mixing models to the same dataset will produce dramatically different
10 results. However, the contribution of sources in sediment transport, using local optimization
11 methods (simple bars) are more similar to each other than using global optimization methods that
12 has reduced variability within, but not among individual models. For example, on March 16 with
13 2.1 m³/s water discharge and turbidity of 38NTU, local optimization methods identified the
14 contribution of channel banks ranged between 55% with the Slattery model and 88% with the
15 Hughes model. Differences in the contribution of channel banks among models using GA are
16 much more variable between the modified Collins model showing that 96% of sediment
17 originated from this source, and only 1% of material provided by this source according to
18 Landwehr and modified Landwehr mixing models.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The influence of discharge on the selection of model and optimization method is evidenced
38 during the highest discharge event (Q=32.5m³/s) on January 7th. Using local optimization
39 produces consistency in results among the 7 models compared with global optimization. For
40 example, channel banks contributed between 82% with Landwehr model and 93% with Slattery
41 and Motha models using local optimization. Applying GA techniques to the dataset produces a
42 range of source contribution from channel banks from 91% with modified Collins to 0% with
43 Landwehr model.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 In total, channel banks are the main sediment supply in all sampling events and GA-based
55 mixing models, except for Landwehr and modified Landwehr mixing models in which pasture
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 areas were shown as dominant. Using local optimization methods, channel banks remained the
5
6 dominant source of sediment in all mixing models. Furthermore, the results of the Motha model
7
8 based on the root mean square of relative errors, and Slattery model based on the sum of squares
9
10 of errors are identical in both global and local optimization methods. Although the modified
11
12 Landwehr model divides the number of samples in a source area by the variance, the percentage
13
14 source sediment contribution is identical in both Landwehr and modified Landwehr models. This
15
16 phenomenon is also observed for Collins and modified Collins models when local optimization
17
18 methods alone are considered.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **5.2.2 Bléone watershed**

25
26 The Bléone watershed is a 907 km² mountainous subalpine watershed located in the Durance
27
28 River district in south-eastern France. A total of 18 soil samples from four different geologic
29
30 units were collected, consisting of 8 samples from Black marl; 6 from Marl-limestone sites; 2
31
32 from Quaternary deposits and 2 from Conglomerate. Riverbed sediment was collected from three
33
34 sites along the Bléone River, and at two sites along the Bès River and their origin was calculated
35
36 using the seven mixing models listed in Table 3.
37
38
39
40

41 **Table 5.** Mean and standard deviation of the best fingerprint properties and their tracer
42
43 discriminatory weighting from DFA in Bleon watershed.
44

45 Fingerprint 46 property 47 selected	48 Mean	49 Standard 50 Deviation	51 Wilks' 52 Lambda	53 % source 54 type samples 55 classified 56 correctly	57 Tracer 58 Discriminatory 59 weighting
60 Ra-226	23.5	7.9	0.0405	38.9	1.2
61 Al	4.7	1.6	0.0076	77.8	2.3
62 Ni	40.2	12	0.0024	33.3	1
63 V	75.3	24	0.0001	66.7	2
64 Cu	15.5	5.2	0.000515	44.4	1.3
65 Ag	0.2	0.08	0.000253	38.9	1.2

1
2
3
4 Forty fingerprint properties including radionuclide elements (^{137}Cs , $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$, ^{40}K , ^{226}Ra , ^{228}Ra ,
5
6 ^{228}Th , ^{234}Th), rare earth elements (Ce, Eu, La, Lu, Sm, Tb, Yb), major elements (Fe, K, Na, Al,
7
8 Ca, Mg, Ti) and trace elements (As, Ba, Co, Cr, Cs, Hf, Sc, Ta, Th, Zn, Ag, Co, Cr, Cs, Hf, Sc,
9
10 Ta, Th, Zn) were analyzed in both surface soil and sediment samples. The ability of these tracers
11
12 to discriminate between potential sediment sources was investigated by conducting the Kruskal-
13
14 Wallis H-test and discriminant function analysis (DFA). Finally, one geogenic radionuclide (Ra-
15
16 226) and five metal (Al, Ni, V, Cu, Ag) tracers were selected as the best tracers using DFA
17
18 (Table 5).
19
20
21
22

23
24 **(Figure 4.)**
25

26
27
28 Contrary to the NFBR watershed, we cannot assess the stability of each mixing model in Bléone
29
30 watershed as the sampling locations change along both Bès and Bléone Rivers. All mixing
31
32 models generate different percentages of contributions using both local optimization and genetic
33
34 algorithm optimization methods in the Bléone watershed (as also reported in NFBR). The use of
35
36 GA optimization produces a wider range of sediment source contributions than using local
37
38 methods. For example, at site BE7 of the Bès River (light grey), Black marl and Quaternary
39
40 deposits are identified as the main sediment supply using local optimization methods. In contrast,
41
42 almost all suspended sediments are identified as originating from Marl-limestone sources when
43
44 using the modified Collins and Landwehr models with GA optimization, with the Collins,
45
46 Hughes, Motha and Slattery mixing models recording both the quaternary deposit and black marl
47
48 as the dominant sediment sources.
49
50
51
52

53
54
55 In both the NFBR and Bléon watersheds, the Motha and Slattery mixing models provide similar
56
57 results for the relative contribution of source sediments using both local and global optimization.
58
59
60
61

In the Bléone watershed, the use of GA and local optimization methods with the Landwehr and modified Landwehr models were not able to predict similar source contributions for sediments, whereas these models gave identical results using both GA and local optimization in the NFBR watershed.

