



HAL
open science

Combining hillslope erosion and river connectivity models to assess large scale fine sediment transfers: Application over the Rhône River (France)

Clément Fabre, Mathieu Fressard, Simone Bizzi, Flora Branger, Hervé Piegay

► To cite this version:

Clément Fabre, Mathieu Fressard, Simone Bizzi, Flora Branger, Hervé Piegay. Combining hillslope erosion and river connectivity models to assess large scale fine sediment transfers: Application over the Rhône River (France). *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 2024, 49 (10), pp.3027-3045. 10.1002/esp.5874 . hal-04678894

HAL Id: hal-04678894

<https://hal.science/hal-04678894v1>

Submitted on 27 Aug 2024

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.

Combining hillslope erosion and river connectivity models to assess large scale fine sediment transfers: application over the Rhône River (France).

Clément Fabre^{1,*}, Mathieu Fressard^{1,4}, Simone Bizzi², Flora Branger³, Hervé Piegay¹

¹*Univ. Lyon, University Lumière Lyon 2, UMR 5600 CNRS-Environnement Ville Société – LYON, F-69007, France.*

²*Department of Geosciences, University of Padova, 35122 Padua, Italy*

³*INRAE, UR RiverLy, Centre de Lyon-Grenoble, Villeurbanne, France*

⁴*Normandie Univ., University of Caen Normandie, UMR 6266 CNRS-Identité et Différenciation de l'Espace, de l'Environnement et des Sociétés – CAEN, F-14000, France*

Abstract:

Sediment connectivity at the catchment scale includes the processes linking sediment sources, sinks and the river outlet. Soil erosion models usually estimate yields without considering riverine processes or human infrastructures that may affect sediment connectivity. Quantifying these processes at a large scale is determinant to understanding sediment transfers from the continental lands to the marine ecosystems. This study tries to fill this gap by coupling the soil erosion model WaTEM/SEDEM (WS) with the riverine connectivity tool CASCADE to quantify sediment fluxes in the Rhône watershed. The coupling returned a good fitting with deviations of -51.7%. WS alone predict better the exported fluxes with a deviation of -34.9%. Nevertheless, this paper shows the importance of considering connectivity and transport capacity to develop a more realistic representation of fine sediment dynamics at large scale. However, connectivity tools depend on the quality of the models (soil erosion and

27 hydrology) and the geomorphological data on which they depend, which is a limiting factor in
28 large-scale studies.

29

30 **Keywords: sediment connectivity; soil erosion models; suspended load; Rhône**

31

32 **1 Introduction**

33 Rivers are more than pipes transporting water. They play a significant role in carrying
34 sediments and depositing them downstream or into oceans (Zarfl and Dunn, 2022). These
35 transported materials shape river morphology and riverine ecosystems by conveying nutrients
36 and pollutants. Modifications in sediment fluxes and connectivity have huge impacts on the
37 stability of river systems and the biodiversity or the socioeconomic activities that rely on them
38 (Downs and Piegay, 2019; Kondolf et al., 2018; Zarfl and Dunn, 2022).

39 Anthropogenic disturbances on rivers, such as dams or intensive agriculture, impact
40 sediment supply and consequently lead to significant river-process shifts (Kondolf et al., 2014;
41 Richter et al., 2010; Vörösmarty et al., 2003). In addition, developing multiple dams creates a
42 trapping effect that may induce sediment starvation downstream. In this sense, the global
43 fluvial suspended load decreased by 50% between 1950 and 2010 (Syvitski et al., 2022).
44 Moreover, Kondolf (1997) showed that the large amounts of clear water delivered by dams
45 affect the geomorphology of riverbeds downstream, leading to ecosystem degradation. River
46 mouths are also threatened by this decrease in sediment delivery due to coastal degradation
47 and the shrinking of the river delta (Kondolf et al., 2018; 2022; Syvitski et al., 2009).

48 The concept of sediment connectivity has been used for decades to describe the source-
49 to-sink sediment transport dynamics (Heckmann et al., 2018; Najafi et al., 2021). It can be
50 defined as “the degree to which a catchment facilitates the transfer of water and sediment
51 through itself, through coupling relationships between its components; it reflects the (dis-
52)continuity of runoff and sediment pathways at a given point in time” (Heckmann et al., 2018).
53 It has proven helpful in characterising sediment distribution patterns (spatial and temporal),
54 sediment cascades, and channel aggradation and degradation processes (Borrelli et al., 2018;
55 Brierley et al., 2022; Cavalli et al., 2013). Several authors state that the application of numerical
56 models is necessary to develop and apply the concept (especially at a regional scale) since
57 the diversity of the processes involved at multiple spatiotemporal scales limits the feasibility of
58 empirical studies, as those in few occasions undertaken in small well-monitored catchments
59 (e.g. Fryirs et al., 2007; Heckmann et al., 2018; Schmitt et al., 2016).

60 For the numerical modelling of sediment transport at the regional scale, the scientific
61 community has developed two main types of models. The first class of models is soil erosion
62 models, which represent the detachment of fine sediment based on empirical relationships
63 mostly calibrated on soil particles affected by runoff processes depending on rainfall intensity
64 and land use type). These approaches mainly rely on the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE)
65 or its adaptations. They have been extensively applied to assess the erosion potential of
66 hillslopes and their connectivity to the river network (Panagos et al., 2015). Applications of
67 WaTEM/SEDEM (Borelli et al., 2018; Van Oost et al., 2000; Van Rompaey et al., 2001),
68 INVEST (Hamel et al., 2017; Hooftman et al., 2023; Posner et al., 2016) are good examples
69 of these attempts. These models almost completely neglect the complexity of geomorphic
70 processes from different types of detachment processes and surface processes (e.g.
71 landslides, runoff, and river processes) and consider rivers as pipes directly conveying
72 sediments to the catchment outlets.

73 Another family of models focuses on sediment connectivity and tries to address the
74 complexities of detachment and transport processes, but so far mostly focused on the semi-
75 quantitative representation of landscape sediment connectivity (Cossart and Fressard, 2017;
76 Fressard and Cossart, 2018; Heckmann et al., 2013; 2015). Recent efforts have been placed
77 to simulate contemporary (or short-term) sediment connectivity and transport in the more
78 realistic complexities of geomorphic surface processes occurring in a landscape (Baartman et
79 al., 2018; Bizzi et al., 2021; Czuba and Fofoula-Georgiou, 2015; Hirschberg et al., 2021; Khan
80 et al., 2021; Rossi et al., 2017; Schmitt et al., 2018).

81 In this context, we aim to contribute to filling a specific research gap with this work: coupling
82 a soil erosion model (European scale WaTEM/SEDEM model developed by Borelli et al., 2018)
83 with a river network sediment connectivity model (the CASCADE model – Schmitt et al., 2016;
84 Tangi et al., 2019). We conducted this research on the French part of the Rhône River as a
85 large set of validation data (i.e. Suspended Particulate Matter -SPM- field monitoring) was
86 made available in the framework of the *Rhône Sediment Observatory* (“Observatoire des
87 Sédiments du Rhône” – OSR; <http://graie.org/osr/>) and the Arc-Isère observatory (Thollet et
88 al., 2021).

89 First, we aimed to represent in a more realistic way how fine sediments are transported in
90 the fluvial network once they have been produced/generated on slopes and floodplains by
91 runoff processes by coupling the two model types. Both approaches will be compared and
92 discussed. We developed a stepwise comparison approach with a progressive rise in the
93 degree of complexity of the models to assess the benefits of this coupling. Second, we
94 estimated hot spots of sediment transport and deposition in the catchment with multiple

95 anthropogenic pressures. Finally, we discussed the benefits of such a model coupling and the
96 prospects of further research in this domain.

97


98 **2 Study area and observed data used for validation**

99 The Rhône River flows through ca. 800 km in Switzerland and the South-East of France
100 between its source in the Alps and its outlet in the Mediterranean Sea (Figure 1). The Rhône
101 watershed covers about 97,800 km². In this study, only the French part of the catchment is
102 studied, as the Swiss and the French parts are considered disconnected by Lake Geneva.

103 The French part of the Rhône covers 87,444 km², about 90% of the total area of the
104 catchment. It presents multiple human infrastructures with 22 hydroelectric dams on the main
105 river course (Dugué et al., 2015) and numerous dams in the main tributaries. Only two main
106 dams are considered in this study as they are known to interrupt sediment connectivity (Figure
107 1). The outlet is considered at the last main monitoring site (Beaucaire; station 25a on Figure
108 1), just upstream of the Rhône delta. The average discharge at this station is about 1,700 m³
109 s⁻¹. The Rhône watershed presents a marked climatic and geological diversity. The section
110 from Lake Geneva to the confluence with the Saône River in Lyon (called the “Upper Rhône”)
111 has a hydrological regime mainly influenced by snow and glacier melting. In this part, a few
112 tributaries flow to the Rhône River, including the Arve or the Ain. The Saône River, its largest
113 tributary in terms of discharge, is characterised by an oceanic pluvial regime, resulting in the
114 highest discharges occurring in winter. The Isère, the second main tributary, comes from the
115 Alps with a strong slope gradient and a snow-melt regime (highest discharges in summer).

116 Mediterranean hydroclimatic conditions influence the other southern tributaries. On the right
117 bank, the Ardèche or the Gardon show low average water discharges but short and violent
118 flash-flood events in autumn and spring. On the left bank, the Durance River, combining a
119 snow-melt regime and a Mediterranean influence, has less rapid flood events but delivers
120 higher discharges. The Rhône River ends its course surrounding the Camargue delta and flows
121 in the Mediterranean Sea.

