

DETERMINATION OF WATER RETENTION BY THE NATIVE FIELD OF THE PAMPA BIOME WITH SIMULATED RAIN

Cabrieli Aline Jaeger*, Renato Beppler Spohr, Edner Baumhardt***,
Fagner Augusto Rontani******

* Graduate Student of the Graduate Program in Environmental Science and
Technology, Federal University of Santa Maria – Frederico Westphalen Campus,
cabrieli@hotmail.com

Graduate Program in Environmental Science and Technology, Federal University
of Santa Maria – Frederico Westphalen Campus, renato.spohr@ufsm.br
Department of Forest Engineering, Federal University of Santa Maria – Frederico
Westphalen Campus, ednerb@gmail.com

Ph.D. Student at North Dakota State University – Fargo Campus, United States,
fagner_rontani@outlook.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/raega.v6i1l.95494>

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to evaluate the applicability of two different methods to determine water retention by native vegetation of the Pampa Biome, using a rainfall simulator. Method 1 used structured samples of native field vegetation and soil, and method 2 used vegetation samples without the presence of soil; all of which were submitted to the application of simulated rain. With the obtained data, it was possible to estimate the amount of water retained by the vegetation. The results from the application of method 1 pointed to retention values of 5.4% and 10.9%, 18.6% and 27.8%. While by applying method 2 the retention values found were 8.5% and 12.7%. In any case, both methods showed significant values of water retention by this vegetation, and the variations can be associated with the chosen method, as well as with the natural characteristics of each study area.

KEYWORDS: VEGETATION. HYDROLOGICAL. METHODOLOGY.

RESUMO

O objetivo deste trabalho é avaliar a aplicabilidade de duas metodologias distintas para determinar a retenção de água pela vegetação nativa do Bioma Pampa, utilizando um simulador de chuvas. A metodologia 1 utilizou-se de amostras estruturadas de vegetação de campo nativo e de solo, e a metodologia 2 utilizou-se apenas de amostras de vegetação sem a presença de solo; todas quais foram submetidas à aplicação de chuva simulada. Com os dados obtidos, estimou-se a quantidade de água que esta vegetação retém em eventos chuvosos. Por meio do método 1 encontrou-se valores estimados de retenção de 5,4% e 10,9%, 18,6% e 27,8%. Já, pelo método 2 encontrou-se valores estimados de retenção de 8,5% e 12,7%. De todo modo, ambos os métodos apresentaram valores

significativos de retenção de água por esta vegetação, sendo as variações encontradas associadas à própria metodologia, ou às características naturais de cada área de estudo.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: VEGETAÇÃO. HIDROLÓGICOS. METODOLOGIA.

INTRODUCTION

Due to the growing demand for natural resources, water is a natural element that is becoming increasingly scarce in quality and quantity, (TUNDISI; MATSUMURA-TUNDISI, 2020). Because it is a limited and essential life resource (BRASIL, 1997), it is extremely relevant to monitor it and conduct integrated studies of hydrology, pedology, geology and land use (FACCO; CANCELIER, 2019), to better understand interactions between the components present in water systems.

Interception is a hydrological process directly related to the vegetation (RODRIGUES; PRUSKI, 2019); which consists of rainwater being temporarily retained by plants, and later returned to the atmosphere through evaporation (RIBEIRO FILHO et al., 2019).

Although many components of the relationship between vegetation and hydrological processes are well known, in what concerns the native vegetation of the Pampa biome, little is known about its interaction between the water balance, mainly regarding the precipitation retention process (GIGLIO; KOBIYAMA, 2013); which makes it difficult to establish a parameter for comparisons that would makes it possible to evaluate the effects that changes in the natural vegetation can cause on hydrological variables in this biome.

Current studies that determine the interception of water by herbaceous vegetation only mention the intervention of the aerial part of the plants (TSIKO et al., 2012; LANZA, 2015; ZOU et al., 2015; REICHERT et al., 2017; BRITTO; BAPTISTA; LIMA, 2019; GORDON et al., 2020; EBLING et al., 2021), it is important to obtain water retention data from both the aerial part and from the underground part of herbaceous species; considering that the root system also influences the amount of precipitated water that is available to the groundwater, due to the direct relationship that the roots have with the soil water (LU et al., 2020).

Thus, the present study aimed to evaluate the applicability of two distinct methods to determine water retention by native vegetation of the Pampa Biome, using a rainfall simulator.

The tests of rain simulations were carried out in November of 2014 and November of 2022 in the county of Rosário do Sul in Rio Grande do Sul, in Brazil, and in November of 2021 in the county of Caçapava do Sul in Rio Grande do Sul, in Brazil. One of the methods used to determine water retention by herbaceous vegetation of native field, samples of vegetation and soil were used, and for the other, only vegetation samples.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Location of the study areas

The study was conducted in two distinct areas of the state of Rio Grande do Sul, in Brazil, one is located in the county of Rosário do Sul (RO), in which data collection

took place in November 2014 and November 2022, and the other in the county of Caçapava do Sul (CA), in which the data collection happened in November 2021.

