A Rangeland Hydrology and Erosion Model

M.A. Nearing[1], H. Wei[2], J.J. Stone[3], F.B. Pierson[4], K.E. Spaeth[5], M.A. Weltz[6], D.C. Flanagan[7], M. Hernandez[2]

ABSTRACT

Soil loss rates on rangelands are considered one of the few quantitative indicators for assessing rangeland health and conservation practice effectiveness. An erosion model to predict soil loss specific for rangeland applications is needed because existing erosion models were developed from croplands where the hydrologic and erosion processes are different. The Rangeland Hydrology and Erosion Model (RHEM) was designed to fill that need. RHEM is an event-based derivation of the WEPP model made by removing relationships developed specifically for croplands and incorporating new equations derived from rangeland data. RHEM represents erosion processes under disturbed and undisturbed rangeland conditions, it adopts a new splash erosion and thin sheet-flow transport equation developed from rangeland data, and it links the model hydrologic and erosion parameters with rangeland plant communities by providing a new system of parameter estimation equations based on 204 plots in 49 rangeland sites distributed across 15 western U.S. states. RHEM estimates runoff, erosion, and sediment delivery rates and volumes at the spatial scale of the hillslope and the temporal scale of a single rainfall event. Experiments were conducted to generate independent data for model evaluation and the Coefficients of Determination (r^2) of runoff and erosion predictions were 0.87

[1] Research Leader, Southwest Watershed Research Center, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Tucson, AZ; [2]Assistant Research Scientist, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ; [3] Research Hydrologist, Southwest Watershed Research Center, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Tucson, AZ; [4] Research Leader, Northwest Watershed Research Center, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Boise, ID; [5] Research Rangeland Management Specialist, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Ft. Worth, TX; [6] Research Rangeland Management Specialist, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Reno, NV; [7]Research Agricultural Engineer, USDA-ARS National Soil Erosion Research Laboratory, West Lafayette, IN.

and 0.50 respectively, which indicated the ability of RHEM to provide reasonable runoff and soil loss prediction capabilities for rangeland management and research needs.

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of work has been undertaken to develop soil erosion prediction models, but most of the focus has been on applications to croplands. For example, in the process of developing the USLE, western rangelands in the United States were largely unrepresented. The focus at that time was on erosion from cropped lands, as evidenced by the locations of the 49 field research stations for collection of data. None of these stations were located on rangeland sites, and the large majority of them were located in the eastern part of the country. Correspondent development and application of empirical USLE-like models in countries outside the United States have also usually focused on croplands (Schwertmann et al., 1987; Larionov, 1993).

In 1981 a conference was held in Tucson, AZ to collectively summarize knowledge on "Estimating Erosion and Sediment Yield on Rangelands" (USDA-ARS, 1982). That workshop included summaries of work on the application of the USLE to rangelands, such as the rainfall erosivity factor (R) (Simanton and Renard, 1982), the slope factors (L and S) (McCool, 1982), and the cropping and management factors (C and P) (Foster, 1982a). A reading of this work today illustrates the limitations of data and understanding of rangeland erosion processes of the time. The work represented in that workshop also shows a notable lack of connection with the scientific understanding at the time of rangeland science, ecology, and management. For example, the paper on C and P factors makes no mention of the rangeland science concepts of that time, such as range condition or climax plant communities. The paper for the workshop on L and S factors included no data on slope length and steepness from in-situ rangelands under natural rainfall, because no such data existed. The effort to apply the USLE to rangelands appeared to be based on a transfer of knowledge from croplands to rangelands with sparse data from rangelands and educated guesses regarding how to adjust parameter values. Conceptually, the basis of the science was from cropland erosion. The knowledge gained from this workshop, and subsequent work inspired thereby, was largely incorporated into the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) (Renard et al., 1997).

There remain data limitation problems for development of an erosion prediction tool for application on rangelands, particularly with regard to data under natural rainfall conditions. However, we do know much more today about erosion on rangelands than we did in 1981, and we have significantly more data as well. For example, a large number of experiments were conducted using a rainfall simulator in conjunction with parameterization efforts for the development of the process-based Water Erosion Prediction Project (WEPP) model (Laflen et al., 1991; Foster and Lane, 1987; Nearing et al., 1989a). Experiments were conducted in 1986 through 1988 at 24 rangeland sites in the western U.S. using a rotating boom rainfall simulator (Simanton et al., 1991). Subsequently, from 1990 through 1993 data were collected at an additional 26 rangeland sites in ten western states using a similar technique (Pierson et al., 2002). These data sets have both improved our understanding of the rangeland infiltration (Spaeth et al., 1996) and erosion (Wei et al., 2009) processes, and provided a wealth of data for potential use in developing model parameter estimation equations. In addition there have been many other studies of rangeland runoff and erosion processes conducted in the past two decades (e.g., Wilcox, 1994; Parsons et al., 1996; Tongway and Ludwig, 1997; Pierson et al., 2002; Paige et al., 2003; Chartier and Rostagno, 2006; Bartley et al., 2006).

