For submission to Biogeochemistry LBA Issue

Runoff sources and land cover change in the Amazon: An end member mixing analysis from small watersheds

Christopher Neill[1,*], Joaquin E. Chaves[1,9], Trent Biggs[2], Linda A. Deegan[1], Helmut Elsenbeer[3], Ricardo O. Figueiredo[4], Sonja Germer[3,10], Mark S. Johnson[5], Johannes Lehmann[6], Daniel Markewitz[7], Marisa C. Piccolo[8]

[1]The Ecosystems Center, Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA 02543, USA
[2]Department of Geography, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA 92182-4493, USA
[3]University of Potsdam, Institute of Geoecology, Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24-25, 14476 Golm, Germany
[4]EMBRAPA Amazônia Oriental, Avenida Enéas Pinheiro, Belém, PA, 66095-100, Brazil.
[5]Instituite for Resources, Environment and Sustainability and Department of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of British Columbia, 6339 Stores Road, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, V6T 1Z4.
[6]Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, Cornell University, 918 Bradfield Hall, Ithaca NY 14853, USA
[7]D. B. Warnell School of Forest Resources, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602 USA
[8]Laboratório Ciclagem de Nutrients, Centro de Energia Nuclear na Agricultura, Universidade de São Paulo, Avendia Centenário, 303, CEP 13416-000, Piracicaba, SP, Brazil

[9]Current address: Science Systems and Applications Inc., NASA Calibration and Validation Office, 1450 South Rolling Rd., Halethorpe, MD 21227

[10]Current address: Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Jägerstr. 22/23, 10117 Berlin, Germany

*Corresponding author

Keywords: cattle pasture; deforestation; flowpaths; principal components analysis; overland flow; soil solution

Abstract

The flowpaths by which water moves from watersheds to streams has important consequences for the runoff dynamics and biogeochemistry of surface waters in the Amazon Basin. The clearing of Amazon forest to cattle pasture has the potential to change runoff sources to streams by shifting runoff to more surficial flow pathways. We applied end member mixing analysis (EMMA) to ten small watersheds throughout the Amazon in which solute composition of streamwater and groundwater, overland flow, soil solution, throughfall and rainwater were measured, largely as part of the Large-Scale Biosphere-Atmosphere Experiment in Amazonia. We found a range in the extent to which streamwater samples fell within the mixing space determined by potential flowpath end members, suggesting that some water sources to streams were not sampled. The contribution of overland flow as a source of stream flow was greater in pasture watersheds than in forest watersheds of comparable size. Increases in overland flow contribution to pasture streams ranged in some cases from 0% in forest to 27 to 28% in pasture and were broadly consistent with results from hydrometric sampling of Amazon forest and pasture watersheds that indicate 17- to 18-fold increase in the overland flow contribution to stream flow in pastures. In forest, overland flow was an important contribution to stream flow (45 to 57%) in ephemeral streams where flows were dominated by stormflow. Overland flow contribution to stream flow decreased in importance with increasing watershed area, from 21 to 57% in forest and 60 to 89% in pasture watersheds <10 ha to 0% in forest and 27 to 28% in pastures in watersheds >100 ha. Soil solution contributions to stream flow were similar across watershed area and groundwater inputs generally increased in proportion to decreases in overland flow. Application of EMMA across multiple watersheds indicated patterns across

gradients of stream size and land cover that were consistent with patterns determined by detailed hydrometric sampling.

Introduction

The Amazon region encompasses the world's largest river basin and the largest area of extant tropical forest. Since the 1970s, more tropical forest has been cleared in the Amazon Basin than in any other tropical forest region and non-forest land now comprises nearly 20% of the Brazilian Amazon (Fearnside 2005; Simon and Garagorry 2005; INPE 2010). Cattle pasture, which historically has been the main driver for Amazon forest clearing, continues to be the most extensive use of cleared land in the Amazon (Buschbacher 1986; INPE 2010).

Conversion of Amazon forest to pasture has altered watershed hydrological processes by shifting the sources of water to stream flow to more rapid surface-dominated flowpaths because of soil compaction and decreased soil hydraulic conductivity associated with cattle grazing (Biggs et al. 2006; Moraes et al. 2006; Zimmermann et al. 2006; Germer et al. 2009; Germer et al. 2010). This alteration not only affects the transport of water to streams but has broader implications for watershed biogeochemistry because it alters the potential for transport of sediments and dissolved materials (Williams and Melack 1997; Neill et al. 2001; Davidson et al. 2004; Biggs et al. 2006; Germer et al. 2009). It also influences biogeochemical transformations as shifts in flowpaths modify water contact with reactive surfaces, redox conditions and chemical environments (Hill 1990; Creed et al. 1996; Boyer et al. 1997; Hill et al. 2000, McClain et al. 2003; Chaves et al. 2009). To date, the effects of land use on the distribution of water sources to streams have been quantified in several small catchments, but these have not been examined in multiple basins across different watershed sizes or across the diversity of topographic settings and soils that make up the Amazon basin as a whole.

