

Introduction to special issue on connectivity in water and sediment dynamics

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Earth Surface Processes and Landforms</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | ESP-15-0003.R1 |
| Wiley - Manuscript type: | ESEX commentary |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 12-Jan-2015 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Parsons, Anthony; University of Sheffield, Geography Bracken, Louise; Durham University, Geography Poepl, Ronald; University of Vienna, Department of Geography and Regional Research Wainwright, John; University of Durham, Geography keesstra, Saskia; Wageningen University, Land degradation and development; |
| Keywords: | connectivity, water, sediment |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

review

1
2
3 Connectivity has emerged in recent years as a significant conceptual framework within which
4 to address the spatial and temporal variability in runoff and sediment transport (Bracken and
5 Croke, 2007; Hopp and Mc Donnell, 2009; Heckmann *et al.*, 2010; Wainwright *et al.*, 2011).
6 The concept has had particular application in the field of catchment hydrology (Ali and Roy,
7 2010; McGuire and McDonnell, 2007; Mueller *et al.*, 2007; Ocampo *et al.*, 2006; Tromp-Van
8 Meerveld and McDonnell, 2006), but has also been employed in, for example, explaining
9 rates of sediment transport in river channels (Hooke, 2003), soil erosion by water (Lesschen
10 *et al.*, 2009; Lexartza-Artza I. and Wainwright, J. 2011), in the study of aeolian processes
11 (Okin and Gillette, 2001; Okin *et al.*, 2009) and in fire propagation. This special issue draws
12 together several of the papers that were presented in the session “Connectivity in water and
13 sediment dynamics: how do we move forwards?” at the 2012 General Assembly of the
14 European Geosciences Union in Vienna, Austria. The session drew a variety of types of
15 presentation, and those submitted for this special issue fall into three groups. In the first
16 group (Ali *et al.*, 2014; Croke *et al.*, 2013; Goulsbra *et al.*, 2014; Pechenick *et al.*, 2014 and
17 Puttock *et al.*, 2013) are empirical studies that address connectivity in a variety of specific
18 environments and conditions. The second group (Baartman *et al.*, 2013; Harel and Mouche,
19 2014 and Kirkby, 2014) employs a modelling approach to explore the effects of landscape
20 complexity and spatial heterogeneity on connectivity and runoff and sediment yield. Finally,
21 Bracken *et al.* present a more theoretical exploration of the interlinkages between sediment
22 and water connectivity.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Empirical Studies

33 Ali *et al.* (2014) explore the use of wetness indices to predict the dynamics of connected
34 saturation areas in two Scottish catchments. Specifically, they address the questions of
35 whether they work equally well in wet and dry periods, if the inclusion of soil data improves
36 the predictive power, and what role spatial resolution has in affecting predictive power. The
37 study raises the question of how far can indices take us in predicting catchment responses to a
38 range of rainfall inputs. Croke *et al.* (2013) undertake a study of an extreme flood event to
39 assess both hydrological and sediment connectivity under such conditions. They address the
40 roles of channel capacity in determining hydrological connectivity, channel banks as sources
41 of sediment, floodplains as sinks of sediment during overbank discharges, and the non-
42 linearity of responses due to spatial variability of channel floodplain connectivity. As these
43 authors point out, it is often argued that extreme events are sufficiently large to ensure
44 connection between various landscape elements. However, this study of one of the largest
45 floods ever recorded in Australia reveals a more complex picture such that it is argued that
46 the development of quantitative indices of connectivity will need to take account of spatially
47 variable and non-linear changes in key variables such as channel capacity and flood
48 conveyance. Goulsbra *et al.* (2014) employ a dense network of sensors to investigate the
49 importance of flow in ephemeral channels in the hydrological response of a peat catchment.
50 The study, again, highlights the importance of spatial variability in controlling overall
51 connectivity and catchment response. The study of Pechenick *et al.* (2014) moves away from
52 assessing responses of catchment to different inputs to consider the effects of anthropogenic
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 structures on catchment connectivity. Roads, particularly in forested catchments, play an
4 important role as conduits of water so that developing metrics that can quantify their effects
5 is an important element in catchment management. In this study road metrics are shown to
6 be effective in predicting downstream channel condition. The final study in this group
7 (Puttock *et al.*, 2013) addresses the impact of environmental change on water, sediment and
8 carbon losses from catchments in New Mexico. The effects of vegetation change on
9 catchment responses in this environment have been extensively studied (e.g., Abrahams *et*
10 *al.*, 1995; Parsons *et al.*, 1996a), and particularly with respect to its effect on flow pathways
11 (e.g., Parsons *et al.*, 1996b; Mueller *et al.*, 2008; Turnbull *et al.*, 2011). This study employs a
12 flow pathway metric to examine the effects of a grass-woody vegetation change. In common
13 with many previous studies, this one finds more runoff, higher sediment and organic carbon
14 yields from the woody sites. These changes are associated with longer flow pathways, and it
15 is argued that increased hydrological connectivity is an emergent property of this type of
16 vegetation change that can be used to classify and evaluate landscape hydrological response.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Modelling studies