In 1985, USDA-ARS initiated the Water Erosion Prediction Project (WEPP) and WEPP was released in 1995 representing the assemblage of state-of-the-art process-based erosion modeling technologies (Flanagan and Nearing, 1995). WEPP is based on fundamentals of infiltration, hydrology, plant science, hydraulics, and erosion mechanics (Nearing et al., 1989a). As a process-based model, WEPP has the advantages over empirical models for its capabilities to estimate spatial and temporal distributions of net soil loss and to extrapolate to a broad range of conditions (Nearing et al., 1990). During 1987 to 1988, the WEPP team collected a large set of erosion data from rangelands across the western US for parameterization of erosion and hydrology factors. However, WEPP is limited in application to rangelands because many of the model concepts and erosion equations were developed from experiments on croplands. It has not been widely accepted by many rangeland managers, though it has found application in the BLM and Forest Service for rangeland application using the cropland plant growth and water balance routines.

The objective of this study was to develop an event-based runoff and water erosion model best suited for application to rangelands of the western United States. We extracted algorithms from the process-based WEPP model, excluding relationships that were relevant only to cropland application and incorporating relationships specific to rangelands. Rainfall simulation data collected on rangeland plots from the WEPP and IRWET (IRWET and NRST, 1998) projects were combined and analyzed, which together covered 49 rangeland sites distributed across 15 western states (Figure 1).

Statistical analyses of these data form the basis of parameter estimation equations for the primary infiltration and erodibility parameters for the model. A new splash erosion and thin sheet-flow transport equation specific for rangeland developed based on the rangeland database (Wei et al., 2009) was incorporated. Sensitivity and uncertainty analysis were conducted for the code that was developed for the model (Wei et al., 2007; Wei et al., 2008). This paper presents the overall conceptualization and structure of the RHEM model, a new system of parameter estimation equations specific for this model and based on the existing data, and results of model evaluation tests using independent measured data.

METHODS

Model Structure

The infiltration equations in RHEM are taken directly from the WEPP model. Infiltration is computed using the Green-Ampt Mein-Larson model (Mein and Larson, 1973) for unsteady intermittent rainfall as modified by Chu (1978). The rainfall excess rate is conceptualized as occurring only when the rainfall rate is greater than the infiltration rate.

$$f_i = \frac{F_i - F_{i-1}}{t_i - t_{i-1}} \qquad [1]$$

Equation [1] is used to calculate the average infiltration rate, f_i (m s^{-1}), for a time interval t_i - t_{i-1}, where F (m) is the cumulative infiltration depth that is computed from the Green-Ampt Mein-Larson model in a Newton-Raphson iteration as:

$$K_e t = F_i - \psi\theta_d \ln\left(1 + \frac{F_i}{\psi\theta_d}\right) \qquad [2]$$

where, K_e (m s^{-1}) is infiltration rate, t is time after time to ponding (s), ψ is average capillary potential (m), and θ_d is soil moisture deficit (m m^{-1}), which is calculated as the difference between porosity and initial soil water content. Shallow lateral subsurface flow is not considered in the model.

The runoff routing equations used in RHEM use an analytical solution to the kinematic wave equation using the method of characteristics for the case where excess rainfall rate is approximated by a series of step functions, i.e., where rainfall intensity is constant within an arbitrary time interval but varies from interval to interval (Flanagan and Nearing, 1995). The empirical routing equations used in the WEPP model for the (now archaic) purpose of reducing computer run-time to approximate the kinematic wave solutions were not used. The rainfall excess amount at each time interval is computed when the rainfall rate exceeds the infiltration capacity:

$$\begin{aligned} &V_i = R_i - F_i && \text{when} \quad I_i > f_i \text{ and } F_i < S_p \\ &V_i = V_{i-1} && \text{when} \quad I_i \le f_i \text{ and } F_i < S_p \\ &V_i = R_i && \text{when} \quad F_i \ge S_p \end{aligned} \qquad [3]$$

where, V_i, R_i, and F_i are the rainfall excess amount, rainfall amount, and infiltration amount in each time interval (m); I_i is the rainfall rate (m s^{-1}); and S_p is the depression storage (m). Then the rainfall excess rate, v, is calculated for each time interval:

$$v_i = \frac{V_i - V_{i-1}}{t_i - t_{i-1}} \qquad [4]$$

Equation [5], the kinematic wave equation, is used to route the rainfall excess on a sloping surface:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial q}{\partial x} = v \qquad [5]$$

where h is depth of flow (m), q is discharge per unit width of the plane ($m^3 \cdot m^{-1} \cdot s^{-1}$), and x is distance from the top of the plane (m). Runoff discharge, q (m), is calculated using a depth-discharge relationship:

$$q = \alpha h^{1.5} \quad [6]$$

where α is the depth-discharge coefficient that is related to Darcy-Weisbach hydraulic friction factors.

