

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

**AN EVALUATION OF WIND EROSION HAZARD
IN FALLOW LANDS OF SEMIARID ARAGON (NE SPAIN)**

M.V. López*, R. Gracia, and J.L. Arrúe

* Corresponding author. Tel.: 34 (9) 76 71 61 46; fax: 34 (9) 76 71 61 45; e-mail:
vlopez@eead.csic.es. Soil Science Department, Estación Experimental de Aula Dei, Consejo
Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), POB 1005, 50080-Zaragoza, Spain.

1 María V. López is a post-doctoral contract researcher, Ricardo Gracia is a technical agricultural
2 engineer, and José L. Arrúe is a soil scientist in the Soil Science Department of the Estación
3 Experimental de Aula Dei, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), P.O. Box 202,
4 50080 Zaragoza, Spain. The authors thank J. Machín for his assistance with the characterization
5 and classification of soils and the Centro Meteorológico de Aragón, La Rioja y Navarra of the
6 Instituto Nacional de Meteorología for providing the meteorological data needed for this study.
7 The first author is grateful to the Spanish Ministry of Education and Culture for her PNFPI
8 contract. This research was supported by the Comisión Interministerial de Ciencia y Tecnología
9 (Grant no. AGF98-0261-CO2-02).

1 **Abstract**

2 Long fallowing (16-17 months), in the cereal-fallow rotation, may favour soil losses by
3 wind erosion in agricultural soils of semiarid Aragon (NE Spain). With the objective of
4 evaluating the risk of wind erosion in this area, soil losses for the most critical period of fallow
5 (February-April) were estimated from a total of 67 fallow fields by using the Wind Erosion
6 Equation (WEQ). All soils were medium-textured soils being the loam the most frequent
7 textural class (45%). The CaCO₃ content in the soil was higher than 200 g kg⁻¹ in 90% of the
8 fields. Mouldboard plough, chisel plough, and disk harrow were the main primary tillage tools
9 used by farmers during fallow. Soil cover by crop residues was negligible (<1%) in 76% of the
10 fields and only in 20% tilling was done perpendicularly to dominant wind direction. The
11 highest erodibility values corresponded to soils with a sandy loam texture and traditionally
12 tilled with mouldboard plough. Predicted wind erosion was high to very high in 30% of the
13 fields (>20 Mg ha⁻¹). The WEQ estimated erosion reductions to tolerable levels if reduced
14 tillage, with chiseling as primary tillage, is adequately adopted in the dryland cereal production
15 areas of semiarid Aragon.

16

17

18

19 Key words: Wind erosion, fallowing, dryland farming, reduced tillage, crop residues, surface
20 roughness, wind-erodible fraction.

1 **Introduction**

2 From a spatial point of view, it is generally thought that soil erosion by wind, as compared to
3 water erosion, is not a major land degradation issue in the European Mediterranean environments
4 (Poesen and Hooke, 1999). Accordingly, research and knowledge currently available on wind
5 erosion processes in these environments are rather limited.

6 One of the potential wind erosion areas identified in southern Europe is located in Central
7 Aragon, in the middle part of the Ebro river valley, north-east Spain (De Ploey et al., 1989). Many
8 factors and conditions influencing wind erosion affect agricultural land across this region. The
9 climate is semiarid, with a rainfall regime characterized by low and erratic precipitation imposing
10 significant constraints on agricultural production (Austin et al., 1998). In semiarid Aragon, one of
11 the driest areas in the Iberian peninsula and probably the most arid inland region in Europe, high
12 evaporative demands are accentuated by dry and strong winds blowing throughout most of the
13 year (Herrero and Snyder, 1997). These winds, locally known as Cierzo, have a dominant WNW
14 direction and are frequent events with wind speeds and gusts higher than 10 m s^{-1} (Biel and García
15 de Pedraza, 1962). The soil moisture regime is markedly aridic and soils are mostly alkaline, with
16 low organic matter contents and a dominant loam to loamy sand texture.

17 In addition to these unique climatic and lithological features, current land use and
18 management practices in semiarid Aragon contribute to making this area prone to land degradation
19 by wind erosion. According to most recent statistics (Gobierno de Aragón, 2000), agricultural land
20 accounts for 38% of the total surface ($47,700 \text{ km}^2$) of Aragon. Within rainfed arable land (1.38
21 million ha), about 760,000 ha are cultivated with herbaceous crops (80% grown to wheat, *Triticum*
22 *aestivum* L., and barley, *Hordeum vulgare* L.) and 460,000 ha more are fallowed every year. It is
23 estimated that more than half of rainfed cropland is located in areas with an average annual
24 precipitation less than 400 mm where the risk of wind erosion might be more accentuated. In these
25 areas, the most common cropping system is the traditional cereal-fallow rotation (one crop in 2
26 years), which extends over about 430,000 ha and involves a long-fallow period of about 16-17

1 months. Ploughing of fallow fields in late winter and early spring dries out the surface soil and
2 leaves bare fields prone to wind erosion especially at the end of the fallow period, from late spring
3 to seeding of the next crop. In addition, overgrazing may also enhance the risk of wind erosion in
4 fallow lands, especially in dry years when low crop yields result in insufficient residue cover.

5 Previous studies carried out at a plot scale in semiarid Aragon have shown that the risk of
6 severe wind erosion could be high in agricultural soils. These studies also indicate that wind
7 erosion processes (i.e. dust emission and saltation transport) are largely dependant on the type and
8 timing of tillage operations and the frequency of strong *Cierzo* events (López et., 1998; Sterk et
9 al., 1999). In this region wind erosion processes may occur slowly and their harmful effects on
10 soil quality and productivity go unnoticed for many years, especially if they are masked by mixing
11 by intensive soil tillage. Consequently, adoption of suitable land management and soil
12 conservation practices, such as conservation tillage and crop residue management systems, in
13 erodible dryland agroecosystems of semiarid Aragon are needed. However, before specific farmer-
14 friendly measures to prevent wind erosion can be devised and transferred within dryland cropping
15 systems, wind erosion research in the region should be conducted to assess at a large scale the
16 magnitude of wind erosion hazards, identifying those areas where wind erosion could be most
17 threatening to sustainable agricultural productivity.