25
26 Baartman *et al.* (2013) test the hypothesis that increasing landscape complexity (overall
27 relief, slope variability and stream order) is associated with decreasing sediment connectivity
28 (expressed as the sediment-delivery ratio) using the landscape evolution model LAPSUS
29 (Schoorl *et al.*, 2002) to simulate erosion and deposition by overland flow within both virtual
30 and real landscapes. The study predicts an inverse logarithmic relationship between the two.
31 Harel and Mouche (2014) take us back to the issue of spatial heterogeneity that was
32 examined in several of the empirical studies to explore the effects of spatial soil infiltrability
33 in runoff production. The study suggests that increased runoff is not necessarily related to
34 increased connectivity; a result which if supported by empirical studies would undermine the
35 argument for connectivity as a useful tool in predicting runoff responses to rainfall. In the last
36 of this group of papers, Kirkby (2014), similarly, addresses issues of landscape complexity
37 and spatial heterogeneity in determining the runoff response of landscapes to spatially
38 uniform rainfall input of varying intensities and durations. In a series of simulations, he
39 explores runoff responses in terms of hydrograph shape in relation to connectivity structure,
40 and investigates the probability that rainfall landing on a particular part of a hillslope will be
41 delivered to the base of the slope as runoff. The paper highlights a growing awareness of the
42 role of rainfall inputs on emerging connectivity, underlining the move towards a more
43 process-based approach to understanding connectivity.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Conceptual Development

53
54 In the final paper of this special issue Bracken *et al.* (2014) evaluate the concept of
55 connectivity as a framework for understanding sediment transfer across multiple scales.
56 Specifically they examine the relationships among the frequency-magnitude distributions of
57 sediment detachment and transport processes, the spatial and temporal feedbacks between
58
59
60

1
2
3 sediment-detachment and transport processes, and mechanisms of sediment detachment and
4 transport to develop a new framework for sediment connectivity. The framework is illustrated
5 with reference to fluvial systems, but it is argued that it could be readily expanded to other
6 process domains.
7
8
9

10 11 Synthesis

12
13 Although the papers that form this special issue are a self-selected subgroup of those
14 presented at the EGU session, they reflect the current state of the art in connectivity.
15 Numerous empirical and modelling studies couch the findings of non-linear responses in
16 runoff and sediment yield in terms of connectivity (Lexartza-Artza and Wainwright 2009,
17 2011; Okin *et al.*, 2009; Bracken *et al.*, 2013, Fryirs, 2013), and efforts have been made to
18 develop indices of connectivity (Borselli *et al.*, 2008; Wichmann *et al.*, 2009; Ali and Roy,
19 2010; Cavalli *et al.*, 2013; Heckmann *et al.*, 2013). The term has been refined to distinguish
20 between so-called structural and functional (or process-based) connectivity (Turnbull *et al.*,
21 2008; Wainwright *et al.*, 2011; Bracken *et al.*, 2013). Although it may be evident that the
22 concept helps us to express the complexity (in terms of water and sediment yields) of
23 landscape responses to rainfall inputs, does it improve our ability to understand or predict
24 those responses? Is connectivity no more than old wine repackaged into new bottles, as
25 Bracken *et al.* (2014) suggest? Notwithstanding the efforts made by Bracken *et al.* (2014)
26 there would still seem to be some way to go in connectivity research before this nagging
27 concern can be assuaged. That it can be will undoubtedly be an important task for a number
28 of ongoing research initiatives. First, COST Action ES1306 (Connecteur: Connecting
29 European Connectivity Research), which commenced in 2014 was also spawned by the EGU
30 session. The COST Action underpins sessions at the 2015 EGU meeting and a range of future
31 workshops on connectivity in water and sediment dynamics (see <http://connecteur.info/>).
32 Secondly, The Gordon Research Conference in 2015 will focus on 'Interactions of hydrology,
33 biology and geochemistry; thresholds in time and space'. Connectivity will be a central theme
34 of presentations and discussions. Finally, the 2016 Binghamton Symposium will also focus
35 on 'Connectivity in Geomorphology' and will continue to maintain the international interest
36 in connectivity in water and sediment dynamics. By the end of 2016, it may be hoped that
37 consensus will have emerged about the usefulness of connectivity as a significant conceptual
38 framework within which to address the spatial and temporal variability in runoff and
39 sediment transport.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 References