RHEM calculates sediment load in the runoff along the hillslope as the total net detachment and deposition from rainfall splash, overland sheet flow, and concentrated flow, using a steady state sediment continuity equation:

$$\frac{dG}{dx} = D_{ss} + D_c \quad [7]$$

Where G (kg m^{-1} s^{-1}) is sediment load in the flow and D_{ss} and D_c are splash and sheet erosion and concentrated flow erosion, respectively, as discussed below. The numerical solution of Equation [7] is that used in the WEPP model (Nearing et al., 1989a), with source terms (D_{ss} and D_c) based on rangeland derived parameters.

Conceptually there are basic scale and process representations that differ for the rangeland model compared to WEPP. In croplands, erosion is often characterized as a combination of rill and interrill erosion (Meyer et al., 1975; Meyer, 1981), where rills are relatively small, actively scouring flow channels, and interrill areas are the relatively flat areas between the rills wherein soil loss is dominated by splash and thin sheet-flow erosion. Rill erosion generates a significant amount of erosion and often dominates the erosion rates from cultivated agricultural fields. However, rangeland soils are un-tilled and generally consolidated, and hence significant rilling does not occur readily under most undisturbed rangeland situations. In most cases erosion in rangelands on the plot and hillslope scale is dominated by splash erosion and thin sheet-flow transport, and erosion rates in these cases can often be lower than those for cropland soils (Wei et al., 2009). Thus in terms of scale, the D_{ss} term in Eq. [7] will normally represent a much larger area and slope length than generally is represented by the interrill erosion term in WEPP. This issue was discussed in more detail by Wei et al. (2009).

RHEM adopts the new splash and sheet erosion equation developed from rangeland erosion data (Wei et al., 2009):

$$D_{ss} = K_{ss} I^{1.052} q^{0.592} \qquad [8]$$

where D_{ss} (kg m^{-2} s^{-1}) is the rate of splash and sheet erosion for the area, K_{ss} is the splash and sheet erodibility coefficient; I (m s^{-1}) is rainfall intensity; and q (m s^{-1}) is runoff rate. Equation [8] is the only existent splash and sheet equation developed from a broadly based rangeland dataset. The equation takes into account the dependent relationship between I and q, which was ignored by previous similar type of equations for interrill erosion. Also, Wei et al. (2009) used large plot data (32.5 m^2) to encompass the spatial heterogeneity of rangelands, and the equation was shown to be effective in predicting erosion from splash and sheet flow in rangelands.

In rangelands, significant concentrated flow detachment causing small scour channels (rills) at the scale of the splash and sheet erosion plot (ca. ~ 20-50 m^2) generally only occurs under disturbed or otherwise exceptional conditions. Under such conditions, concentrated flow erosion in RHEM is represented using an excess shear stress equation of the form (Foster, 1982b):

$$\mathrm{D_c} = \mathrm{K_c}\left(\tau - \tau_c\right)\left(1 - \frac{\mathrm{G}}{\mathrm{T_c}}\right) \qquad [9]$$

where D_c (kg m^{-2} s^{-1}) is the rate of concentrated flow erosion for the area, K_c (s m^{-1}) is the concentrated flow erodibility coefficient, τ (Pa) is the shear stress of the concentrated flow on the soil surface, τ_c (Pa) is the critical shear stress for the soil (the level of flow shear that must be exceeded before concentrated flow detachment is initiated), G (kg m^{-1} s^{-1}) is the sediment load in the flow, and T_c (kg m^{-1} s^{-1}) is the sediment transport capacity of the flow. Transport capacity is calculated using the Yalin equation in a manner similar to that used in the WEPP model (Finkner et al., 1989).

Model Parameters

Parameter estimation is important in process-based erosion modeling because in order to obtain them directly for a specific site they must be optimized from field measured runoff and soil loss data. The system of parameter estimation equations statistically relate inputs to measurable soil and vegetation properties, from which the required model input values for a site may be estimated.

The data we used for developing the new splash and sheet erosion equation included data previously collected by the WEPP Rangeland Field Experiment in 1987 and 1988 (Simanton et al., 1991; Laflen et al., 1991; 1997), as well as data collected by the Interagency Rangeland Water Erosion Team (IRWET) from 1990 through 1993 (IRWET and NRST, 1998; Pierson et al., 2002). The IRWET project was coordinated closely with the WEPP model development so that the experimental design and the data format were compatible with that of WEPP. The WEPP-IRWET rangeland dataset contains measurements of simulated rainfall, runoff and sediment discharge and soil and plant properties, on 204 plots from 49 rangeland sites distributed across 15 western states

(Fig. 1). Plot sizes were 3.06 m wide by 10.7 m long. The database covered a wide range of rangeland soil types (Table 1).