End member mixing analysis (EMMA) can identify the water sources within catchments that contribute to stream flow (Christophersen et al. 1990; Christophersen and Hooper 1992). This approach assumes that the chemistry of streamwater is the product of a mixture of discrete “sources” within catchments, in which solutes behave conservatively as they travel to streams. EMMA has been used to quantify groundwater, soil solution and overland flow sources to small streams in both temperate (Genereux et al. 1993; Mulholland 1993; Burns et al. 2001; Hooper 2001) and tropical (Elsenbeer et al. 1995; Chaves et al. 2008) settings. EMMA offers a way of using comparable datasets on the chemistry of water sources and streamwater to compare water sources to streams across multiple catchments. We compiled data on the chemistry of streamwater and the chemistry of specific hydrologic flowpaths from studies of ten small Amazon catchments. These catchments represented a range of forest, pasture and mixed forest and pasture land use. We used EMMA to quantify the contribution of different hydrologic flowpaths to stream flows. Our objectives were to: (1) identify trends in water sources to stream flow across forest watersheds that could be determined from solute concentrations in streamwater and potential flowpath sources and compared with direct hydrometric measurements, (2) compare water sources in forest and pasture watersheds to identify the effects of land conversion on flowpath structure, and (3) examine how sources changed across a range of watershed scales.

Methods

Study sites

We derived data from published studies and unpublished results from sites examined under LBA that ranged from zero-order intermittent streams to third-order perennial streams (Fig. 1). Catchments ranged from 0.7 to 10,000 ha and included six forest watersheds, three pasture watersheds and one watershed that contained mixed forest and pasture. Soil types across sites were predominantly Ultisols with only one site (Vitória) on Oxisols (Table 1).

Nova Vida contained two pairs of second-order perennial forest and pasture streams (Neill et al. 2006). The catchments consisted of broad areas of rolling hills bisected by distinct floodplains 20 to 50 m wide. The pastures in both catchments were created directly from forest cleared in 1989. Bedrock was predominantly Pre-Cambrian granite and soils were predominantly Kandiudults and Paleudults.

Rancho Grande contained adjacent forest and pasture catchments that drained to 0-order streams (Chaves et al. 2008; Germer et al. 2009). The forest stream was ephemeral and flowed mostly during storms. The pasture stream was intermittent and flowed nearly continuously during the wet season. The pasture was cleared in 1985 and planted to pasture in 1986. The bedrock was predominantly granite and gneiss, which has eroded into a low relief landscape of flat valley floors with gently rolling slopes bound by steep ridges as high as 150 m. Streams originated in areas of low relief on the plateaus approximately 50 to 100 m upstream of larger perennial streams. Soils were Kandiudults.

Fazenda Vitória in Paragominas contained a large perennial second-order stream that drained a mixture of forest and pasture (Markewitz et al. 2001; Markewitz et al. 2004). Forest was originally cleared for pasture in 1969. The catchment topography consisted of broad plateaus bisected by the stream channel. The bedrock was predominantly granitic and soils were primarily Haplustoxes on plateaus and Plinthustults on side slopes.

Juruena was an undisturbed forest catchment on Ultisols drained by a small, perennial first-order stream (Johnson et al. 2006). Topography was gently undulating typical of the Brazilian shield on granitic bedrock and the stream was located in a narrow (0.5 m) riparian zone that originated at the base of the hillsope. Soils were Ultisols.

La Cuenca was an undisturbed forest catchment that contained a first-order stream. The catchment had a narrow valley floor, pronounced headwater gullies and steep slopes (Elsenbeer et al. 1992). Soils were Ultisols.

Nossa Senhora was a pasture catchment that was deforested in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Biggs et al. 2006). There was no natural channel and compacted cattle paths routed overland flow to the base of the hillslope. The catchment contained gentle slopes of 1 to 3% with a steeper slope to a 25-m wide near-stream zone. The catchment was on gneissic bedrock and Paleudults.

Data sources

We assembled cation and anion concentration data from streamwater and from catchment sources of water that were potential sources of stream flows at each site. These included rain, groundwater, soil solution, throughfall and overland flow. The location of groundwater sampling varied among plateau, the riparian zone and springs. All potential sources were sampled during the same time period at each site except for the two exceptions noted below. Streamwater samples reflected the representative flows at each site and were predominantly baseflow in perennial streams (Nova Vida, Vitória, La Cuenca, Juruena) and stormflows in ephemeral streams (Rancho Grande, Nossa Senhora).

At Nova Vida potential forest and pasture sources sampled were rain, groundwater and soil solution at 30 and 100 cm collected with tension lysimeters. Throughfall was sampled in forest and overland flow was sampled in pasture. No overland flow was captured by collectors in the forest. All Nova Vida water chemistry data spanned seven water years (1994-2001) during which periodic samplings were conducted both during the rainy and dry seasons (Neill et al. 2001). Streamwater samples were collected by grab sampling predominantly during baseflows across rainy and dry seasons.

