Use of a calibrated SWAT model to support (BMP) evaluations in the Maumee River watershed

Chelsie Boles Todd Redder Joseph V. DePinto

Presented as part of a special session on work in the Western Lake Erie Basin 2015 SWAT Conference

Purdue University West Lafayette, Indiana, USA October 12-16, 2015



Environment

Scientists

Engineers

Presentation Outline

- Summary of LimnoTech modeling activities in WBLE
- Overview of Maumee SWAT model
- Maumee SWAT calibration:
 - "Goodness of fit" calibration statistics (flow, pollutant loads)
 - Additional model-data comparisons (e.g., tile flow, crop yield)
- SWAT scenario evaluation:
 - Review chosen scenarios
 - Results of scenario runs



Relevant Modeling Activities in WBLE

- Watershed Modeling:
 - Blanchard River AnnAGNPS (USACE, 2009-10)
 - Tiffin River SWAT (USACE, 2011-12)
 - Ephemeral gully erosion represented
 - Farmer reverse auctions cover crops, filter strips, tile drain management

Maumee SWAT modeling (2011-present)

- Preliminary evaluation of "upscaled" BMPs (GLPF)
 e.g., cover crops, conservation tillage
- "4R" nutrient management evaluation (IPNI)
- "Western Lake Erie Ecosystem Model" (WLEEM)
 - Simulates nutrient transport & fate, harmful algal bloom (HABs)
 - Various funding sources recently applied for Annex 4



Maumee Basin SWAT Model – Subbasin Delineation





Maumee SWAT Model Lineage

- Based on original EcoFore SWAT model (Bosch et al. 2011):
 - Subbasin delineation roughly based on HUC-12 delineation
 - Simulation time period: 1995-2005
- Key LimnoTech refinements include:
 - SWAT 2012 framework adopted (updated from SWAT 2005)
 - Simulation period updated to 1995-2010
 - Incorporation of detailed cropland management input data from ARS Maumee CEAP SWAT model
 - Preliminary representation of soluble reactive P (SRP) transport through tile drains



Hydrology Calibration Metrics



Model Calibration Locations

- Model originally calibrated to Waterville station:
 - USGS gage: 04193500
 - Heidelberg monitoring (sediment, nutrients)
- Additional stations to monitor model fit for tributary branches and stations upstream of Waterville
- At least one station on each major tributary considered for flow calibration



Flow Calibration Statistics

- All stations meet the standards confirming at least a "Satisfactory" calibration for monthly guidelines
- Most stations meet the "Very Good" guidelines for monthly NSE
- No Moriasi et al., 2007 standards given for R², but statistic is greater than 0.50 for all locations

Moriasi, D. N., J. G. Arnold, M. W. Van Liew, R. L. Bingner, R. D. Harmel, and T. L. Veith. 2007. "Model Evaluation Guidelines for Systematic Quantification of Accuracy in Watershed Simulations." *Transactions of the ASABE* 50 (3): 885–900.

<u>Note</u>: Daily PBIAS values equal monthly PBIAS values.

		Monthly		Da	ily
	R-Sq	NSE	P-Bias	R-Sq	NSE
Maumee at Waterville	0.93	0.91	-11.50	0.81	0.81
Maumee near Defiance	0.93	0.91	-12.32	0.81	0.80
Maumee at New Haven	0.90	0.89	-6.55	0.72	0.71
Blanchard near Findlay	0.82	0.78	15.61	0.57	0.55
St. Joseph near Ft. Wayne	0.85	0.77	-16.98	0.66	0.44
Auglaize near Defiance	0.92	0.91	-9.66	0.75	0.73
Auglaize near Ft. Jennings	0.86	0.83	-16.78	0.57	0.55
St. Mary's near Ft. Wayne	0.89	0.89	-1.19	0.72	0.72
St. Mary's near Decatur	0.90	0.89	-5.36	0.70	0.69
Tiffin at Stryker	0.81	0.74	-11.68	0.65	0.56
Bean Creek at Powers	0.75	0.72	-0.68	0.62	0.57

Water Budget for Entire Maumee Basin



Tile Drainage (as % of precipitation):

- Target range: 10-31% (mean: ~21%)
- Model: ~19% on tile-drained land



Tile Flow by HUC-8 Watershed

	From Model		Target Tile %		
HUC8	Tile Flow	% Area	MIN	MAX	In Range?
	(Avg., % of Precip)	Tiled			
Blanchard	15%	85%	8%	31%	YES
Lower Auglaize	12%	88%	8%	33%	YES
Lower Maumee	10%	67%	<u>6%</u>	25%	YES
St. Joseph	17%	63%	6%	23%	YES
St. Marys	17%	82%	8%	31%	YES
Tiffin	16%	71%	7%	26%	YES
Upper Auglaize	16%	79%	8%	29%	YES
Upper Maumee	16%	80%	8%	30%	YES