122 Since 2009, SPM transport has been monitored at the outlet of the main tributaries of the
123 Rhône River and along the mainstem within the OSR framework. The locations of the
124 monitoring sites are shown in Figure 1.



125

126
127
128

Figure 1: The river network of the Rhône River and its main tributaries. The sampling stations used in this study cover multiple parts of the mainstream and several tributaries of the Rhône catchment. Details on the stations can be found in Table 1. The arrow designates the flow direction.

129

130

131

132
133

Table 1: Sampling stations used in the study and corresponding streams. Locations of the stations can be found in Figure 1

Station number	Station	Stream
1	Genève	Arve
2	Motz	Fier
3	Belmont	Guiers
4	Bugey	Upper Rhône
5	Creys	Upper Rhône
6	Tignieu-Jamezieu	Bourbre
7	Pont-de-Chazey	Ain
8	Jons	Upper Rhône
9	Lyon	Saône
10	Givors	Gier
11	Andancette	Rhône
12	Saint-Sorlin-d'Arves	Arvan
13	Villette	Arvan
14	Saint-Jean-de-Maurienne	Arvan
15	Pontamafrey	Arc
16	Chamousset	Arc
17	Montmelian	Isère
18	Grenoble	Isère
19	Beaumont-Monteux	Isère
20	Livron	Drôme
21	Cruas	Rhône
22	Saint-Martin-d'Ardèche	Ardèche
23	Bonpas	Durance
24	Remoulins	Gardon
25a	Beaucaire	Rhône
25b	Arles	Rhône


134

135 The monitoring network is based on the *Rhône Sediment Observatory* (OSR) program. It
136 includes 25 sampling stations covering multiple catchments of various sizes (Figure 1; Table
137 1). The monitoring network consists of the permanent survey of water level (with regular
138 gauging to derive flow) and turbidity (with regular samplings to derive SPM concentration and
139 thus fluxes). More information on the monitoring network can be found in Thollet et al. (2021)
140 and Lepage et al. (2021). Six stations are located on the Rhône corridor. The others are mainly
141 located on the major tributaries close to the confluence with the Rhône River. The historical
142 outlet gauging station at Beaucaire (station 25a) covers 98% of the catchment area. For SPM
143 concentrations, measurements from the Arles station (station 25b), located 4km downstream
144 of the Beaucaire station, were used. SPM concentrations at Beaucaire are assumed to be
145 close to those measured at Arles. Five other stations deliver SPM concentrations at different
146 stages of the Rhône corridor (Figure 1). Most tributaries are covered by one station at their
147 outlet except for the Isère catchment, which presents eight stations, including those of the Arc
148 River and the Arvan River (Thollet et al., 2021; Figure 1). Our period of study is between 2010
149 and 2019.

150

151 **3 Materials and methods**

152 Two models have been acquired or constructed over the study area to model fine sediment
153 transfers. Models outputs were compared to SPM fluxes monitored in the 23 sampling stations
154 regularly distributed over the catchment. Figure 2 presents a general flow chart of the
155 employed methodology and main parameters used to construct the two models.



156

157 *Figure 2: General flow chart of the methodology used in this study.*

158

159 **3.1 Soil erosion models**


160 **3.1.1 The WaTEM/SEDEM (WS) model**

161 Borelli et al. (2018) modelled the long-term annual rates of soil loss, sediment transfer and
162 deposition in $\text{Mg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$ at the European scale using the Water and Tillage Erosion Model
163 (WaTEM/SEDEM, Van Oost et al., 2000). WaTEM/SEDEM (WS) is an extension of the
164 Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) model from Panagos et al. (2015). Based on
165 topography and land cover, the eroded material estimated with RUSLE by Panagos et al.
166 (2015; Model 1) is routed to the nearest stream according to a transport capacity formula.
167 Therefore, part of the eroded material estimated by RUSLE is deposited before reaching the
168 nearest stream (about 85% of the total amount at the European scale). WS at the European
169 scale was developed with a high-resolution (25 m) digital elevation model (DEM). Borelli et al.

170 (2018) provide more details on the model calibration. The model can be downloaded at
171 <https://esdac.jrc.ec.europa.eu/themes/sediment-transport-using-watemsedem>.

172 3.1.2 Soil loss estimates by soil erosion models

173 Figure 3 details the net soil loss rates estimated by both models at the scale of the French
174 part of the Rhône catchment. By considering deposition before entering rivers, Borelli et al.
175 (2018) showed that only 15.3% of the total eroded soil estimated by RUSLE at the European
176 scale is routed to the streams in WS. In the Rhône catchment, the average net soil loss
177 estimated by is $0.98 \pm 4.35 \text{ Mg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$. As a comparison, RUSLE returns a sediment yield of
178 $4.30 \pm 5.96 \text{ Mg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$ at the Rhône scale (Panagos et al., 2015), resulting in a Sediment
179 Delivery Ratio of 22.8%, slightly higher than the European average. It is important to note that
180 WS does not evaluate soil loss in areas that are not prone to soil erosion, such as urban areas,
181 bare rocks, glaciers, wetlands, lakes, rivers, and inland waters (Borelli et al., 2018). Therefore,
182 high-elevated areas, especially in the Alps, do not have net soil loss values.



183

184 Figure 3: Net soil loss rates (in $\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{y}^{-1}$) estimated by the WaTEM/SEDEM model (25m resolution) from Borelli
185 et al. (2018) at the Rhône scale.

186 **3.2 Sediment connectivity tool: the CASCADE model**

187 3.2.1 Presentation

188 The CAthment Sediment Connectivity And Delivery (CASCADE) model was developed
189 by Schmitt et al. (2016, 2018). It provides information regarding sediment connectivity at the
190 river network scale by combining graph theory and sediment transport modelling (Tangi et al.,
191 2019). The main advantage of CASCADE is the quantification of sediment loads with spatial
192 information about their provenance and destination. It is achieved by simulating the fate of
193 sediment loads and their interaction with downstream processes. CASCADE was developed
194 to provide spatial information on sediment transport processes and the impacts of alterations
195 in the river network, such as human infrastructures.

196 As inputs, CASCADE requires a river network as a succession of nodes and reaches.
197 Hydromorphologic attributes related to sediment transport are assigned to each reach (slope,
198 length, drained area, discharge, active channel width, grain size distribution, and Manning's
199 roughness coefficient). These attributes are used to calculate the transport capacity of each
200 reach, i.e. the amount of energy available to transport sediment of a specific size. The user
201 can choose between the following four sediment transport formulas: Engelund and Hansen
202 (1967), Wilcock and Crowe (2003), Wong and Parker (2006), and Yang (1973) and others can
203 be implemented by the users if needed. These transport formulas mainly represent bed-
204 material load (Church, 2006) with emphasis on bedload or suspended load according to the
205 formula implemented.

To estimate fine sediment (< 8 mm) transport in CASCADE, several adaptations have been
206 necessary. Indeed, CASCADE adopts common sediment transport formula developed in the
207 literature. Sediment transport formulas tend in the vast majority to represent the bed material
and not the suspended load that we are aiming in this paper. Therefore, we modified the
208 original version of the model to set a limit of transported materials as the total fine sediment
209 reaching the river as estimated by the WaTEM/SEDEM model.

210

211

212 Concerning external sources and barriers, the user can add dams that retain materials or
213 sediment sources from the hillslopes or riverbanks.

214 CASCADE is a static model simulating the instantaneous sediment transport fluxes in each
215 reach for a single discharge value. By looping over the different discharge quantiles,
216 CASCADE can represent the dynamic of the mean hydrological cycle. Details on the
217 functioning of CASCADE can be found on the model website (<http://cascade.deib.polimi.it/>) or
218 in Tangi et al. (2019).

219 3.2.2 Modelling inputs

220 3.2.2.1 River Network

221 River network delineation was done using the TopoToolbox (Figure 1; Schwanghart and
222 Scherler, 2014). TopoToolbox comprises Matlab functions that analyse relief and flow
223 pathways in digital elevation models (DEMs). TopoToolbox can delineate river networks and
224 calculate the terrain attributes CASCADE requires, such as slope. More information on the
225 TopoToolbox can be found at <https://topotoolbox.wordpress.com/>. We used the BD Alti® as
226 the source DEM (<https://geoservices.ign.fr/bdalti>) with a resolution of 25m. Pre-processing
227 based on Wang and Liu (2006) fill sinks algorithm were performed before implementing it in
228 CASCADE.

229 We selected the Rhône corridor and its main tributaries to be part of the modelled network
230 as fine sediment is sampled at their outlets. We also added the Arc and the Arvan rivers (Figure
231 1) because of the high amount of monitoring data available in the Arc-Isère observatory (Thollet
232 et al., 2021). The stream reaches were partitioned manually by using breaknodes separating
233 reaches assumed to have different geomorphological characteristics.

234 3.2.2.2 Discharge

235 Discharge data were extracted from the distributed hydrological model J2000-Rhône
236 (Branger et al., 2016; Morel et al., 2023). J2000-Rhône is an adaptation of the hydrologic model
237 J2000 on the Rhône River catchment (Krause, 2001). As J2000, J2000-Rhône is based on
238 Hydrological Response Units (HRUs). These HRUs have homogeneous landscape
239 characteristics, such as slope, altitude, soils, or land use, and delineate areas that are
240 assumed to be subject to similar hydrological processes. The version of J2000-Rhône from
241 which we extracted discharge data includes multiple dams. The river network from J2000-
242 Rhône differ from the river network delineated by TopoToolbox and used in this study.
243 Therefore, for each stream of the river network, we manually attributed the corresponding
244 stream in J2000-Rhône to represent the evolution of discharge along the Rhône River and its
245 main tributaries.