5.2.3 Goodness of fit results

The accuracy of source contribution values resulting from the application of 7 mixing models and two optimization methods can be tested with goodness-of-fit (GOF) values (Table 6).

Table 6. GOF values of seven mixing model and two optimisations

Mixing models	Optimization method	GOF (%)					
		Bléone catchment			NFBR catchment		
		Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max
Collins	GA	53	75.5	90	13.3	15.4	16.8
	Local	62.2	76.8	89.2	30.3	54	79
Modified Collins	GA	43.4	60.5	70	22.3	61	73.7
	Local	60.8	72.5	87.8	18	55.7	75.3
Hughes	GA	61.6	76.7	88.5	1	21.7	78
	Local	63	77	88.6	35.7	60.3	75.4
Landwehr	GA	48	63.7	74.7	<0	<0	<0
	Local	59.7	75.6	88	25.5	48	67.3
Modified Landwehr	GA	56	70.4	85	<0	<0	<0
	Local	59.7	75.5	87.3	22.6	50.6	73.2
Motha	GA	64.4	76.4	88	68.4	31	73.8
	Local	64.4	76.3	88.8	48.7	23.3	77
Slattery	GA	64.7	76.1	89	69.3	30.6	75
	Local	62.8	76.3	88.8	67.5	28.2	77

Improved accuracy in both catchments was obtained when applying the original Collins model using a local optimisation method than using a modified Collins mixing model. The use of GA in the modified Collins mixing model, improved accuracy to 61% within the catchment with more source samples (NFBR with 99 source samples in 3 sources), compared with local optimisation with a 55.7% goodness-of-fit. In the catchment with fewer sources (Bleon with 18 source samples in 4 sources), local optimization was the more powerful method for calculating

1
2
3
4 source contributions (GOF=72.5%). In the Hughes model that uses the actual values rather than
5
6 statistic parameters, local optimization produced a higher goodness-of-fit of 77% and 60.3% in
7
8 Bleon and NFBR catchments respectively..
9

10
11 Comparing the application of all mixing models in each catchment, the Hughes mixing model
12
13 appears a more robust method in Bléone catchment using local optimization method
14
15 (GOF=77%), and the modified Collins in NFBR catchment using GA optimization (GOF= 61%).
16
17
18
19

20 21 **6 Conclusion**

22
23 Suspended sediments in fluvial systems can lead to a number of detrimental environmental and
24
25 operational impacts. Sediment fingerprinting techniques have been applied to fluvial systems to
26
27 identify sources of sediment; however the selection of model and optimization method can have
28
29 profound effect on the output of sediment fingerprinting analyses. This is the first review that has
30
31 compared the most prevalent mixing models (including the application of genetic algorithms) to
32
33 an actual dataset to quantify variability in the output depending on the application of mixing
34
35 model.
36
37
38

39
40 All sediment fingerprinting studies must decide on the choice of field sampling methods, and
41
42 selection of tracers as well as mixing models. Allowing for time and budget constraints, the
43
44 study objective should drive the field sampling method. For example, fluvial sampling is the
45
46 preferred method to determine the origin of sediment deposited in a dam, whereas point
47
48 sampling is the most appropriate method to monitor sediment contribution in a flood event.
49
50 Budget will also drive the selection of tracers used as sediment fingerprint properties. Physical
51
52 tracers are less expensive and can be measured easily, but they are not conservative and may lead
53
54 to ambiguity in interpretation of results. Geochemical tracers are favored due to large number of
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 elements available for sediment fingerprint measurements. Radionuclide tracers are the most
5
6 powerful tracers to distinguish soils from different land uses, but need expensive instruments.
7