The municipality RO has a humid subtropical Cfa climate, according to the Köppen classification, with hot summers and average annual temperature of 18.6 °C (ALVARES et al., 2013). Its annual precipitation varies between 1500 to 1600 mm, with rainfalls well distributed throughout the year (MATZENAUER; RADIN; ALMEIDA, 2011), and the soils are moderately deep (STRECK et al., 2018) with high sand content in the surface layer (AVILA, 2014).

The municipality of CA, according to the Köppen classification, has a Cfb climate for the higher parts and Cfa in the lower parts. Summer is warm and humid, and winter is cool; average annual temperature is 18°C (MATZENAUER; RADIN; ALMEIDA, 2011). Annual precipitation varies between 1670 mm (NUNES et al., 2013) and 1727 mm, with rainfalls well distributed throughout the year (MATZENAUER; RADIN; ALMEIDA, 2011); and the soils are shallow, stony, and sandy (CARNEIRO et al., 2016).

Both studied areas have a predominance of a wavy relief pattern (DIAS; TRENTIN, 2018; CARNEIRO et al., 2016) with natural vegetation, composed mainly of grasses (QUADROS et al., 2006; NUNES et al., 2013), which are kept under continuous grazing at a height of approximately 0.50 m.

Extraction of native field readers

A total of 96 samples were collected, of which 56 were obtained in the test area located in the city of Rosario do Sul and 40 in Caçapava do Sul. The sampling points were selected at random with each test area, and for each of these points a sample set was collected, which was composed of three samples of vegetation (vegetation + soil), and a control sample (soil only), totaling four samples. Each sample set was extracted from the same sampling point.

For the sample extraction, metal trays with removable bottom measuring 0.50 m x 0.40 m were used. To mark the dimensions of the samples, the metal trays were placed on the ground, delimiting the area of each one, so that the samples could have their sides cut.

Regarding depth, each sample had its bottom sawn to a height of approximately 0.05 m thickness, so that the bottom plate of the tray could be inserted, obtaining native field readouts with their preserved structures (Figure 1).

The control samples were extracted in a layer immediately below the place where the vegetation samples were collected, using the same methodology, however, only collecting soil.

Figure 1 - Extraction sequence of samples containing vegetation (A to E) and extraction of control sample (F).



Source: Authors, 2014.

(A) Allocation of the tray on the area to be sampled; (B) Cutting and insertion of the tray at 5 cm depth; (C) Cutting in depth of the sample; (D) Insertion of the removable bottom of the tray; (E) Removal of the sample with its structure preserved; (F) Taken from the witness sample with its structure preserved.

Tests with simulated rainfall (Method 1)

After collecting and weighing the samples to obtain the sample mass before rain exposure, they were placed on a wooden bench arranged in the area covered by the simulator, which reproduces the slope of the field in which these samples were naturally arranged (slope of 13%).

The rainfall simulator used for the tests was calibrated and validated by Spohr et al. (2015), presenting a relationship that exceeds 84% between the rain produced and the natural rain. The coverage area of the simulated rain was 1.0m x 1.2m, approximately,

which was applied at an intensity of 100 mm.h⁻¹, during 10 minutes for each of the tests performed, simulating a high intensity rain.

To avoid the soil surface sealing caused by the direct impact of the raindrop, the control samples (without vegetation) were covered with a 50% shading screen, before being subjected to the simulation.

After each test with simulated rain took place, there was a waiting period of 5 minutes until the excess water drained from the tray stopped, before weighing the samples again, and obtaining the mass of the samples after applying the rain.

The mass of water retained in each of the control samples was determined by calculating the gravimetric content (Equation 1), and the average results were then calculated.

$$Ug = \frac{Mu - Ms}{Ms} * 100 \quad (1)$$

Ug is the gravimetric water content present in the control sample (%); Ms is the mass of the control sample obtained before applying the simulated rain (g); and Mu is the mass of the control sample obtained after the application of simulated rain (g).

