Modelling nitrous oxide (N_2O) emission from soils using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT): A case study of Athabasca River Basin (ARB), Canada

Narayan K. Shrestha, Junye Wang*

¹Athabasca River Basin Research Institute (ARBRI) Athabasca University, 1 University Drive, Athabasca, Alberta T9S 3A3, Canada *Correspondence to: junyew@athabascau.ca



Background



Greenhouse gas emissions from the top 10 emitting regions





Background...

- Although Prairie farmlands have been significant CO₂ sink, N₂O increase attributed to nitrogen fertilizer increase
- N₂O is more potent (~300 times) than CO₂
- Site based measurements often fail to capture the spatial and temporal variability of N_2O
- Regional scale modelling is thus needed to test various adaptation measures
- Various tools (DNDC, DAYCENT, etc) are being used for such purposes, still regional scale estimations are often scare





N₂O modelling – choice of a modelling tool

The Athabasca River Basin (ARB)

- The Athabasca River Basin (ARB), Canada contributes significantly to the provincial economy
- Ever increasing industrialization and growing population have posed on an immense pressure to the water resources of the basin
- Environmental impacts of industries and different human activities on the ecological functioning of the river are quite evident
- An integrated modeling framework encompassing both the terrestrial and aquatic systems is needed for holistic analysis of the river basin
- Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) is chosen as modelling framework



The SWAT model of ARB

- A SWAT model is built up using high resolution spatial and meteorological data set, considering point sources of pollution from WWTPs and industries, 57° Nand using appropriate management practices for agriculture land, grass land, 56° Npasture and other land-use types
- Sensitivity, calibration and validation and uncertainty analysis have been carried out for streamflow, sediment and various water quality variables
- We refer to Shrestha & Wang (2017), Shrestha et al. (2017) for details of the SWAT model of the ARB



N₂O modelling in SWAT

- We incorporated semi-empirical equations of Parton et al. (1996, 2001) for N_2O emission from nitrification and denitrification
- In general, these equations calculate the potential N_2O flux rate subject to several 'reduction factors' that reflect environmental controls on the flux

Denitrification

$$DENIT_{total} = \min \left[F_{denit} (NO3), F_{denit} (C) \right] * F_{denit} (WFPS) * F_{denit} (SOLT)$$

$$F_{N2O,denit} = \frac{DENIT_{total}}{(1 + Ratio_{N2:N2O})}$$

$$Ratio_{N2:N2O} = \min \left[F_{ratio} (NO3), F_{ratio} (C) \right] * F_{ratio} (WFPS)$$

Nitrification

$$F_{\text{NO3,nit}} = Net_{\text{min}} * K_1 + K_{\text{max}} * \text{NH4} * F_{nit}(SOLT) * F_{nit}(WFPS) * F_{nit}(pH)$$

N₂O modelling in SWAT: Calibration and validation in a cropped field

• Location: SK, Canada; Crop: Winter wheat; Fertilizer: 70 kg N/ha; Calibration: 2013; Validation: 2014



N₂O modelling in SWAT: Calibration and validation in a shelterbelt

• Location: SK, Canada; Treeline: Pine; Fertilizer: None; Calibration: 2013; Validation: 2014



N₂O modelling in SWAT: Calibration and validation in a grassland site

Location: AB; Grazing intensity: Heavy (4.8 AMU/ha) Fertilizer: Urine and manure; Calibration: • 2013-14; Validation: 2015



Date

N2O modelling in SWAT: WFPS simulations

• SWAT simulated soil moisture (volumetric) vs 0.125° ERA-Interim reanalysis product (Dee et al. 2011) at each pixels (resampled to 0.05°x0.05°) for a period of 1990-2005



N₂O modelling in SWAT: Soil temperature simulations

• SWAT simulated soil temperature vs 0.125° ERA-Interim reanalysis product (Dee et al. 2011) at each pixels (resampled to 0.05°x0.05°) for a period of 1990-2005



