

# **SOIL & WATER ASSESSMENT TOOL**



*Theoretical Documentation*

*Version 2009*



Texas A&M System



COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE  
AND LIFE SCIENCES

TR-406  
2011

## Soil and Water Assessment Tool Theoretical Documentation Version 2009

By

S.L. Neitsch, J.G. Arnold, J.R. Kiniry, J.R. Williams

Grassland, Soil and Water Research Laboratory – Agricultural Research Service  
Blackland Research Center – Texas AgriLife Research

**September 2011**

**Texas Water Resources Institute Technical Report No. 406**  
Texas A&M University System  
College Station, Texas 77843-2118



# **SOIL AND WATER ASSESSMENT TOOL THEORETICAL DOCUMENTATION**

---

## **VERSION 2009**

S.L. NEITSCH, J.G. ARNOLD, J.R. KINIRY, J.R. WILLIAMS

AUGUST, 2009

GRASSLAND, SOIL AND WATER RESEARCH LABORATORY ◦ AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE  
808 EAST BLACKLAND ROAD ◦ TEMPLE, TEXAS 76502

BLACKLAND RESEARCH CENTER ◦ TEXAS AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION  
720 EAST BLACKLAND ROAD ◦ TEMPLE, TEXAS 76502



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

---

The SWAT model is a continuation of thirty years of non-point source modeling. In addition to the Agricultural Research Service and Texas A&M University, several federal agencies including the US Environmental Protection Agency, Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and Bureau of Indian Affairs have contributed to the model. We also want to thank all the state environmental agencies (with special thanks to Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources), state NRCS offices (with special thanks to the Texas State Office), numerous universities in the United States and abroad, and consultants who contributed to all aspects of the model. We appreciate your contributions and look forward to continued collaboration.



# CONTENTS

---

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>0.1 DEVELOPMENT OF SWAT</b>	3
<b>0.2 OVERVIEW OF SWAT</b>	6
LAND PHASE OF THE HYDROLOGIC CYCLE	9
ROUTING PHASE OF THE HYDROLOGIC CYCLE	21
<b>0.3 REFERENCES</b>	24
 <b>SECTION 1: CLIMATE</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 1:1</b>	
<b>EQUATIONS: ENERGY</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>1:1.1 SUN-EARTH RELATIONSHIPS</b>	30
DISTANCE BETWEEN EARTH AND SUN	30
SOLAR DECLINATION	30
SOLAR NOON, SUNRISE, SUNSET, AND DAYLENGTH	31
<b>1:1.2 SOLAR RADIATION</b>	32
EXTRATERRESTRIAL RADIATION	32
SOLAR RADIATION UNDER CLOUDLESS SKIES	34
DAILY SOLAR RADIATION	34
HOURLY SOLAR RADIATION	35
DAILY NET RADIATION	36
<b>1:1.3 TEMPERATURE</b>	39
DAILY AIR TEMPERATURE	39

HOURLY AIR TEMPERATURE	40
SOIL TEMPERATURE	40
WATER TEMPERATURE	45
<b>1:1.4 WIND SPEED</b>	46
<b>1:1.5 NOMENCLATURE</b>	47
<b>1:1.6 REFERENCES</b>	49

## CHAPTER 1:2

<b>EQUATIONS: ATMOSPHERIC WATER</b>	51
<b>1:2.1 PRECIPITATION</b>	52
<b>1:2.2 MAXIMUM HALF-HOUR RAINFALL</b>	53
<b>1:2.3 WATER VAPOR</b>	53
<b>1:2.4 SNOW COVER</b>	56
<b>1:2.5 SNOW MELT</b>	59
SNOW PACK TEMPERATURE	59
SNOW MELT EQUATION	60
<b>1:2.6 NOMENCLATURE</b>	61
<b>1:2.7 REFERENCES</b>	62

