SWAT supporting cost-effectiveness of riparian forests for river water quality improvement

> Emanuel Escobar Research Fellow (UMinho, Portugal)

emanuelescobarjuipa@gmail.com

Claudia Carvalho-Santos, Ana Castro, Elif Ozturk, José Pedro Ramião, Ana Faria Lopes, Cláudia Pascoal





**Universidade do Minho** Escola de Ciências centro de **biologia molecular** e ambiental

**IB·S** 

INSTITUTO DE CIÊNCIA E INOVAÇÃO PARA A BIO-SUSTENTABILIDADE



2022.06375.PTDC





12<sup>th</sup> July, 2024

## **1. Introduction**





Poor

### Environmental Effectiveness of schemes (based on meta-analysis)



Buffer width	5 m	10 m	20 m	50 m	100 m
Nitrate-N	20%	30%	40%	80%	90+%
Phosphate-P	10%	20%	30%	60%	90+%
Suspended Sediment	80%	90+%	90+%	90+%	90+%

Forests for Water Services: A Step-by-Step Guide for Payment Schemes

Table 2

Percent reduction in diffuse pollutant concentration from upslope land to watercourses achievable from a well-designed and managed woodland buffer of variable width. Interpolated from relationships derived from review by Perez-Silos (2017).

# Best agricultural practices on water quality

- Fertilizer incorporation, conservation tillage and Filter Strips
- 25% reduction in sediments and nutrient export







**water** 

Article

Modeling the Effectiveness of Sustainable Agricultural Practices in Reducing Sediments and Nutrient Export from a River Basin

## 2. Project structure



米以

Universidade do Minho Escola de Ciências

**Tree-based solutions** 

Hydrological modelling

Water quality

Cost-benefit analysis

## 3. Objectives

- To evaluate the **environmental effectiveness** of 2 riparian forest buffer scenarios in reducing sediments and nutrients to the rivers using **SWAT**
- To calculate the **cost-effectiveness** of the of 2 riparian forest buffer scenarios



### A) Study area



Cávado River Basin

- ✤ Area 1581 km<sup>2</sup>
- Annual precipitation is 1300 mm
- 9 dams located
- Soil classes were aggregated into 8 groups
- Land covers were aggregated into 16 groups
- Three classes of slope

#### **B)** Data

Variables	Source	Description		
DEM	NASA Shuttle Radar Topogra- phy Mission (SRTM)	1 Arc-Second Global Land Elevation Map		
Stream network	SNIAmb	Stream network according to the Water Framework Directive (WFD)		
Land cover	DGT	COS 2010 (Land use map), 1 ha (minimum mapping unit). Classes were aggregated into seven main cover classes		
Soil	Leitão et al. (2013)	Soil Ecological Value of Mainland Portugal, 1:50 000. Classes were aggregated into seven main soil classes		
Precipitation and temperature	E-OBS	Mean daily precipitation (mm), maximum and minimum daily temperature (°C) from E-OBS gridded dataset, from 1970 to 2018		
Climate (other variables)	SNIRH	Hourly values from 2003 to 2017 were converted to daily values of solar radiation (MJ), relative humidity (%), and wind speed (m/s) from climate 3 climate stations		
River discharge	SNIRH	Daily observations of river discharge (m <sup>3</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> ) at 1 hydrometric station. Calibration period: 1980–1982; Validation: 1983–1985		
Water flow-in to reservoirs	SNIRH	Daily observations of water flow-in (m <sup>3</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> ) to 6 reservoirs. Calibration period: 2004–2006; Validation: 2015–2017		
Reservoirs	SNIRH, EDP	Location and input data for reservoirs		
Water abstraction	SNIG, APA	Location of surface water abstractions and volume of water abstracted		

Soil & Water SWAT Assessment Tool

## C) Calibration and Validation



\_\_\_\_\_water

Article

#### Modeling the Effectiveness of Sustainable Agricultural Practices in Reducing Sediments and Nutrient Export from a River Basin

MDPI

José Pedro Ramião <sup>1,2,3,</sup>\*<sup>1</sup>), Cláudia Carvalho-Santos <sup>1,2,3</sup><sup>1</sup>), Rute Pinto <sup>4</sup> and Cláudia Pascoal <sup>1,2,3</sup><sup>1</sup>

Modified SWAT general parameters for Cávado basin during calibration and validation period (1995-2001) with 3-year period of warm-up