RHEM's system of parameter estimation equations and procedure reflects the concept that hydrology and erosion processes on rangeland are affected by plant growth forms. We first classified the natural plots in the WEPP-IRWET database into four groups based on their dominant plant forms: bunchgrass, sodgrass, annual grass and forbs, and shrubs. Then values of K_e and K_{ss} for each plot were calculated from the measured runoff rates, sediment concentration data, and corresponding equations. Multiple linear regression was then conducted to develop equations between the logarithm of the input values for K_e and K_{ss} and soil and cover properties. These equations were developed for both the total dataset and for each plant form group where possible. For the total data set analyses averages of replicated plots were used, and for the analyses of the individual dominant plant forms individual plot values were used. Large plots were used because the relatively high heterogeneity of rangeland conditions requires a relatively large representative area. Small plots on the order of 1 meter square were not used to develop parameters.

Results are given in Table 2 and Table 3, where, *clay* is the fraction of clay content of upper 4 cm of surface soil; *gcover* is the fraction of total ground cover including rocks, litter, basal area, and cryptogams; *sand* is the fractional sand content of surface soil; *cancov* is the fraction of canopy cover; *rokcov* is the fraction of rock cover; and *litter* is the fraction of litter cover on the soil surface. *xhydgrp* refers to the hydrologic group of the soil. The value of *xhydgrp* is 1, 2, 3, and 4 for hydrologic groups A, B, C, and D, respectively. No significant relationship for estimating K_{ss} for the full dataset was obtained, and hence none was reported. Also, estimating K_{ss} for the bunchgrass was problematic. A statistically significant equation could only be obtained when the 18 data points for tall grass prairie and Kentucky Bluegrass were excluded from the analyses.

For undisturbed sites rills are not generally active in many rangeland situations. More work is needed in order to define parameters for RHEM under situations where concentrated flow is active, and disturbed rangeland sites are not discussed in this paper. However, even under undisturbed conditions analysis has shown (Nearing et al., 1989b) a relatively small, but significant, increase in sediment loads as a function of flow rates. Thus for undisturbed sites, we utilize in this study a relatively small, baseline value of K_c (0.000477 $m \cdot s^{-1}$) and τ_c (1.23 Pa) based on average results from WEPP rangeland experiments (Laflen et al., 1991) for purposes of model evaluation.

MODEL EVALUATION

A set of rainfall simulation experiments at 6 sites located south of Tucson, AZ, U.S.A. was conducted to collect data for model evaluation (Table 4). Estimation equations developed for each plant form group were used in the model evaluation. The plot sizes for evaluation were of a similar order and experimental procedures were similar to those of the large plots from the WEPP-IRWET database as well as for the splash and sheet erosion equation we developed for RHEM (Wei et al., 2009). The sediment load also fell into the range of the WEPP-IRWET dataset, e.g., 0-2.0 ton/ha.

Figure 2 shows that the regression slope was 1.0075, the coefficient of determination, r^2, was 0.87, and the Nash-Sutcliffe model efficiency, E, was 0.83, which indicates that runoff volumes from RHEM were quite close to the observed volumes. A slope of 0.81, r^2 of 0.50 and E of 0.21in Fig. 3 show that the sediment prediction is overall acceptable. The somewhat lower level of fit for erosion compared to runoff volumes was not unexpected because the accuracy of the sediment prediction is dependent on multiple factors, such as accuracy of the runoff prediction, the uncertainty in the parameter estimation equations for both K_e and K_{ss}, and the sediment detachment equations. Furthermore, it has been shown that there is higher uncertainty associated with lower soil loss predictions due to the natural variability of the within-treatment variability (Nearing et al., 1999; Nearing, 2000). The erosion rates measured here were relatively low because the sites were undisturbed. More experiments and data collection are in progress to improve the RHEM and test the model prediction on larger soil loss events.

DISCUSSION

Our scientific understandings of soil erosion processes on rangelands, as well as the inherently different management questions asked in regard to rangelands, suggest the need for a context and conceptualization for the development and use of erosion models for rangeland management and assessment different from croplands. Toward that end, this study was undertaken to develop a Rangeland Hydrology and Erosion Model (RHEM) that incorporates the up-to-date scientific understanding of hydrology and erosion processes in rangelands. This paper reports a first step in that process.

The research problems associated with building an erosion model appropriate for rangeland applications include how to correctly characterize the rangeland hydrology and erosion processes, how to structure model concepts and model equations to represent these processes, and how to address management effects specific for rangelands. In addition, the model should maintain a balance between being complete enough to represent the important and complex processes of nature and being user-friendly so as to be easily applied. For a model to be useful for prediction purposes requires that sufficient amounts of data are available and used to develop the parameter estimation equations needed to apply the model at unmeasured sites with some level of confidence.

A key concept of RHEM is that splash erosion and thin sheet-flow transport act as the dominant set of processes on undisturbed rangeland sites. For purposes of representing and parameterizing the sheet and splash erosion model, the area of consideration is of the order of a minimum of 12 to 50 square meters in size, which makes it large enough to encompass some of the higher levels of heterogeneity found on rangeland hillslopes as compared to cropland slopes. The size of the rainfall simulator plots used as a basis for the RHEM parameter equations (32.7 m^2) falls in the appropriate scale range.