246 Simulated yearly average discharges over the 2010-2019 period are within the range of
247 observed values at the different monitoring sites, with a slight underestimation of 11.6% (Table
248 2).

249 To estimate annual sediment fluxes, CASCADE processes with yearly discharge quantiles.
250 In this study, we used the following quantiles (0.1, 10, 30, 50, 70, 90, 99.9, and 100% of water
251 discharges) to represent the different hydrologic conditions. Therefore, we calculated these
252 quantiles for each stream of the CASCADE river network.

253
254

Table 2: Comparison of observed and simulated yearly average water discharges with J2000-Rhône at the different monitoring sites over the 2010-2019 period.

Station number	Station	Stream	Obs. (m ³ s ⁻¹)	Sim. (J2000; m ³ s ⁻¹)	Bias (%)
1	Genève	Arve	73.9	60.1	-18.7
2	Motz	Fier	41.2	33.7	-18.2
3	Belmont	Guiers	16.0	15.3	-4.5
4	Bugey	Upper Rhône	-	444.5	
5	Creys	Upper Rhône	457.0	438.7	-4.0
6	Tignieu-Jameyzieu	Bourbre	7.7	8.6	12.9
7	Pont-de-Chazey	Ain	123.0	95.2	-22.6
8	Jons	Upper Rhône	457.0	562.4	23.1
9	Lyon	Saône	473.0	445.8	-5.8
10	Givors	Gier	3.2	3.4	6.6
11	Andancette	Rhône	-	1046.9	
12	Saint-Sorlin-d'Arves	Arvan	1.2	1.0	-17.5
13	Villette	Arvan	1.2	1.0	-13.3
14	Saint-Jean-de-Maurienne	Arvan	2.8	2.4	-15.4
15	Pontamafrey	Arc	30.0	18.0	-40.1
16	Chamousset	Arc	49.1	56.2	14.6
17	Montmelian	Isère	121.0	99.4	-17.8
18	Grenoble	Isère	178.0	117.7	-33.9
19	Beaumont-Montoux	Isère	333.0	227.2	-31.8
20	Livron	Drôme	20.0	14.4	-28.2
21	Cruas	Rhône	-	1344.0	
22	Saint-Martin-d'Ardèche	Ardèche	65.0	58.2	-10.4
23	Bonpas	Durance	190.0	141.2	-25.7
24	Remoulins	Gardon	32.7	31.8	-2.7
25a	Beaucaire	Rhône	1690.0	1660.8	-1.7
Average					-11.6

255

256 3.2.2.3 Active flow width

257 Morel et al. (2019) calculated active flow widths for every stream in France, including the
258 Rhône River. In this study, we used their formula based on the discharge as follows:


$$259 W_i^{(ac)} = a Q_i^b$$

260 where $W_i^{(ac)}$ is the active flow width for stream i (m), Q_i is the discharge for stream i (m³.s⁻¹),
261 a is a parameter specific to the geomorphology of the catchment, while b is linked to the
262 riverbed characteristics, particularly the changes of active flow widths regarding discharge
263 variations. a and b are determined for each stream based on Morel et al. (2019).

264 3.2.2.4 Manning-Strickler coefficients

265 Manning-Strickler coefficients (n) were calculated for each reach based on multiple
266 observations available in the scientific literature and technical reports (Figure 4). Correlations
267 were computed between n and hydromorphological parameters, such as slope, active flow

268 width, or average discharge in the considered streams, which are variables used to determine
 269 n (Manning et al., 1890). Each of these correlations was made independently for each stream,
 270 and the final value was selected based on the best-fitting regression analysis. For most
 271 streams, slope was found to be the best variable for predicting n , agreeing with experimental
 272 studies (Hessel et al., 2003; Marcus et al., 1992). All correlations are in Appendix 1 and some
 273 of them can be found in Figure 4 as examples.



274
 275 *Figure 4: Manning-Strickler coefficients (n) for several tributaries and the Rhône corridor based on observations*
 276 *and hydromorphological parameters. Data comes from Dugué (2009) and from the CARHYCE project*
 277 *(<https://carhyce.eaufrance.fr/>). Q stands for discharge.*

278
 279 CASCADE needs to define the modelled sediment classes based on the Φ scale
 280 (Krumbein, 1934), which is a logarithmic scale describing grain size and computed as follows:

281
$$\Phi = -\log_2 \frac{D}{D_0}$$

282 where Φ is the Krumbein phi scale, D is the diameter of the particle in millimetres, and D_0 is a
 283 reference diameter, equal to 1 mm, kept to make the equation dimensionally consistent.

284 In this study, we intend to simulate suspended load. Usually, grains smaller than 0.125 mm
 285 tend to travel in suspension (Wilcock et al., 2009). Coarse grains (> 8 mm) tend to travel as
 286 bedload. In between, grains travel as bedload or suspended load, depending on the strength
 287 of the flow (Wilcock et al., 2009). As we chose to simulate fine sediment, we chose to simulate
 288 particles with a diameter between 0.001 and 8 mm, i.e., a ϕ value between -3 and 10 (Table

289 3). Part of the simulated flux might be transported by bed load, but we assume it is negligible
290 compared to the total suspended load by restricting ϕ values between -3 and 10.

291 *Table 3: Classification of grains in CASCADE to simulate suspended load based on Krumbein (1934).*

Classification	Φ scale	Size (mm)
Silt/Clay	4 to 10	0.001 – 0.062
Sand	-1 to 4	0.062 – 2
Gravel	-3 to -1	2 - 8

292

293 3.2.2.5 *Transport capacity formula*

294 CASCADE integrates several transport capacity formulas adapted to each sediment
295 particle size class simulated. This paper assesses how well CASCADE can simulate fine
296 sediment transport mainly supplied by soil erosion models such as WS. We used the Yang
297 formula among the available transport capacity formulas (Yang, 1973). This formula is a total
298 load transport equation which bases transport on stream power, the product of velocity and
299 shear stress. The equation comprises two separate relations for sand and gravel transport. In
300 this study, we decided to use the relation for sand transport, as a part of the sand is transported
301 within the suspended load (Krumbein, 1934; Wilcock et al., 2009).

302 3.2.2.6 *Dams*

303 In large watersheds such as the Rhône, dams have impacts on the water cycle and may
304 be able to trap fine sediment. Multiple dams are located on the Rhône corridor and its
305 tributaries. In this study, where we focus on fine sediment transfer at a yearly timescale, we
306 only considered the largest dams directly influencing downstream transport. On the modelled
307 network, we included two large dams (Serre-Ponçon on the Durance River and Vouglans on
308 the Ain River; Figure 1) that are known to interrupt the sediment connectivity (their trapping
309 coefficient of fine sediment in CASCADE was set to 100%). Other dams known to interrupt the
310 sediment connectivity are in the Drac and the Verdon subcatchments. They were considered
311 by not providing fine sediment sources to the streams in these two subcatchments (Figure 1).
312 Other facilities were not considered as we assume their influence on fine sediment connectivity
313 is negligible at a yearly timescale, since regular flushes (yearly in the Alps) are performed to
314 avoid sediment accumulation upstream. Only their influence on discharge was considered, as
315 they are included in J2000-Rhône.

316 3.2.2.7 *Suspended sediment grain size distribution and sediment sources*

317 Regular grain size distribution measurements of SPM (about one sample per month) were
318 conducted at each monitoring station used in this study. They were collected in the framework
319 of the *Rhône Sediment Observatory* (OSR; <http://graie.org/osr/>). Locations of the
320 measurements can be found in Figure 1. Table 4 shows the average grain size distribution of

321 the suspended load for each sampling station. Data were not available for each tributary. For
 322 these streams, we attributed the values from the closest station downstream, e.g., the Jons
 323 station on the Rhône corridor for the Guiers, the Ain, and the Bourbre rivers.

324 *Table 4: Average suspended sediment grain size distribution (D_{10} , D_{50} , and D_{90}) for each stream during the period*
 325 *of study. The closest station with grain size distribution data is selected. Values are estimated based on the Rhône*
 326 *Sediment Observatory and the Arc-Isère databases.*

Stream (or section)	Selected station (station number)	D_{10} (mm)	D_{50} (mm)	D_{90} (mm)
Arve	Jons (8)	$3.38 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$9.91 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Fier	Motz (2)	$2.81 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.34 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$7.30 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Guiers	Jons (8)	$3.38 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$9.91 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Ain	Jons (8)	$3.38 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$9.91 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Bourbre	Jons (8)	$3.38 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$9.91 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Saône	Lyon (9)	$2.67 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.22 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$4.34 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Gier	Givors (10)	$6.57 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.79 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$8.52 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Arvan	Beaumont-Montoux (19)	$4.39 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.98 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.49 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Arc	Beaumont-Montoux (19)	$4.39 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.98 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.49 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Isère	Beaumont-Montoux (19)	$4.39 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.98 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.49 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Drôme	Livron (20)	$2.60 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.08 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$7.04 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Ardèche	Saint-Martin-d'Ardèche (22)	$5.28 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.59 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$8.88 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Durance	Bonpas (23)	$2.75 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.79 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.67 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Gardon	Remoulins (24)	$6.07 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.51 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$7.60 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Rhône (from Geneva Lake to Jons)	Jons (8)	$3.38 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$9.91 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.57 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Rhône (from Jons to Andancette)	Andancette (11)	$3.17 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.61 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.88 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Rhône (from Andancette to Arles)	Arles (25b)	$4.54 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.97 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.55 \cdot 10^{-2}$

327

328 The transport of hillslope sediments to each stream of the river network was calculated
 329 based on the WS model (Borelli et al., 2018) described in section 3.1. This model provides
 330 long-term averages of annual soil loss and deposition rates at the European scale. For each
 331 reach in our river network, we delineated the area that drains directly to the reach and
 332 calculated the average soil loss rate in this area. Then, we attributed this value to each stream
 333 as the average soil loss rate of its drained hillslopes.