8
9 Our review of 25 sediment fingerprinting studies identified land-use and geology as the most
10
11 prevalent discriminators of sediment sources. The relative importance of sediment sources to
12
13 drainage systems should vary among different catchments due to the contrasts in geology,
14
15 watershed morphology, hydrology, connectivity of river systems, human interference and many
16
17 more factors. This inherent variability translates to a reliance on the final step of all sediment
18
19 fingerprinting studies; computing the contribution of different sediment sources via mixing
20
21 models. Using a common dataset, we have shown that different mixing models can identify
22
23 different relative contributions of sediment sources, but that the range of values among models
24
25 are within an acceptable range of errors (i.e. relative error, mean squared error etc.) in objective
26
27 functions reported by the original authors. Based on GOF, the modified Collins and Hughes
28
29 mixing models are the most powerful models to estimate the source contribution to transported
30
31 sediments. Also, global optimization methods must be carefully applied when using the Hughes
32
33 mixing model. We suggest the use of a model that combines the best explanatory parameters
34
35 from modified Collins (it uses correction factors) and Hughes (it uses iterations of all data not
36
37 mean values) with optimization based on genetic algorithms would best predict the relative
38
39 contribution of sediment sources to fluvial systems.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Blake, W. H., Ficken, K. J., Taylor, P., Russell, M. A. and Walling, D. E. 2012, Tracing crop-specific sediment sources in agricultural catchments. *Geomorphology* Vol. 139–140, No., pp. 322-329.
- Brown, A. G. 1985, The potential use of pollen in the identification of suspended sediment sources. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 27-32.
- Caitcheon, G., Prosser, I., Wallbrink, P., Douglas, G., Olley, J., Hughes, A., Hancock, G. and Scott, A. 2001, Sediment delivery from Moreton Bay's main tributaries: a multifaceted approach to identifying sediment sources. *Third Australian Stream Management Conference, Brisbane*, pp. 103-107.
- Caitcheon, G. G., Olley, J. M., Pantus, F., Hancock, G. and Leslie, C. 2012, The dominant erosion processes supplying fine sediment to three major rivers in tropical Australia, the Daly (NT), Mitchell (Qld) and Flinders (Qld) Rivers. *Geomorphology* Vol. 151–152, No. 0, pp. 188-195.
- Carter, J., Owens, P. N., Walling, D. E. and Leeks, G. J. L. 2003, Fingerprinting suspended sediment sources in a large urban river system. *The Science of The Total Environment* Vol. 314-316, No. 0, pp. 513-534.
- Chapman, A. S., Foster, I. D. L., Lees, J. A., Hodgkinson, R. A. and Jackson, R. H. 2001, Particulate phosphorus transport by sub-surface drainage from agricultural land in the UK. *Environmental significance at the catchment and national scale. Science of The Total Environment* Vol. 266, No. 1-3, pp. 95-102.
- Collins, A. L. and Walling, D. E. 2004, Documenting catchment suspended sediment sources: problems, approaches and prospects. *Progress in Physical Geography* Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 159-196.
- Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E. and Leeks, G. J. L. 1996, Composite fingerprinting of the spatial source of fluvial suspended sediment: a case study of the Exe and Severn river basins, United Kingdom. *Géomorphologie: relief, processus, environnement* Vol. No., pp. 41-53.
- Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E. and Leeks, G. J. L. 1997a, Fingerprinting the Origin of Fluvial Suspended Sediment in Larger River Basins: Combining Assessment of Spatial Provenance and Source Type. *Geografiska Annaler. Series A, Physical Geography* Vol. 79, No. 4, pp. 239-254.
- Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E. and Leeks, G. J. L. 1997b, Source type ascription for fluvial suspended sediment based on a quantitative composite fingerprinting technique. *Catena* Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 1-27.
- Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E. and Leeks, G. J. L. 1998, Use of composite fingerprints to determine the provenance of the contemporary suspended sediment load transported by rivers. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 31-52.
- Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E., Webb, L. and King, P. 2010, Apportioning catchment scale sediment sources using a modified composite fingerprinting technique incorporating property weightings and prior information. *Geoderma* Vol. 155, No. 3-4, pp. 249-261.
- Collins, A. L., Zhang, Y., Walling, D. E., Grenfell, S. E. and Smith, P. 2010, Tracing sediment loss from eroding farm tracks using a geochemical fingerprinting procedure combining local and genetic algorithm optimisation. *Science of The Total Environment* Vol. 408, No. 22, pp. 5461-5471.
- Collins, A. L., Zhang, Y., Walling, D. E., Grenfell, S. E., Smith, P., Grischeff, J., Locke, A., Sweetapple, A. and Brogden, D. 2012, Quantifying fine-grained sediment sources in the River Axe catchment, southwest England: application of a Monte Carlo numerical modelling framework incorporating local and genetic algorithm optimisation. *Hydrological Processes* Vol. 26, No. 13, pp. 1962-1983.
- Croke, J. and Mockler, S. 2001, Gully initiation and road-to-stream linkage in a forested catchment, southeastern Australia. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 205-217.
- Davis, M. and Fox, J. F. 2009, Sediment fingerprinting: Review of the method and future improvements for allocating nonpoint source pollution. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* Vol. 135, No. 7, pp. 490-504.