Water Quality Calibration Metrics

Landscape Nutrient Yields

Average Landscape Loading, Agriculture



Tile Drainage: Dissolved Nutrients



Observed Range: ~ 0.01 – 1.0 mg/L (K. King, OSU)





- Simulated NO₃ loading of **21.15 kg/ha** for tiledrained AGRR lands.
- Compares favorably with **23.17 kg/ha** measured by Kladivko et al., 2004 for Indiana

Nutrient & Sediment Calibration Metrics

- All stations meet the standards confirming at least a "Satisfactory" calibration for monthly guidelines for nitrogen and phosphorus constituents.
- Most stations meet the "Very Good" guidelines for *PBIAS* (*Abs(PBIAS) < 25*)
- Monthly sediment loads at Waterville are just outside the "Satisfactory" range (±55)

<u>Note</u>: Instream sediment calibration has no influence on nutrients

		Maumee at	Blanchard	Tiffin at
		Waterville	near Findlay	Stryker
	R-squared	0.72	0.62	0.88
SRF IUdu	P-Bias	-17.69	51.96	2.31
Thiland	R-squared	0.81	0.46	0.70
TIN IOad	P-Bias	-21.50	4.76	-51.24
NO load	R-squared	0.73	0.37	0.65
NO3 IOAU	P-Bias	-22.49	2.98	-57.71
TDlood	R-squared	0.79	0.87	0.91
TP load	P-Bias	-0.42	24.52	-42.16
Sed Load	R-squared	0.75	0.80	0.57
	P-Bias	57.46	-23.71	-200.63

All values reported are on a monthly time-step

"Spring" P Loads: Feeding Harmful Algal Bloom Production (Waterville)



R²: 0.78 NSE: 0.62 (Good / Satisfactory) PBIAS: -10.6 (Very Good)

Crop Yield Comparison (2000 – 2005)





Maumee SWAT: Evaluating Extreme Scenarios

Inclusion in the WLEB Assemblage

- Modeling teams presented their calibrated Maumee models at a workshop in June at the University of Michigan Water Center
- All models were updated to run a common time period (2000 to 2014) with first five years used as model warmup
- All models were given a common set of precipitation and temperature inputs
- All models were given a common set of point source inputs
- No recalibration

What Scenarios?

1	Fertilizer placement: Subsurface fertilizer application	All cropland will have fertilizers applied to the subsurface.
2	Fertilizer rate: P fertilizer rate cut in half	All cropland will have P fertilizer rates cut by 50% of baseline condition. N fertilizer rates are the same as baseline.
3	Fertilizer timing I: P applied in spring	All cropland will have P applied in the spring prior to planting
4	Fertilizer timing II: P applied in fall	All cropland will have P applied in the fall following harvest
5	Cover crop: Cereal rye	All cropland will have a cereal rye cover crop applied in all winters that the ground was bare.
6	Drainage water management: Testing the approach	All cropland will have tile drains held near the soil surface over winter and summer months.
7	Tillage: Continuous no-till	All cropland will be managed without any tillage except for a no-till drill at crop planting.
8	Crop rotation I: Continuous corn	All cropland will be converted to a continuous corn crop rotation.
9	Crop rotation II: Winter wheat	All cropland will be converted to a rotation including at least one year of wheat, using whatever wheat-containing rotation each model already includes in the baseline.
10	Buffer strips: Average effectiveness	All cropland will be given a buffer strip of average effectiveness.
11	Wetlands: Testing the approach	One wetland scenario will potentially be run through all models to test the approach of simulating wetlands in SWAT.

Each scenario is applied to 100% of the applicable AGRR HRU areas

Total P Results



Total P Results



 \bigcirc

Mineral P Results



 \bigcirc

Mineral P Results



 \bigcirc





Questions?

Funding Acknowledgements:

- **Great Lakes Protection Fund** \bullet
- International Plant Nutrition Institute (IPNI): • 4R Nutrient Stewardship Research Fund

Contact Information:

Chelsie Boles LimnoTech Ann Arbor, MI

Email: cboles@limno.com Phone: 734-332-1200





2005

Date/Time

Main Menu

Zoom Exten

Std. View

Excel Export

2010

General Ontions

Reservoir

Aggregation

200,000

불 150,000

50,000

2000

Station

(kg-P)