54
55 Abrahams AD, Parsons AJ, and Wainwright J. 1995. Effects of vegetation change on interrill
56 runoff and erosion, Walnut Gulch, southern Arizona. *Geomorphology* **13**: 37-48.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ali G, Birkel C, Tetzlaff D, Soulsby C, McDonnoell JJ, Tarolli p. 2014. A comparison of
4 wetness indices for the prediction of observed connected saturated areas under
5 contrasting conditions. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **39**: 399-413.
6
7
8
9 Ali GA, Roy AG. 2010. Shopping for hydrologically representative connectivity metrics in a
10 humid temperate forested catchment. *Water Resources Research* **46**: W12544.
11
12
13 Baartman JEM, Masselink R, Keesstra SD, Temme JAM. 2013. Linking landscape
14 morphological complexity and sediment connectivity. *Earth Surface Processes and*
15 *Landforms* **38**:1457-1471.
16
17
18
19 Borselli L, Cassi P, Torri D. 2008. Prolegomena to sediment and flow connectivity in the
20 landscape: A GIS and field numerical assessment. *Catena* **75**: 268-277.
21
22
23
24 Bracken LJ, Croke J. 2007. The concept of hydrological connectivity and its contribution to
25 understanding runoff dominated geomorphic systems. *Hydrological Processes* **21**:
26 1749–1763.
27
28
29
30 Bracken LJ, Turnbull L, Wainwright J, Bogaart P. 2014. Sediment connectivity: a framework
31 for understanding sediment transport at multiple scales. *Earth Surface Processes and*
32 *Landforms* DOI: 10.1002/esp.3635
33
34
35
36 Bracken LJ, Wainwright J, Ali GA, Tetzlaff D, Smith MW, Reaney SM., Roy AG. 2013.
37 Concepts of hydrological connectivity: Research approaches, pathways and future
38 agendas. *Earth-Science Reviews* **119**:17-34.
39
40
41
42 Cavalli M, Trevisani S, Comiti F, Marchi L. 2013. Geomorphometric assessment of spatial
43 sediment connectivity in small Alpine catchments. *Geomorphology* **188**: 31–41,
44 doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.05.007.
45
46
47
48 Croke J, Fryirs K, Thompson C. 2013. Channel-floodplain connectivity during an extreme
49 flood event: implications for sediment erosion, deposition, and delivery. *Earth*
50 *Surface Processes and Landforms* **38**: 1444-1456
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fryirs K. 2013. (Dis)Connectivity in catchment sediment cascades: a fresh look at the
4 sediment delivery problem. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **38**: 30–46,
5 doi:10.1002/esp.3242.
6
7
8
- 9 Goulsbra C, Evans M, Lindsay C. 2014. Temporary streams in a peatland catchment: pattern,
10 timing, and controls on stream network expansion and contraction. *Earth Surface*
11 *Processes and Landforms* **39**:790-803.
12
13
- 14 Harel M-A and Mouche E. 2014. Is the connectivity function a good indicator of soil
15 infiltrability distribution and runoff flow dimension? *Earth Surface Processes and*
16 *Landforms* DOI: 10.1002/esp3604.
17
18
19
- 20 Heckmann T, Thiel M, Schwanghart W, Haas F, Becht M. 2010. Using graph theory to
21 quantify coarse sediment connectivity in alpine geosystems. *Geophysical Research*
22 *Abstracts*, EGU General Assembly, Vienna.
23
24
25
26
- 27 Heckmann T, Schwanghart W. 2013. Geomorphic coupling and sediment connectivity in an
28 alpine catchment - exploring sediment cascades using graph theory. *Geomorphology*
29 **182** : 89-103.
30
31
32
- 33 Hooke J. 2003. Coarse sediment connectivity in river channel systems: a conceptual
34 framework and methodology. *Geomorphology* **56** : 79-94.
35
36
37
- 38 Hopp L, McDonnell JJ. 2009. Connectivity at the hillslope scale: Identifying interactions
39 between storm size, bedrock permeability, slope angle and soil depth. *Journal of*
40 *Hydrology* **376**: 378-391.
41
42
43
- 44 Kirkby MJ. 2014. Do not only connect: a model of infiltration-excess overland flow based on
45 simulation. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* DOI: 10.1002/esp.3556.
46
47
48
- 49 Lesschen JP, Schoorl JM, Cammeraat LH. 2009. Modelling runoff and erosion for a semi-
50 arid catchment using a multi-scale approach based on hydrological connectivity.