N₂O modelling in SWAT: N₂O simulations

• SWAT simulated soil moisture (volumetric) vs 0.5° model-based estimates of Hashimoto (2012) at each pixels (resampled to 0.05°x0.05°) for a period of 1990-2005





N₂O modelling in SWAT: Temporal and spatial trends (period: 1990-2005)

N₂O modelling in SWAT: Temporal and spatial trends (period: 1990-2005)



AGRL

RNGB

BARR

SWRN

- Hotspots: Agricultural areas
- Hot-moments: Spring (agricultural areas), summer (forest)



N₂O modelling in SWAT: Emission in changing climate



N₂O modelling in SWAT: Emission in changing climate

N₂O modelling in SWAT: Emission in changing climate



Periods →	Base Period	Drier	Drier	Wetter	Wetter	
Regions↓	(gN/ha/yr)	Colder	Warmer	Colder	Warmer	
Headwater	35.6	21%	112%	27%	126%	
Foothill	43.4	-3%	57%	7%	60%	
Prairie	773.9	6%	54%	-17%	21%	
Lesser Slave	604.5	-7%	24%	-12%	-3%	
Boreal	370.6	13%	172%	-23%	21%	
Watershed	412.5	5%	106%	-19%	13%	





N₂O modelling in SWAT: Emission in changing climate

N₂O modelling in SWAT: Adaptation measures

1. Agriculture

- Base case: optimal dose of N-fertilizer (100 lb N/ac, early spring banded application)
- Sc1: same as base but split fertilizer application (4 times: 40% spring, 10% seedling, 25% tillering, 25% flowering)
- Sc2: minimum recommended dose of N (40 lb N/ac)
- Sc3: same as Sc2 but split into 4 applications
- Sc4(a): 99% crop residue left on ground, 1% biomass harvested
- Sc4(b): 75% biomass harvested (25% left)
- Sc4(c): 99% biomass harvested (1% left)

2. Pasture: minimum recommended dose of N (base: 200 lb N/ac, 4 applications, minimum: 70 lb N/ac)

3. Grassland: light grazing (BIO_EAT: 2.4 kg/ha/day and MANURE_KG = 0.89 kg/ha/da, as per Gao et al., 2017)



Conclusions

- Incorporated several semi-empirical equations to estimate N₂O emission from nitrification and denitrification in the SWAT model
- Tested against field data of a cropped field, a shelterbelt site and a grassland site of cold climate regions of Canada
- Upscaling of site-specific parameters to watershed scale (of Athabasca River Basin, ARB of Western Canada)
- Temporal and spatial heterogeneity of N₂O emission in the ARB
- Agricultural areas are hot-spots of N₂O emission
- Significant spring N₂O emission (hot-moment), more than 50% of annual emission at agricultural areas
- N₂O emission from ARB would increase in future, especially in Drier-Warmer condition (watershed scale increment in annual emission is more than two-fold)
- Different adaptation measures in the agriculture areas especially fertilizer and residue management, would decrease the emission substantially

Acknowledgements

- Yang et al. (2017) and Wagena et al (2017) for sharing their version of module
- Amadi et al. (2016) for sharing N₂O, WFPS and Soil Temperature data for Cropped Area and Shelterbelts of Outlook, SK, Canada
- Gao et al. (2017) for sharing N_2O and WFPS data for Grassland of Stavely, AB, Canada
- Xinzhong Du for helping to process climate change data
- My colleagues at Athabasca River Basin Research Institute, Athabasca University, AB, Canada