Dominant erosion processes vary with rangeland conditions. As an example, Tongway and Ludwig (1997) compared the water flow on good-condition grassland vs. degraded grassland. Tortuous and uniformly distributed flow form on dense grassland, and long straight fetches, often representing areas of concentrated flow, were found on the degraded grasslands with few tussocks. Degraded rangeland sites after disturbances such as fire, long-term severe drought, severe over-grazing also show different dominant erosion processes. Disturbances can reduce the protective vegetation cover on rangeland soil surfaces and change the soil structure and topography such that the dominant erosion process may shift from splash and sheet erosion to rill erosion. A study by Pierson et al. (2002) examined the fire impacts with simulated rainfall on sagebrush-dominated foothills near Boise, Idaho, and found high concentrations of rills and significant increases in soil loss rates on the burned slopes. For representing erosion on sites with significant disturbances, and where concentrated flow erosion plays a significant role, the model has the capacity to combine splash and sheet erosion with concentrated flow erosion based on the degree of the system disturbance. For purposes of the model application, a "disturbed site" is simply one that exhibits appreciable erosion by concentrated flow, which is a condition that can be induced by disturbances such as fire, rain on snow, mechanical disturbance, or an unusual amount of cover removal for any reason. The data used for this study did not include disturbed sites. Work is underway to improve the model for use in disturbed conditions.

There have been a couple of previous studies that have compared Green-Ampt model infiltration parameters derived from rainfall simulation experiments to those derived from natural rainfall events on hillslopes. Nearing et al. (1996) reported simulator measured Green-Ampt conductivities on data from 30 soils compared to Green-Ampt parameters optimized using the WEPP model and natural runoff data from the same soils. In general the simulator K_e values were greater, most of them by a factor ranging from 2 to 4 times. All of these soils were in humid climates and used for crop production rather than animal grazing. Burns (2010) reported results from application of the KINEROS2 model (Goodrich et al., 2006) to simulator plots and hillslopes under natural rainfall in southern Arizona rangelands. KINEROS2 uses the Smith-Parlange (Smith et al., 1995) model for infiltration, which is an extension and conceptual improvement of the Green-Ampt model. Burns (2010) reported that the hillslope infiltration value from the simulator data ranged from 3 to 6 times greater than the value calibrated for the hillslopes. For RHEM we recommend that the values of K_e reported in this paper be reduced by a factor of 3 when applied to natural rainfall conditions.

IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A Rangeland Hydrology and Erosion Model (RHEM) was developed in order to fill the need for a process-based rangeland erosion model that can function as a practical tool for quantifying runoff and erosion rates specific to western US rangelands in order to provide reasonable runoff and soil loss prediction capabilities for rangeland management and research. It was designed for government agencies, land managers and conservationists who need sound, science-based technology to model and predict erosion processes on rangelands and assess rangeland conservation practices effects.

RHEM represents a modified and improved (for rangeland application) version of the WEPP model code specific for rangeland application and based on fundamentals of infiltration, hydrology, plant science, hydraulics, and erosion mechanics. When linked with appropriate data, plant information, and management models RHEM should be capable of capturing the mechanics of how plant species, disturbances such as fire, climate change and management practices affect erosion rates on rangelands.

Individual evaluation experimental data indicated the ability of RHEM to predict runoff and sediment from undisturbed rangeland surfaces. More work is in progress on collecting more data, describing and quantifying disturbed rangelands, and testing the model efficiency on predicting larger soil loss events. Work is also underway to produce a working continuous simulation model specific to rangeland plants and soils.

LITERATURE CITED

Bartley, R., C.H. Roth, J. Ludwig, D. McJannet, A. Liedloff, J. Corfield, A. Hawdon, and B. Abbott. 2006. Runoff and erosion from Australia's tropical semi-arid rangelands: influence of ground cover for differing space and time scales. Hydrological Processes 20:3317-3333.

Bruns, I.S.C. 2010. Reducing Uncertainty in Hydrological Modeling: A Step-Wise Multi-Scale Calibration Approach. Masters of Science Thesis, Univ. Arizona, School Natural Resources. Tucson, AZ.

Chartier, M.P., and C.M. Rostagno. 2006. Soil erosion thresholds and alternative states in northeastern Patagonian rangelands. *Rangeland Ecol Manage* 59:616–624.

Chu, S.T. 1978. Infiltration during an unsteady rain. *Water Resources Research* 14(3):461-466.

Finkner, S.C., M.A. Nearing, G.R. Foster, and J.E. Gilley. 1989. A simplified equation for modeling sediment transport capacity. *Trans. Am. Soc of Agric. Eng.* 32:1545-1550.

Flanagan, D.C, and M.A. Nearing (eds.). 1995. USDA-Water Erosion Prediction project: Hillslope profile and watershed model documentation. NSERL Report No. 10. USDA-ARS National Soil Erosion Research Laboratory, West Lafayette, IN 47097-1196.