By obtaining the gravimetric content of the control samples (Ug), it was possible to estimate the mass of water retained by the soil samples present within the vegetation samples. To obtain the result, the turgid biomass of the vegetation was discounted from the total dry mass of each sample with vegetation, obtained before the application of rain; then, the result obtained was multiplied by the average percentage of the gravimetric content of the control samples, as described in Equation 2. Therefore, the difference between the total mass of water retained by the sample and the amount of water retained by the soil, resulted in the content volume retained by vegetation, which was converted into the water retention.

$$Ma = (Mua - Msa) - (Msa - Bt) * MUg \quad (2)$$

In which Ma refers to the mass of water retained by vegetation (g) in each simulated rain event; Msa is the mass of the sample with vegetation (g) obtained before the application of simulated rain; Mua is the mass of the sample with vegetation (g) obtained after the simulated rain; Bt is the turgid biomass of the vegetation (g), obtained by weighing only the vegetal part of the samples; and MUg is the average percentage of gravimetric soil moisture (%), obtained by Equation 1.

As for the amount of rain that fell in each of the tests, this was determined using 8 water collecting cups, a pluviometer type, with a catchment area of 0.005026 m², installed under the simulator's coverage area. The amount of water that fell on the samples during the simulated rain was used to determine the percentage of water that was retained in the samples in each test.

Simulated rainfall tests (Method 2)

After the tests described in method 1, the samples collected in the municipality of RO in 2022 were submitted to another method to determine water retention by the native

vegetation of the Pampa Biome. As this method only used samples that contained native vegetation, the control samples were discarded, and those with vegetation were washed to remove all soil from them, as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2 - Demonstration of the washing process of the samples for the soil removal in them.



Source: Authors, 2022.

Subsequently, the samples were dried out in the shade for approximately 4 hours, until all the water on the vegetation evaporated, and then, they were weighed to obtain their “dry” mass (before the application of simulated rain) and were again subjected to the simulation of rain, under the same conditions as those described in method 1, however, with application of rain for only 5 minutes for each of the tests.

After each simulation, a waiting time of 2 minutes was applied to account for the drainage of the excess of water, and then the samples were weighed again to obtain their wet mass. The volumetric content of water retained by the vegetation can be determined by using Equation 3.

$$Ma = \frac{\frac{(M_{uv}-B_t) - (M_{sv}-B_s)}{A_l} + 10}{B_t} \quad (3)$$

In which Ma is the mass of water retained by the vegetation (mm. Kg⁻¹); Muv is the mass of the plant sample obtained after the application of simulated rain (g); Bu is the mass of the wet tray, obtained after the application of simulated rain (g); Msv is the mass of the plant sample obtained before the application of simulated rain (g); Bs is the mass of the dry tray, obtained before the application of simulated rain (g); Al is the area of the sod (cm²); and Bt is the turgid biomass of the vegetation (Kg).

Rainfall data

From the determination of the water retained by the vegetation of the Pampa biome, historical precipitation data from this region was used to estimate the amount of water retained over a period of 24 months. The historical rainfall data were acquired through the HidroWeb Portal (stations 03054007 in Rosário do Sul and 03053022 in Caçapava do Sul), from the years of 2019 and 2020.

When processing the rainfall data obtained, it was considered that for events that had a sequence of two days or more of rain occurrence, water retention took place in just

one day, as a greater amount of water precipitated in longer periods causes the saturation of the vegetation.

Thus, having determined the number of rainy days in which there was effective retention, these were multiplied by the amount of water retained in the vegetation, obtained through rain simulation tests; and then, the percentage of water retained by the vegetation of the Pampa Biome was estimated, considering the total precipitation for the respective years.

Plant Biomass

The turgid biomass of the vegetation of the native field (shoot and root) used in Equations 2 and 3, was determined using 5 samples (1m²) of each test area, from which the soil was removed and its mass was obtained by weighing.

Subsequently, the same plant material was dried in an oven at 65°C until a constant weight was obtained, to obtain its dry biomass, which was used in the analysis to understand the influence of the biomass of the native field can on the amount of water retained by this vegetation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Water retention by the vegetation obtained by Method 1

In this method the simulated rain applied on the samples presented few variations between the tests, presenting an average of 16.9 mm for the performed tests in the municipality of Rosário do Sul (RO), and 17.7 mm from those performed in Caçapava do Sul (CA). The small variations observed may be related to the limitations of the method.

Table 1 - Soil gravimetric content (Ug) and water depth retained by vegetation, obtained from the tests performed with simulated rain, from method 1.

County	Rosário do Sul		Caçapava do Sul	
	Layer retained in the vegetation		Layer retained in the vegetation	
Test	Ug on soil (%)	(mm)*	Ug on soil (%)	(mm)*
1	8.4	1.5	20.0	2.4
2	9.4	2.3	18.4	0.0
3	8.6	1.4	18.6	1.7
4	10.2	3.5	18.8	3.3
5	10.3	4.2	24.7	3.5
6	19.7	6.9	10.6	0.7
7	8.7	6.1	22.0	1.2
8	12.0	4.6	16.5	3.2
9	6.8	4.6	23.2	0.4
10	8.3	3.9	23.5	0.3
11	18.5	2.2	-	-
12	22.8	2.0	-	-

13	17.0	3.1	-	-
14	26.8	3.3	-	-
Mean	13.4	3.5	19.6	1.7
SD	6.1	1.6	3.9	1.3
CV	45.7%	44.9%	20.0%	76.5%

Source: Authors, 2022.