18 The purpose of this study was twofold: (i) characterize fallow lands of semiarid Aragon with
19 regard to current soil and crop residue management practices and their effects on soil surface
20 properties affecting wind erosion and (ii) evaluate the risk of wind erosion during the most critical
21 period of fallow using estimated values of soil losses from the Wind Erosion Equation (WEQ;
22 Woodruff and Siddoway, 1965).

23

24 **Materials and methods**

25 ***Field characterization.*** A total of 67 fallow fields were randomly selected within the main
26 dryland cereal production areas of semiarid Aragon with mean annual rainfall <400 mm (Fig. 1).

1 Field site selection was made according to the soil type, topography, and tillage practices
2 characterizing each zone. The fields were located between latitudes 40°59'N and 41°50'N and
3 longitudes 1°24'W and 0°15'E, covering an area of about 13,000 km². Within these dryland areas,
4 fallow lands extend over about 200,000 ha. Elevation ranged from 250 to 760 m and most of the
5 fields were nearly level. Only 10 fields had a knolly topography with slopes between 2 and 10%.

6 Following primary tillage operations applied in February-March, a general description of each
7 field was made (field dimensions and orientation, tillage implement used, ridge characteristics). At
8 the same time, soil samples from the upper 2.5 cm were collected to determine the following soil
9 surface properties.

10 Particle size distribution was determined by the pipet method (Gee and Bauder, 1986) and
11 organic matter content, CaCO₃ content, gypsum content, electrical conductivity, EC (H₂O, 1:5),
12 and pH (H₂O, 1:2.5) by standard methods (Page et al., 1982). Percent soil cover with crop residues
13 and stones and dry matter of residues (after oven-drying at 65-70 °C for 48 h) were also
14 determined.

15 Wind-erodible fraction (EF) was calculated as the percentage of dry aggregates <0.84 mm in
16 diameter separated from the soil surface sample by using an electromagnetic sieve shaker (CISA,
17 Barcelona). An electromagnet transmits vertical vibrations to the sieves along with a
18 simultaneous rotating movement to the soil material, which prevents the classical clogging of
19 sieves. Although we did not use the standard rotary sieve as required by the WEQ, we followed
20 the general recommendations of Skidmore (1988) to achieve an adequate separation of dry soil
21 aggregates when using a more readily available flat sieve. Thus, in order to determine the
22 optimum combination of sieving time and sieving intensity (vertical vibration height), a series of
23 experiments testing different sieving times and intensities were carried out using soils with
24 contrasting EF values. After observing a good separation of soil aggregates, without clogging
25 and breakdown, a sieving time of 6 minutes and a sieving intensity of 1 mm were finally fixed.
26 The EF values obtained by this sieving procedure were compared to those estimated from soil

1 physical and chemical properties, using the equation of Fryrear et al. (1994). The correlation
2 found was highly significant ($r=0.939$; $P<0.01$). This finding and the fact that the equation of
3 Fryrear et al. (1994) is used in the Revised Wind Erosion Equation (RWEQ; Fryrear et al., 2000)
4 as an alternative to the standard rotary sieve, indicate that the EF values obtained in the present
5 study are comparable with those that could have been obtained using the standard rotary sieve.

6 For a more complete characterization of soil surface conditions, in 16 representative fields all
7 the above determinations were made at 6 points along a WNW-ESE transect, whereas in the rest
8 of the fields only one sampling point was considered. Soil types were identified according to the
9 FAO classification (FAO-UNESCO, 1990).

10

11 ***Application of the Wind Erosion Equation.*** The WEQ (Woodruff and Siddoway, 1965) is
12 described in the following form

13

$$E = f(I, K, C, L, V)$$

14 where E is the annual soil loss (Mg ha^{-1}), I the soil erodibility factor ($\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), K the soil ridge
15 roughness factor, C the climatic factor, L the unsheltered mean travel distance of wind across a
16 field (m) and V the equivalent vegetative cover (Mg ha^{-1}).

17 The soil erodibility factor, I , is the potential annual soil loss from a wide, unsheltered, isolated
18 field with a bare, smooth, noncrusted surface. It was obtained from the table for soil erodibility
19 generated by Woodruff and Siddoway (1965) on the basis of the percentage of dry aggregates
20 >0.84 mm in diameter. For fields with a knolly topography (windward slopes $>1.5\%$ and lengths
21 <150 m) the I value was adjusted following Woodruff and Siddoway (1965).

22 The soil ridge roughness factor, K , takes into account the resistance to wind erosion caused by
23 ridges. It is a function of the relation between ridge height and ridge spacing and it was obtained
24 from the equations defined by Williams et al. (1984). Ridge orientation was determined with
25 respect to the dominant WNW direction of the *Cierzo* wind.

1 The climatic factor, C , was derived from the wind erosion climatic erosivity (CE) as it was
2 proposed by Skidmore (1986). CE is based on the mechanics of wind erosion and accounts for the
3 influence of surface soil moisture, wind speed and wind speed probability distribution. Weather
4 variables required for its calculation are precipitation, net radiation, wind speed and wind speed
5 probability density function. Mean monthly values of these parameters were obtained for a 20-
6 year period (1965-1984) using daily records of precipitation, wind and solar radiation collected at
7 the Zaragoza Airport weather station (41°39'N, 1°00'W, 247 m asl). The wind data set for this
8 reference period was the most reliable and suitably available for the study area.

9 Daily values of average wind speed were calculated from wind run readings. Mean monthly
10 net radiation was calculated from solar radiation through the relationship given by Rosenberg et al.
11 (1983). Since it was not possible to obtain the wind speed probability density function (only mean
12 values of wind speed were available), CE was calculated from the simplified procedure developed
13 by Skidmore (1986). Although CE was obtained for each month, only CE values corresponding to
14 the period of interest (February-April) were used to calculate C .