Foster, G.R. 1982a. Special problems in the application of the USLE to rangelands: C and P factors. In Proceedings of Workshop on Estimating Erosion and Sediment Yield on Rangelands. U.S. Dep. Agric., Agric. Res. Serv., *Agricultural Reviews and Manuals* ARM-W-26. p. 96-100.

Foster, G.R. 1982b. Modeling the Erosion Process. *In:* Haan et al. (eds.), Hydrologic Modeling of Small Watersheds Am. Soc. Agric. Eng. Monograph #5, St. Joseph, MI. p. 295-380

Foster, G.R., and L.J. Lane. 1987. User requirements: USDA-Water Erosion Prediction Project (WEPP). NSERL Report No. 1, USDA-ARS National Soil Erosion Research Laboratory, W. Lafayette, IN. 43 p.

Goodrich, D.C., Unkrich, C.L., Smith, R., Woolhiser, D. 2006. KINEROS2 - New features and capabilities. Proc. 3rd Fed. Interagency Hydrologic Modeling Conf., April 2-6, 2006. Reno, Nevada. 2006 CDROM.

IRWET and NRST. 1998. Interagency Rangeland Water Erosion Project report and state data summaries. Interagency Rangeland Water Erosion Team (IRWET) and National Rangeland Study Team (NRST). USDA-ARS.

Laflen, J.M., W.J. Elliot, J.R. Simanton, C.S. Holzhey, and K.D. Kohl. 1991. WEPP – Soil erodibility experiments for rangeland and cropland soils. *J. Soil Water Conservation* 46:39-44.

Laflen, J.M., W.J. Elliot, D.C. Flanagan, C.R. Meyer, and M.A. Nearing. 1997. WEPP-Predicting water erosion using a process-based model. *J. Soil Water Conservation* 52:96-102.

Larionov, G.A. 1993. Erosion and deflation of soils. (In Russian). Moscow Univ. Press, Moscow.

McCool, D.K. 1982. Effects of slope length and steepness on soil erosion from rangelands. In Proceedings of Workshop on Estimating Erosion and Sediment Yield on Rangelands. U.S. Dep. Agric., Agric. Res. Serv. *Agricultural Reviews and Manuals* ARM-W-26. p. 73-95.

Mein, R.G. and C.L. Larson. 1973. Modeling infiltration during a steady rain. *Water Resources Research* 9:384-394.

Meyer, L.D., G.R. Foster, and M.M. Romkens. 1975. Source of soil eroded by water from upland slopes. In: Present and Prospective Technology for Predicting Sediment Yields and Sources, Proc. Sediment Yield Workshop. USDA-ARS-40. p. 177-189.

Meyer, L.D. 1981. How rain intensity affects interrill erosion. *Transactions of ASAE* 24(6): 1472-1475.

Nearing, M.A., G.R. Foster, L.J. Lane, and S.C. Finkner. 1989a. A process-based soil erosion model for USDA-Water Erosion Prediction Project technology. *Trans. Am. Soc of Agric. Eng.* 32:1587-1593.

Nearing, M.A., D.I. Page, J.R. Simanton, and L.J. Lane. 1989b. Determining erodibility parameters from rangeland field data for a process-based erosion model. *Trans. Am. Soc of Agric. Eng.* 32:919-924.

Nearing, M.A., L.J. Lane, E.E. Alberts, and J.M. Laflen. 1990. Prediction technology for soil erosion by water: Status and research needs. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 54:1702-1711.

Nearing, M.A., B.Y. Liu, L.M. Risse, X. Zhang, 1996. Curve numbers and Green-Ampt effective hydraulic conductivities. Am. Water Resources Assoc. Bulletin 32(1):125-136.

Nearing, M.A., G. Govers, and L.D. Norton. 1999. Variability in soil erosion data from replicated plots. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 63: 1829-1835.

Nearing, M.A. 2000. Evaluating soil erosion models using measured plot data: accounting for variability in the data. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 25:1035-1043.

Paige, G.B., Stone, J.J., Smith, J., Kennedy, J.R. 2003. The Walnut Gulch rainfall simulator: A computer-controlled variable intensity rainfall simulator. Applied Engr. in Agric., ASAE 20(1):25-31.

Parsons, A., A. Abrahams, and J. Wainwright. 1996. Response of interrill runoff and erosion rates to vegetation change in southern Arizona. *Geomorphology* 14:311-317.

34/REV05. 122 p.

Pierson, F.B., K.E. Spaeth, M.A. Weltz, and D.H. Carlson. 2002. Hydrologic response of diverse western rangelands. *J. Rangeland Management* 55:558-570.

Renard, K.G., G.R. Foster, G.A. Weesies, D.K. McCool, and D.C. Yoder. Coordinators. 1997. Predicting soil erosion by water: A guide to conservation planning with the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). U.S. Dept. of Agric., Agriculture Handbook No. 703. 404 p.

