

Coupling soil erosion model and lake sediment records reveals the importance of Alpine erosion crisis in total sediment exports during the Holocene

> Théo MAZURE – PhD Candidate (INRAE, France)

Under the supervision of : Jean-Philippe Jenny (INRAE, France), Georges-Marie Saulnier (CNRS, France), Vincent Chanudet (EDF, France)

Picture : Jean-Marie Thomas

I. Context & objectives Reconstruct long-term soil erosion dynamics

 \mathbb{N}

3

Model reconstructions



Model reconstructions



Model reconstructions



Empirical reconstructions



 \mathbf{I}

Model reconstructions



Empirical reconstructions



Idea



Goals:

- Methodological → Convert soil erosion proxies into soil erosion unit (t.km⁻².yr⁻¹) by using erosion model
- Thematic → Investigate soil erosion dynamics over the Holocene period (12,000 last years)

II. Materials and methods *Combining model & paleo data*

Specific region: French Northwestern-Alps



 Plenty of paleo-reconstructions of soil erosion
Inter-comparison possible between study sites (Progressive acceleration + Erosion crisis)

Modified from Arnaud et al., 2016

 \mathbb{N}

Study sites

Six natural lakes with available high resolution erosion signals (Annecy, Anterne, Benit, Moras, Paladru, La Thuile)



Figure: Study sites map.

Mazure et al., in review

Paleo-environmental data

Long-term erosion proxies chosen from available data in the <u>litterature</u>

Site	Core	Erosion proxy	Time period (cal. yr. BP)	Source
Annecy	LA13	SAR (cm ⁻² .yr ⁻¹)	[0;4350]	Jones et al., 2013
Anterne	ANT-07	SAR (cm.yr ⁻¹)	[0;9950]	Giguet-Covex et al., 2011
Benit	BEN14 & BEN16	TAR (mg.cm ⁻² .yr ⁻¹)	[-50;2110]	Bajard et al., 2018
Moras	MOR08-MC	TAR (mg.cm ⁻² .yr ⁻¹)	[-50;3950]	Doyen et al., 2013
Paladru	PAL09-MC	Ti (kcps)	[-50 ; 9950]	Doyen et al., 2016
Thuile	THU10	Erosion (t.km- ² .yr ⁻¹)	[-64 ; 12010]	Bajard et al., 2017

Table: Paleo-data used in this study.

Erosion model: Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE)

Mean soil loss rate: E = R*K*LS*C*P (Renard et al., 1997)

Constant: R, K, LS & P (Panagos et al., 2015)

• Variable: HYDE 3.2 (Goldewijk et al., 2017)



Erosion data available

IV



Model data temporal variability



14

 \mathbf{I}

Model and Proxy data temporal variabilities

High



Proxy
RUSLE

15

IV

Model and Proxy data temporal variabilities



 \mathbb{N}

16

<u>RUSLE-HYDE miss</u> « transient erosion crisis » periods in all study sites

Similar variabilities of data



Watershed erosion and Lake sedimentation

- 1. Not supposed to be synchronous (sediment production VS transfert, deposition...)
- 2. Time delay = 10^2 to 10^3 years (Hoffmann, 2015)

Deal with asynchronicity

Suppress temporality between signals = Cumulative Density Function (CDF)



Determine how much signals have similar statistical variability on the same time period

Erosion proxies conversion

 \mathbb{N}



Erosion proxies conversion



III. Results Conversion of erosion proxies into soil erosion unit (t.km⁻².yr⁻¹)

 \mathbf{I}

Method corroboration

> Method corroboration on the <u>La Thuile watershed</u>:

- Fast sediment transfer from hillslopes to the lake
- Erosion proxy already expressed as erosion unit (t.km⁻².yr⁻¹)

Site	Recent SRP (cal. yr. BP)	R ² (raw data)	R ² CDF	Slope correlation
Annecy	[0;500]	0,66	0,85	1190,83
Anterne	[0;1300]	0,24	0,91	2062,28
Benit	[0;700]	0,02	0,96	5,93
Moras	[-50;1600]	0,02	0,87	0,51
Paladru	[-50 ; 1100]	0,09	0,93	1,20
La Thuile	[-64; 800]	0,10	0,94	1,00

Figure: Statistical results of the conversion formula calculation (Recent SRP = Recent Scientific References Period)

Method performance

Good correlation on Scientific Reference Periods (SRP)



Table: Correlation between RUSLE-HYDE and proxies on SRP dates for each study site.

Converted paleo data

Erosion proxies in same unit RUSLE-PALEO (t.km⁻².yr⁻¹) Quantitative inter-comparison between sites possible



Figure: Quantified terrigenous proxies for the study sites.

III. Results Holocene soil erosion dynamics

 \mathbf{I}

RUSLE Paleo vs RUSLE HYDE

RUSLE-PALEO and RUSLE-HYDE both expressed as erosion unit
Quantification of erosion dynamics by RUSLE-PALEO vs RUSLE-HYDE



Figure: RUSLE Paleo vs RUSLE HYDE erosion fluxes.

 \mathbf{I}

Cumulative Holocene erosion exports

Crisis periods exports (RUSLE-PALEO) = 51 % [+35 % ; +64 %]

<u>RUSLE-HYDE under-estimation</u> = 48 % [-1 % ; +60 %]



Sediment records seem to be appropriated to assess and quantify long-term erosion dynamics at the local (or possibly even regional?) scale

Sediment records could potentially improve longterm erosion simulations, which represent well progressive erosion acceleration but miss transient erosion periods (half of the total erosion exports)

 <u>Hypothesis</u>: Under-estimation of the intensities of land-use change and of land-use practices \mathbb{N}





Thank you for your attention !



https://theo-mazure.netlify.app/

Picture : Jean-Marie Thomas