## CHAPTER 1:3

<b>EQUATIONS: WEATHER GENERATOR</b>	65
<b>1:3.1 PRECIPITATION</b>	66
OCCURRENCE OF WET OR DRY DAY	66
AMOUNT OF PRECIPITATION	67
<b>1:3.2 MAXIMUM HALF-HOUR RAINFALL</b>	68
MONTHLY MAXIMUM HALF-HOUR RAIN	68
DAILY MAXIMUM HALF-HOUR RAIN VALUE	69
<b>1:3.3 DISTRIBUTION OF RAINFALL WITHIN DAY</b>	71
NORMALIZED INTENSITY DISTRIBUTION	71
GENERATED TIME TO PEAK INTENSITY	73
TOTAL RAINFALL AND DURATION	74
<b>1:3.4 SOLAR RADIATION &amp; TEMPERATURE</b>	76
DAILY RESIDUALS	76
GENERATED VALUES	78
ADJUSTMENT FOR CLEAR/OVERCAST CONDITIONS	79
<b>1:3.5 RELATIVE HUMIDITY</b>	81
MEAN MONTHLY RELATIVE HUMIDITY	81
GENERATED DAILY VALUE	82

ADJUSTMENT FOR CLEAR/OVERCAST CONDITIONS	83
<b>1:3.6 WIND SPEED</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>1:3.7 NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>1:3.8 REFERENCES</b>	<b>87</b>

## CHAPTER 1:4

<b>EQUATIONS: CLIMATE CUSTOMIZATION</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>1:4.1 ELEVATION BANDS</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>1:4.2 CLIMATE CHANGE</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>1:4.3 WEATHER FORECAST INCORPORATION</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>1:4.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>96</b>

---

## SECTION 2: HYDROLOGY

### CHAPTER 2:1

<b>EQUATIONS: SURFACE RUNOFF</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2:1.1 RUNOFF VOLUME: SCS CURVE NUMBER PROCEDURE</b>	<b>99</b>
SCS CURVE NUMBER	100
<b>2:1.2 RUNOFF VOLUME: GREEN &amp; AMPT INFILTRATION METHOD</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>2:1.3 PEAK RUNOFF RATE</b>	<b>110</b>
TIME OF CONCENTRATION	110
RUNOFF COEFFICIENT	113
RAINFALL INTENSITY	114
MODIFIED RATIONAL FORMULA	115
<b>2:1.4 SURFACE RUNOFF LAG</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>2:1.5 TRANSMISSION LOSSES</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>2:1.6 NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>2:1.7 REFERENCES</b>	<b>120</b>

### CHAPTER 2:2

<b>EQUATIONS: EVAPOTRANSPIRATION</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>2:2.1 CANOPY STORAGE</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>2:2.2 POTENTIAL EVAPOTRANSPIRATION</b>	<b>125</b>
PENMAN-MONTEITH METHOD	126
PRIESTLEY-TAYLOR METHOD	132
HARGREAVES METHOD	132

<b>2:2.3 ACTUAL EVAPOTRANSPIRATION</b>	134
EVAPORATION OF INTERCEPTED RAINFALL	134
TRANSPIRATION	135
SUBLIMATION AND EVAPORATION FROM THE SOIL	135
<b>2:2.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	140
<b>2:2.5 REFERENCES</b>	142

## CHAPTER 2:3

<b>EQUATIONS: SOIL WATER</b>	146
<b>2:3.1 SOIL STRUCTURE</b>	147
<b>2:3.2 PERCOLATION</b>	151
<b>2:3.3 BYPASS FLOW</b>	152
<b>2:3.4 PERCHED WATER TABLE</b>	158
<b>2:3.5 LATERAL FLOW</b>	160
LATERAL FLOW LAG	162
<b>2:3.6 NOMENCLATURE</b>	164
<b>2:3.7 REFERENCES</b>	166