15 The field length factor, WF , accounts for the influence of field dimensions on reducing wind
16 erosion. On an unprotected eroding field the rate of soil flow is zero on the windward edge and
17 increases with distance until reaching a maximum value. This maximum distance (L_o) and the
18 mean travel distance of wind across the field (L) were incorporated into the equation developed by
19 Williams et al. (1984) to determine WF . L was calculated by considering the width and length of
20 the field and its orientation with respect to the prevailing wind direction (Williams et al., 1984).

21 The vegetative cover factor, V , expressed as small grain equivalent, takes into account the
22 effect of amount, kind and orientation of vegetative cover on controlling wind erosion. The mass
23 of crop residues was introduced into the equations developed by Williams et al. (1984) using crop
24 specific coefficients for flat random winter wheat residues (Lyles and Allison, 1981).

1 Solution of WEQ gives the expected annual amount of wind erosion, E , from a particular
2 agricultural field. The combination of factors to determine E was done stepwise as follows
3 (Williams et al., 1984; Skidmore, 1988):

$$4 \quad E1 = I \quad [1]$$

$$5 \quad E2 = I K \quad [2]$$

$$6 \quad E3 = I K C \quad [3]$$

$$7 \quad E4 = (WF^{0.348} + E3^{0.348} - E2^{0.348})^{2.87} \quad [4]$$

$$8 \quad E5 = \Psi_1 E4^{\Psi_2} = E \quad [5]$$

9 The parameters Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 are functions of the factor V as described by Williams et al. (1984).

10

11 **Statistical analysis.** Correlation and regression analysis were performed to identify and
12 evaluate the degree of association among the measured soil properties. Special attention was paid
13 to the relationship between EF and the rest of physical and chemical properties as predictive
14 variables. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to detect variations in the studied
15 properties under different soil management practices and soil types. Duncan's multiple range test
16 was used to compare among means. When data showed non-normality, transformations were
17 made and ANOVA conducted with the transformed data. Computations were performed using
18 Statgraphics Plus software.

19

20 **Results and discussion**

21 **Susceptibility of soil to wind erosion.** Soil erodibility (I) ranged from 0 to 244 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹,
22 corresponding to wind-erodible fractions (EF) of 8 and 83%, respectively. Following the
23 erodibility classification of Shiyatyi (1965) (cited by Zachar, 1982), 21% of the studied soils were
24 highly erodible with I values >100 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ and EF >50%, 13% moderately erodible (I
25 between 50 and 100 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ and EF between 40 and 50%) and 66% slightly erodible (I <50

1 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ and EF <40%). From this latter group, almost half of the soils, with *I* values <10 Mg
2 ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹, were totally resistant to wind erosion.

3 Basic soil properties, such as texture and organic matter content, and soil management have
4 been frequently described as the main factors affecting soil aggregation in agricultural soils
5 (Gillette, 1988; Black and Chanasyk, 1989; Zobeck and Popham, 1990; Fryrear et al., 1994). In
6 our study, significant relationships were found between EF and some of the soil surface properties
7 measured (Table 1). There was correlation of EF with texture (positive with sand content and
8 negative with silt and clay contents), being EF adequately predicted from the sand/(silt+clay) ratio
9 (Fig. 2). This significant relationship ($r^2=0.426$; $P<0.001$) was considered satisfactory due to the
10 relatively narrow margin of textures found in the study area. All soils were medium-textured soils,
11 varying from sandy loam to silty clay loam. Sand content ranged from 30 to 640 g kg⁻¹, silt from
12 210 to 800 g kg⁻¹ and clay from 30 to 370 g kg⁻¹. As it can be seen in Fig. 2, the highest values of
13 EF corresponded to sandy loam soils followed by loam soils, the most frequent textural class
14 observed (45%). Whereas loam soils were present all over the study area, sandy loam soils were
15 restricted to zone C (Fig. 1). The lower soil erodibility of the rest of soils is explained by the
16 bonding effect of silt and clay fractions, providing a higher dry aggregate stability (Skidmore and
17 Layton, 1992; Quiroga et al., 1998). However, the data scatter observed in Fig. 2, especially for
18 the loam soils, indicates that other factors besides soil texture are affecting EF in the study area.

19 A significant but weak positive correlation was observed between EF and soil organic matter
20 content (Table 1). However, this relationship was due to two outlying values of organic matter (33
21 and 36 g kg⁻¹) because their exclusion made this relation non significant ($r=0.168$; $P=0.181$).
22 These two fields were in zone E, where soils are comparatively richer in organic matter, with
23 mean contents of 35 g kg⁻¹ (Machín and Navas, 1994). Despite the relatively high organic matter
24 content of these soils, their EF values were also high (50-70%) which contrasts with the general
25 association of good conditions in soil aggregation with high levels of soil organic matter (Fryrear
26 et al., 1994). Different studies indicate, however, that organic matter can act as an aggregating or

1 disaggregating agent or have no effect, depending of its amount, composition and the presence of
2 other aggregating materials (Breuninger et al., 1989; Igwe et al., 1999). Furthermore, the effect of
3 organic matter on soil aggregation depends on its decomposition process. Initially, an increase in
4 soil aggregation occurs due to the numerous cementing substances produced by microorganisms
5 attacking the vegetative matter. However, as the decomposition continues, the stability of
6 aggregates decreases since the cementing products, in turn, are destroyed by other
7 microorganisms. Therefore, a good soil aggregation condition depends on the frequent addition of
8 vegetative matter to the soil, being a more persistent condition if this vegetative matter is retained
9 on the surface (Chepil and Woodruff, 1963).