- 1
2
3
4 Devereux, O. H., Prestegard, K. L., Needelman, B. A. and Gellis, A. C. 2010, Suspended-sediment
5 sources in an urban watershed, Northeast Branch Anacostia River, Maryland. *Hydrological*
6 *Processes* Vol. 24, No. 11, pp. 1391-1403.
- 7
8 Dirszowsky, R. W. 2004, Bed sediment sources and mixing in the glacierized upper Fraser River
9 watershed, east-central British Columbia. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* Vol. 29, No. 5,
10 pp. 533-552.
- 11 Douglas, G., Caitcheon, G. G. and Palmer, M. 2009, Sediment source identification and residence times
12 in the Maroochy River estuary, southeast Queensland, Australia. *Environmental Geology* Vol. 57,
13 No. 3, pp. 629-639.
- 14 Dyer, F. J. and Olley, J. M. 1996, Preliminary results from determining sediment sources to the Tarago
15 Reservoir, Victoria, Australia: implications for sediment yield. In *Erosion and Sediment Yield:*
16 *Global and Regional Perspectives (Proceedings of the Exeter Symposium)*, Wallingford, pp. 143-
17 151.
- 18
19 Edwards, A. C. and Withers, P. J. A. 2008, Transport and delivery of suspended solids, nitrogen and
20 phosphorus from various sources to freshwaters in the UK. *Journal of Hydrology* Vol. 350, No. 3-
21 4, pp. 144-153.
- 22 Estrany, J., Garcia, C. and Walling, D. E. 2010, An investigation of soil erosion and redistribution in a
23 Mediterranean lowland agricultural catchment using caesium-137. *International Journal of*
24 *Sediment Research* Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 1-16.
- 25 Evrard, O., Navratil, O., Ayrault, S., Ahmadi, M., Némery, J., Legout, C., Lefèvre, I., Poirel, A., Bonté, P.
26 and Esteves, M. 2011, Combining suspended sediment monitoring and fingerprinting to
27 determine the spatial origin of fine sediment in a mountainous river catchment. *Earth Surface*
28 *Processes and Landforms* Vol. 36, No. 8, pp. 1072-1089.
- 29
30 Evrard, O., Poulencard, J., Némery, J., Ayrault, S., Gratiot, N., Duvert, C., Prat, C., Lefèvre, I., Bonté, P.
31 and Esteves, M. 2012, Tracing sediment sources in a tropical highland catchment of central
32 Mexico by using conventional and alternative fingerprinting methods. *Hydrological Processes*
33 Vol. No., pp. n/a-n/a.
- 34 Foster, G. R. 1988, Modeling soil erosion and sediment. *Soil erosion research methods*, Ankeny, Iowa,,
35 pp. 97-117.
- 36
37 Foster, I. D. L., Boardman, J. and Keay-Bright, J. 2007, Sediment tracing and environmental history for
38 two catchments, Karoo Uplands, South Africa. *Geomorphology* Vol. 90, No. 1-2, pp. 126-143.
- 39 Fox, J. F. and Papanicolaou, A. N. 2007, The Use of Carbon and Nitrogen Isotopes to Study Watershed
40 Erosion Processes. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association* Vol. 43, No.
41 4, pp. 1047-1064.
- 42 Fox, J. F. and Papanicolaou, A. N. 2008, An un-mixing model to study watershed erosion processes.
43 *Advances in Water Resources* Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 96-108.
- 44 Gellis, A. C., Emmett, W. W. and Leopold, L. B. 2005, Channel and hillslope processes revisited in the
45 Arroyo de los Frijoles watershed near Santa Fe, New Mexico. *U.S. Geological Survey*
46 *Professional Paper*. 1704: 53.
- 47
48 Gellis, A. C., Hupp, C. R., Pavich, M. J., Landwehr, J. M., Banks, W. S. L., Hubbard, B. E., Langland, M.
49 J., Ritchie, J. C. and Reuter, J. M. 2009, Sources, transport, and storage of sediment in the
50 Chesapeake Bay Watershed. *U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report* 2008-5186:
51 95.
- 52 Goldberg, D. E. 1989, Genetic algorithms in search, optimization, and machine learning. Addison-
53 Wesley, Reading, MA, USA.
- 54 Grimshaw, D. L. and Lewin, J. 1980, Source identification for suspended sediments. *Journal of*
55 *Hydrology* Vol. 47, No. 1-2, pp. 151-162.
- 56
57 Gruszowski, K. E., Foster, I. D. L., Lees, J. A. and Charlesworth, S. M. 2003, Sediment sources and
58 transport pathways in a rural catchment, Herefordshire, UK. *Hydrological Processes* Vol. 17, No.
59 13, pp. 2665-2681.
- 60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Hardy, F., Bariteau, L., Lorrain, S., Theriault, I., Gagnon, G., Messier, D. and Rougerie, J. F. 2010,
5 Geochemical tracing and spatial evolution of the sediment bed load of the Romaine River,