Schwertmann, U., W. Vogl, and M. Kainz. (1987). Bodenerosion durch Wasser — Vorhersage des Abtrags und Bewertung von Gegenmaßnahmen. Ulmer Verlag, Stuttgart. 64 p.

Simanton, J.R., and K.G. Renard. 1982. The USLE rainfall factor for Southwestern U.S. Rangelands. In Proceedings of Workshop on Estimating Erosion and Sediment Yield on Rangelands. Dep. Agric., Agric. Res. Serv. *Agricultural Reviews and Manuals ARM-W-26* p. 50-62.

Simanton, J.R., M.A. Weltz, and H.D. Larson. 1991. Rangeland experiments to parameterize the Water Erosion Prediction Project model: Vegetation canopy cover effects. *J. Rangeland Management* 44:276-281.

Smith, R.E., Goodrich, D.C., Woolhiser, D.A., Unkrich, C.L. 1995. KINEROS - A kinematic runoff and erosion model. Chpt. 20 In: Computer Models of Watershed Hydrology, V.P. Singh (ed.), Water Resources Publs., pp. 697-732.

Spaeth, K.E., F.B. Pierson, M.A. Weltz, and J.B. Awang. 1996. Gradient analysis of infiltration and environmental variables as related to rangeland vegetation. *Trans. Am. Soc of Agric. Eng.* 39:67-77.

Tongway, D.J., and J.A. Ludwig. 1997. The nature of landscape dysfunction in rangelands. In: J. Ludwig, D. Tongway, D. Freudenberger, J. Noble and K. Hodgkinson (eds.). Landscape Ecology: Function and Management. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, Collingwood, Victoria, Australia. p. 49-61.

USDA-ARS, 1982. Proceedings of the workshop on estimating erosion and sediment yield on rangelands; 7–9 March 1981; Tucson, AZ. Washington, DC: USDA. ARS *Agricultural Reviews and Manuals* ARM-W-26.

Wei, H., M.A. Nearing, and J.J. Stone. 2007. A comprehensive sensitivity analysis framework for model evaluation and improvement using a case study of the rangeland hydrology and erosion model. *Trans. Am. Soc of Agric. Eng.* 50:945-953.

Wei, H., M.A. Nearing, J.J. Stone, and D.D. Breshears. 2008. A dual Monte Carlo approach to estimate model uncertainty and its application to the Rangeland Hydrology and Erosion Model. *Trans. Am. Soc of Agric. Eng.* 51:515-520.

Wei, H., M.A. Nearing, and J.J. Stone. D.P. Guertin, K.E. Spaeth, F.B. Pierson, M.H. Nichols, and C.A. Moffett. 2009. A new splash and sheet erosion equation for rangelands. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* (accepted).

Wilcox, B.P. 1994. Runoff and erosion in intercanopy zones of Pinyon-Juniper woodlands. *Journal of Range Management* 47:285-295.

List of Figures

List of Tables

Table 1. WEPP-IRWET experimental sites used to develop RHEM

Site	Number of plots	State	City	Soil texture	Dominant plant form
A187	2	AZ	Tombstone	Sandy loam	shrub
A287	2	AZ	Tombstone	Sandy clay loam	bunchgrass
C187	2	TX	Sonora	Cobbly clay	sodgrass
D187	2	OK	Chickasha	Loam	sodgrass/bunchgrass
D188	2	OK	Chickasha	Loam	sodgrass/bunchgrass
D287	2	OK	Chickasha	Sandy loam	bunchgrass
D288	2	OK	Chickasha	Sandy loam	bunchgrass
E287	2	OK	Woodward	Loam	bunchgrass
E288	2	OK	Woodward	Loam	bunchgrass
E588	2	OK	Woodward	Sandy loam	bunchgrass
F187	2	MT	Sidney	Loam	forb
G187	2	CO	Degater	Silty Clay	shrub
H187	2	SD	Cottonwood	Clay	bunchgrass
H188	2	SD	Cottonwood	Clay	bunchgrass
H287	2	SD	Cottonwood	Clay	bunchgrass
H288	2	SD	Cottonwood	Clay	bunchgrass
I187	2	NM	Los Alamos	Sandy loam	forb
J187	2	NM	Cuba	Sandy loam	sodgrass
K187	2	CA	Susanville	Sandy loam	shrub
K188	2	CA	Susanville	Sandy loam	shrub
K288	2	CA	Susanville	Sandy loam	shrub
H392	3	ND	Killdeer	Sandy loam	bunchgrass
K287	4	CA	Susanville	Sandy loam	shrub
B190	6	NE	Wahoo	Loam	sodgrass
B290	6	NE	Wahoo	Loam	sodgrass/bunchgrass
C190	6	TX	Amarillo	Loam	bunchgrass
C190	6	TX	Amarillo	Loam	sodgrass
E191	6	KS	Eureka	Silty clay loam	forb
E291	6	KS	Eureka	Silty clay loam	sodgrass/bunchgrass
E391	6	KS	Eureka	Silty clay	sodgrass
F191	6	CO	Akron	Loam	bunchgrass
F291	6	CO	Akron	Fine sandy loam	bunchgrass
F391	6	CO	Akron	Loam	sodgrass
G191	6	WY	Newcastle	Very fine sandy loam	bunchgrass
G291	6	WY	Newcastle	Clay loam	bunchgrass
G391	6	WY	Newcastle	Very fine sandy loam	bunchgrass
H192	6	ND	Killdeer	Sandy loam	bunchgrass
H292	6	ND	Killdeer	Fine sandy loam	bunchgrass
I192	6	WY	Buffalo	Silt loam	shrub