At Rancho Grande sources sampled in both forest and pasture were rain, groundwater, soil solution from tension lysimeters at deths of 20 and 100 cm and overland flow. Throughfall was also sampled in the forest. All Rancho Grande water chemistry data spanned one rainy season from August 2004 to April 2005 (Chaves et al. 2008; Germer et al. 2009). Streamwater samples were collected during events by Isco® automatic water samplers over periods of three to about 24 hours when water was flowing.

At Fazenda Vitória we sampled rain, groundwater from upland, near-stream and hyporheic zones, soil solution collected with tension lysimeters at a depth of 20 cm and overland flow. Groundwater, soil solution and overland flow were collected in both forest and pasture portions of the watershed. All Vitória water chemistry data spanned seven water years (1994-2001). Streamwater samples were collected by grab sampling across a range of streamwater levels during the rainy season (Markewitz et al. 2004). These samples represented predominantly rainy season baseflow but included some samples at moderate stormflows.

At Juruena, we sampled were rain, groundwater (including spring water), throughfall and overland flow. Because no soil solution data were available, soil solution collected in a forested watershed on similar soils at Fazenda Nova Vida was tested as potential end member. All water chemistry data for Juruena were collected during two years (Nov. 2003 to Nov. 2005). Streamwater sampling was by grab sampling of baseflow at an average interval of 10 d, and stormflow samples for three rain events during that period (Johnson et al. 2006).

At La Cuenca we sampled rain, groundwater, soil solution at a depth of 30 cm with tension lysimeters, throughfall and overland flow. Streamwater chemistry was based on sampling stormflow during five rain events between March and September 1988 (Elsenbeer et al. 1996).

At Nossa Senhora, catchment sources were groundwater and overland flow. Nossa Senhora water chemistry was from stormflows during six rain events between September and November 2002 (Biggs et al. 2006). Stormflow was collected from water draining to the base of the hillslope. Because our initial EMMA results suggested an unsampled end member and because no *in situ* soil solution chemistry data were available for Nossa Senhora, we added data on soil solution from the Rancho Grande pasture watershed on a similar Ultisol as a potential end member (Biggs et al. 2006).

Data analysis

We used a multivariate end member mixing analysis technique based on principal component analysis (PCA) (Christophersen and Hooper 1992, Hooper 2003) to identify potential sources of stream flow (i.e., the end members), and calculate their relative contribution. The purpose of the PCA is to find a “lower-dimensional” space, *U*, which allows for the use of an over-determined set of equations in which more solute tracers than necessary are used to solve for the end-members proportions, while incorporating most of the variance associated with the tracers. The dimensionality of U space, and hence the maximum number of end members that can be resolved, is determined by the number of vectors (m) retained from the PCA. In this study, we retained two vectors from the PCAs for each site, which allowed solving for a maximum of three end members, and to conveniently display and analyze the mixing space as a two-dimensional "mixing diagram." The decision to solve for either two or three end members for a particular set of observations was based on the spread of the data between potential end members on the mixing diagrams and information about the nature of the flow data (i.e., base v. stormflow).

For the actual analyses standardized (mean centered and scaled to standard deviation) stream chemistry observations (n) and median end-member concentrations for each of the solutes available at each site (p) were projected onto the m-dimensional U space by the orthogonal projection

$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{X}\,\mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{T}} \qquad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{U}$ is the $n \times m$ projected data matrix, $\mathbf{X}$ is the $n \times p$ standardized data matrix, and $\mathbf{V}$ is the is the $m \times p$ matrix of the retained eigenvectors. The projected end members that best bounded the stream data in U space were chosen as end members for the mixing models in each watershed.

The proportion of the chosen end member in each streamwater observation was obtained by solving the following system of linear equations:

$$1 = x + y + z \quad (2)$$

$$SW_{U1} = x\,EM_{1\,U1} + y\,EM_{2\,U1} + z\,EM_{3\,U1} \quad (3)$$

$$SW_{U2} = x\,EM_{1\,U2} + y\,EM_{2\,U2} + z\,EM_{3\,U2} \quad (4)$$

where *x*, *y*, and *z* are the unknown proportions of each end member; SW_{U1} and SW_{U2} are the coordinates in *U* space, *U* 1 and *U* 2, for a streamwater observation. Likewise, $EM_{n\ U1}$ and $EM_{n\ U2}$ are the coefficients in *U* space for the *n*th end member. Equations 2 to 4 depict the case for a three end member mixing scenario. Because of various sources of error, such as non-conservative solute behavior, time-dependent end member variability, and/or analytical uncertainty, some stream observations lie outside the mixing domain defined by the end members chosen as sources of stream flow. The solutions to the above equations in those cases result in end member fractions for which negative values are found. To circumvent that problem, the outlier observations were perpendicularly projected to the line joining the two non-zero end members and solved geometrically in *U* space as binary mixtures of these two end members (Liu et al. 2004).