*Mean of the three repetitions; SD = standard deviation; CV = coefficient of variation.

The gravimetric soil moisture in the control samples (Table 1) was higher for CA soil (19.6%) than for RO soil (13.4%). This difference is possibly related to the characteristics of the soil, since the RO was visibly sandier, while the CA soil appeared to have higher levels of silt/clay, which may explain its greater water retention capacity (BUSKE, 2013).

As for the amount of dry biomass (shoot and root), the value found for the native field of CA was 2.16 kg.m⁻²; while for RO, the value found in 2014 was 1.48 kg.m⁻² and in 2022, was 3.64 kg.m⁻². This difference observed between the two years in the RO area may be related to the fact that, in the year 2022, litter was considered in the biomass accounting, while in 2014 it was not.

In any case, the vegetation samples obtained showed development characteristics very similar to those found in the literature: sparse aerial biomass due to grazing in the area (GÓES et al., 2021) and a high root density in the superficial layers of the soil, which influenced the proportion of existing plant material (TENTARDINI, 2015; ATAIDE, 2015).

The average water depth retained by vegetation in RO was 3.5 mm, while in CA was 1.7 mm, presenting high variability of retention data in relation to the average for both areas, 45.7 and 76.5%, respectively. This variation may be related to the amount, type of biomass and floristic composition, as well as the variation, although subtle, in the thickness of the samples, because the amount of root biomass varies according to its depth (ATAIDE, 2015).

The percentage of water retained by the vegetation during the simulation tests was 20.9% and 9.4%, for the tests performed in RO and CA, respectively. Considering the provisions of Lima (2008), these values may have been minimized due to rainfall intensity and application time, since these were obtained through a simulated rain of 100 mm.h⁻¹ applied for 10 minutes.

However, considering that the average monthly interception by herbaceous vegetation of the native field in the literature is 7.5% (BAUMHARDT, 2010), the values found in this study were higher. However, the present methodology was idealized considering the aerial and root parts of the plants, and not only the aerial part, as presented by Reichert et al. (2017) and Lanza (2015), which may have influenced this due to the increased water retention that the root part of the plants provides; according to Dunnett et al. (2008), water retention is higher in plants with high root biomass.

Water retention by vegetation by Method 2

The simulated rain applied on the vegetation samples also presented little variation in this second method, presenting an average of 9.6 mm and coefficient of variation of 9.2%, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 - Water retention by native field vegetation obtained by tests performed with simulated rain in Rosário do Sul, from method 2.

Test	Rain (mm)	Turgid biomass (Kg)*	Depth retained in the vegetation (mm)*	Water retained in the vegetation (mm/Kg) *
1	8.5	1.39	1.76	1.29
2	9.2	1.38	1.34	1.10
3	9.5	1.43	1.45	1.00
4	11.3	1.23	1.88	1.23
5	9.1	1.38	1.85	1.66
6	9.8	1.36	1.63	1.32
Mean	9.6	1.4	1.6	1.3
SD	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.2
CV	9.2%	4.7%	12.1%	16.4%

Source: Authors, 2022.

* Mean of the four repetitions; SD = standard deviation; CV = coefficient of variation.

The water depth retained by the vegetation presented an average of 1.6 mm, which corresponds to 17.2% of the rainfall on the samples (applied at 100 mm.h^{-1} for 5 minutes). This percentage was lower than that found by other authors who evaluated the interception by herbaceous species: Simpson and Francis (2021) obtained retention values ranging from 26.4% to 100%; while Zou et al. (2015) observed an interception between 25 and 60%; and Gordon et al. (2020) found an average retention of 21% of the total incident precipitation for this type of vegetation.

The difference to the literature may lie in the rain intensity, higher in this study; since, according to Lima (2008), the lower the intensity of a rain, the greater the amount of water retained by the vegetation, and the loss due to interception in these cases can reach 100% of the total rainfall.

Plant biomass also influences the amount of water that is retained by native field vegetation, as reported in studies conducted by Liu et al. (2018) and Sisi, Jia e Han (2020) plants showed a relationship between the interception capacity of rain and biomass.

Thus, the RO vegetation presented a mean density biomass of 1.4 kg per sample, with low standard deviation (0.1 kg) and low coefficient of variation (4.7%) of the data. The relation between biomass and the amount of water retained is approximately 1.3 mm for kilogram of native herbaceous vegetation.