6 Quebec, Canada. CATENA Vol. 81, No. 1, pp. 66-76.
- 7 Hatfield, R. G. and Maher, B. A. 2009, Fingerprinting upland sediment sources : particle size-specific
8 magnetic linkages between soils, lake and suspended sediments. Earth Surface Processes and
9 Landforms Vol. 34, No. 10, pp. 1359-1373.
- 10 He, Q. and Owens, P. 1995, Determination of suspended sediment provenance using caesium-137,
11 unsupported lead-210 and radium-226: a numerical mixing model approach. In Sediment and
12 Water Quality in River Catchments. G. A. Foster IDL, Webb BW. Chichester, Wiley: 207-227.
- 13 Hughes, A. O., Olley, J. M., Croke, J. C. and McKergow, L. A. 2009, Sediment source changes over the
14 last 250 years in a dry-tropical catchment, central Queensland, Australia. Geomorphology Vol.
15 104, No. 3-4, pp. 262-275.
- 16 Hughes, A. O., Olley, J. M., Croke, J. C. and McKergow, L. A. 2009, Sediment source changes over the
17 last 250 years in a dry-tropical catchment, central Queensland, Australia. Geomorphology Vol.
18 104, No. 3-4, pp. 262-275.
- 19 Jenns, N., Heppell, C. M., Burt, T. P., Walden, J. and Foster, I. D. L. 2002, Investigating contemporary
20 and historical sediment inputs to Slapton Higher Ley: an analysis of the robustness of source
21 ascription methods when applied to lake sediment data. Hydrological Processes Vol. 16, No. 17,
22 pp. 3467-3486.
- 23 Klages, M. G. and Hsieh, Y. P. 1975, Suspended solids carried by the Gallatin River of southwestern
24 Montana: II. Using mineralogy for inferring sources. Journal of Environmental Quality Vol. 4,
25 No. 1, pp. 68-73.
- 26 Kouhpeima, A., Feiznia, S., Ahmadi, H., Hashemi, S. A. and Zareiee, A. R. 2010, Application of
27 quantitative composite fingerprinting technique to identify the main sediment sources in two
28 small catchments of Iran. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Vol. 7, No., pp. 6677-6698.
- 29 Krause, A. K., Franks, S. W., Kalma, J. D., Loughran, R. J. and Rowan, J. S. 2003, Multi-parameter
30 fingerprinting of sediment deposition in a small gullied catchment in SE Australia. CATENA
31 Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 327-348.
- 32 Krein, A., Petticrew, E. and Udelhoven, T. 2003, The use of fine sediment fractal dimensions and colour
33 to determine sediment sources in a small watershed. Catena Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 165-179.
- 34 Lartiges, B. S., Deneux-Mustin, S., Villemin, G., Mustin, C., Barrès, O., Chamerois, M., Gerard, B. and
35 Babut, M. 2001, Composition, structure and size distribution of suspended particulates from the
36 Rhine River. Water Research Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 808-816.
- 37 Lawler, D. M., Grove, J. R., Couperthwaite, J. S. and Leeks, G. J. L. 1999, Downstream change in river
38 bank erosion rates in the Swale–Ouse system, northern England. Hydrological Processes Vol. 13,
39 No. 7, pp. 977-992.
- 40 Lees, J. A. 1997, Mineral magnetic properties of mixtures of environmental and synthetic materials: linear
41 additivity and interaction effects. Geophysical Journal International Vol. 131, No. 2, pp. 335-346.
- 42 Loughran, R. J. and Campbell, B. L. 1995, The identification of catchment sediment sources. In Sediment
43 and Water Quality in River Catchments. I. D. L. Foster, A. M. Gurnell and B. W. Webb.
44 Chichester, Wiley: 189-205.
- 45 Madej, M. A. 2001, Erosion and sediment delivery following removal of forest roads. Earth Surface
46 Processes and Landforms Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 175-190.
- 47 Maher, B. A. 1998, Magnetic properties of modern soils and Quaternary loessic paleosols: paleoclimatic
48 implications. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology Vol. 137, No. 1-2, pp. 25-54.
- 49 Martínez-Carreras, N., Krein, A., Gallart, F., Iffly, J. F., Pfister, L., Hoffmann, L. and Owens, P. N. 2010,
50 Assessment of different colour parameters for discriminating potential suspended sediment
51 sources and provenance: A multi-scale study in Luxembourg. Geomorphology Vol. 118, No. 1-2,
52 pp. 118-129.
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Matissoff, G., C., B. E. and J., W. P. 2002, Soil Erosion and Sediment Sources in an Ohio Watershed
5 using Beryllium-7, Cesium-137, and Lead-210. *Journal of Environmental Quality* Vol. 31, No. 1,