To examine pattern of sources across watersheds of different sizes, we plotted the EMMA-derived flowpath contributions against watershed area. Flowpath contributions were determined two ways: (1) as percent of total water yield from the watershed, and (2) as total water yield. Comparisons of total yield allowed us to compare contributions in pastures where the total water moving different flowpaths (e.g., overland flow) was much greater than from forest. The contributions were determined only during the period of streamwater sampling. For the smallest watersheds with ephemeral streams, this amounted to the time surface flow was present.

All data analyses were carried out in R version 2.7.0 (R Development Core Team 2008).

Results

Solute and end member selection

In most cases the solutes Na^+, K^+, Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} provided the clearest two-dimensional projections of the mixing space (Table 2). In two cases (Nova Vida and Rancho Grande pastures) addition of a fourth solute did not explain additional variation. In several other cases, inclusion of SO_4^{2-} (Vitória), Si (La Cuenca) or Cl^- (Nossa Senhora) improved mixing space projections (Table 2). Groundwater was an end member in every catchment and soil solution was an end member in nine of ten catchments (Table 2). Overland flow was a third end member in the four Rondônia pasture catchments and either overland flow or throughfall were end members in the smallest forest catchments (Table 2).

Individual watershed end-member mixing

For the larger of the two forest watersheds at Nova Vida, most of the stream observations were distributed between soil solution and groundwater end members (Fig. 2). The EMMA identified groundwater as the major contributor to stream flow (94%), with the rest attributed to soil solution (Table 3). For the smaller forest watershed at Nova Vida, stream observations also fell between the soil solution and groundwater end members, although with considerably more scatter. Groundwater was the largest contributor to stream flow (62%), while soil solution provided the remaining flow (38%) (Table 3).

In both pasture watersheds at Nova Vida, the stream observations were by overland flow, shallow soil solution and riparian groundwater (Fig. 2). The EMMA solutions for these two pasture catchments were nearly identical. Estimated contributions to flow from overland flow were 27 to 28%, from groundwater 26 to 30%, and from soil solution 43 to 46 % (Table 3).

In the forest watershed at Rancho Grande, stream observations for the first ("early") and second ("late") half of the rainy seasons were best bound by throughfall, groundwater, and shallow soil solution (Fig. 2). In the pasture, observations were distributed mostly between overland flow and groundwater, with less variability in streamwater tending towards soil solution (Fig. 2). Estimated contributions to flow for the entire rainy season in the Rancho Grande forest were 57% from throughfall, 24% from groundwater and 19% from shallow soil solution (Table 3). In the pasture watershed at Rancho Grande, overland flow dominated stream flow at 60%, groundwater contribution was 35%, and soil solution was 5% (Table 3).

In the mixed land use watershed at Vitória, the set of end-members that bounded the largest number of stream observations in the mixing diagram were upland groundwater, near-stream groundwater and pasture overland flow (Fig 2). The EMMA found flow contributions at 40% from upland groundwater, 23% from near stream groundwater, and 37% from pasture overland flow (Table 3).

The mixing diagram for the forest watershed at Juruena showed most of the baseflow stream observations distributed between the groundwater and the soil solution end members (Fig. 2). Stormflow observations appear chemically distinct and plotted closer to the overland flow end member on the mixing diagram (Fig. 2). To solve the EMMA we used groundwater, soil solution, and overland flow end members. Baseflow observations were solved as binary mixtures of the soil and groundwater end members given the distribution of the observation between these two components and the physical impossibility of overland flow to act as a source outside of precipitation events in this small (1.9 ha) watershed. Stormflow was solved as mixture of all three end members. Groundwater was as the main contributor to flow at approximately 60% during baseflow and stormflow, while soil solution provided the remaining 40% of baseflow (Table 3). The estimated contribution of overland flow to total stormflow was 21%.

In the forest watershed at La Cuenca, overland flow, soil solution, and groundwater were the end members that bounded the greatest number of stream observations in the mixing diagram (Fig. 2). The calculated contributions to flow were 45% from overland flow, 27% from soil solution and 28% from groundwater (Table 3).

In the pasture watershed at Nossa Senhora, most streamwater observations fell outside any potential mixing domain that could be created with any of the end members incorporated in the analysis, including those from the very similar pasture watershed at Rancho Grande (Fig. 2). Although, most stream observations plotted close to the overland flow end member, the observations tended towards the chemical signature of the Rancho Grande groundwater rather than that of groundwater. We solved the EMMA using overland flow, the Rancho Grande groundwater and soil solution end members. The contributions to flow calculated in this manner were 89% from overland flow,11% from groundwater and < 1% from soil solution.