10 No significant correlation was found between EF and other soil chemical properties (Table 1).
11 The CaCO_3 content varied between 16 and 772 g kg^{-1} , being higher than 200 g kg^{-1} in 90% of the
12 soils. The gypsum content, ranging from 24 to 602 g kg^{-1} , was higher than 100 g kg^{-1} in only 13%
13 of the soils. Although calcareous soils are dominant in Central Aragon (Montañés et al., 1991),
14 gypsiferous soils area also present in 13% of the surface of the Zaragoza province, being the
15 largest area of these soils in Spain (Machín and Navas, 1998). In our study, calcareous soils were
16 unevenly distributed all over the study area, the most calcareous ones ($\text{CaCO}_3 > 600 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$) being
17 located in some fields of zones K and L (Fig. 1). Gypsiferous soils were located in fields of zones
18 D, F, G and K. The high content of CaCO_3 in our soils is probably an important factor of
19 erodibility since, according to Breuninger et al. (1989), medium-textured soils have a more
20 disaggregated surface layer when CaCO_3 is significant in their composition. In fact, this
21 disaggregating effect of CaCO_3 has been observed for most of the soil textures except for sands
22 and loamy sands (Chepil and Woodruff, 1963). In our study, no effect of CaCO_3 on EF was
23 observed (Table 1). However, when only the data from soils classified as Calcisols were analyzed,
24 a significant but relatively weak relationship was obtained ($r=0.303$; $P<0.05$), supporting the
25 observations of Chepil and Woodruff (1963) and Breuninger et al. (1989). No correlation was
26 found between gypsum content and EF.

1 Although high levels of gypsum or CaCO_3 in the soil surface allow to differentiate the four
2 soil types identified for the sampled fields (Table 2), soil erodibility had no correspondence with
3 soil type. Whereas soils are classified considering the different horizons of the soil profile, the
4 measured properties characterize only the soil surface. In addition, the surface layer in the sampled
5 soils has been continuously altered by annual tillage practices.

6 Three main tillage implements were identified in the study area as primary tillage tools used
7 by farmers during the fallow period: mouldboard plough (MP), chisel plough (Ch) and disk
8 harrow (DH). MP, the most traditional implement in the region, was used in 61 of the 67 fields
9 and Ch and DH in 4 and 2 fields, respectively. In 7 cases, a roller (R) was attached at the rear of
10 the main implement. DH replacing MP as primary tillage tool was observed in zone D (Fig. 1)
11 whereas, as a complementary implement following MP (MP+DH), was noted in zone F. The use
12 of Ch was restricted to zone I. Soil tillage had a significant effect on soil erodibility through EF
13 (Fig. 3). Thus, Ch was distinguished from the rest of tillage practices by producing the lowest EF
14 ($P < 0.001$), between 15 and 36% less EF than that produced by Ch+R and MP+R, respectively.
15 The lack of statistical significance among the other tillage operations was likely due to the large
16 differences in the number of fields under each tillage practice (for example, 52 fields with MP and
17 only 1 with DH). In addition, the influence of tillage on EF can be obscured by the effect of
18 texture, as discussed above. A higher statistical precision in the comparisons can be obtained by
19 both considering only EF data from the representative fields (with 6 values per field) and
20 comparing soils with the same texture and similar chemical composition (organic matter, CaCO_3 ,
21 and gypsum contents). Since not all tillage practices were done in soils with the same texture, a
22 different ANOVA must be performed to compare among the maximum number of tillage
23 practices. Only one field per textural class could be selected since Ch+R, DH+R and MP+DH
24 were applied only in one of the representative fields. Results from Table 3 indicate that, whereas
25 the EF produced by MP did not significantly increase by the following pass of DH (MP+DH), it
26 did when R was attached to MP (MP+R). Likewise, Ch+R led to the most favourable soil

1 aggregation with the lowest value of EF. A better soil aggregation status after Ch than after MP
2 was also observed in previous wind erosion studies carried out in two different soils of semiarid
3 Aragon (López et al., 1998; 2000). In contrast, this result does not agree with other observations in
4 soils of Texas (Zobeck and Popham, 1990; Fryrear et al., 1994), reporting a reduction in soil
5 erodibility with MP by bringing nonerodible aggregates to the soil surface. This disagreement may
6 be due to the different nature of these soils. Thus, the Texas soils are much sandier than our soils
7 and are not affected by high CaCO₃ contents. On the other hand, it is also probable that the soil
8 moisture content at the time of tillage was lower in our fields. Tilling under low soil moisture
9 content is not uncommon in the semiarid areas of Aragon, where the opportunity of tillage is
10 limited because of the uncertain nature of rainfall distribution (López et al., 1996). Thus, whereas
11 Ch operation may be done when soil is drier, MP requires a certain level of soil moisture to
12 produce soil cloddiness. On the other hand, the increase in EF after R, regardless of the main tool
13 to which it was attached, was in agreement with field observations of a high pulverization of soil
14 aggregates during the pass of a crushing element.

15 In summary, soil texture and soil management were the main factors affecting soil erodibility,
16 explaining together 50% of the total EF variability. Other factors not considered, such as soil
17 water content at the time of tillage, could also have contributed to the remaining variability in EF.
18 Among the *I* values >100 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹, the highest (170-244 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹) were found in zone C
19 (Fig. 1) where soils had a sandy loam texture and tillage was done with MP or MP+R. Although
20 soils in zone E were loam, the high *I* values (101-161 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹) in all fields could be attributed
21 to the relatively high sand content (average of 454 g kg⁻¹) and tilling with MP. The rest of the
22 fields were dispersed among different zones (B, K and M) and their high erodibility could be
23 explained by a high sand content, MP tillage and a high CaCO₃ content, as it was the case of
24 fallow fields in zone K.