It is noteworthy that these retention values found in the present study, refer only to the thinnest native field vegetation, representing the smallest portion of plants found in this biome, since it is kept under grazing, with a height of aerial part and root depth of approximately 0.50 m. That is, for the native herbaceous vegetation that has the highest amount of biomass, the water retention value is likely to be higher.

The observed difference between the results of the two methods possibly occurred, because method 1 uses vegetation samples with soil, and considering that there is an interaction between soil and root that favors water retention, this method showed higher values, when compared to method 2, which used samples containing vegetation.

However, it is emphasized that method 1 may have presented a low sensitivity to the amount of water retained by the plant samples, since null water retention results were obtained by the vegetation for the tests performed in CA, indicating that according to the chosen methodology, a greater amount of water was retained by the soil compared to the vegetation. Thus, the results suggest that for small portions of water retained by plants, method 1 did not present enough sensitivity to record such quantities.

As for method 2, as it only considered the existing vegetation in the samples, it was more sensitive to small amounts of water. Thus, the water retention value found for the aerial and root part of these samples is the amount that effectively becomes unavailable for infiltration, as it returns to the atmosphere through evaporation.

Estimation of water retained by native field in precipitation events

Through the 2019 and 2020 rainfall data obtained for both study areas, it was possible to estimate the amount of water that native field vegetation retains during a drier year (2020), in which the total precipitation is below the historical average; and in a more humid year (2021) in which the total precipitation was higher than the historical average.

For the municipality of CA in which the total incident precipitation was 1963.3 mm in 2019 and 1285.5 mm in 2020, the average annual retention estimate was, respectively, 5.4% and 10.9%, obtained from 38 and 44 precipitation events that effectively had retention in those years. For the municipality of RO, the total incident precipitation was 1960.1 mm in 2019 and 991.8 mm in 2020, and the number of rainfall events that were retained was 44 and 55 for the respective years. Thus, using method 1, the average annual retention by herbaceous vegetation was 18.6% and 27.8% for 2019 and 2020, respectively (Table 3).

Table 3 - Estimated values of water retention by the herbaceous vegetation of the Pampa biome, for the 24 months evaluated, according to data obtained from method 1.

Mth	Rosário do Sul						Caçapava do Sul					
	2019			2020			2019			2020		
	EV	Total PP (mm)	RV (%)	EV	Total PP (mm)	RV (%)	EV	Total PP (mm)	RV (%)	E V	Total PP (mm)	RV (%)
jan	2	431.6	1.6	5	78.2	22.4	4	302.1	2.3	3	275.3	1.9
feb	5	87.3	20.0	1	23.2	15.1	6	68.5	14.9	3	19.9	25.6
mar	3	101.5	10.3	4	54.4	25.7	5	95	8.9	2	50.4	6.7
apr	4	145.1	9.6	4	14.4	97.2	1	194.7	0.9	6	25.8	39.5
may	6	174.3	12.0	5	206.1	8.5	3	263.1	1.9	2	204.6	1.7
jun	3	33.2	31.6	7	163.7	15.0	3	65.6	7.8	4	153.2	4.4
jul	3	259	4.1	4	66.3	21.1	3	241	2.1	7	114.7	10.4

aug	5	57.1	30.6	4	32.1	43.6	4	109.3	6.2	2	68.7	4.9
sep	3	63.9	16.4	7	108.5	22.6	1	96.8	1.8	2	146.7	2.3
oct	2	496.5	1.4	3	72.3	14.5	1	395.4	0.4	4	64	10.6
nov	4	90.4	15.5	5	61.4	28.5	3	58.6	8.7	4	43.4	15.7
dec	4	20.2	69.3	6	111.2	18.9	4	73.2	9.3	5	118.8	7.2
Tot.	44	1960.1	18.6*	55	991.8	27.8*	38	1963.3	5.4*	44	1285.5	10.9*

Source: Authors, 2022.

*Annual average; EV = event of rain that there was retention; PP = precipitation; RV = water retention by vegetation.

There are higher retention values for RO vegetation, however, the number of rainfall events lasting less than two days was also higher in this municipality, which probably explains this retention difference between the areas, because, according to Rodrigues et al. (2015) a greater number of rain events with prolonged durations lead to lower water retention, due to the saturation of the aerial part of vegetation and soil.

Other factors that may have influenced the results found is that the two areas are in distinct geographic spaces, and although they are inserted in the same biome, there is a variation in floristic composition and plant characteristics between the areas, and also, there is variation in climatological characteristics. Such factors can directly influence the vegetation's capacity of water retention (FERRETO et al., 2021).

As for method 2, water retention values for vegetation were estimated at 8.5% and 12.7% for 2019 and 2020, respectively (Table 4).

Table 4 - Estimated values of water retention by the herbaceous vegetation of the Pampa biome, for the 24 months evaluated, according to data obtained from method 2.