I292	6	WY	Buffalo	Loam	bunchgrass
J192	6	ID	Blackfoot	Silt loam	shrub
J292	6	ID	Blackfoot	Silt loam	bunchgrass
K192	6	AZ	Prescott	Sandy loam	bunchgrass
K292	6	AZ	Prescott	Sandy loam	bunchgrass
L193	6	CA	San L Obispo	Clay loam	forb
L293	6	CA	San L Obispo	Clay loam	annual grass
M193	6	UT	Cedar City	Sandy loam	shrub
M293	6	UT	Cedar City	Sandy loam	sodgrass

Table 2. Parameter estimation equations for the Green-Ampt infiltration parameter, *Ke*

Equations	r^2	n
All Data K_e **= 10^(0.2881 – 1.346*clay*[†] + 3.347*gcover*[‡] + 0.411*cancov*)**	**0.54**	**62**
Sod grass K_e **= 10^(1.18 - 1.60*clay* + 0.55*cancov*[§])**	**0.41**	**72**
Shrub K_e **= 10^(0.86 - 0.46*clay* + 1.01*rokcov*[¶] + 0.22*gcover*)**	**0.60**	**32**
Annual grass and forbs K_e **= 10^(1.88 - 0.28*xhydgrp*[#])**	**0.80**	**10**
Bunchgrass K_e **= 10^(0.07 + 0.89*sand*[††] + 0.74*gcover*)**	**0.40**	**131**

[†]*clay* is the clay content of top 4 cm of soil (g g^{-1});
[‡]*gcover* is total ground cover including rocks, litter, basal area, and cryptogams (m^2 m^{-2});
[§]*cancov* is the canopy cover (m^2 m^{-2});
[¶]*rokcov* is rock cover (m^2 m^{-2});
[#]*xhydgrp* refers to the hydrologic group of the soil. The value of *xhydgrp* is 1, 2, 3, and 4 for hydrologic groups A, B, C, and D, respectively;
[††]*sand* is the sand content of surface soil (g g^{-1}).
clay, *gcover*, *cancov*, *rokcov*, and *sand* are expressed as fractions ranging zero to one in value.

Table 3. Parameter estimation equations for the splash and sheet erosion parameter, *Kss*

Equations	**r^2**	**n**
Sod grass **K_{ss} = 10^(3.54 - 0.85*gcover* †– 0.37*cancov*‡)**	**0.26**	**75**
Shrub **K_{ss} = 10^(3.89 - 1.08*rokcov*§ – 1.98*cancov*)**	**0.54**	**30**
Annual grass and forbs **K_{ss} = 10^(3.77 - 1.82*clay*¶ - 0.29*gcover* - 0.25*cancov*)**	**0.71**	**22**
Bunch grass excluding tall grass prairie and Kentucky Blue **K_{ss} = 10^(3.30 - 0.57*litter*# – 0.40*cancov*◦**	**0.27**	**113**
Bunch grass plots that are tall grass prairie and/or Kentucky Blue **K_{ss} = 473** (the mean value)		**18**

‡*gcover* is total ground cover including rocks, litter, basal area, and cryptogams (m^2 m^{-2});
§*cancov* is the canopy cover (m^2 m^{-2});
¶*rokcov* is rock cover (m^2 m^{-2});
†*clay* is the clay content of surface soil (g g^{-1});
#*litter* is litter cover on soil surface (m^2 m^{-2}).
All the factors above are expressed as fractions ranging zero to one in value.

Table 4. Experimental plots used for model evaluation

Site	Number of plots	Average slope (%)	Soil texture	Dominant plant form
ER2	4	12.9	sandy loam	bunch grass
ER3	4	13.6	sandy loam	bunch grass
ER4	4	4.3	sandy loam	bunch grass
Kreen	4	10.8	sandy loam	bunch grass
LH	4	15.8	sandy loam	Shrub
Tank	4	22.0	clay loam	bunch grass



Figure 1. WEPP-IRWET data site locations.



Figure 2. Runoff volume predicted from RHEM vs. observed values from the evaluation data sets. r^2 is the coefficient of determination, and E is the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency coefficient.



Figure 3. Soil loss values predicted from RHEM vs. observed soil loss from the evaluation data sets. r^2 is the coefficient of determination, and E is the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency coefficient.