Patterns as a function of watershed size

The contribution of overland flow as a source of stream flow was always greater in pasture watersheds than in forest watersheds of comparable size (Fig. 3). This was true both when contributions were considered as a fraction of total flow or as the instantaneous water yield over the time that flow was logged at each site (Fig. 4). The contribution from soil solution remained relatively constant across watershed size. For groundwater, no clear pattern emerged with land use, while its role as a proportion of total flow increased significantly with watershed size (Fig. 3).

Discussion

Application of EMMA to watershed studies is most commonly performed in small well-instrumented and well-sampled watersheds where a qualitative understanding of source contributions to stream flow is developed from a detailed understanding of basin characteristics and hydrometric sampling (Elsenbeer and Lack 1996; Hooper 2001; Chaves et al. 2008). In these cases, EMMA can be used to test specific hypotheses about sources to stream flow and to determine if all potential sources have been identified in the case that stream flow samples fall outside the mixing space (Hooper et al. 2001). We found a wide range in the extent to which streamwater samples fell within the mixing space determined by the sources for which solute concentrations were available. For example, streamwater samples in forests at Nova Vida, Rancho Grande and Juruena and the mixed watershed at Vitória were well constrained by the sources sampled, but the forest at La Cuenca and the pastures at Nova Vida, Rancho Grande and Nossa Senhora were not. This suggests potentially (1) the existence of sources of streamwater in these watersheds that were not sampled, or (2) sampling of sources that was insufficient to capture the true range of variability in space and time that actually contributes to stream flow. In the case of the Nova Vida pastures, for example, greater variation in the chemistry of overland flow or soil solution might capture some of the points outside the mixing space. While sampling of end members occurred concurrently with sampling of stream flow in these watersheds, none were sampled year-round at a frequency sufficient to capture the annual range of solute concentrations. In these cases where the mixing diagrams did not capture the full range of streamwater solute concentrations, EMMA indicated which additional sources might contribute and which sources may not have been adequately sampled.

We found that the proportional contribution to stream flow of water with chemical characteristics of overland flow was higher in pasture than in forest and that absolute flows from pasture were higher. This was consistent with measurements of soil hydraulic properties from Amazon forest and pasture that indicate that conversion to cattle pasture leads to reduction of surface soil infiltrability and hydraulic conductivity to the extent necessary to generate overland or near-surface horizontal flows (Zimmermann et al. 2006) and with direct hydrometric measurements of greatly enhanced flow from Amazon pasture watersheds (Biggs et al. 2006; Moraes et al. 2006; Germer et al. 2009, 2010). Moraes et al. (2006) and Germer et al. (2009) found 17- to 18-fold increases in overland flow in small (~1 ha) pasture compared with forest watersheds in Vitória and Rancho Grande.

The wide range of EMMA-derived overland flow contributions to stream flow (0 to 45%) in the forested watersheds was unexpected. We attribute this in part to the range in catchment size of our sites and in part to potentially a wide range in permeability change with depth. The highest contributions of overland flow occurred at Nossa Sehnora, Rancho Grande and La Cuenca. At La Cuenca, the decrease in permeability with depth was among most pronounced reported (Elsenbeer 2001). Given high rainfall totals and intensities, these captured a very small overall percentage of watershed runoff. For example, the forest stream at Rancho Grande captured 3 to 4% of total runoff (Chaves et al. 2009). So while the contribution of overland flow to stream flow in these streams was high and dominated by surficial flows, the total flow in these streams was small. The perennial streams in the larger watersheds at Nova Vida (watershed areas of 250 to 1,740 ha) captured larger flows from groundwater and any storm-derived flows from surficial flowpaths were small in comparison to flows derived from groundwater and soil solution.

At Nossa Sehnora, the groundwater table was several meters below the ground surface at the sampling point and direct observations of runoff processes during the storms suggested that all of the water sampled in the pasture watershed was generated by overland flow. Any contribution of groundwater determined from EMMA likely reflects the temporal variations in the chemical composition of overland flow, rather than actual contribution of groundwater to stream flow. The EMMA suggested that the contribution of soil water to stormflow from the hillslope was minimal and dominated by overland flow. Given these observations, appropriate endmembers for the Nossa Senhora site might include different types of overland flow that interacted with chemically distinct surface materials, such as cattle feces, vegetation, and surface litter.

The small spring-fed stream at Juruena was somewhat different in that <5% of annual stream flow was stormflow (Johnson et al. 2006). Using a purely hydrometrics approach resulted in an estimated runoff coefficient of 3% for 27 storms (Johnson et al. 2007). Using electrical conductivity as a tracer for hydrograph separation and the TRANSEP model (Johnson et al.

2007) found that stormflow averaged 4% across 14 rain events. The hydrochemical data required for the application of EMMA was only available for 3 storms for the Juruena catchment. While stormflow comprised <5 % of total annual stream flow at Juruena, Johnson et al. (2007) found stormflow consisted of 79% pre-event water and 21% event water. This TRANSEP-based estimate was consistent with the EMMA results for Juruena, which estimated the contribution of overland flow to total stormflow also at 21%. The Juruena stream was the exception to the finding that the groundwater contribution to stream flow increased with watershed size.