25

1 **Ridge roughness.** Tillage affects soil losses by wind erosion through both soil aggregation, as
2 discussed earlier, and surface roughness. The effectiveness of ridges in reducing wind erosion
3 depends on their height, spacing and orientation with respect to wind direction. In the study area,
4 MP produced ridges with a mean height of 6.7 cm and a mean spacing of 43 cm; ridges produced
5 by Ch were 11 cm height and 51 cm apart; and those created by DH were 1.8 cm height at 13 cm
6 intervals. Derived mean values of factor K were 0.46, 0.57 and 0.78 for Ch, MP and DH,
7 respectively. These figures indicate a higher reduction in I (Eq. [2]) after Ch (54%) than after MP
8 (43%) or DH (22%). In all cases, the roughness created by ridges was destroyed by R when it
9 followed the main tool ($K=1$). On the other hand, the protection provided by ridges is really
10 effective when ridges are oriented perpendicularly to wind direction. In our study, only 14 out of a
11 total of 60 fields with a ridged surface, had tillage operations perpendicular to the WNW direction
12 of the *Cierzo* wind. In these fields, the range in the ridge direction was between 0° (north) and 45°
13 (north-east). On the contrary, in 20 fields ridges were running parallel to the *Cierzo*, exactly in the
14 range of 90° - 135° . In these cases, a value of 1 was assigned to K and, thereby, I was not reduced
15 by tillage roughness. In the remaining 26 fields, ridge orientation was considered nearly
16 perpendicular to the *Cierzo* and K was estimated as the mean value of those corresponding to the
17 perpendicular and parallel directions. The absence of a predominant ridge direction indicates that,
18 regardless of the type of tillage implement commonly used in a given zone, farmers in the region
19 do not take into account the tillage orientation with respect to wind. In those fields where tillage
20 was done perpendicularly or nearly perpendicularly to the *Cierzo* direction, I was reduced between
21 10% and 50% (average of 30%) (Eq. [2]).

22 The WEQ does not take into account the effect of stones as nonerodible material covering the
23 soil surface. Since some fields showed a certain level of stoniness, soil cover by stones and
24 pebbles was included in the WEQ by applying the mathematical relationship established by
25 Fryrear (1985) between soil loss ratio and the percentage of soil cover by nonerodible material.
26 Thus, some fields in zone I had the highest levels of stoniness with percentages of soil cover of

1 13% and 20%. Likewise, soils in zones E and C were covered by stones in about 10-15% of the
2 surface. These values of soil cover implied reductions in $E2$ ranging from 10% to 60%.

3

4 **Climatic erosivity.** Table 4 shows monthly values of climatic parameters used to calculate
5 mean values of CE and C for a 20-year period. The scale (c) and shape (k) parameters of the
6 Weibull distribution, determined from the wind speed, are also presented. Values of k close to 2 in
7 all months allowed us to determine CE from the simplified method of Skidmore (1986). February,
8 March and April, together with December, were the most erosive months with C values varying
9 between 119% and 215%. According to the FAO classification (FAO, 1980), climatic erosivity in
10 these months was high to very high. Wind speed seemed to be the determinant factor of the high
11 climatic severity. A C factor of 166%, as mean value for the February-April period, was included
12 in the step $E3$ of the WEQ (Eq. [3]). From this point onward, it was assumed that the climatic
13 conditions for this period prevailed for the entire year.

14

15 **Field dimension and orientation.** Field dimensions varied extensively with lengths ranging
16 from 80 to 1650 m and widths from 40 to 1000 m (surfaces of 0.3-160 ha), without observing any
17 tendency in their distribution by zones. Likewise, no predominant field orientation was detected.
18 In any case, the field was not long enough to reach the L_0 distance and, therefore, estimates of soil
19 erosion were always lower than the maximum erosion at L_0 . Reductions in $E3$ (Eq. [4]) depended
20 on the soil erodibility, being almost total in fields with $I < 10 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and only by 7% in fields
21 with $I \sim 200 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$.

22

23 **Soil cover by crop residues.** Maintaining residue cover on the soil surface is considered the
24 most effective method to control wind erosion (Skidmore, 1988; Watson, 1994). In many semiarid
25 regions, however, low biomass production, as well as inadequate agricultural practices, lead to
26 limited amounts of crop residues and, thereby, insufficient soil protection. This is the case of the

1 study area, where soil cover by crop residues was negligible (<1%) in 76% of the fields. The
2 highest percentages of residue cover (10-25%) corresponded to fields tilled with Ch in zone I. In
3 all cases crop residues laid flat on the surface. Although residue covers of 2-5% provided
4 reductions in $E4$ of 10-20% (Eq. [5]), these were not sufficient to decrease soil erosion estimates
5 from high to tolerable levels.

6
7 ***Expected soil losses by wind erosion.*** Estimates of average annual soil loss were multiplied
8 by the fraction of CE corresponding to the February-April period (i.e. 42%; Table 4) to obtain
9 values of expected wind erosion for this critical fallow period (Table 5). According to the FAO
10 classification (FAO, 1980), the predicted wind erosion was high to very high in 30% of the fallow
11 fields surveyed in the study area (from 22 to 141 Mg ha⁻¹) and moderate in 28% (5-19 Mg ha⁻¹)
12 (Table 5). Fields with a high risk of wind erosion were located in zones C, E, B, D, K and M, and
13 also, but with minor representation, in zones L and N (Fig. 4). This high expected wind erosion is
14 explained by a high soil erodibility, mainly due to both a relatively high sand content and
15 intensive tillage. In addition, the low amounts of crop residue coupled with the large unsheltered
16 fields widths, and tillage more or less parallel to the *Cierzo* direction do little to reduce the risk of
17 erosion.

18 It should be mentioned that values of soil erosion predicted from the WEQ are estimates of
19 average soil loss and, therefore, they should be used with caution. The estimations may differ from
20 the actual soil losses due to variations from the average of climatic parameters, such as
21 precipitation and wind. Thus, the wind erosion hazard is accelerated during a drought year because
22 the lack de precipitation leads to a lower residue production and a higher soil erodibility (Merrill
23 et al., 1999). Likewise, the WEQ does not account for temporal variation of soil surface
24 properties. Although in our study soil losses were only estimated for the February-April period
25 and the soil was not disturbed by management practices during this period, some changes in soil
26 erodibility could have occurred. For example, significant changes in EF in relatively short periods

1 of time may be associated with climatic processes (Larney et al., 1994) and with the wind erosion
2 process itself, such as a gradual depletion in erodible particles up to reach a situation of limited
3 supply of particles available for erosion (López, 1998; López et al., 2000). In spite of these
4 limitations, the WEQ has been useful in the present study to identify agricultural zones with a
5 higher risk of wind erosion and to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative control practices.