6 pp. 54-61.
7
8 McLennan, S. M. 1993, Weathering and global denudation. *The Journal of Geology* Vol. 101, No. 2, pp.
9 295-303.
10
11 Miller, J. R., Lord, M., Yurkovich, S., Mackin, G. and Kolenbrander, L. 2005, HISTORICAL TRENDS
12 IN SEDIMENTATION RATES AND SEDIMENT PROVENANCE, FAIRFIELD LAKE,
13 WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA1. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources*
14 Association Vol. 41, No. 5, pp. 1053-1075.
15
16 Minella, J. P. G., Merten, G. H. and Clarke, R. T. 2004, identification of sediment sources in a small rural
17 drainage basin. IAHS Publication, Wallingford, U. K.
18
19 Minella, J. P. G., Walling, D. E. and Merten, G. H. 2008, Combining sediment source tracing techniques
20 with traditional monitoring to assess the impact of improved land management on catchment
21 sediment yields. *Journal of Hydrology* Vol. 348, No. 3-4, pp. 546-563.
22
23 Mizugaki, S., Onda, Y., Fukuyama, T., Koga, S., Asai, H. and Hiramatsu, S. 2008, Estimation of
24 suspended sediment sources using ¹³⁷Cs and ²¹⁰Pbex in unmanaged Japanese cypress plantation
25 watersheds in southern Japan. *Hydrological Processes* Vol. 22, No. 23, pp. 4519-4531.
26
27 Morris, G. L. and Fan, J. 1997, Reservoir sedimentation handbook. McGraw-Hill, New York.
28
29 Motha, J. A., Wallbrink, P. J., Hairsine, P. B. and Grayson, R. B. 2002, Tracer properties of eroded
30 sediment and source material. *Hydrological Processes* Vol. 16, No., pp. 1983-2000.
31
32 Motha, J. A., Wallbrink, P. J., Hairsine, P. B. and Grayson, R. B. 2002, Tracer properties of eroded
33 sediment and source material. *Hydrological Processes* Vol. 16, No. 10, pp. 1983-2000.
34
35 Motha, J. A., Wallbrink, P. J., Hairsine, P. B. and Grayson, R. B. 2003, Determining the sources of
36 suspended sediment in a forested catchment in southeastern Australia. *Water Resources Research*
37 Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 1056-1070.
38
39 Motha, J. A., Wallbrink, P. J., Hairsine, P. B. and Grayson, R. B. 2004, Unsealed roads as suspended
40 sediment sources in an agricultural catchment in south-eastern Australia. *Journal of Hydrology*
41 Vol. 286, No. 1-4, pp. 1-18.
42
43 Mukundan, R., Radcliffe, D. E., Ritchie, J. C., Risse, L. M. and McKinley, R. A. 2010, Sediment
44 fingerprinting to determine the source of suspended sediment in a southern Piedmont stream.
45 *Journal of environmental Quality* Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 1328-1337.
46
47 Nagle, G. N. and Ritchie, J. C. 2004, Wheat field erosion rates and channel bottom sediment sources in an
48 intensively cropped northeastern Oregon drainage basin. *Land Degradation & Development* Vol.
49 15, No. 1, pp. 15-26.
50
51 Navratil, O., Evrard, O., Esteves, M., Legout, C., Ayrault, S., Némery, J., Mate-Marin, A., Ahmadi, M.,
52 Lefèvre, I., Poirel, A. and Bonté, P. 2012, Temporal variability of suspended sediment sources in
53 an alpine catchment combining river/rainfall monitoring and sediment fingerprinting. *Earth*
54 *Surface Processes and Landforms* Vol. 37, No. 8, pp. 828-846.
55
56 Nelson, E. J. and Booth, D. B. 2002, Sediment sources in an urbanizing, mixed land-use watershed.
57 *Journal of Hydrology* Vol. 264, No. 1-4, pp. 51-68.
58
59 Nicholls, D. J. 2001, The source and behaviour of fine sediment deposits in the River Torridge Devon and
60 their implications for salmon spawning. PhD, University of Exeter.
61
62 Nosrati, K., Govers, G., Ahmadi, H., Sharifi, F., Amoozegar, M. A., Merckx, R. and Vanmaercke, M.
63 2011, An exploratory study on the use of enzyme activities as sediment tracers: biochemical
64 fingerprints? *International Journal of Sediment Research* Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 136-151.
65
66 Olley, J., Burton, J., Smolders, K., Pantus, F. and Pietsch, T. 2012, The application of fallout
67 radionuclides to determine the dominant erosion process in water supply catchments of
68 subtropical South-east Queensland, Australia. *Hydrological Processes* Vol. No., pp. n/a-n/a.
69
70 Olley, J. and Caitcheon, G. 2000, Major element chemistry of sediments from the Darling-Barwon river
71 and its tributaries: implications for sediment and phosphorus sources. *Hydrological Processes*
72 Vol. 14, No. 7, pp. 1159-1175.