334 Concerning the granulometry of sources, we assumed that they are close to the values
 335 observed in the river. Therefore, we attributed to each sub-catchment the values of D_{10} , D_{50}
 336 and D_{90} from the closest monitoring station as shown in Table 4.

337

338 **4 Results**

339 **4.1 Models parameters and inputs**

340 4.1.1 The sediment sources models and their integration into CASCADE


341 The aggregation of the mean erosion rates at the scale of small sub-catchments allow (1)
 342 a first description of the location of sediment sources at the catchment scale and (2) the

343 integration of these inputs as sediment sources in the CASCADE framework. WS provides
344 erosion rates of $0.98 \pm 4.35 \text{ Mg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$ for the whole Rhône catchment, ranging from 0 to
345 $1318.3 \text{ Mg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$.

346 Figure 5 shows sub-catchment scale aggregated sediment transport to the river network
347 modelled using WS. Higher erosion rates characterise the alpine region. It is particularly true
348 regarding the central alpine massifs, including the upstream Isère, the Arc and the upstream
349 Durance valleys. On the contrary, several alpine catchments show lower sediment transport
350 rates, probably due to catchment connectivity properties (e.g., southeastern basins, upstream
351 Durance). The Saône catchment (Figure 1) and most central and southern catchments show
352 relatively low sediment transfers to rivers, mainly between 0 and $0.05 \text{ Mg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$).

353 A comparison between these soil loss rates calculated by WS and the SPM monitored at
354 gauging stations will be provided in section 4.3.

355




356

357 *Figure 5: Estimates of net erosion with WaTEM/SEDEM in each sub-catchment. Sources from hatched*
358 *subcatchments are set to $0 \text{ Mg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{y}^{-1}$ due to dams influence.*

359 4.1.2 Stream network parameters of the CASCADE model

360 The average values of the four main parameters enabling CASCADE to predict sediment
 361 yield are presented in Figure 6. A classical progressive discharge rise from upstream to
 362 downstream can be observed with a maximum value of $1,625 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ at the catchment outlet
 363 (Figure 6a). At the regional scale, the map illustrates the significant contribution of the
 364 upstream part of the Rhône and the Saône rivers to the total discharge. Alpine catchments
 365 (i.e., Isère and Durance) also contribute significantly to the Rhône discharge. The active flow
 366 width is directly deduced from discharge and thus shows a consistent pattern at the regional
 367 scale (Figure 6b).

368



369

370 *Figure 6: Details on the average values of the main CASCADE parameters (a: discharge, b: active flow width, c:*
 371 *Manning's coefficient, d: D50) in each stream.*

372 The mean Manning-Strickler coefficient is 0.184 (Figure 6c). It is irregularly distributed over
 373 the catchment. The Rhône corridor is characterised by the lowest values, from 0 to 0.05.

374 Conversely, the highest values are located upstream of the main Alpine watersheds (i.e., the
375 Fier and the Isère rivers), and upstream of the Saône and the Ain rivers. The Ardèche is also
376 characterised by high Manning-Strickler coefficients. On their downstream parts, the main
377 tributaries (Saône, Drôme, Isère, Durance) have low to average values (between 0.05 and
378 0.08).


379 Regarding grain size distribution (Figure 6d), the Saône River stands out for the low D50
380 values observed (i.e., between below 0.01 mm). The other tributaries and the Rhône corridor
381 show higher values. Most of the rivers present a general pattern organised as a progressive
382 decrease of the D50 from upstream (values above 0.11 mm) to downstream (between 0.04
383 and 0.06 mm).

384 **4.2 Sediment fluxes and deposition returned by WS/CASCADE**

385 WS/CASCADE (Model 2) shows relatively consistent patterns at the regional scale, even
386 if absolute values differ (Figure 7).

387 The Isère, Saône, and Durance rivers are the main contributors to the total fine sediment
388 fluxes (respectively 0.43, 0.50, 0.41 Tg.y⁻¹) and show a progressive rise from up to
389 downstream. The upper Rhône (from Geneva Lake to Lyon) is also characterised by important
390 sediment fluxes (0.31 Tg.y⁻¹ at Jons) with major contributions from the Arve (0.07 Tg.y⁻¹) and
391 the Ain rivers (0.05 Tg.y⁻¹). The other smaller tributaries show lower contributions to total fluxes.

392 Very few sections show significant deposition patterns. The main deposition areas can be
393 found directly upstream of the two main dams that were included in the models (i.e., Serre-
394 Ponçon – Durance- and Vouglans – Ain). The lower valleys of the Ardèche River and the Fier
395 River, characterised by large and flat floodplains, also show wide deposition patterns directly
396 linked to the shallow slopes of these reaches.



397

398 *Figure 7: Transported (a) and deposited (b) fine sediment in Tg y⁻¹ evaluated in Model 2 in each reach.*


399

400 **4.3 Comparison between models and validation**

401 Figure 8 compares the modelled fine sediment fluxes using the two models tested in this
 402 paper with the mean interannual fluxes monitored at the 25 sampling stations. Both models
 403 are well correlated with observed fluxes with Pearson correlation coefficients above 0.85,
 404 returning slight underestimations for most of the monitoring sites. Model 1 slightly
 405 underestimates the exports (-34.9% on average; Appendix 2).

406 By considering Model 1 as sediment sources for CASCADE, the resulting estimates are
 407 decreasing, indicating the occurrence of significant sediment deposition potential in the river
 408 network (-51.7% on average with Model 2).

409 Following these results, Model 1 provides the best fitting with the observed values. In
 410 contrast, Model 2 provides relatively satisfying results that remain within the order of magnitude
 411 of the observed data, even if it underestimates sediment fluxes.




412

413 *Figure 8: Comparison between observed and simulated fluxes for Model 1 (left) and Model 2 (right). Fluxes*
 414 *simulated by Model 1 are soil loss rates considering that all sediment entering the stream cannot deposit while*
 415 *fluxes simulated by Model 2 are in-stream fluxes. The legend is ordered based on the tributaries entering the Rhône*
 416 *corridor from upstream to downstream.*

417

418 Figure 9 shows the deviation between observed and simulated fluxes at each monitoring
 419 site. It highlights the general underestimation of Models 1 and 2. For Model 1, exports from
 420 eastern streams coming from the Alps (mainly the Arve, the Isère, and the Durance rivers)
 421 present the largest underestimations. Concerning Model 2, few exports are well predicted
 422 (Appendix 2), such as the Bourbre River (+8.1%), the Gardon River (-4.6%), or the Guiers
 423 River (-19.8%). Others are overestimated, like the Gier River (+78.0%) or the Saône River
 424 (+53.1%). The exports from the remaining rivers are underestimated. By focusing on the most
 425 significant fluxes, the deviation at the Rhône outlet is mainly due to an underestimation of the
 426 Durance export that propagates downstream.



427

428 *Figure 9: Relative differences between observed and simulated fluxes at each monitoring station with WS (left) and*
 429 *WS/CASCADE (right). Fluxes simulated WS are soil loss rates considering that all sediment entering the stream*
 430 *cannot deposit while fluxes simulated by WS/CASCADE are in-stream fluxes. Details on the values can be found*
 431 *in Appendix 2.*

432

433 **4.4 In-stream deposition and sediment connectivity of the main tributaries to the** 434 **Rhône corridor**

435 Table 5 details the amount of deposited materials estimated by Model 2 in each sub-
 436 catchment. It shows that most of the deposition occurs in the Durance River (58.4%), especially
 437 in the Serre-Ponçon dam, one of the most important dams in the Rhône catchment, followed
 438 by the Fier (16.4%) and the Ardèche (13.5%) rivers. At the sub-catchment scale, most of the
 439 materials entering the stream in the Ardèche and the Fier deposits before being exported
 440 (59.0% and 80.1%, respectively). This can be explained by the shallow slopes in the
 441 downstream alluvial plains. The Ain and the Durance rivers are also poorly connected since
 442 about 30% of the flux is retained, mainly in dams.