Month	Rosário do Sul					
	2019			2020		
	EV	PP total	RV	EV	PP total	RV
January	2	431.6	0.7%	5	78.2	10.2%
February	5	87.3	9.2%	1	23.2	6.9%
March	3	101.5	4.7%	4	54.4	11.8%
April	4	145.1	4.4%	4	14.4	44.4%
May	6	174.3	5.5%	5	206.1	3.9%
June	3	33.2	14.5%	7	163.7	6.8%
July	3	259	1.9%	4	66.3	9.7%
August	5	57.1	14.0%	4	32.1	19.9%
September	3	63.9	7.5%	7	108.5	10.3%
October	2	496.5	0.6%	3	72.3	6.6%
November	4	90.4	7.1%	5	61.4	13.0%
December	4	20.2	31.7%	6	111.2	8.6%
Total	44	1960.1	8.5%*	55	991.8	12.7%*

Source: Authors, 2022.

*Annual average; EV = event of rain that there was retention; PP = precipitation; RV = water retention by vegetation.

Thus, the average retention estimated for these two years was 10.6%, a value close to that found by Reichert et al. (2017), whose rain interception by the native vegetation of the Pampa Biome showed an average of 8.95% of the total incident precipitation. However, it is emphasized that the values found by the authors were obtained by using a different methodology, which only considered the interception of the aerial part of the vegetation, acquired 0.10 m above the soil surface; while this considers the entire plant structure (aerial and root part).

CONCLUSION

The studies that cover the relationships between the native field vegetation of the Pampa biome and the hydrological variables are still scarce, due to the lack of methodologies that allow obtaining such data.

The use of the rainfall simulator as a methodology for data acquisition of water retention by native herbaceous vegetation was efficient to obtain the variable for both used methods. However, in method 1 it was possible to perceive some limitations, such as the lack of sensitivity to capture small amounts of water present in the samples, and the influence that the interaction between soil and root causes on the amount of water retention.

Thus, method 1 showed very significant retention values for both areas studied, and the municipality of Rosario do Sul had a higher percentage of water retention by native vegetation, compared to Caçapava do Sul, both for the tests with simulated rain, as for the estimates made with the precipitation occurred in the region.

On method 2, as there is no interaction between soil and root, retention is being evaluated only by plant parts; therefore, the results refer to the amount of water that is effectively retained by the vegetation, with its variability being related to the plant biomass present in the samples.

REFERENCES

ALVARES, C. A.; et al (2013). Köppen's climate classification map for Brazil. *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, Gebrüder Borntraeger, Stuttgart, v. 22, p. 711-728. Recuperado em 29 de julho de 2023, de: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/http://www.lerf.eco.br/img/publicacoes/Alvares_etal_2014.pdf.

ATAIDE, P. F. (2015). Biomassa subterrânea da pastagem natural sob intensidades de pastejo contrastantes e submetida a diferimentos (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade

Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre, RS. Recuperado em 25 julho de 2023, de: <https://lume.ufrgs.br/handle/10183/117643>.

AVILA, C. B. (2014). Variação da infiltração devido a alterações de uso do solo: estudo de caso de implantação de floresta em Bioma Pampa (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria, RS. Recuperado em 25 de julho de 2023, de: <https://repositorio.ufsm.br/handle/1/8749>.

BAUMHARDT, E. (2010). Balanço hídrico de microbacia com eucalipto e pastagem nativa na região da campanha do RS (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria, RS.

BRASIL. Lei nº 9.433 de 08 de janeiro de 1997. Institui a Política Nacional de Recursos Hídricos, cria o Sistema Nacional de Gerenciamento de Recursos Hídricos, e dá outras providências. Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil, Brasília.

BRITTO, M.; BAPTISTA, G. M. M.; LIMA, E. A. (2019). O estudo dos componentes do ciclo hidrológico desde métodos tradicionais até o uso de sensoriamento remoto: uma revisão. Cadernos de Arquitetura e Urbanismo, Paranoá, v. 23, p. 127-146. Recuperado em 16 de julho de 2023, de: <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/paranoa/article/view/25952>.

BUSKE, T. C. (2013). Comportamento da umidade do solo determinada por métodos expeditos (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria, RS. Recuperado em 26 de julho de 2023, de: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://repositorio.ufsm.br/bitstream/handle/1/7564/BUSKE%2C%20TAISE%20CRISTINE.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

CARNEIRO, A. M.; et al. (2016). Cactos do Rio Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre: Fundação Zoobotânica do Rio Grande do Sul.