- 1
2
3
4 Olley, J. M. and Caitcheon, G. 2000, Major element chemistry of sediments from the Darling–Barwon
5 river and its tributaries: implications for sediment and phosphorus sources. *Hydrological*
6 *Processes* Vol. 14, No. 7, pp. 1159-1175.
- 7
8 Olley, J. M., Caitcheon, G. G., Hancock, G. and Wallbrink, P. 2001, Tracing and dating techniques for
9 sediment and associated substances, CSIRO Land and Water, Canberra.
- 10
11 Olley, J. M., Caitcheon, G. G., Hancock, G. and Wallbrink, P. J. 2001, Tracing and dating techniques for
12 sediment and associated substances. CSIRO Land and Water, Canberra.
- 13
14 Olley, J. M., Murray, A. S., Mackenzie, D. H. and Edwards, K. 1993, Identifying sediment sources in a
15 gullied catchment using natural and anthropogenic radioactivity. *Water Resour. Res.* Vol. 29, No.
16 4, pp. 1037-1043.
- 17
18 Owens, P. N., Walling, D. E. and Leeks, G. J. L. 2000, Tracing fluvial suspended sediment sources in the
19 catchment of the River Tweed, Scotland, using composite fingerprints and a numerical mixing
20 model. *Tracers in Geomorphology*. Chichester, Wiley: 291-307.
- 21
22 Papanicolaou, A. N., Fox, J. F. and Marshall, J. 2003, Soil fingerprinting in the Palouse basin, USA using
23 stable carbon and nitrogen isotopes. *International Journal of Sediment Research* Vol. 18, No. 2,
24 pp. 291-297.
- 25
26 Peart, M. R. 1993, Using sediment properties as natural tracers for sediment source: two case studies from
27 Hong Kong. *Tracers in Hydrology*. Proceedings of the Yokohama Symposium, IAHS
28 Publication. 215: 313-318.
- 29
30 Phillips, J. M., Russell, M. A. and Walling, D. E. 2000, Time-integrated sampling of fluvial suspended
31 sediment: a simple methodology for small catchments. *Hydrological Processes* Vol. 14, No. 14,
32 pp. 2589-2602.
- 33
34 Pietola, L., Horn, R. and Yli-Halla, M. 2005, Effects of trampling by cattle on the hydraulic and
35 mechanical properties of soil. *Soil and Tillage Research* Vol. 82, No. 1, pp. 99-108.
- 36
37 Poulencard, J., Perrette, Y., Fanget, B., Quetin, P., Trevisan, D. and Dorioz, J. M. 2009, Infrared
38 spectroscopy tracing of sediment sources in a small rural watershed (French Alps). *Science of*
39 *The Total Environment* Vol. 407, No. 8, pp. 2808-2819.
- 40
41 Prosser, I. P., Rutherford, I. D., Olley, J. M., Young, W. J., Wallbrink, P. J. and Moran, C. J. 2001, Large-
42 scale patterns of erosion and sediment transport in river networks, with examples from Australia.
43 *Marine And Freshwater Research* Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 81-99.
- 44
45 Ramos-Scharrón, C. E. and MacDonald, L. H. 2007, Measurement and prediction of natural and
46 anthropogenic sediment sources, St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands. *Catena* Vol. 71, No. 2, pp. 250-
47 266.
- 48
49 Reid, L. M. and Dunne, T. 1996, Rapid evaluation of sediment budgets. *Catena Verlag GMBH,*
50 *Reiskirchen, Germany.*
- 51
52 Rhoton, F. E., Emmerich, W. E., DiCarlo, D. A., Nearing, M. A. and Ritchie, J. C. 2008, Identification of
53 suspended sediment sources using soil characteristics in a semiarid watershed. *Soil Science*
54 *Society of American Journal* Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 1102-1112.
- 55
56 Richards, C. and Bacon, K. L. 1994, Influence of fine sediment on macroinvertebrate colonization of
57 surface and hyporheic stream substrates. *Great Basin Naturalist* Vol. 54, No., pp. 106-113.
- 58
59 Rowan, J. S., Goodwill, P. and Franks, S. W. 2000, Uncertainty estimation in fingerprinting suspended
60 sediment sources. *Tracers in Geomorphology*. I. D. L. Foster. Chichester, UK, Wiley: 279-290.
- 61
62 Russell, M. A., Walling, D. E. and Hodgkinson, R. A. 2001, Suspended sediment sources in two small
63 lowland agricultural catchments in the UK. *Journal of Hydrology* Vol. 252, No. 1-4, pp. 1-24.
- 64
65 Sheridan, G. J., Noske, P. J., Lane, P. N. J. and Sherwin, C. B. 2008, Using rainfall simulation and site
66 measurements to predict annual interrill erodibility and phosphorus generation rates from
67 unsealed forest roads: Validation against in-situ erosion measurements. *Catena* Vol. 73, No. 1, pp.
68 49-62.
- 69
70 Slattery, M., Walden, J. and Burt, T. P. 2000, Fingerprinting suspended sediment sources using mineral
71 magnetic measurements- A quantitative approach. *Tracers in geomorphology*, John Wiley and
72 Sons: 309-322.