Parameters	Description in SWAT	Initial value	Calibration
Groundwater			
Cn2	Curve number for moisture condition II	Various	-10
Reservoir			
RES_D50	Grain size of sediments	0	20
<b>RES_NSED</b>			
	Equilibrium sediment concentration	1	0.9
Sediments			
USLE_K	Erodibility factor	0.23	0.02
Nitrates			
NPERCO	Nitrate percolation coefficient	0.20	0.97
Phosphorus			
ERORGP	Phosphorus enrichment ratio	0	1.14

## D) Riparian Forest scenarios development

#### **D1) Opportunity Mapping**



#### D2) Creation of new land cover

- Two scenarios of 2.5 and 5 m of riparian forest buffer
- Applied only in 10 subbasins
- Create one more land cover class (SALG)
- Add SALG class that intersects in the Agriculture lands (areas more than 2 ha)





#### **Species of riparian forest (SALG)**:

Willow, Oak and native forest

## Lowlands with intensive dairy farming

### **E) Cost-Effectiveness Analysis**

#### i) Total cost equation

$$TC_{PV} = (C_{plant.})_{t=0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{(C_{maint.} + C_{opp.})}{(1+d)^t}$$

TCpv= Total cost

Cplant = cost of planting the forest

Cmaint = cost of forest maintenance

Copp = opportunity cost

d = 3.24 interest rate of 10-year government bonds

#### ii) Environmental effectiveness



EEj = environmental effectiveness or water quality improvement for pollutant j, Pbt = pollution level in the water at time t in the baseline scenario (i.e. no forestation) Pst = is the pollution level after the forestation scenario

 $EE^{j} = \sum_{t=1} p_{st} - p_{bt} \leftrightarrow p_{st} < p_{bt}$ 

T = lifespan considered for the scenarios.

#### iii) Cost-effectiveness ratio

$$CE_j = \frac{-(TC_{PV})/n_P}{EE^j}$$

Cej =cost-effectiveness ratio for pollutant j

TCPV = present value of the total cost

nP = number of pollutants

Eej = environmental effectiveness of the forestation scenario for pollutant j

## **5. Results**





## **5. Results**

## Environmental effectiveness

Scenario	Total suspended sediments	NO <sub>3</sub>	Ρ
2.5 m	<b>\$</b> 5.3%	₽2.4%	<b>1</b> .8%
5 m	<b>↓</b> 32.9%	<b>4</b> %	<b>↓</b> 3.3%



## **5. Results**

## **Total costs**

**2.5m buffer (29 ha)** 

#### 5m buffer (57 ha)

ltem	Cost(€) (min)	Cost(€) (max)	Cost(€) (average)	ltem	Cost(€) (min)	Cost(€) (max)	Cost(€) (average)
1. Forest Plantation	17,680.13	265,202.01	61,880.46	1. Forest Plantation	34,052.01	510,780.01	119,182.01
2. Maintenance	363,017.58	499,149.17	431,083.38	2. Maintenance	699,173.15	961,363.09	830,268.12
3. Opportunity cost	0	2,414,072.63	1,207,036.31	3.Opportunity cost	0	4,573,263.66	2,286,631.83
Total cost	380,697.71	3,178,423.81	1,700,000.16	Total cost	733,225.16	6,045,406.78	3,236,081.96



### **Cost-effectiveness Ratios (€/mg)**

#### 2.5m buffer

#### 5m buffer

CE	Nitrates	Phosphorus	Sediments	
<b>S</b>	(N – NO <sub>3</sub> )	(P)	(TSS)	
Cost Min	13,631.83	196,913.31	398.25	
Cost Max	113,811.41	1,644,018.11	3,325.02	
Cost Average	60,872.75	879,313.52	1,778.41	

CE	Nitrates (N – NO <sub>3</sub> )	Phosphorus (P)	Sediments (TSS)
Cost Min	16,950.55	209,328.24	123.53
Cost Max	139,756.5 5	1,725,901.45	1,018.52
Cost Average	74,811.12	923,868.12	545.21

Least costly pollutant is sediment in both scenarios

Phosphorus is the most expensive

## 6. Conclusions

**SWAT** was able to capture the hydrology of Cávado basin and support **economic analysis** 

**Riparian forest buffers** demonstrate their ability to regulate pollutants

**Sediments were the least costly** pollutant to reduce in both scenarios

The **cost-effectiveness** analysis is important to support the implementation of **environmental financial schemes** to protect the water bodies



## THANK YOU!!!



2022.06375.PTDC

https://trees4waterpt.wixsite.com/trees-4-water/

Acknowledgments:







