#### Identification of point and diffuse sources and role of retention processes in large river basins: comparison of three approaches



**Cornelia Hesse, Valentina Krysanova and Fred Hattermann** 

Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research



### **Outline**

- 1. Case study basin: Saale
- 2. Model SWIM
- 3. Three approaches for nutrient retention in large basins
- 4. Step 1: retention in the landscape three pathways
- 5. Step 2: retention in the landscape differentiation of retention coefficients for three pathways
- 6. Conclusions and outlook

## **Diversity of landscapes in the Elbe basin**









## **Case study basin: Saale**



- Second largest tributary of the Elbe
- 👌 Length 413 km
- brainage basin ~ 24000 km²





## **Case study basin: Saale**



### SWIM (Soil and Water Integrated Model)



SWIM was developed in PIK (Potsdam) based on SWAT-93 and MATSALU for climate and land use change impact studies

#### **Spatial disaggregation**

Soils

Hydrotops are sets of units in subbasins with uniform land use and soils

Land use

**Subbasins** 

### From the hydrotope to the basin level





http://www.smhi.se/foretag/m/hbv\_demo/

## Nutrient retention in watersheds: 3 approaches

#### Three approaches:

- retention in a landscape is described separately for surface, subsurface and groundwater flows by a linear differential equation (Hattermann et al., 2005) as a function of mean residence time T and decomposition rate λ, with constant T<sub>sur</sub>, T<sub>sub</sub>, T<sub>gw</sub> and λ<sub>sur</sub>, λ<sub>sub</sub>, λ<sub>gw</sub> for the basin;
   the same as in the first approach, but differentiating T = T = and λ = λ = λ = for hydrotopes
  - $\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{sur}}$ ,  $\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{sub}}$ ,  $\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{gw}}$  and  $\lambda_{\mathsf{sur}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\mathsf{sub}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\mathsf{gw}}$  for hydrotopes depending on soil properties and g-w conditions; &
- coupling SWIM with the model WASP to additionally describe retention processes in the river network in combination with approaches 1 or 2.

### **Approach 1: nutrient retention**

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + \frac{\vec{u}}{R} \nabla c - \nabla \left(\frac{Dg}{R} \nabla c\right) - \frac{\sigma}{R} + \lambda c + \frac{q}{mn_f R} (c - c_{in}) = 0$$

c = concentration n = eff. porosity m = aquifer thickness  $\lambda$  = turnover coeff R = faktor of retardation

#### Simplifications:

- Full mixture during the transport process
- Residence time is normally distributed
- Linear degradation

$$\frac{dC_t}{dt} = C_{t, in} - C_{t, out} - \lambda C_t$$

$$C_{t} = KC_{t,out}$$

$$C_{t,out} = C_{t,in} \frac{1}{1 + K\lambda} (1 - e^{-(1/K + \lambda)t}) + C_{t-1,out} e^{-(1/K + \lambda)t}$$

Classical approach:

the convection-dispersion equation But:

-it is nonlinear and has to be solved numerically

- high data demand

- K = mean residence time,
- $\lambda$  = decomposition rate,
- C = concentration

#### **Approach 1: The mean residence time**



#### The mean residence time

- K = f (flow path, permeability, porosity, gradient in groundwater table) for subsurface flow
- K = f (flow path, permeability, porosity, and gradient in topography and Manning's roughness) for surface flow.
- The distance L to the river is calculated following the gradient in groundwater table to the river.
- K can be estimated using the seepage velocity v<sub>s</sub> (m d<sup>-1</sup>), where k is hydraulic conductivity of the spatial unit z, J is dimensionless hydraulic gradient, and S is the specific yield (average ~40 years, up to > 1000 years).

#### **Approach 1: The decomposition rate**

The decomposition rate  $\lambda$  is a function of redox potential and carbon concentration of the catchment sediments.

Initial values can be established using data from Wendland et al. (1993): a half-life time of nitrate N between 1 and 3 years, which corresponds to  $\lambda$  values between 6.10<sup>-4</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> and 2.10<sup>-3</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>.

## Validation using first approach: water discharge



### Validation using first approach: N-NO<sub>3</sub> load



# Approach 2: differentiated retention coefficients

Nutrient retention in a landscape is described separately for surface, subsurface and groundwater flows as a function of mean residence time T and decomposition rate  $\lambda$ ,

and T<sub>sur</sub>, T<sub>sub</sub>, T<sub>gw</sub>,  $\lambda_{sur}$ ,  $\lambda_{sub}$ ,  $\lambda_{gw}$  are differentiated depending on soil properties and g-w conditions.

## Estimation of Denitrification conditions in soils of Central Europe

	Soil water nutrients temperature PH TOT				TOTAL	
Bodentyp	Bodenwasser- verhältnisse	Nährsubstrat	Temperatur	pH-Wert	Gesamt- einstufung	•
Podsol	_	_	-	_	_	(
podsolige Braunerde	0	-	-	-	-	Ì
podsolierte Parabraunerde	o	-	-	-	-	
Braunerde (basenarm)	-0	0	-	-	-	
Syrosem	-	-	-	-	-	
Pararendzina	0	0+	+0	+	0	
Rendzina	0	0+	0	+	0	
Braunerde (basenreich)	0	0+	0	0+	0	I
Parabraunerde	0	0+	0	-0+	0	
Pseudogley	+	-	0-	0-	+	
Tschernosem	0+	+	+	+	+	
Pseudogley	+	-0	0-	0-	+	
Gley	+	+		0	+	
Aueböden	+	+	0	+	+	
Marschböden	+	+	0	+0	+	
Niedermoor	+	+	0	+	+	
Hochmoor	+	+	0	-	+	

+ good conditions for D:

gley, pseudogley, loess, marsch, moor, tschernosem

#### O neutral conditions for D:

brown soils, parabrown soils, rendzina, pararendzina

#### — poor conditions for D:

podsol, podsol-brown soils, syrosem

Wendland et al. Atlas zum Nitratstrom in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland

#### **Denitrification conditions in soils, Germany**







### **Conclusions and outlook**

Water quality modelling in large river basins should include consideration of retention processes on the way to river network.

The **I hypothesis** to be proved: in large river basins the residence time and decomposition rate should be differentiated based on soil properties and groundwater conditions.

The **II hypothesis** to be proved: in large river basins description of nutrient retention processes in river (e.g. coupling SWIM with WASP or QUAL2E) is needed to better represent water quality.