References

- Amadi, C.C., Van Rees, K.C.J. and Farrell, R.E. (2016) Soil–atmosphere exchange of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide in shelterbelts compared with adjacent cropped fields. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 223(Supplement C), 123-134.
- Butterbach-Bahl, K., Baggs, E.M., Dannenmann, M., Kiese, R. and Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S. (2013) Nitrous oxide emissions from soils: how well do we understand the processes and their controls? Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 368(1621).
- Davidson, E.A., Galloway, J.N., Millar, N. and Leach, A.M. (2014) N-related greenhouse gases in North America: innovations for a sustainable future. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 9-10(Supplement C), 1-8.
- ECCC (2017) Environment and Climate Change Canada. In: https://www.ec.gc.ca/indicateurs-indicators/default.asp?lang=en&n=FBF8455E-1
- Gao, X., Thomas, B.W., Beck, R., Thompson, D.J., Zhao, M., Willms, W.D. and Hao, X. (2017) Long-Term Grazing Alters Soil Trace Gas Fluxes from Grasslands in the Foothills of the Rocky Mountains, Canada. Land Degradation & Development, n/an/a.
- Giorgi, F., Bi, X., 2005. Regional changes in surface climate interannual variability for the 21st century from ensembles of global model simulations. Geophysical Research Letters 32, L13701.
- Lutz, A.F. et al., 2016. Selecting representative climate models for climate change impact studies: an advanced envelope-based selection approach. International Journal of Climatology, 36(12): 3988-4005. DOI:10.1002/joc.4608
- Murdock, T.Q., Cannon, A.J., Sobie, S.R., 2013. Statistical downscaling of future climate projections, Pacific Climate Impacts Consortium (PCIC), Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

- Parton, W.J., Holland, E.A., Del Grosso, S.J., Hartman, M.D., Martin, R.E., Mosier, A.R., Ojima, D.S. and Schimel, D.S. (2001) Generalized model for NO x and N2O emissions from soils. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres 106(D15), 17403-17419.
- Parton, W.J., Mosier, A.R., Ojima, D.S., Valentine, D.W., Schimel, D.S., Weier, K. and Kulmala, A.E. (1996) Generalized model for N2 and N2O production from nitrification and denitrification. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 10(3), 401-412.
- Shrestha, N.K., Wang, J., 2017. Hydrological Modeling of Athabasca River Basin, Canada using Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), GeoConvention, May 18-19, 2017, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
- Shrestha, N.K., Wang, J., 2017. Hydrological Modeling of Athabasca River Basin, Canada using Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), GeoConvention, May 18-19, 2017, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
- Shrestha, N.K., Du, X., Wang, J., 2017. Assessing climate change impacts on fresh water resources of the Athabasca River Basin, Canada. Science of The Total Environment, 601–602: 425-440.
- Wagena, M.B., Bock, E.M., Sommerlot, A.R., Fuka, D.R. and Easton, Z.M. (2017) Development of a nitrous oxide routine for the SWAT model to assess greenhouse gas emissions from agroecosystems. Environmental Modelling & Software 89, 131-143.
- Yang, Q., Zhang, X., Abraha, M., Del Grosso, S., Robertson, G.P. and Chen, J. (2017) Enhancing the soil and water assessment tool model for simulating N2O emissions of three agricultural systems. Ecosystem Health and Sustainability 3(2), e01259-n/a.

Supplementary Slides



Model built-up: Spatial Data set



Streamflow results: some graphical illustrations

Streamflow results: overall qualitative rating

- Ability of the SWAT model to simulate the streamflow at various locations with varying degrees of accuracy
- Headwater: "Very Good"
- Foothill: "Very Good" at main river, "Good" at tributaries
- Prairie: "Good" at upstream reaches and "Very Good" at downstream reaches
- Lesser Slave: "Satisfactory" to "Good" for some tributaries and "Very Good" at main river
- Boreal: underperformed at the lower parts of the boreal region, especially the North-Eastern part



Erosion and sediment transport modelling of the ARB

- The erosion rates (sediment yield: SYLD) depend on land-use, soil and slope of the basin
- Sediment concentrations at different stations have been simulated with reasonable accuracy (below: at Athabasca river above Fort McMurray)



Sediment Concentration (mg/l)



Water quality modelling of the ARB

• At Athabasca river above Fort McMurray



Total Nitrogen (mg-N/l)



Dissolved Oxygen (mg-O2/l)



Total Phosphrus (mg-P/l)



Water quality modelling of the ARB

• Spatial variation of nutrient loading rates (Total Nitrogen: TN and Total Phosphorus: TP) from sub-basins