443

444

445 *Table 5: Estimates of deposition and connectivity in each sub-catchment with WS/CASCADE. The connectivity is*
 446 *estimated by comparing the flux at the outlet to the total amount of sediment entering the stream.*

Stream	Deposition				Connectivity		
	Deposited material (Tg.y ⁻¹)	% of deposit in dams	% of deposit compared to flux simulated at monitoring site	% of the total deposit in the whole catchment	Flux exported (Tg.y ⁻¹)	Sources (Tg.y ⁻¹)	Connectivity (%)
Ain	2.0 10 ⁻²	99.9	30.5	6.2	4.5 10 ⁻²	6.5 10 ⁻²	69.6
Arc	1.0 10 ⁻⁶	-	7.5 10 ⁻⁴	3.1 10 ⁻⁴	1.3 10 ⁻¹	1.3 10 ⁻¹	100
Ardèche	4.3 10 ⁻²	-	59.0	13.5	3.0 10 ⁻²	7.3 10 ⁻²	41.0
Arvan	0	-	0	0	1.5 10 ⁻²	1.5 10 ⁻²	99.9
Arve	0	-	0	0	6.8 10 ⁻²	6.8 10 ⁻²	100
Bourbre	0	-	0	0	2.6 10 ⁻²	2.6 10 ⁻²	100
Drôme	3.2 10 ⁻³	-	4.0	1.0	7.7 10 ⁻²	8.0 10 ⁻²	96.9
Durance	1.9 10 ⁻¹	99.9	31.2	58.4	4.1 10 ⁻¹	6.0 10 ⁻¹	68.9
Fier	5.2 10 ⁻²	-	80.1	16.4	1.3 10 ⁻²	6.5 10 ⁻²	19.9
Gardon	1.6 10 ⁻³	-	2.9	0.5	5.5 10 ⁻²	5.7 10 ⁻²	97.2
Gier	1.4 10 ⁻⁵	-	0.1	6.0 10 ⁻³	2.3 10 ⁻²	2.3 10 ⁻²	100
Guiers	0	-	0	0	1.1 10 ⁻²	1.2 10 ⁻²	94.0
Isère	1.2 10 ⁻²	-	2.8	3.9	4.3 10 ⁻¹	4.4 10 ⁻¹	97.1
Rhône	0	-	0	0	2.4 10 ⁻¹	2.9 10 ⁻¹	84.1
Saône	1.0 10 ⁻⁶	-	2.0 10 ⁻⁴	3.0 10 ⁻⁴	5.0 10 ⁻¹	5.0 10 ⁻¹	100

447

448 By comparing the flux estimated at each monitoring site to the total amount of sediment
 449 entering the stream in the corresponding drained catchment, we could assess the suspended
 450 load connectivity of each tributary to the Rhône River.

451 The Ain and the Durance rivers are 69.6% and 68.9% connected (meaning that 69.6% and
 452 68.9% of the sediment that reaches the stream in the catchment will effectively enter the Rhône
 453 corridor at a one-year timescale period). These values are mainly due to the presence of large
 454 dams that interrupt the sediment connectivity (Citterio and Piegay, 2009; Rollet et al., 2014),
 455 which is highlighted in Table 5 and Appendix 2. Only two catchments present low to very low
 456 connectivity values (i.e. the Fier with 19.9% and the Ardèche with 41.0%) mainly due to
 457 deposits occurring close to the confluence (Figure 7 & Table 5). The remaining catchments
 458 present high connectivity (above 90%) as they present no or few deposits, and no large dams
 459 retain the suspended load.

460 By comparing the results obtained with WS alone and with WS coupled with CASCADE,
 461 we can approach the role of the river in transporting materials in a large catchment (Table 6).
 462 Coupling WS with CASCADE reduces the exported fluxes ranging from 5.4% to 83.3%
 463 (according to the tributary).

464

465

466

467

468 *Table 6: Simulated suspended load differences between Models 1 (WS) and 2 (WS/CASCADE).*

Stream	Model 1 (Tg.y ⁻¹)	Model 2 (Tg.y ⁻¹)	Difference (%)
Ain	0.07	0.04	-35.3
Arc	0.20	0.13	-35.5
Ardèche	0.07	0.02	-68.5
Arvan	0.02	0.02	-12.7
Arve	0.13	0.06	-57.3
Bourbre	0.03	0.02	-15.5
Drôme	0.08	0.08	-6.0
Durance	0.77	0.41	-46.8
Fier	0.08	0.01	-83.3
Gardon	0.06	0.04	-24.5
Gier	0.02	0.01	-5.4
Guiers	0.01	0.01	-9.2
Isère	0.95	0.43	-54.8
Rhône	3.48	2.43	-30.0
Saône	0.53	0.49	-6.7
Upper Rhône	0.25	0.22	-11.1

469

470 **5 Discussion**

471 **5.1 Sediment connectivity and erosion models**

472 This paper intends to evaluate the abilities of WS coupled or not with the CASCADE toolbox
 473 to represent suspended load in a large catchment. From a fundamental point of view, hillslope
 474 erosion models alone underestimate the effects of the stream on sediment dynamics in a
 475 watershed as they consider that sediment entering the stream proceeds automatically to the
 476 outlet (Hamel et al., 2015; Van Rompaey et al., 2001). Indeed, in-stream processes or
 477 obstacles within the stream, such as large dams, may alter or improve sediment connectivity
 478 (Czuba and Foufoula-Georgiou, 2015; Schmitt et al., 2018). The CASCADE toolbox fills this
 479 gap and coupling it with soil erosion models may represent actual sediment dynamics in a
 480 large watershed (Tangi et al., 2019).

481 Indeed, comparing WS estimates with in-stream concentrations is inadequate but coupling
 482 them with CASCADE helps in considering riverine processes, which may reproduce observed
 483 dynamics. Here, we showed that WS is a good input for CASCADE as the coupling returns
 484 simulations close to actual sources delivered to the streams in the Rhône catchment.

485 Nevertheless, both approaches with WS underestimated the exported fluxes but returned
 486 results close to the observations. WS is a European-scale model and may not be adapted at
 487 a catchment scale. A soil erosion model adapted to the Rhône catchment may be developed
 488 and tested to pass through this issue. The ideal answer that may be obtained with the latter
 489 may be between slightly higher than WS estimations.

490 From a fundamental point of view, RUSLE-derived models as WS strictly represent the rill
 491 and inter-rill erosion processes (Renard et al., 1997), which are often the main processes
 492 involved in most agricultural lands and hilly valleys in the catchment. However, the erosion

493 dynamics in the mountains are more complex and involve a wide variety of processes, such
494 as gully erosion, debris flow, or landslides, which are known to contribute significantly to the
495 transfer of sediments to rivers (Cossart et al., 2018; Remaître et al., 2005; Theule et al., 2012).
496 As mentioned in the introduction, these processes are more difficult to model (especially
497 regarding volumes contribution to rivers), and their integration into the CASCADE framework
498 remains challenging, especially at such a large scale. In the case of the Rhône catchment, a
499 potential solution might be to apply correction factors to sediment sources depending on their
500 susceptibility to mass movement processes.


501 In this study, we used the Yang (1973) formula to model SPM transfers in the network,
502 which accounts for different ranges of particle sizes depending on transport capacity of flow
503 (Table 3). This formula was not developed for suspended load simulations. This may be a main
504 source of uncertainty as our validation data are suspended load data. Therefore, completing
505 our observed data with bed material fluxes may help in using CASCADE at the scale of the
506 Rhône.

507 RUSLE-based models generally account for particles below 1 mm (Renard et al., 1997;
508 Vigiak et al., 2012). The SPM monitoring using water flow meters coupled with turbidity sensors
509 may measure various grain size ranges but generally below 0.125 mm (Wilcock et al., 2009).
510 In that sense, it is generally considered that turbidity sensors are very sensitive to grain size
511 and that the suspended sand fraction might be greatly underestimated (e.g., Foster et al., 1992;
512 Camenen et al., 2018; 2020). Thus, it can be assumed that most of the observed fluxes coming
513 from monitoring stations, especially for catchments draining the Alps, might underestimate the
514 sand fraction transported in the suspended load. This consideration must be accounted when
515 comparing measured and modelled values. More generally, the variety of the considered grain
516 size distributions simplified under the term of SPM may lead to imprecision in both the
517 modelling framework and the comparison of models with SPM monitoring values for validation.

518 **5.2 Potential methodological and dataset improvements**

519 In this section, we tried to explain the deviation we obtained between the observed and the
520 simulated fluxes estimated with Models 1 and 2. These deviations may come from different
521 steps of the modelling process. First, we tried to estimate the missing information in the
522 sediment inputs from hillslopes. As shown in Figure 2, WS estimates do not cover the entire
523 Rhône catchment. Indeed, soil loss rates are not estimated by this model in high-elevated
524 areas due to the presence of glaciers or bare rocks. Nevertheless, we assume that these areas
525 might play a non-negligible role in bringing materials to the streams. Part of the
526 underestimations in our study might be explained by this missing information. To highlight this
527 link, we calculated for each monitoring site the coverage of the erosion model and the average

528 elevation in its total catchment area and compared those values to the deviations (Figure 10).
 529 We found that sub-catchments with underestimated fluxes are mainly sub-catchments where
 530 the WS raster only covers between 50 and 80% of the total catchment area. In the same way,
 531 these sub-catchments have a high mean elevation, meaning that mountainous sub-
 532 catchments appear to be the main areas where underestimation is observable. Correcting this
 533 deviation in the estimates of sediment sources might improve our simulations at the different
 534 outlets.




535

536 *Figure 10: Relative differences and differences between observed fluxes and simulations with WS and with*
 537 *CASCADE compared with the areal fraction covered by external sources and the mean elevation in each sub-*
 538 *catchment.*

539

540 Second, simulated water exports at the monitoring sites show deviations between -40.1%
 541 and +14.6%, where most sites have underestimated exports (Table 2). Indeed, Figure 11
 542 shows that most of the sites with an underestimated flux in fine sediment also have low
 543 discharge values compared to observations. The discharge representation may then explain a
 544 part of the underestimation of sediment fluxes by coupling WS with CASCADE. Nevertheless,
 545 some sites present higher discharge values while sediment fluxes are still underestimated.