6
7 ***Wind erosion control practices.*** The WEQ can be used to design optimal management
8 strategies to control wind erosion by determining which combination of I , K , L and V is required
9 to reduce soil losses to a tolerable level. With this purpose, the WEQ was applied in the fallow
10 fields presenting a high to very high risk of wind erosion during the February-April period (>20
11 Mg ha^{-1}). Thus, for the fields with the highest risk of erosion ($>80 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$; Fig. 4), where MP or
12 MP+R was used, ploughing perpendicularly to the prevailing WNW direction, without the R pass,
13 would reduce the expected wind erosion by about 40%. In addition, if L is shortened through a
14 reduction in the field size, the expected soil loss would lower to moderate levels (i.e. $4\text{-}20 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$).
15 Thus, the WEQ predicts a mean reduction of 80% in soil erosion if the field is shortened to
16 about 20 m (an adequate distance to operate with the current farming machinery). Stripcropping,
17 alternating narrow strips of cereal with fallow (the two stages of the traditional cereal-fallow
18 rotation), could also be a viable strategy to reduce L and, hence, soil losses. Finally, a sufficient
19 amount of crop residues could provide a good soil protection. However, between 600 and 1000 kg
20 ha^{-1} of cereal residues would be needed to reduce erosion to a tolerable level ($\sim 4 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$) and
21 maintaining this amount of residues after ploughing is not a possible option in the study area. A
22 higher residue cover can be obtained through conservation tillage systems. In this sense, if MP is
23 substituted by Ch, the amount of residues estimated by the WEQ to have a soil loss of 4 Mg ha^{-1}
24 would be of $200\text{-}400 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$. This level of crop residue could be retained most years in zones with
25 an average cereal yield of $1300\text{-}1500 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$. This takes into account that about 70% of cereal

1 residues remains after chiseling (Carter et al., 1992) and about 80% after weathering from harvest
2 to primary tillage (Dickey et al., 1986).

3 For the fallow fields with a high risk of wind erosion (i.e. 20-80 Mg ha⁻¹; Fig. 4), the WEQ
4 indicates that tilling narrow strips of land (20-80 m wide) with MP or DH perpendicularly to the
5 WNW direction would be sufficient to achieve low soil losses (<0.30 Mg ha⁻¹). However, better
6 control of wind erosion would be achieved with conservation tillage, such as reduced tillage with
7 chiseling as primary operation. Previous results on crop and soil response to conservation tillage
8 (López et al., 1996, 1998; López and Arrúe, 1997) indicate that reduced tillage can be
9 recommended as a fallow management alternative in semiarid Aragon. In fact, chiseling is being
10 introduced by farmers in zone I.

11 It would be desirable that the above recommendations, which farmers could easily incorporate
12 into their cropping systems with the farming equipment currently available, could be used for the
13 development of specific guidelines on best agricultural management practices for wind erosion
14 prevention in semiarid Aragon.

REFERENCES CITED

- 1
- 2 Austin, R.B., C. Cantero-Martínez, J.L. Arrúe, E. Playán, and P. Cano-Marcellán. 1998. Yield-
3 rainfall relationships in cereal cropping systems in the Ebro river valley of Spain. *European*
4 *Journal of Agronomy* 8:239-248.
- 5 Biel, A. and L. García de Pedraza. 1962. El clima en Zaragoza y ensayo climatológico para el
6 Valle del Ebro. Ministerio del Aire, Servicio Meteorológico Nacional. Publicaciones Serie A
7 (Memorias) No. 36, Madrid, 57 p.
- 8 Black, J.M.W. and D.S. Chanasyk. 1989. The wind erodibility of some Alberta soils after seeding:
9 aggregation in relation to field parameters. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science* 69:835-847.
- 10 Breuninger, R.H., D.A. Gillette, and R. Kihl. 1989. Formation of wind-erodible aggregates for
11 salty soils and soils with less than 50% sand composition in natural terrestrial environments.
12 In: Leinen, M., Sarnthein, M. (Eds.), *Paleoclimatology and Paleometeorology: Modern and*
13 *Past Patterns of Global Atmospheric Transport*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 31-63.
- 14 Carter, D., P. Findlater, and S. Porritt. 1992. Stubble retention for control wind erosion. *W.A.*
15 *Journal of Agriculture* 33:15-17.
- 16 Chepil, W.S., N.P. Woodruff. 1963. The physics of wind erosion and its control. *Advances in*
17 *Agronomy* 15:211-302.
- 18 De Ploey, J., A.V. Auzet, H.R. Bork, N. Misopolinos, G. Rodolfi, M. Sala, and N.G. Silleos. 1989.
19 *Soil Erosion Map of Western Europe*. Catena Verlag, Cremlingen-Destedt, Germany.
- 20 Dickey, E.C., P.J. Jasa, and D.P. Shelton. 1986. Estimating residue cover. *NebGuide G86-793*,
21 *University of Nebraska, Lincoln*, 4 p.
- 22 FAO. 1980. A provisional methodology for soil degradation assessment. FAO-UNESCO, Rome.
- 23 FAO-UNESCO. 1990. *Soil Map of the World. Revised Legend*, World Soil Resources Report No.
24 60, FAO, Rome.
- 25 Fryrear, D.W. 1985. Soil cover and wind erosion. *Transactions of the ASAE* 28:781-784.