DIAS, D. F.; TRENTIN, R. (2018). Compartimentação morfolitológica do município de Rosário do Sul - RS: uma análise integrada do meio físico. Revista Caminhos de Geografia, Uberlândia – MG, v. 19, n. 65, p. 218–231. Resgatado em 20 de julho de 2023, de: <https://seer.ufu.br/index.php/caminhosdegeografia/article/view/38348>.

DUNNETT, N.; et al. (2008). Influence of vegetation composition on runoff in two simulated green roof experiments. Urban Ecosyst, [S.l.], v. 11, n. 4, p. 385–398. Resgatado em 29 de julho de 2023, de: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226399359_Influence_of_vegetation_composition_on_runoff_in_two_simulated_green_roof_experiments.

EBLING, É. D.; et al. (2021). Event-based hydrology and sedimentation in paired watersheds under commercial eucalyptus and grasslands in the Brazilian Pampa biome.

International Soil and Water Conservation Research, [S.l.], v. 9, p. 180 – 194. Recuperado em 25 de julho de 2023, de: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095633920300836>.

FACCO, J.; CANCELIER, J. W. (2019). Geografia II: Educação do campo. Santa Maria, RS: UFSM, 2019. Recuperado em 04 de agosto de 2023, de: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://repositorio.ufsm.br/bitstream/handle/1/19108/Curso_Lic-Ed-Cam_Geografia-II.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

FERRETO, D. O. C.; et al. (2021). Rainfall partitioning in young clonal plantations Eucalyptus species in a subtropical environment, and implications for water and forest management. International Soil and Water Conservation Research, article in press, [S.l.]. Resgatado em 02 de agosto de 2023, de: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095633921000034?via%3Dihub>.

GIGLIO, J. N.; KOBAYAMA, M. (2013). Interceptação da Chuva: Uma Revisão com Ênfase no Monitoramento em Florestas Brasileiras. Revista Brasileira de Recursos Hídricos, [S.l.], v. 18, n. 2, p. 297-317. Resgatado em 26 de julho de 2023, de: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305306477_Interceptacao_da_Chuva_Uma_Revisao_com_Enfase_no_Monitoramento_em_Florestas_Brasileiras.

GÓES, Q. R.; et al. (2021). Análise da fauna edáfica em diferentes usos do solo no Bioma Pampa. Ciência Florestal, Santa Maria, v. 31, n. 1, p. 123-144. Resgatado em 19 de julho de 2023, de: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/cienciaflorestal/article/view/32130>.

GORDON, D. A. R.; et al. (2020). Rainfall interception and redistribution by a common North American understory and pasture forb, Eupatorium capillifolium (Lam. dogfennel). Hydrology and Earth System Sciences. [S.l.]. Resgatado em 25 de julho de 2023, de: <https://hess.copernicus.org/articles/24/4587/2020/>.

LANZA, R. (2015). Hidrologia comparativa e perda de solo e água em bacias hidrográficas cultivadas com eucalipto e campo nativo com pastagem manejada (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria, RS. Recuperado em 30 de julho de 2023, de: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://repositorio.ufsm.br/bitstream/handle/1/5621/LANZA,%20REGIS.pdf?sequence=1>.

LIMA, W. P. (2008). Hidrologia florestal aplicada ao manejo de bacias hidrográficas. 2. ed. Piracicaba, São Paulo: [s.n.]. Recuperado em 05 de agosto de 2023, de: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://www.ipef.br/publicacoes/acervo_historico/informacoestecnicas/hidrologia_florestal_aplicada_ao_manejo_de_bacias_hidrograficas.pdf.

LIU, Y.; et al. (2018). Variable hydrological effects of herbs and shrubs in the arid northeastern Qinghai-Tibet Plateau, China. *Journal of Mountain Science*, v. 15, p. 1532–1545. Recuperado em 25 de julho de 2023, de: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11629-017-4411-2>.

LU, J. et al. (2020). Root-induced changes of soil hydraulic properties – A review. *Journal of Hydrology*, v. 589. Recuperado em 25 de julho de 2023, de: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342346197_Root-induced_changes_of_soil_hydraulic_properties_-_A_review.

MATZENAUER, R.; RADIN, B.; ALMEIDA, I. R. (Ed.). (2011). Atlas Climático: Rio Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre: Secretaria da Agricultura Pecuária e Agronegócio; Fundação Estadual de Pesquisa Agropecuária (FEPAGRO). Recuperado em 30 de julho de 2023, de: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://www.agricultura.rs.gov.br/upload/arquivos/202005/13110034-atlas-climatico-rs.pdf>.

NUNES, M. M. C.; et al. (2013). Análise multitemporal do Uso e Cobertura da Terra no município de Caçapava do Sul - RS nos anos de 1991, 2001 e 2011. In: Anais XVI Simpósio Brasileiro de Sensoriamento Remoto - SBSR, INPE. Foz do Iguaçu, PR. Recuperado em 29 de julho de 2023, de: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/http://marte2.sid.inpe.br/col/dpi.inpe.br/marte2/2013/05.28.23.30.42/doc/p0480.pdf>.