546

547 *Figure 11: Comparison between deviations in discharge and fine sediment fluxes. The x axis corresponds to*
 548 *deviations between observed discharges and those simulated by J2000-Rhône. The y axis shows the deviations*
 549 *between observed fine sediment fluxes and those simulated by Model 2.*

550

551 It is important to note that the river networks delineated in J2000-Rhône and CASCADE
 552 differ. Discharge values for each reach of the CASCADE's river network were chosen by
 553 manually selecting the closest reach in the J2000-Rhône's channels, which could lead to
 554 misestimations in discharge in some reaches.

555 We used a simplified version of the stream network, only considering the main tributaries
 556 to the Rhône River, i.e. where fine sediment is sampled. This is also due to the limited
 557 hydrological and geomorphological information available in other smaller rivers in the Rhône
 558 catchment. However, the numerous small tributaries may collectively have a significant
 559 influence at the catchment scale, which cannot be evaluated yet. This study uses the static
 560 version of CASCADE to estimate the average annual export in the Rhône River based on
 561 discharge quantiles. This approach does not represent flash floods occurring in some sub-
 562 catchments or any flushing of the dams in the whole catchment. Using the recently developed
 563 dynamic version of CASCADE (D-CASCADE; Tangi et al., 2022) may help capture the
 564 temporal variability occurring in the Rhône catchment. Nevertheless, the complexity of this
 565 watershed, highly influenced by anthropogenic activities, may be hard to capture in a dynamic
 566 approach.

567 This study considered only two dams known to interrupt the sediment connectivity (Figure
 568 1). Some other dams were considered by not considering sources coming from their respective
 569 subcatchments (Figure 5). However, multiple dams are implemented on the Rhône River and
 570 its main tributaries. Even if these dams do not stop the sediment connectivity, they may slow
 571 down the exported fluxes or retain a substantial part of the suspended loads. As the Rhône
 572 catchment counts about 50 dams and multiple weirs, even if local retention is low, the total


573 amount of materials retained may not be negligible, especially for the largest materials (e.g.,
574 Belletti et al., 2020).

575 **5.3 Sediment sources compared with other local studies**

576 We assessed the origin of the suspended load at Beaucaire (the outlet) and at Jons, the
577 sampling station draining the Upper Rhône catchment (Figure 12), as previous research
578 explored SPM origins in these two stations using tracers or fingerprinting. We showed that
579 most of the suspended load comes from the Rhône corridor. At Jons, the main tributaries
580 feeding the Rhône load are the Arve, the Ain, and the Bourbre rivers. Dabrin et al. (2021) also
581 found a main contribution of the Arve to the suspended load at Jons by using a 1-D hydro-
582 sedimentary model and a fingerprinting approach. Dabrin et al. (2021) also observed a
583 substantial contribution from the Fier River, which we do not find with our approach. Indeed,
584 we observe important deposition in some sections of the Fier (Figure 7). An inadequate
585 parameterisation of these sections, such as a bad representation of slopes or Manning-
586 Strickler coefficients, might explain the important deposition. Thus, we might underestimate
587 the actual contribution of this tributary to the total fluxes.

588 At the Rhône outlet, the main contributors are the Saône, the Durance, and the Isère. Here,
589 using tracers, Bégorre et al. (2022) reconstructed the contributions of the main tributaries to
590 the Rhône River outlet from 1980 to 2015. In the last decade, they found a significant
591 contribution from the Durance watershed, followed by the Ardèche and the Isère catchments.
592 In the same way, observed fluxes show that the Durance and the Isère rivers deliver to the
593 Rhône corridor about half of the suspended load observed at the outlet (Poulier et al., 2019).
594 The Durance River may play a more important role than what is presented in Figure 10
595 because CASCADE largely underestimates the exports (-84.8%) on this tributary, probably
596 due to both discharge and sediment sources underestimations as mentioned in sections 4.4
597 and 5.2. Indeed, simulated discharge at the outlet of the Durance is 25% lower than
598 observations. Concerning sediment sources, the erosion map covers a limited fraction of the
599 Durance catchment (82%). This excludes noteworthy mountain areas very sensitive to erosion
600 and sediment transfers which might be important sources of sediments to the Durance (e.g.,
601 the marly Badlands of the Alpine foothills, Ariango et al., 2021; Klotz et al., 2023).

602



603

604 *Figure 12: Origin of suspended load in the Upper Rhône at Jons (left) and at the outlet of the Rhône at Beaucaire*
 605 *(right).*

606

607 **6 Conclusion**

608 This work attempted to show the role of in-stream connectivity models such as CASCADE
 609 in representing fine sediment dynamics in a large basin with numerous anthropogenic
 610 disturbances, such as the Rhône. Nevertheless, the coupling of CASCADE with
 611 WaTEM/SEDEM returned fluxes further from observations than WaTEM/SEDEM alone. These
 612 deviations may come from many sources, e.g. discharge data, misestimates of erosion in high-
 613 elevated areas, unadapted transport capacity formulas, or unadapted validation data.

614 Future applications should generate better data in terms of amount and size of sources
 615 supply for the missing zones neglected by traditional soil erosion models (e.g., landslides,
 616 mountain areas) to further explore the added value of coupling CASCADE with a soil erosion
 617 model. As well as better representation of dam trapping efficiencies and hydrological
 618 simulations could further enhance our ability to predict fine sediment dynamics at large scale
 619 and highlight the significance and necessity of a proper representation of river network
 620 connectivity. Increasing our monitoring assets across the basin to include all processes
 621 involved with fine sediment generation will provide the ability to have plausible ranges of
 622 sediment supply and then to develop integrated (soil erosion, detachment processes, river
 623 network connectivity) models capable to provide robust fine sediment predictions in the near
 624 future.

625 **7 References**

- 626 Alewell, C., Borrelli, P., Meusburger, K., Panagos, P., 2019. Using the USLE: Chances,
627 challenges and limitations of soil erosion modelling. *International soil and water*
628 *conservation research* 7, 203–225.
- 629 Ariagno, C., Le Bouteiller, C., Van Der Beek, P., Klotz, S., 2022. Sediment export in marly
630 badland catchments modulated by frost-cracking intensity, Draix–Bléone Critical Zone
631 Observatory, SE France. *Earth Surf. Dynam.* 10, 81–96. [https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-10-](https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-10-81-2022)
632 [81-2022](https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-10-81-2022)
- 633 Baartman, J.E.M., Temme, A.J.A.M., Saco, P.M., 2018. The effect of landform variation on
634 vegetation patterning and related sediment dynamics. *Earth Surf Processes Landf* 43,
635 2121–2135. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4377>
- 636 Bégorre, C., Dabrin, A., Masson, M., Mourier, B., Eyrolle, F., Lepage, H., Morereau, A.,
637 Coquery, M., 2022. Reconstruction of historical suspended particulate matter contributions
638 of Rhône River tributaries to the Mediterranean Sea. *Geomorphology* 417, 108445.
- 639 Belletti, B., Garcia De Leaniz, C., Jones, J., Bizzi, S., Börger, L., Segura, G., Castelletti, A.,
640 Van De Bund, W., Aarestrup, K., Barry, J., Belka, K., Berkhuisen, A., Birnie-Gauvin, K.,
641 Bussettini, M., Carolli, M., Consuegra, S., Dopico, E., Feierfeil, T., Fernández, S.,
642 Fernandez Garrido, P., Garcia-Vazquez, E., Garrido, S., Giannico, G., Gough, P., Jepsen,
643 N., Jones, P.E., Kemp, P., Kerr, J., King, J., Łapińska, M., Lázaro, G., Lucas, M.C.,
644 Marcello, L., Martin, P., McGinnity, P., O’Hanley, J., Olivo Del Amo, R., Parasiewicz, P.,
645 Pusch, M., Rincon, G., Rodriguez, C., Royte, J., Schneider, C.T., Tummers, J.S., Vallesi,
646 S., Vowles, A., Verspoor, E., Wanningen, H., Wantzen, K.M., Wildman, L., Zalewski, M.,
647 2020. More than one million barriers fragment Europe’s rivers. *Nature* 588, 436–441.
648 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-3005-2>
- 649 Bizzi, S., Tangi, M., Schmitt, R.J.P., Pitlick, J., Piégay, H., Castelletti, A.F., 2021. Sediment
650 transport at the network scale and its link to channel morphology in the braided Vjosa River
651 system. *Earth Surf Processes Landf* 46, 2946–2962. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.5225>
- 652 Borrelli, P., Van Oost, K., Meusburger, K., Alewell, C., Lugato, E., Panagos, P., 2018. A step
653 towards a holistic assessment of soil degradation in Europe: Coupling on-site erosion with
654 sediment transfer and carbon fluxes. *Environmental Research* 161, 291–298.
655 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.11.009>