Several constraints limit the utility of EMMA for multiple watershed comparisons. First, the use of EMMA requires sampling of multiple flowpaths and sampling both flowpaths and streamwater at a frequency sufficient to capture the majority of seasonal variation in solute chemistry. Second, EMMA requires analysis of multiple solutes, so it is not possible to apply EMMA to studies generally conducted with other objectives that report results for only a single element or a limited set of elements. Third, EMMA assumes that solutes are conservative as they travel both from watersheds to streams and downstream in stream channels (Christophersen and Hooper 1992). While it is widely known that soils and stream channels play major roles in transforming concentrations of biologically active solutes (Qualls 2000; Peterson et al. 2001), fewer experiments have been conducted on elements such as calcium and potassium that along with chloride are typically components of EMMA. Despite these limitations, our application of EMMA across multiple watersheds indicated that EMMA revealed patterns across gradients of stream size and land cover that were consistent with patterns determined by detailed hydrometric sampling.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National Science Foundation (DEB-0315656, DEB-0640661), the NASA LBA Program (NCC5-686, NCC5-69, NCC5-705, NNG066E88A) and by grants from Brazilian agencies FAPESP (03/13172-2) and CNPq (20199/2005-5). We thank Paul Lefebvre for help drawing the Amazon Basin map.

References

Biggs TW, Dunne T, Muraoka T (2006) Transport of water, solutes and nutrients from a pasture hillslope, southwestern Brazilian Amazon. Hydrol Proc 20:2527-2547

Boyer EW, Hornberger G, Bencala E, McKnight DM (1997) Response characteristics of DOC flushing in an alpine catchment. Hydrol Proc 11:1635-1647

Burns DA, McDonnell JJ, Hooper RP, Peters NE, Freer JE, Kendall C, Beven K (2001) Quantifying contributions to storm runoff through end-member mixing analysis and hydrologic measurements at the Panola Mountain Research Watershed (Georgia, USA). Hydrol Proc 15:1903-1924

Buschbacher RJ (1986) Tropical deforestation and pasture development. Bioscience 36:22-28

Chaves JE, Neill C, Germer S, Gouveia Neto S, Krusche AV, Elsenbeer H (2008) Land management impacts on runoff sources in small Amazon watersheds. Hydrol Proc 22:1766-1775

Chaves J, Neill C, Germer S, Gouveia Neto S, Krusche AV, Castellanos Bonilla A, Elsenbeer H (2009) Nitrogen transformations in flowpaths leading from soils to streams in Amazon forest and pasture. Ecosystems 12:961-972.

Christophersen N, Hooper RP (1992) Multivariate analysis of streamwater chemical data: The use of principal components analysis for the end-member mixing problem. Water Resour Res 28:99-107

Christophersen N, Neal C, Hooper RP, Vogt RD, Andersen S (1990) Modelling streamwater chemistry as a mixture of soilwater end-members—a step towards second-generation acidification models. J Hydrol 116:307-320

Creed IF, Band LF, Foster NW, Morrison IK, Nicolson JA, Smekin RS, Jeffries DS (1996) Regulation of nitrate-N release from temperate forests: A test of the N flushing hypothesis. Water Resour Res 32:3337-3354

Davidson EA, Neill C, Krusche AV, Ballester MVR, Markewitz D, Figueiredo RO (2004) Loss of nutrients from terrestrial ecosystems to streams and the atmosphere following land use in Amazonia. In: DeFries RS, Asner GP, Houghton RA (eds), Ecosystems and Land Use Change. American Geophysical Union, Wash. DC, pp. 147-158

Elsenbeer H (2001) Hydrologic flowpaths in tropical rainforest soilscapes—a review. Hydrol Proc 15:715-1759

Elsenbeer H, Cassel DK, Castro J (1992) Spatial analysis of soil hydraulic conductivity in a tropical rainforest catchment. Water Resour Res 28:3201-3214

Elsenbeer H, Lack A (1996) Hydrometric and hydrochemical eveidence for fast flowpaths at La Cuenca, western Amazonia. J Hydrol 180:237-250

Elsenbeer H, Lack A, Cassel DK (1996) The stormflow chemistry at La Cuenca, western Amazonia. Interciencia 21:133-139

Elsenbeer H, Lorieri D, Bonell M (1995) Mixing model approaches to estimate stormflow sources in an overland flow-dominated tropical rain forest catchment. Water Resour Res 31:2267-2278

Fearnside PM (2005) Deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia: History, rates, and consequences. Conserv. Biol 19:680-688

Figueiredo RO, Markewitz D, Davidson EA, Schuler AE, Satrin O de S, Silva, P. de S (2010) Land-use efffects on the chemical attributes of low-order streams in the eastern Amazon. J. Geophys. Res 115, doi: 10.1029/2009JG001200.