- 1
2
3
4 Slattery, M. C., Burt, T. P. and Walden, J. 1995, The application of mineral magnetic measurements to
5 quantify within-storm variations in suspended sediment sources. *Tracer Technologies for*
6 *Hydrological Systems. Proceedings of a Boulder Symposium, IAHS Publication. 229: 143-151.*
7
8 Vanden Bygaart, A. J. and Protz, R. 2001, Bomb-Fallout Cs-137 as a Marker of Geomorphic Stability in
9 Dune Sands and Soils, Pinery Provincial Park, Ontario, Canada. *Earth Surface Processes and*
10 *Landforms Vol. 26, No., pp. 689-700.*
11 Wallbrink, P. J. and Murray, A. S. 1996, Determining soil loss using the inventory ratio of excess Lead-
12 210 to Cesium-137. *Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI, ETATS-UNIS.*
13 Wallbrink, P. J., Murray, A. S., Olley, J. M. and Olive, L. J. 1998, Determining sources and transit times
14 of suspended sediment in the Murrumbidgee River, New South Wales, Australia, using fallout
15 137Cs and 210Pb. *Water Resour. Res. Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 879-887.*
16 Walling, D. E. 2005, Tracing suspended sediment sources in catchments and river systems. *Science of*
17 *The Total Environment Vol. 344, No. 1-3, pp. 159-184.*
18 Walling, D. E. and Amos, C. M. 1999, Source, storage and mobilisation of fine sediment in a chalk
19 stream system. *Hydrological Processes Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 323-340.*
20 Walling, D. E., Collins, A. L., Sickingabula, H. M. and Leeks, G. J. L. 2001, Integrated assessment of
21 catchment suspended sediment budgets: a Zambian example. *Land Degradation & Development*
22 *Vol. 12, No. 5, pp. 387-415.*
23 Walling, D. E., Collins, A. L. and Stroud, R. W. 2008, Tracing suspended sediment and particulate
24 phosphorus sources in catchments. *Journal of Hydrology Vol. 350, No. 3-4, pp. 274-289.*
25 Walling, D. E., Owens, P. N. and Leeks, G. J. L. 1999, Fingerprinting suspended sediment sources in the
26 catchment of the River Ouse, Yorkshire, UK. *Hydrological Processes Vol. 13, No. 7, pp. 955-*
27 *975.*
28 Walling, D. E. and Woodward, J. C. 1995, Tracing sources of suspended sediment in river basins: a case
29 study of the River Culm, Devon, UK. *Marine and Freshwater Research Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 327-*
30 *336.*
31 Walling, D. E., Woodward, J. C. and Nicholas, A. P. 1993, A multi-parameter approach to fingerprinting
32 suspended-sediment sources IAHS publication.
33 Wasson, R. J., Mazari, R. K., Starr, B. and Clifton, G. 1998, The recent history of erosion and
34 sedimentation on the Southern Tablelands of southeastern Australia: sediment flux dominated by
35 channel incision. *Geomorphology Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 291-308.*
36 Weltje, G. J. and Brommer, M. B. 2011, Sediment-budget modelling of multi-sourced basin fills:
37 application to recent deposits of the western Adriatic mud wedge (Italy). *Basin Research Vol. 23,*
38 *No. 3, pp. 291-308.*
39 Wemple, B. C., Swanson, F. J. and Jones, J. A. 2001, Forest roads and geomorphic process interactions,
40 Cascade Range, Oregon. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 191-204.*
41 Wilkinson, S. N., Hancock, G. J., Bartley, R., Hawdon, A. A. and Keen, R. J. In press, Using sediment
42 tracing to assess processes and spatial patterns of erosion in grazed rangelands, Burdekin River
43 basin, Australia. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment Vol. No. 0.*
44 Williams, G. P. 1989, Sediment concentration versus water discharge during single hydrologic events in
45 rivers. *Journal of Hydrology Vol. 111, No. 1-4, pp. 89-106.*
46 Wood, P. J. and Armitage, P. D. 1997, Biological Effects of Fine Sediment in the Lotic Environment.
47 *Environmental Management Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 203-217.*
48 Wright, J. F. and Berrie, A. D. 1987, Ecological effects of groundwater pumping and a natural drought on
49 the upper reaches of a chalk stream. *Regulated Rivers: Research & Management Vol. 1, No. 2,*
50 *pp. 145-160.*
51 Zapata, F. 2003, The use of environmental radionuclides as tracers in soil erosion and sedimentation
52 investigations: recent advances and future developments. *Soil and Tillage Research Vol. 69, No.*
53 *1-2, pp. 3-13.*
54 Zhang, Q., Lei, T. and Zhao, J. 2008, Estimation of the detachment rate in eroding rills in flume
55 experiments using an REE tracing method. *Geoderma Vol. 147, No. 1-2, pp. 8-15.*
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Figure 1.** The process required for sediment fingerprinting in fluvial systems, including sample
5 collection, tracer selection and analyses, mixing model selection to determine sediment source
6 contribution.
7

8
9 **Figure 2.** Frequency distributions for the contribution of channel bank/Sub-surface and surface
10 sources of sediment from the 47 watersheds reviewed in Table 2.
11

12
13 **Figure 3.** Percent relative contribution of three sediment sources (channel banks, construction
14 sites, pastures) based on seven mixing models and seven flood event in the NFBR watershed. Q
15 is flow discharge in m^3/s and T is turbidity in NTU (nephelometric turbidity unit).
16
17

18 **Figure 4.** Percentage of relative contribution of four geologic sources to sediment (Black marl,
19 Marl-limestone, Quaternary deposit, Conglomerate) for seven mixing models and three sediment
20 samples along the Bléone River, and two sediment samples along the Bes River.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 1.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 2.




Figure 3.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 4.