51 *Geomorphology* **109**: 174-183.
52
53
54
- 55 Lexartza-Artza I, Wainwright J. 2009. Hydrological connectivity: linking concepts with
56 practical implications. *Catena* **79**: 146–152.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lexartza-Artza I. and Wainwright, J. 2011. Making connections: changing sediment sources
4 and sinks in an upland catchment. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **36**: 1090-
5 1104.
6
7
8
9 McGuire KJ, McDonnell JJ. 2007. Hydrological connectivity of hillslopes and streams:
10 Characteristic time scales and nonlinearities. *Water Resources Research* **46**:
11 DOI: 10.1029/2010WR009341
12
13
14
15 Mueller EN, Wainwright J, Parsons AJ. 2007. Impact of connectivity on the modelling of
16 overland flow within semiarid shrubland environments, *Water Resources Research*
17 **43**: W09412, doi:10.1029/2006WR005006.
18
19
20
21 Müller EN, Wainwright J, Parsons AJ. 2008. Spatial variability of soil and nutrient
22 parameters within grasslands and shrublands of a semi-arid environment, Jornada
23 Basin, New Mexico. *Ecohydrology* **1**: 3-12.
24
25
26
27 Ocampo CJ, Sivapalan M, Oldham C. 2006. Hydrological connectivity of upland-riparian
28 zones in agricultural catchments: Implications for runoff generation and nitrate
29 transport. *Journal of Hydrology* **331**: 643-658.
30
31
32
33 Okin GS, Gillette DA. 2001. Distribution of vegetation in wind-dominated landscapes:
34 Implications for wind erosion modeling and landscape processes. *Journal of*
35 *Geophysical Research* **106**: 9673-9683.
36
37
38
39 Okin GS, Parsons AJ, Wainwright J, Herrick JE, Bestelmeyer BT, Peters DPC, Fredrickson
40 EL. 2009. Do changes in connectivity explain desertification? *Bioscience* **59**:237-244.
41
42
43
44 Parsons AJ, Abrahams AD, Wainwright J. 1996a. Responses of interrill runoff and erosion
45 rates to vegetation change in southern Arizona. *Geomorphology* **14**: 311-317.
46
47
48
49 Parsons AJ, Wainwright J, Abrahams AD. 1996b. Runoff and erosion on semi-arid hillslopes.
50 In: M.G. Anderson and S.M. Brooks (eds.) *Advances in Hillslope Processes*, Wiley,
51 Chichester, pp.1061-1078.
52
53
54
55 Pechenick AM, Rizzo DM, Morrissey LA, Garvey KM, Underwood KL, Wemple BC. 2014.
56 A multi-scale statistical approach to assess the effects of connectivity of road and
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 stream networks on geomorphic channel condition. *Earth Surface Processes and*
4 *Landforms* DOI: 10.1002/esp.3611.
5
6
7
8 Puttock A, Macleod CJA, Bol R, Sessford P, Dugait J, Brazier RE. 2013. Changes in
9 ecosystem structure, function and hydrological connectivity control water, soil and
10 carbon losses in semi-arid grass to woody vegetation transition. *Earth Surface*
11 *Processes and Landforms* **38**: 1602-1611.
12
13
14
15 Schoorl JM, Veldkamp A, Bouma J. 2002. Modeling Water and Soil Redistribution in a
16 Dynamic Landscape Context. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **66**: 1610-
17 1619.
18
19
20
21 Tromp-Van Meerveld HJ, McDonnell JJ. 2006. Threshold relations in subsurface stormflow:
22 2. The fill and spill hypothesis. *Water Resources Research* **42**: W02411.
23
24
25
26 Turnbull L, Wainwright J, Brazier RE. 2008. A conceptual framework for understanding
27 semi-arid land degradation: Ecohydrological interactions across multiple-space and
28 time scales. *Ecohydrology* **1**:23-34.
29
30
31
32 Turnbull L, Wainwright J, Brazier RE. 2011. Nutrient dynamics during runoff events over a
33 transition from grassland to shrubland. *Hydrological Processes*, **24**: 393-414.
34
35
36
37 Wainwright, J, Turnbull L, Ibrahim TG, Lexartza-Artza I, Thornton, SF, Brazier R. 2011.
38 Linking environmental regimes, space and time: Interpretations of structural and
39 functional connectivity. *Geomorphology* **126**: 387-404.
40
41
42
43 Wichmann V, Heckmann T, Haas F, Becht M. 2009. A new modelling approach to delineate
44 the spatial extent of alpine sediment cascades: GIS and SDA applications in
45 geomorphology. *Geomorphology* **111**: 70–78.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60