Water quality status assessment of the ARB

- Spatial variation of water quality status of river reaches
- Based on Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) formulation considering dissolved oxygen (DO), total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) simulation results, and their comparison with "objective values" as set by the AEP



Equations of Parton et al. (1996, 2001)

- Effect on nitrification:
- (a) WFPS
- (b) Soil Temperature
- (c) pH
- (d) Soil NH4



Equations of Parton et al. (1996, 2001)

• Effect on potential denitrification rate:



Equations of Parton et al. (1996, 2001)

• Effect on potential denitrification rate:





Scenarios

Land-use	Types→	Agriculture land*		Pasture			Grassland		
Cases↓		N-Application	P-Application	Frequency and Timing	N-Application	P-Application	Frequency and Timing	Grazing	Manure
Base Case		100 lb N/ac ¹	35 lb P2O5/ac ²	1 and Spring (April 1)	200 lb N/ac ³	60 lb P2O5/ac ⁴	4 and refer ³	6 kg/ha/day ⁹	5.5 kg/ha/day ⁹
Scenarios	Sc-1	same as base	same as base	4 and see $below^{\#}$	-	-	-	-	-
	Sc-2	40 lb N/ac	20 lb P2O5/ac2	same as base	-	-	-	-	-
	Sc-3	same as Sc-2	same as Sc-2	same as Sc-1	-	-	-	-	-
	Sc-4(a) san	aama aa haaa	same as base	same as base but different					
		ame as base		redsidue management ⁵	-	-	-	-	-
	Sc-4(b) sam	ama ag baga	same as base	same as base but different					
		same as base		redsidue management ⁶	-	-	-	-	-
	Sc-4(c) s	same as base	same as base	same as base but different					
				redsidue management ⁷	-	-	-	-	-
	Sc-5	-	-	-	70 lb N/ac ⁸	35 lb P2O5/ac ⁸	4 and refer ³	-	-
	Sc-6	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.4 kg/ha/day ¹⁰	0.89 kg/ha/day ¹⁰

*Spring Wheat or Barley

[#]40% in Spring (April 1), 10% at seedling (May 1), 25% at Tillering (June 15), 25% at Flowering/Stem Elongation

¹Economically optimal rate of N-application as per AGRI-FACTS (2013), range 40-130 lb N/ac.

²Average of the range of values (20-50 lbP2O5/ac) as per AGRI-FACTS (2004)

³Four applications for 2 cuttings, 60 lb N/ac in early spring, 50 lb N/ac in mid-June, 50 lb N/ac in mid-July, 40 lb N/ac mid-August. Range 70-110 ln N/ac without irrigation and 200lb N/ac with irrigation. Refer AGRI-FACTS (2005a,b)

⁴One application of 60 lb P2O5/ac in early spring. Range 70-110 ln N/ac and 35-45 lb P2O5/ac for without irrigation and 60 lb P2O5/ac with irrigation. Refer AGRI-FACTS (2005a,b) ⁵In base case, residue Harvest Index (HI_OVR) would vary between 0.25 (at worst water stressed condition) and 0.45 (optimal condition) as per water stress factor, so as the Stover Fraction Removed (FRAC_HARVK). Refer Arnold et al. (2011). In this scenario, values of HI_OVR and FRAC_HARVK are fixed at 1% (meaning 99% left in the field)

⁶Values of Harvest Index (HI_OVR) and Stover Fraction Removed (FRAC_HARVK) are fixed at 75% (meaning 25% left in the field)

⁷Values of Harvest Index (HI_OVR) and Stover Fraction Removed (FRAC_HARVK) are fixed at 99% (meaning only 1% left in the field)

⁸Minimum value of the range as specified in AGRI-FACTS (2005a,b)

⁹Values calculated considering 2 ac/cow, dry weight of biomass consumed = 11 kg/ha/day (5-16 lb/ac/day) and moisture content = 85%. Refer AGRI-FACTS (1998)

¹⁰As per Light Grazing (1.2 AMU/ha) intensity, as per Gao et al. (2017)