- 1 Fryrear, D.W., C.A. Krammes, D.L. Williamson, and T.M. Zobeck. 1994. Computing the wind
2 erodible fraction of soils. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 49:183-188.
- 3 Fryrear, D.W., J.D. Bilbro, A. Saleh, H. Schomberg, J.E. Stout, and T.M. Zobeck. 2000. RWEQ:
4 Improved wind erosion technology. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 55:183-189.
- 5 Gee, G.W. and J.W. Bauder. 1986. Particle-size analysis. In: Klute, A. (Ed.), *Methods of Soil*
6 *Analysis: Part 1. Physical and Mineralogical Methods*, 2nd edn. Agronomy No. 9, ASA,
7 Madison, WI, pp. 383-411.
- 8 Gillette, D.A., 1988. Threshold friction velocities for dust production for agricultural soils. *Journal*
9 *of Geophysical Research* 93:12645-12662.
- 10 Gobierno de Aragón. 2000. Anuario Estadístico de Aragón 1998. Departamento de Agricultura,
11 Secretaría General Técnica, Zaragoza. Available at <http://www.aragob.es/agri/ama/ama.htm>
12 (verified 12 May 2000).
- 13 Herrero, J. and R.L. Snyder. 1997. Aridity and irrigation in Aragón, Spain. *Journal of Arid*
14 *Environments* 35:535-547.
- 15 Igwe, C.A., F.O.R. Akamigbo, and J.S.C. Mbagwu. 1999. Chemical and mineralogical properties
16 of soils in southeastern Nigeria in relation to aggregate stability. *Geoderma* 92:111-123.
- 17 Larney, F.J., C.W. Lindwall, and M.S. Bullock. 1994. Fallow management and overwinter effects
18 on wind erodibility in Southern Alberta. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 58:1788-
19 1794.
- 20 López, M.V. 1998. Wind erosion in agricultural soils: an example of limited supply of particles
21 available for erosion. *Catena* 33:17-28.
- 22 López, M.V. and J.L. Arrúe. 1997. Growth, yield and water use efficiency of winter barley in
23 response to conservation tillage in a semiarid region of Spain. *Soil & Tillage Research* 44:35-
24 54.

- 1 López, M.V., J.L. Arrúe, and V. Sánchez-Girón. 1996. A comparison between seasonal changes in
2 soil water storage and penetration resistance under conventional and conservation tillage
3 systems in Aragon. *Soil & Tillage Research* 37:251-271.
- 4 López, M.V., M. Sabre, R. Gracia, J.L. Arrúe, and L. Gomes. 1998. Tillage effects on soil surface
5 conditions and dust emission by wind erosion in semiarid Aragon (NE Spain). *Soil & Tillage
6 Research* 45:91-105.
- 7 López, M.V., R. Gracia, and J.L. Arrúe. 2000. Effects of reduced tillage on soil surface properties
8 affecting wind erosion in semiarid fallow lands of Central Aragon. *European Journal of
9 Agronomy* 12:191-199.
- 10 Lyles, L. and B.E. Allison. 1981. Equivalent wind-erosion protection from selected crop residues.
11 *Transactions of the ASAE* 24:405-408.
- 12 Machín, J. and A. Navas. 1994. Los suelos de los Montes de Peñaflor, Acampo de Hospital y otras
13 zonas de interés municipal. Final Report. CSIC-Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza Project, Spain.
- 14 Machín, J. and A. Navas. 1998. Spatial analysis of gypsiferous soils in the Zaragoza province
15 (Spain), using GIS as an aid to conservation. *Geoderma* 87:57-66.
- 16 Merrill, S.D., A.L. Black, D.W. Fryrear, A. Saleh, T.M. Zobeck, A.D. Halvorson, and D.L.
17 Tanaka. 1999. Soil wind erosion hazard of spring wheat-fallow as affected by long-term
18 climate and tillage. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 63:1768-1777.
- 19 Montañés, L., M. Sanz, and L. Heras. 1991. Fertilidad de los suelos de secano de la provincia de
20 Zaragoza. Diputación General de Aragón, Departamento de Agricultura, Ganadería y Montes.
21 Serie Estudios Agrarios, Zaragoza, Spain, 233 p.
- 22 Page, A.L., R.H. Miller, and D.R. Keeney (Eds.). 1982. *Methods of Soil Analysis: Part 2.*
23 *Chemical and Microbiological Properties*, 2nd edn. Agronomy No. 9, ASA, Madison, WI.
- 24 Poesen, J.W.A. and J.M. Hooke. 1999. Erosion, flooding and channel management in
25 desertification prone areas of the European Mediterranean. In: Balabanis P. et al. (Eds.)

- 1 Mediterranean Desertification: Research results and policy implications. Volume 1, European
2 Commission, EUR 19303, Luxembourg, pp. 151-197.
- 3 Quiroga, A.R., D.E. Buschiazzo, and N. Peinemann. 1998. Management discriminant properties in
4 semiarid soils. *Soil Science* 163:591-597.
- 5 Rosenberg, N.J., B. Blad, and S.B. Verma. 1983. *Microclimate-The Biological Environment*. John
6 Wiley & Sons, New York, 495 p.
- 7 Shiyatyi, E.I. 1965. Wind structure and velocity over a rugged soil surface (in Russian). *Vestnik*
8 *Sel.-khoz. Nauki* 10, Alma-Ata.
- 9 Skidmore, E.L. 1986. Wind-erosion climatic erosivity. *Climate Change* 9:195-208.
- 10 Skidmore, E.L. 1988. Wind erosion. In: Lal, R. (Ed.), *Soil Erosion Research Methods*. Soil and
11 Water Conservation Society, Iowa, pp. 203-233.
- 12 Skidmore, E.L. and J.B. Layton. 1992. Dry-soil aggregate stability as influenced by selected soil
13 properties. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 56:557-561.
- 14 Sterk, G., M.V. López, and J.L. Arrúe. 1999. Saltation transport on a silt loam soil in north east
15 Spain. *Land Degradation and Development* 10:545-554.
- 16 Watson, S. (Editor). 1994. *Best Management Practices for Wheat: A Guide to Profitable and*
17 *Environmentally Sound Production*. Cooperative Extension System. National Association of
18 Wheat Growers Foundation, Washington, D.C., 119 p.
- 19 Williams, J.R., C.A. Jones, and P.T. Dyke. 1984. A modeling approach to determining the
20 relationship between erosion and soil productivity. *Transactions of the ASAE* 27:129-144.
- 21 Woodruff, N.P. and F.H. Siddoway. 1965. A wind erosion equation. *Soil Science Society of*
22 *America Proceedings* 29:602-608.
- 23 Zachar, D. 1982. *Soil Erosion*. Elsevier/North-Holland Inc., New York, 547 p.
- 24 Zobeck, T.M. and T.W. Popham. 1990. Dry aggregate size distribution of sandy soils as
25 influenced by tillage and precipitation. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 54:198-204.