Genereux DP, Hemond HF, Mulholland PJ (1993) Use of radon-222 and calcium as tracers in a three-end-member mixing model for stream flow generation on the West Fork of Walker Branch Watershed. J Hydrol 142:167-211

Germer S, Neill C, Vetter T, Chaves J, Krusche AV, Elsenbeer H (2009) Implications of long-term land-use change for the hydrology and solute budgets of small catchments in Amazonia. J Hydrol 364:349-363

Germer S, Neill C, Krusche AV, Elsenbeer H (2010) Influence of land-use change on near-surface hydrological processes: Undisturbed forest to pasture. J. Hydrol 380:473-480

Hill, A. 1990. Groundwater flow paths in relation to nitrogen chemistry in the near-stream zone. Hydrobiologia 206:39-52

Hill A, Devito RKJ, Campagnolo S, Sanmugadas K (2000) Subsurface denitrification in a forest riparian zone: Interactions between hydrology and supplies of nitrate and organic carbon. Biogeochem 51:193-223

Hooper RP (2001) Applying the scientific method to small catchment studies: a review of the Panola Mountain experience. Hydrol Proc 15:2039-2050

Hooper RP (2003) Diagnostic tools for mixing models of streamwater chemistry. Water Resour Res 39(3): doi:10.1029/2002WR001528.39:1055

INPE (Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (2010) Monitoramento da floresta Amazônica Brasileira por satelite: Projeto PRODES, São Jose dos Campos, Brazil

Johnson MS, Lehmann J, Couto EG, Filho JPN, Riha SJ (2006) DOC and DIC in flowpaths of Amazon headwater catchments with hydrologically contrasting soils. Biogeochem 81:45-57

Johnson MS, Lehmann J, Riha SJ, Krusche AV, Richey JE, Ometto JPHB, Couto EG (2008) CO_2 efflux from Amazonian headwater streams represents a significant fate for deep soil respiration. Geophys Res Lett 35: 1-5

Johnson MS, Weiler M, Coute EG, Riha SJ, Lehmann J (2007) Storm pulses of dissolved CO2 in a forested headwater Amazonian stream explored using hydrograph separation. Water Resour Res 43, W11201, doi:10.1029/2007WR006359

Liu F, Williams MW, Caine N (2004) Source waters and flow paths in an alpine catchment, Colorado Front Range, United States. Water Resour Res 40(9): doi:10.1029/2004 WR003076

Markewitz D, Davidson EA, Figueiredo RO, Victoria RL, Krusche AV (2001) Control of cation concentrations in streamwaters by surface soil processes in an Amazonian watershed. Nature 410:802-805

Markewitz D, Davidson EA, Moutinho P, Nepstad D (2004) Nutrient loss and redistribution after forest clearing on a highly weathered soil in Amazonia Ecological Applications 14:S177-S199

McClain ME, Boyer EW, Dent CL, Gergel SE, Grimm NB, Groffman PM, Hart SC, Harvey JW, Johnston CA, Mayorga E, McDowell WH, Pinay G (2003) Biogeochemical hot spots and hot moments at the interface of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. Ecosystems 6:301-312

Moraes JM, Schuler AE, Dunne T, Figueiredo RO, Victoria R (2006) Water storage and runoff processes in plinthic soils under forest and pasture in Eastern Amazonia. Hydrol Proc 20:2509-2526.

Mulholland PJ (1993) Hydrometric and stream chemistry evidence of three stormflowpaths in Walker Branch watershed. J Hydrol. 151:291-316

Neill C, Deegan LA, Thomas SM, Cerri CC (2001) Deforestation for pasture alters nitrogen and phosphorus in small Amazonian streams. Ecol Appl 11:1817–1828

Neill C, Deegan LA, Thomas SM, Haupert CL, Krusche AV, Ballester MVR, Victoria RL (2006) Deforestation alters the hydraulic and biogeochemical characteristics of small lowland Amazonian streams. Hydrol Proc 20:2563-2580

Qualls RG (2000) Comparison of the behavior of soluble organic and inorganic nutrients in forest soils. Forest Ecol Manage 138:29-50

Peterson BJ, Wollheim, WM, Mulholland PJ, Webster JR, Meyer JL, Tank JL, Maqrti E, Bowden WB, Valett HM, Hershey AE, McDowell WH, Dodds WK, Hamilton SK, Gregory SV, Morall DD (2001) Control of nitrogen export from watersheds by headwater streams. Science 292:86-90

R Development Core Team (2008) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Simon MF, Garagorry FL (2005) The expansion of agriculture in the Brazilian Amazon. Environ Conservation 32:203-212

Williams MR, Melack JM (1997) Solute export from forested and partially deforested chatchments in the central Amazon. Biogeochem 38:67-102

Zimmermann B, Elsenbeer H, de Moraes JM (2006) The influence of land-use changes on soil hydraulic properties: Implications for runoff generation. Forest Ecol Manage 222:29-38

Table 1

Location and characteristics of catchments used in this study. Rainfall and baseflow were in the year that stream flow samples were collected. Ephemeral streams had flow during rain events. The intermittent stream had flow during the rainy season but not most of the dry season.