- 656 Branger, F., Gouttevin, I., Tilmant, F., Cipriani, T., Barachet, C., Montginoul, M., Le Gros, C.,
657 Sauquet, E., Braud, I., Leblois, E., 2016. Modélisation hydrologique distribuée du Rhône
658 (Research Report). irstea.
- 659 Brierley, G., Tunnicliffe, J., Bizzi, S., Lee, F., Perry, G., Poepl, R., Fryirs, K., 2022. Quantifying
660 Sediment (Dis)Connectivity in the Modeling of River Systems, in: Treatise on
661 Geomorphology. Elsevier, pp. 206–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818234-5.00161-9>
662
- 663 Brown, C.B., 1943. Discussion of “Sedimentation in reservoirs” 69.
- 664 Brune, G.M., 1953. Trap efficiency of reservoirs. *Trans. AGU* 34, 407.
665 <https://doi.org/10.1029/TR034i003p00407>
- 666 Camenen, B., Dramais, G., Buffet, A., Thollet, F., Le Bescond, C., Lagouy, M., Berni, C., Le
667 Coz, J., 2018. Estimation of sand suspension in a secondary channel of an alpine river, in:
668 E3S Web of Conferences. EDP Sciences, p. 04014.
- 669 Camenen, B., Thollet, F., Buffet, A., Dramais, G., Valette, E., Zanker, S., 2020. An estimation
670 of the sand suspension in alpine rivers during a dam flushing event, in: *River Flow 2020*
671 (Proceedings of the 10th Conference on Fluvial Hydraulics).
- 672 Cavalli, M., Trevisani, S., Comiti, F., Marchi, L., 2013. Geomorphometric assessment of spatial
673 sediment connectivity in small Alpine catchments. *Geomorphology* 188, 31–41.
674 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.05.007>
- 675 Church, M., 2006. Bed material transport and the morphology of alluvial river channels. *Annu.*
676 *Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* 34, 325–354.
677 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.earth.33.092203.122721>
- 678 Citterio, A., Piégay, H., 2009. Overbank sedimentation rates in former channel lakes:
679 characterization and control factors. *Sedimentology* 56, 461–482.
680 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3091.2008.00979.x>
- 681 Cossart, É., Fressard, M., 2017. Assessment of structural sediment connectivity within
682 catchments: insights from graph theory. *Earth Surf. Dynam.* 5, 253–268.
683 <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-5-253-2017>
- 684 Cossart, E., Viel, V., Lissak, C., Reulier, R., Fressard, M., Delahaye, D., 2018. How might
685 sediment connectivity change in space and time? *Land Degrad Dev* 29, 2595–2613.
686 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3022>

- 687 Czuba, J.A., Fofoula-Georgiou, E., 2015. Dynamic connectivity in a fluvial network for
688 identifying hotspots of geomorphic change. *Water Resources Research* 51, 1401–1421.
689 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR016139>
- 690 Dabrin, A., Bégorre, C., Bretier, M., Dugué, V., Masson, M., Le Bescond, C., Le Coz, J.,
691 Coquery, M., 2021. Reactivity of particulate element concentrations: apportionment
692 assessment of suspended particulate matter sources in the Upper Rhône River, France. *J*
693 *Soils Sediments* 21, 1256–1274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11368-020-02856-0>
- 694 Downs, P.W., Piégay, H., 2019. Catchment-scale cumulative impact of human activities on
695 river channels in the late Anthropocene: implications, limitations, prospect. *Geomorphology*
696 338, 88–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.03.021>
- 697 Engelund, F., Hansen, E., 1967. A monograph on sediment transport in alluvial streams.
698 Technical University of Denmark Østervoldgade 10, Copenhagen K.
- 699 Foster, I.D.L., Millington, R., Grew, R.G., 1992. The impact of particle size controls on stream
700 turbidity measurement; some implications for suspended sediment yield estimation.
701 *Erosion and sediment transport monitoring programmes in river basins* 210, 51–62.
- 702 Fressard, M., Cossart, E., 2019. A graph theory tool for assessing structural sediment
703 connectivity: Development and application in the Mercurey vineyards (France). *Science of*
704 *The Total Environment* 651, 2566–2584. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.10.158>
- 705 Fryirs, K.A., Brierley, G.J., Preston, N.J., Kasai, M., 2007. Buffers, barriers and blankets: The
706 (dis) connectivity of catchment-scale sediment cascades. *Catena* 70, 49–67.
- 707 Hamel, P., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Sim, S., Mueller, C., 2015. A new approach to modeling the
708 sediment retention service (InVEST 3.0): Case study of the Cape Fear catchment, North
709 Carolina, USA. *Science of The Total Environment* 524–525, 166–177.
710 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.04.027>
- 711 Hamel, P., Falinski, K., Sharp, R., Auerbach, D.A., Sánchez-Canales, M., Denny-Frank,
712 P.J., 2017. Sediment delivery modeling in practice: Comparing the effects of watershed
713 characteristics and data resolution across hydroclimatic regions. *Science of the Total*
714 *Environment* 580, 1381–1388.
- 715 Heckmann, T., Cavalli, M., Cerdan, O., Foerster, S., Javaux, M., Lode, E., Smetanová, A.,
716 Vericat, D., Brardinoni, F., 2018. Indices of sediment connectivity: opportunities,
717 challenges and limitations. *Earth-Science Reviews* 187, 77–108.
718 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2018.08.004>

- 719 Heckmann, T., Schwanghart, W., 2013. Geomorphic coupling and sediment connectivity in an
720 alpine catchment — Exploring sediment cascades using graph theory. *Geomorphology*
721 182, 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.10.033>
- 722 Heckmann, T., Schwanghart, W., Phillips, J.D., 2015. Graph theory—Recent developments of
723 its application in geomorphology. *Geomorphology* 243, 130–146.
724 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.12.024>
- 725 Hessel, R., Jetten, V., Guanhui, Z., 2003. Estimating Manning's n for steep slopes. *CATENA*
726 54, 77–91. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0341-8162\(03\)00058-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0341-8162(03)00058-4)
- 727 Hirschberg, J., Fatichi, S., Bennett, G.L., McArdell, B.W., Peleg, N., Lane, S.N., Schlunegger,
728 F., Molnar, P., 2021. Climate Change Impacts on Sediment Yield and Debris-Flow Activity
729 in an Alpine Catchment. *JGR Earth Surface* 126, e2020JF005739.
730 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JF005739>
- 731 Hooftman, D., Bullock, J., Evans, P., Redhead, J., Ridding, L., Varma, V., Pywell, R., 2023. A
732 model of sediment retention by vegetation for Great Britain: new methodologies &
733 validation. *bioRxiv* 2023.08. 17.553678.
- 734 Khan, S., Fryirs, K., Bizzi, S., 2021. Modelling sediment (dis)connectivity across a river network
735 to understand locational-transmission-filter sensitivity for identifying hotspots of potential
736 geomorphic adjustment. *Earth Surf Processes Landf* 46, 2856–2869.
737 <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.5213>
- 738 Klotz, S., Le Bouteiller, C., Mathys, N., Fontaine, F., Ravanat, X., Olivier, J.-E., Liébault, F.,
739 Jantzi, H., Coulmeau, P., Richard, D., Cambon, J.-P., Meunier, M., 2023. A high-frequency,
740 long-term data set of hydrology and sediment yield: the alpine badland catchments of
741 Draix-Bléone Observatory. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* 15, 4371–4388.
742 <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-4371-2023>
- 743 Kondolf, G.M., 1997. PROFILE: Hungry Water: Effects of Dams and Gravel Mining on River
744 Channels. *Environmental Management* 21, 533–551.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002679900048>
- 746 Kondolf, G.M., Rubin, Z.K., Minear, J.T., 2014. Dams on the Mekong: Cumulative sediment
747 starvation. *Water Resources Research* 50, 5158–5169.
- 748 Kondolf, G.M., Schmitt, R.J., Carling, P., Darby, S., Arias, M., Bizzi, S., Castelletti, A.,
749 Cochrane, T.A., Gibson, S., Kumm, M., 2018. Changing sediment budget of the Mekong:
750 Cumulative threats and management strategies for a large river basin. *Science of the total*
751 *environment* 625, 114–134.

- 752 Kondolf, G.M., Schmitt, R.J.P., Carling, P.A., Goichot, M., Keskinen, M., Arias, M.E., Bizzi, S.,
753 Castelletti, A., Cochrane, T.A., Darby, S.E., Kummu, M., Minderhoud, P.S.J., Nguyen, D.,
754 Nguyen, H.T., Nguyen, N.T., Oeurng, C., Opperman, J., Rubin, Z., San, D.C., Schmeier,
755 S., Wild, T., 2022. Save the Mekong Delta from drowning. *Science* 376, 583–585.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abm5176>
- 757 Krause, P., 2001. Das hydrologische Modellsystem J2000: Beschreibung und Anwendung in
758 grossen Flussgebieten, Schriften des Forschungszentrums Jülich. Forschungszentrum,
759 Zentralbibliothek, Jülich.
- 760 Krumbein, W.C., 1934. Size Frequency Distributions of Sediments. *SEPM JSR Vol. 4.*
761 <https://doi.org/10.1306/D4268EB9-2B26-11D7-8648000102C1865D>
- 762 Lepage, H., Gruat, A., Thollet, F., Le Coz, J., Coquery, M., Masson, M., Dabrin, A.,
763 Radakovitch, O., Eyrolle, F., Labille, J., Jean-Paul, A., Delanghe, D., Raimbault, P., 2021.
764 Concentrations and fluxes of suspended particulate matters and associated contaminants
765 in the Rhône River from Lake Geneva to the Mediterranean Sea.
766 <https://doi.org/10.15454/RJCQZ7>
- 767 Manning, R., Griffith, J.P., Pigot, T.F., Vernon-Harcourt, L.F., 1890. On the flow of water in
768 open channels and pipes.
- 769 Marcus, W.A., Roberts, K., Harvey, L., Tackman, G., 1992. An evaluation of methods for
770 estimating Manning's n in small mountain streams. *Mountain Research and Development*
771 227–239.
- 772 Morel, M., Pella, H., Branger, F., Sauquet, E., Grenouillet, G., Côte, J., Braud, I., Lamouroux,
773 N., 2023. Catchment-scale applications of hydraulic habitat models: Climate change
774 effects on fish. *Ecohydrology* 16, e2513. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.2513>
- 775 Morel, M., Tamisier, V., Pella, H., Booker, D.J., Navratil, O., Piégay, H., Gob, F., Lamouroux,
776 N., 2019. Revisiting the drivers of at-a-station hydraulic geometry in stream reaches.
777 *Geomorphology* 328, 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2018.12.007>
- 778 Najafi, S., Dragovich, D., Heckmann, T., Sadeghi, S.H., 2021. Sediment connectivity concepts
779 and approaches. *Catena* 196, 104880.
- 780 Panagos, P., Borrelli, P., Poesen, J., Ballabio, C., Lugato, E., Meusburger, K., Montanarella,
781 L., Alewell, C., 2015. The new assessment of soil loss by water erosion in Europe.
782 *Environmental Science & Policy* 54, 438–447. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.08.012>
- 783 Paquier, A., 1999. Etude hydraulique de l'Arc de Maurienne (de Modane à l'Isère) - Synthèse.