Figure legends

1

2

3 **Figure 1.** Location of the study fields (λ) within main dryland farming areas (shaded areas) of
4 semiarid Aragon with mean annual rainfall less than 400 mm.

5

6 **Figure 2.** Wind-erodible fraction (aggregates <0.84 mm in diameter) of soil surface (0-2.5 cm
7 depth) as function of soil texture.

8

9 **Figure 3.** Wind-erodible fraction (aggregates <0.84 mm in diameter) of soil surface (0-2.5 cm
10 depth) as affected by tillage (Ch, chisel plough; MP, mouldboard plough; DH, disk harrow;
11 and, R, roller). Different letters indicate significant differences at $P<0.05$.

12

13 **Figure 4.** Predicted wind erosion in the study fields for the February-April period (, >80 Mg ha⁻¹;
14 , 20-80 Mg ha⁻¹; , 4-20 Mg ha⁻¹; , <4 Mg ha⁻¹).

Table 1

Correlation coefficients of physical and chemical soil surface properties (0-2.5 cm depth)

	EF	Sand	Silt	Clay	Org. matter	CaCO ₃	Gypsum	EC	pH	Stoniness
EF ^a	1									
Sand (2000-50 µm)	0.531***	1								
Silt (50-2 µm)	-0.413***	-0.873***	1							
Clay (<2 µm)	-0.324***	-0.427***	-0.068	1						
Organic matter	0.278**	-0.113	0.085	0.074	1					
CaCO ₃	0.082	0.146	-0.151	-0.018	0.057	1				
Gypsum	-0.073	-0.197	0.433***	-0.400***	-0.179	-0.381***	1			
EC ^b	-0.030	-0.403***	0.541***	-0.180	-0.120	-0.153	0.612***	1		
pH	-0.180	0.243**	-0.281**	0.023	-0.325***	0.138	-0.213*	-0.639***	1	
Stoniness ^c	0.402***	0.502***	-0.423***	-0.243**	0.376***	-0.078	-0.085	-0.335***	0.029	1

^a Wind-erodible fraction.^b Electrical conductivity.^c Percentage of soil cover by stones.* Significant at $P < 0.10$.** Significant at $P < 0.05$.*** Significant at $P < 0.01$.

Table 2

Soil surface properties (0-2.5 cm depth) for different soil types (mean values and standard deviation)

	Calcisol	Gypsisol	Leptosol	Regosol	ANOVA <i>F</i> prob.
Frequency	46	7	7	7	
EF ^a (%)	35±21 a ^c	33±10 a	45±17 a	34±11 a	0.441 ^d
CaCO ₃ (g kg ⁻¹)	398±122 a	205±73 b	277±194 ab	347±110 a	0.001
Gypsum (g kg ⁻¹)	47±16 a	360±145 b	57±11 a	89±76 a	<0.001 ^d
EC ^b (dS m ⁻¹)	0.60±0.81 a	2.46±0.17 b	0.53±0.89 a	1.61±1.10 b	<0.001 ^d
pH	8.4±0.3 a	8.2±0.2 a	8.2±0.2 a	8.3±0.3 a	0.110
Organic matter (g kg ⁻¹)	12.0±4.5 a	9.7±4.3 a	20.2±10.3 b	11.4±4.5 a	0.024 ^d

^a Wind-erodible fraction.^b Electrical conductivity.^c Within rows, mean values followed by the same letter are not significantly different at $P < 0.05$.^d Statistics calculated with transformed data.

Table 3

Wind-erodible fraction of soil surface (0-2.5 cm depth) as affected by tillage^a

Textural class	Tillage practice ^b	EF ^c (%)	ANOVA <i>F</i> prob.
Silty clay loam	MP	25 a	0.114
	MP+DH	31 a	
Sandy loam	MP	71 a	0.015
	MP+R	80 b	
Silt loam	Ch+R	13 a	<0.001
	MP	32 b	
	DH+R	42 c	

^a Data from 7 representative fields with six samples per field.

^b MP, mouldboard plough; DH, disk harrow; R, roller; and Ch, chisel plough.

^c Wind-erodible fraction.

Table 4

Basic climatic information to calculate monthly wind erosion climatic erosivity (*CE*) and climatic factor (*C*) for the period 1965-1984

Month	Precipitation (mm)	Net radiation (Mj m ⁻²)	Wind speed ^a (m s ⁻¹)	<i>c</i> ^b (m s ⁻¹)	<i>k</i> ^b	<i>CE</i> (MJ m ⁻²)	<i>C</i> (%)
Jan	21	166	4.8	5.3	1.7	150	93
Feb	21	209	5.0	5.6	1.8	193	119
Mar	28	313	5.2	5.8	1.9	265	164
Apr	32	369	5.5	6.1	1.9	346	215
May	41	474	4.7	5.2	1.7	151	93
Jun	31	528	4.5	5.0	1.7	125	77
Jul	15	598	4.8	5.3	1.7	187	116
Aug	21	526	4.5	5.1	1.7	137	85
Sep	22	393	3.9	4.4	1.5	53	33
Oct	27	307	4.0	4.5	1.6	60	37
Nov	37	185	4.5	5.0	1.7	67	41
Dec	21	137	5.1	5.7	1.8	204	126
Year	317	4205	4.7	5.3	1.7	1938	100

^a At 10-m height.

^b *c* and *k* are the estimated scale and shape parameters of Weibull distribution (Skidmore, 1986).

Table 5

Values and classification of the expected soil losses by wind erosion in the study area

Wind erosion class ^a	Soil loss		Frequency (%)
	Annual ^b (Mg ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	Feb-Apr (Mg ha ⁻¹)	
Zero to slight	<10	<4	42
Moderate	10-50	4-20	28
High	50-200	20-80	21
Very high	>200	>80	9

^a FAO (1980).

^b Estimated for the climatic conditions occurring during the February-April period.