No.	Location	Land cover	Area ha	Rainfall mm	Baseflow L s^{-1}	Flow type, soil	Source
1	Nova Vida, Rondônia	Forest	1 740	1 939	15	Perennial, Ultisol	Neill et al. 2001
2	Nova Vida, Rondônia	Forest	250	1 939	10	Perennial, Ultisol	Neill et al. 2001
3	Nova Vida, Rondônia	Pasture	130	1 939	15	Perennial, Ultisol	Neill et al. 2001
4	Nova Vida, Rondônia	Pasture	720	1 939	18	Perennial, Ultisol	Neill et al. 2001
5	Rancho Grande, Rondônia	Forest	1.4	2 300	0	Ephemeral, Ultisol	Germer et al. 2009
6	Rancho Grande, Rondônia	Pasture	0.7	2 300	<1	Intermittent, Ultisol	Germer et al. 2009
7	Vitória, Pará	Mixed	13,968	1 803	800	Perennial, Oxisol	Markewitz et al. 2004
8	Juruena, Mato Grosso	Forest	1.9	2 379	0.7	Perennial, Ultisol	Johnson et al. 2006
9	La Cuenca, Perú	Forest	0.7	3 300	0	Ephemeral, Ultisol	Elsenbeer et al. 1996
10	Nossa Senhora, Rondônia	Pasture	3.9	1 918	0	Ephemeral, Ultisol	Biggs et al. 2006

Table 2

Chemical tracers and end members selected for EMMA analysis at each site.

No.	Location	Land cover	Tracers used in EMMA	End members selected
1	Nova Vida, RO	Forest	Na^+, K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^+	Riparian groundwater , soil solution
2	Nova Vida, RO	Forest	Na^+, K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^+	Riparian groundwater , soil solution
3	Nova Vida, RO	Pasture	K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^+	Overland flow, riparian groundwater, soil solution
4	Nova Vida, RO	Pasture	K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^+	Overland flow, riparian groundwater, soil solution
5	Rancho Grande, RO	Forest	Na^+, K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^+	Throughfall, groundwater, soil solution
6	Rancho Grande, RO	Pasture	K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^+	Overland flow, groundwater, soil solution
7	Vitória, PA	Mixed	SO_4^{2-}, K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^+	Upland groundwater, near-stream groundwater, pasture overland flow
8	Juruena, MT	Forest	Na^+, K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^+	Spring groundwater, overland flow, soil solution
9	La Cuenca, Peru	Forest	K^+, Si, Ca^+	Overland flow, groundwater, soil solution
10	Nossa Senhora, RO	Pasture	Cl^-, Na^+, K^+	Overland flow, groundwater, soil solution

Table 3

Proportions of end members derived from the EMMA solution at each site. For Juruena, separate analyses were performed for stormflow ([a]) and baseflow ([b]).

No.	Location	Land cover	Overland Flow/ Troughfall (%)	Groundwater (%)	Soil solution (%)
1	Nova Vida, RO	Forest	0	94	6
2	Nova Vida, RO	Forest	0	62	38
3	Nova Vida, RO	Pasture	28	26	46
4	Nova Vida, RO	Pasture	27	30	43
5	Rancho Grande, RO	Forest	57	24	19
6	Rancho Grande, RO	Pasture	60	35	5
7	Vitória, PA	Mixed	37	63	0
8	Juruena, MT	Forest	21[a] (0)[b]	57[a] (60)[b]	22[a] (40)[b]
9	La Cuenca, Peru	Forest	45	28	27
10	Nossa Senhora, RO	Pasture	89	11	< 1

Figure Legends

Figure 1

Location of small watershed studies in the Brazilian Amazon Basin used in this study. The extent of the Amazon River drainage basin is highlighted. Numbers correspond to sites in Table 1.

Figure 2

Two-dimensional mixing diagrams created by EMMA for each watershed. Points represent streamwater concentrations and are coded by discharge (scale bar units are L s-1) Abbreviations are GW (groundwater), OF (overland flow), R (rain), TF (throughfall). Soil 20 and Soil 100 indicate soil solution collected in lysimeters at 20 and 100 cm depth. For Nossa Senhora, rgGW indicates groundwater collected at Rancho Grande. For Fazenda Vitoria, overland flow was from forest (F) and pasture (P), and groundwater was from upland (up), a near-stream zone (ns) and the stream hyporheic zone (hyp).

Figure 3

Proportions of throughfall or overland flow, soil solution and groundwater end members as a percentage of total stream flow plotted against watershed area for all sites. Land cover is forest (F), pasture (P) or mixed (M).

Figure 4

Instantaneous water yield (mm h^{-1}) of throughfall or overland flow, soil solution and groundwater end members plotted against watershed area for all sites. Land cover is forest (F), pasture (P) or mixed (M).