- 784 Posner, S., Verutes, G., Koh, I., Denu, D., Ricketts, T., 2016. Global use of ecosystem service
785 models. *Ecosystem Services* 17, 131–141.
- 786 Poulhier, G., Launay, M., Le Bescond, C., Thollet, F., Coquery, M., Le Coz, J., 2019. Combining
787 flux monitoring and data reconstruction to establish annual budgets of suspended
788 particulate matter, mercury and PCB in the Rhône River from Lake Geneva to the
789 Mediterranean Sea. *Science of The Total Environment* 658, 457–473.
790 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.12.075>
- 791 Recking, A., 2017. *Elements de géomorphologie fluviale. Cahier 2 : La granulométrie des cours*
792 *d'eau (et sa mesure)*. Irstea.
- 793 Recking, A., 2013. An analysis of nonlinearity effects on bed load transport prediction:
794 Nonlinearity and bed load prediction. *J. Geophys. Res. Earth Surf.* 118, 1264–1281.
795 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrf.20090>
- 796 Remaître, A., Malet, J.-P., Maquaire, O., 2005. Morphology and sedimentology of a complex
797 debris flow in a clay-shale basin: Morphology and sedimentology of a debris flow. *Earth*
798 *Surf. Process. Landforms* 30, 339–348. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.1161>
- 799 Renard, K.G., USA, USA (Eds.), 1997. *Predicting soil erosion by water: a guide to conservation*
800 *planning with the revised universal soil loss equation (RUSLE)*, Agriculture handbook.
801 Washington, D. C.
- 802 Richter, B.D., Postel, S., Revenga, C., Scudder, T., Lehner, B., Churchill, A., Chow, M., 2010.
803 *Lost in development's shadow: The downstream human consequences of dams*. *Water*
804 *alternatives* 3, 14.
- 805 Rollet, A.J., Piégay, H., Dufour, S., Bornette, G., Persat, H., 2014. Assessment of
806 consequences of sediment deficit on a gravel river bed downstream of dams in restoration
807 perspectives: application of a multicriteria, hierarchical and spatially explicit diagnosis:
808 sediment deficit consequences. *River Res. Applic.* 30, 939–953.
809 <https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.2689>
- 810 Rossi, L.M.W., Rapidel, B., Roupsard, O., Villatoro-sánchez, M., Mao, Z., Nespoulous, J.,
811 Perez, J., Prieto, I., Roumet, C., Metselaar, K., School, J.M., Claessens, L., Stokes, A.,
812 2017. Sensitivity of the landslide model LAPSUS_LS to vegetation and soil parameters.
813 *Ecological Engineering* 109, 249–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2017.08.010>
- 814 Schmitt, R.J., Bizzi, S., Castelletti, A., 2016. Tracking multiple sediment cascades at the river
815 network scale identifies controls and emerging patterns of sediment connectivity. *Water*
816 *Resources Research* 52, 3941–3965.

- 817 Schmitt, R.J.P., Bizzi, S., Castelletti, A.F., Kondolf, G.M., 2018. Stochastic Modeling of
818 Sediment Connectivity for Reconstructing Sand Fluxes and Origins in the Unmonitored Se
819 Kong, Se San, and Sre Pok Tributaries of the Mekong River. *JGR Earth Surface* 123, 2–
820 25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JF004105>
- 821 Schwanghart, W., Scherler, D., 2014. Short Communication: TopoToolbox 2 – MATLAB-based
822 software for topographic analysis and modeling in Earth surface sciences. *Earth Surf.*
823 *Dynam.* 2, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2-1-2014>
- 824 Siyam, A.M., Mirghani, M., El zein, S., Golla, S., El-sayed, S.M., 2005. Assessment of the
825 Current State of the Nile basin Reservoir Sedimentation problems. NBCN-RE (Nile Basin
826 Capacity Building Network for River Engineering), River Morphology, Research Cluster,
827 Group–I Report.
- 828 Syvitski, J., Ángel, J.R., Saito, Y., Overeem, I., Vörösmarty, C.J., Wang, H., Olago, D., 2022.
829 Earth’s sediment cycle during the Anthropocene. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment* 3,
830 179–196.
- 831 Syvitski, J.P., Kettner, A.J., Overeem, I., Hutton, E.W., Hannon, M.T., Brakenridge, G.R., Day,
832 J., Vörösmarty, C., Saito, Y., Giosan, L., 2009. Sinking deltas due to human activities.
833 *Nature Geoscience* 2, 681–686.
- 834 Tan, G., Chen, P., Deng, J., Xu, Q., Tang, R., Feng, Z., Yi, R., 2019. Review and improvement
835 of conventional models for reservoir sediment trapping efficiency. *Heliyon* 5, e02458.
836 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02458>
- 837 Tangi, M., Bizzi, S., Fryirs, K., Castelletti, A., 2022. A Dynamic, Network Scale Sediment
838 (Dis)Connectivity Model to Reconstruct Historical Sediment Transfer and River Reach
839 Sediment Budgets. *Water Resources Research* 58, e2021WR030784.
840 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021WR030784>
- 841 Tangi, M., Schmitt, R., Bizzi, S., Castelletti, A., 2019. The CASCADE toolbox for analyzing
842 river sediment connectivity and management. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 119,
843 400–406.
- 844 Theule, J.I., Liébault, F., Loye, A., Laigle, D., Jaboyedoff, M., 2012. Sediment budget
845 monitoring of debris-flow and bedload transport in the Manival Torrent, SE France. *Nat.*
846 *Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 12, 731–749. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-12-731-2012>
- 847 Thollet, F., Le Bescond, C., Lagouy, M., Gruat, A., Grisot, G., Le Coz, J., Coquery, M., Lepage,
848 H., Gairoard, S., Gattacceca, J.C., Ambrosi, J.-P., Radakovitch, O., Dur, G., Richard, L.,

- 849 Giner, F., Eyrolle, F., Angot, H., Mourier, D., Bonnefoy, A., Dugué, V., Launay, M., Troudet,
850 L., Labille, J., Kieffer, L., 2021. Observatoire des Sédiments du Rhône, INRAE.
- 851 Van Oost, K., Govers, G., Desmet, P., 2000. Evaluating the effects of changes in landscape
852 structure on soil erosion by water and tillage. *Landscape ecology* 15, 577–589.
- 853 Van Rompaey, A., Bazzoffi, P., Jones, R.J., Montanarella, L., 2005. Modeling sediment yields
854 in Italian catchments. *Geomorphology* 65, 157–169.
- 855 Van Rompaey, A.J.J., Verstraeten, G., Van Oost, K., Govers, G., Poesen, J., 2001. Modelling
856 mean annual sediment yield using a distributed approach. *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms*
857 26, 1221–1236. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.275>
- 858 Vigiak, O., Borselli, L., Newham, L.T.H., McInnes, J., Roberts, A.M., 2012. Comparison of
859 conceptual landscape metrics to define hillslope-scale sediment delivery ratio.
860 *Geomorphology* 138, 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2011.08.026>
- 861 Vörösmarty, C.J., Meybeck, M., Fekete, B., Sharma, K., Green, P., Syvitski, J.P., 2003.
862 Anthropogenic sediment retention: major global impact from registered river
863 impoundments. *Global and planetary change* 39, 169–190.
- 864 Wang, L., Liu, H., 2006. An efficient method for identifying and filling surface depressions in
865 digital elevation models for hydrologic analysis and modelling. *International Journal of*
866 *Geographical Information Science* 20, 193–213.
867 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13658810500433453>
- 868 Wilcock, P.R., Crowe, J.C., 2003. Surface-based Transport Model for Mixed-Size Sediment.
869 *J. Hydraul. Eng.* 129, 120–128. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-
870 9429\(2003\)129:2\(120\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9429(2003)129:2(120))
- 871 Wilcock, P.R., Pitlick, J., Cui, Y., 2009. Sediment transport primer: estimating bed-material
872 transport in gravel-bed rivers. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky
873 Mountain Research.
- 874 Wong, M., Parker, G., 2006. Reanalysis and Correction of Bed-Load Relation of Meyer-Peter
875 and Müller Using Their Own Database. *J. Hydraul. Eng.* 132, 1159–1168.
876 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9429\(2006\)132:11\(1159\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9429(2006)132:11(1159))
- 877 Yang, C.T., 1973. Incipient Motion and Sediment Transport. *J. Hydr. Div.* 99, 1679–1704.
878 <https://doi.org/10.1061/JYCEAJ.0003766>
- 879 Zarfl, C., Dunn, F.E., 2022. The delicate balance of river sediments. *Science* 376, 1385–1386.