## Introduction

While conceptually simple, the dynamic process of surface runoff and soil loss are quite complex. As the effect of the detachment by raindrops and transport of surface runoff on soil erosion by erosive rainfall, soil loss occurs as an ill-defined mix of both particles and aggregates. The objective of this study was to (1) evaluate surface runoff and soil erosion under two different tillage treatments and two slope gradients as related to actual rainfall events and (2) analysis of the dynamic variation of surface runoff, sediment transport and soil solid size during the single natural rainfall case under different treatments.

## Methods

This study site is located at the runoff plots in the Hailun Monitoring and Research Station of Soil and Water Conservation, which is situated at the center of the typical Mollisol zone of Northeast China (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). This study involved different tillage treatments (no-till and conventional till) and slope gradients (5° and 7°). By using Runoff-Sediment Monitoring Device (Fig. 3) and EyeTech Particle Size Analyzer (Ankersmid, Netherlands) to record and analysis the soil solid sizes changes associated with surface runoff and sediment transport process.



Figure 1. Location of Hailun Monitoring and Research Station of Soil and Water **Conservation, Northeast Institute of Geography and Agroecology, Chinese Academy** of Science in the Northeast China (Hailun, Heilongjiang Province)





Figure 2. Hailun Monitoring and Research **Station of Soil and Water Conservation** 

**Figure 3. Runoff-Sediment Monitoring** Device



Figure 4. Cumulative surface runoff (mm) and soil loss (t km-2) of each combination of the tillage treatment and slope gradient over the period May 1st-Octomber 30th, 2016. (BL-5: Bare land on 5° slope gradients; CT-5: Conventional tillage on 5° slope gradients; NT-5: Notillage on 5° slope gradients; CT-7: Conventional tillage on 7° slope gradients; NT-7: Notillage on 7° slope gradients)

# **Overland flow and erosion from runoff plots on a Mollisol in Northeast China**

Shuai Chen<sup>ab</sup>, C. Lee Burras<sup>b</sup> and Xingyi Zhang<sup>a,\*</sup> a. Northeast Institute of Geography and Agroecology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Harbin 150081, China b. Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, USA

Treatment	Rainfall (mm)	Number of runoff	Runoff coefficient (%)	Number of Sediment transport	Erosion modulus (t km <sup>-2</sup> a <sup>-1</sup> )	
BL-5		16	35.6±1.10a	14	5448.7±13.38a	
CT-5	394.3	6	6.5±0.17c	4	188.5±0.55c	
NT-5		2	2.1±0.15d	2	15.1±1.65e	
СТ-7		13	17.3±0.98b	8	1561.2±6.01b	
NT-7		10	6.3±0.26c	4	145.5±3.01d	

Table 1. Annual runoff and soil loss as affected by tillage

Treatment	Without coverage (%).				Add coverage (%)				
	Runoff		Soil loss		Runoff		Soil loss		
	Equation	r <sup>2</sup>	Equation	r <sup>2</sup>		<b>r</b> <sup>2</sup>	Equation	<b>r</b> <sup>2</sup>	
BL-5	RF=0.035F+2.728	0.87	SL=3.799F-5.730	0.93	RF=0.035F+2.728	0.87	SL=3.799F-5.730	0.93	
CT-5	RF=0.016F-0.486	0.65	SL=0.182F-5.435	0.62	RF=0.015F-0.027C+1.377	0.74	SL=0.174F-0.28C+13.631	0.69	
NT-5	RF=0.005F-0.143	0.58	SL=0.015F-0.445	0.61	RF=0.005F-0.007C+0.287	0.65	SL=0.014F-0.02C+0.779	0.68	
СТ-7	RF=0.022F+0.781	0.62	SL=1.748F+1.197	0.79	RF=0.021F-0.054C+4.377	0.78	SL=1.705F-1.726C+116.109	0.83	
NT-7	RF=0.011F-0.009	0.60	SL=0.129F-3.029	0.63	RF=0.01F-0.023C+1.357	0.75	SL=0.125F-0.189C+8.285	0.71	

Table 2. Linear regression equations relating surface runoff (mm), soil loss (t km<sup>-2</sup>), rainfall erosivity (MJ mm ha-1 h-1) and canopy (%) under different treatment on a Mollisol in Northeast China (RF=Runoff (mm), SL=Soil loss (t km<sup>-2</sup>), C = Coverage(%), F=Rainfall erosivity (MJ mm ha<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>))



three rainfall event (September 23 in 2016).

# Results

1. There was 394.3 mm rainfall during 54 events between May and November 2016. Runoff as overland flow occurred 14 times in the control, accounted for 25.9% of the precipitation and caused 54.5 tons/ha erosion. Runoff only occurred twice in the 52 no-till plot and caused 0.2 tons/ha (Fig. 4 and Table 1).

2. R<sup>2</sup> between soil loss, rainfall erosivity and crop canopy to the tillage plots increased 10.2%, compared the value of R2 in the regression equation which just used rainfall erosivity as the factor to express the soil loss in each tillage plot. (Table 2).

3. The curve of surface runoff and soil loss under each treatment were basically consistent with the rainfall curve in every rainfall case (Fig. 5). For the different sized and density material, the movement is differential in the plot and there are ephemeral preferential flows paths across the plot (Fig. 6).

# Conclusion

1. Treatment plot with gentle slope gradient and greater crop coverage better weakened the generation of surface runoff and protected the soil from erosive forces of rainfall.

at the end of rainfall event.



while others were black sediment (aggregates).

2. The proportion of large soil solid decreased with an increase of rainfall intensity, and more silt-size soil solid was found

)中国科学院东北地理与农业生态研究所 Northeast Institute of Geography and Agroecology, Chinese Academy of Sciences