QUADROS, F. L. F.; CRUZ, P.; THEAU, J. (2006). Uso de tipos funcionais de gramíneas como alternativas de diagnóstico da dinâmica e do manejo de campos naturais. In: Anais da Reunião Anual da Sociedade Brasileira de Zootecnia, 2006, João Pessoa, PB.

REICHERT, J. M.; et al. (2017). Water balance in paired watersheds with eucalyptus and degraded grassland in Pampa biome. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, [S.l.], v. 237, n. 238, p. 282–295. Recuperado em 05 de agosto de 2023, de: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314165591_Water_balance_in_paired_watersheds_with_eucalyptus_and_degraded_grassland_in_Pampa_biome.

RIBEIRO FILHO, J. C.; et al. (2019). Incertezas na estimativa da interceptação vegetal por modelos físicos em microclima de altitude em semiárido tropical. *Scientia Forestalis*, Piracicaba, v. 47, n. 123, p. 395-403. Recuperado em 04 de agosto de 2023, de: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://www.ipef.br/publicacoes/scientia/nr123/cap02.pdf>.

RODRIGUES, L. N.; PRUSKI, F. F. (2019). Fundamentos e benefícios do sistema de integração lavoura-pecuária-floresta para os recursos hídricos. In: BUNGENSTAB, D. J.; et al. (Ed.). ILPF: inovação com integração de lavoura, pecuária e floresta. Brasília, DF:

Embrapa, Cap. 13. Recuperado em 06 de agosto de 2023, de: <https://www.infoteca.cnptia.embrapa.br/infoteca/handle/doc/1113073>.

RODRIGUES, V. A.; et al. (2015). Avaliação do escoamento e interceptação da água das chuvas. *Revista Irriga*, [S. l.], v. 1, n. 1, p. 01–13. Recuperado em 30 de julho de 2023, de: <https://irriga.fca.unesp.br/index.php/irriga/article/view/1054>.

SIMPSON, T. J.; FRANCIS, R. A. (2021). Artificial lawns exhibit increased runoff and decreased water retention compared to living lawns following controlled rainfall experiments. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, [S.l.], v. 63. Recuperado em 29 de julho de 2023, de: <https://pubag.nal.usda.gov/catalog/7420045>.

SISI, W.; et al. (2020). Leaf water absorption and canopy rainfall interception of twenty-one plant species in Beijing. *Journal of Beijing Forestry University*, v. 49, n. 9, p. 100–110. Recuperado em 03 de agosto de 2023, de: <http://j.bjfu.edu.cn/en/article/doi/10.12171/j.1000-1522.20190379>.

SPOHR, R. B.; et al. (2015). Desenvolvimento e validação de um simulador de chuvas portátil. *Revista Brasileira de Recursos Hídricos*, v. 20, n. 2, p. 411–417, Porto Alegre, RS. Recuperado em 15 de julho de 2023, de: <https://www.abrhidro.org.br/SGCv3/publicacao.php?PUB=1&ID=157&SUMARIO=5066>.

STRECK, E. V. et al. (2018). Solos do Rio Grande do Sul. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: EMATER/RS. Recuperado em 23 de julho de 2023, de: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.bibliotecaagptea.org.br/agricultura/solos/livros/SOLOS%203%20EDICAO.pdf>.

TENTARDINI, F. R. (2015). Repartição da biomassa e respostas morfogênicas de *Paspalum notatum* ecótipo André da Rocha à disponibilidade de nitrogênio (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS. Recuperado em 03 de agosto de 2023, de: <https://www.lume.ufrgs.br/handle/10183/130792>.

TSIKO, C. T.; et al. (2012). Measuring forest floor and canopy interception in a savannah ecosystem. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth*, [S.l.], v. 47, n. 48, p. 122–127. Recuperado em 05 de agosto de 2023, de: <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2012PCE....47..122T/abstract>.

TUNDISI, J. G.; MATSUMURA-TUNDISI, T. A Água. São Carlos, SP: Scienza, 2020.

ZOU, C. B.; et al. (2015). Canopy Interception for a Tallgrass Prairie under Juniper Encroachment. *PLoS ONE*, [S.l.], v. 10, n. 11. Recuperado em 05 de agosto de 2023, de: <chrome->

extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?type=printable&id=10.1371/journal.pone.0141422.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Author ¹ participated in the collection of data in the field and in the writing of the article; Author ² participated in the orientation of the work, as well as in the collection of data in the field; and Author ³ participated in the co-supervision of the work as well as in the collection of data in the field.