## CHAPTER 2:4

<b>EQUATIONS: GROUNDWATER</b>	168
<b>2:4.1 GROUNDWATER SYSTEMS</b>	169
<b>2:4.2 SHALLOW AQUIFER</b>	171
RECHARGE	172
PARTITIONING OF RECHARGE BETWEEN SHALLOW AND DEEP AQUIFER	173
GROUNDWATER/BASE FLOW	173
REVAP	176
PUMPING	177
GROUNDWATER HEIGHT	177
<b>2:4.3 DEEP AQUIFER</b>	178
<b>2:4.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	179
<b>2:4.5 REFERENCES</b>	180

## **SECTION 3: NUTRIENTS/PESTICIDES**

### **CHAPTER 3:1**

#### **EQUATIONS: NITROGEN** 182

---

<b>3:1.1 NITROGEN CYCLE IN THE SOIL</b>	183
INITIALIZATION OF SOIL NITROGEN LEVELS	185
<b>3:1.2 MINERALIZATION &amp; DECOMPOSITION/ IMMOBILIZATION</b>	187
HUMUS MINERALIZATION	188
RESIDUE DECOMPOSITION & MINERALIZATION	189
<b>3:1.3 NITRIFICATION &amp; AMMONIA VOLATILIZATION</b>	191
<b>3:1.4 DENITRIFICATION</b>	194
<b>3:1.5 ATMOSPHERIC DEPOSITION</b>	195
NITROGEN IN RAINFALL	196
NITROGEN DRY DEPOSITION	197
<b>3:1.6 FIXATION</b>	198
<b>3:1.7 UPWARD MOVEMENT OF NITRATE IN WATER</b>	198
<b>3:1.8 LEACHING</b>	198
<b>3:1.9 NITRATE IN THE SHALLOW AQUIFER</b>	199
<b>3:1.10 NOMENCLATURE</b>	201
<b>3:1.11 REFERENCES</b>	203

### **CHAPTER 3:2**

#### **EQUATIONS: PHOSPHORUS** 206

---

<b>3:2.1 PHOSPHORUS CYCLE</b>	207
INITIALIZATION OF SOIL PHOSPHORUS LEVELS	208
<b>3:2.2 MINERALIZATION &amp; DECOMPOSITION/ IMMOBILIZATION</b>	210
HUMUS MINERALIZATION	211
RESIDUE DECOMPOSITION & MINERALIZATION	212
<b>3:2.3 SORPTION OF INORGANIC P</b>	214
<b>3:2.4 LEACHING</b>	216
<b>3:2.5 PHOSPHORUS IN THE SHALLOW AQUIFER</b>	217
<b>3:2.6 NOMENCLATURE</b>	217
<b>3:2.7 REFERENCES</b>	218

<b>CHAPTER 3:3</b>	
<b>EQUATIONS: PESTICIDES</b>	221
<b>3:3.1 WASH-OFF</b>	222
<b>3:3.2 DEGRADATION</b>	223
<b>3:3.3 LEACHING</b>	225
<b>3:3.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	225
<b>3:3.5 REFERENCES</b>	225

---

<b>CHAPTER 3:4</b>	
<b>EQUATIONS: BACTERIA</b>	227
<b>3:4.1 WASH-OFF</b>	229
<b>3:4.2 BACTERIA DIE-OFF/RE-GROWTH</b>	229
<b>3:4.3 LEACHING</b>	233
<b>3:4.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	234
<b>3:4.5 REFERENCES</b>	236

---

<b>CHAPTER 3:5</b>	
<b>EQUATIONS: CARBON</b>	238
<b>3:5.1 SUB-MODEL DESCRIPTION</b>	239
<b>3:5.2 CHANGES FROM PREVIOUS VERSION</b>	243
<b>3:5.3 ANALYTICAL SOLUTIONS</b>	244
<b>3:5.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	247
<b>3:5.5 REFERENCES</b>	248

---

<b>SECTION 4: EROSION</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 4:1</b>	
<b>EQUATIONS: SEDIMENT</b>	251
<b>4:1.1 MUSLE</b>	252
SOIL ERODIBILITY FACTOR	253
COVER AND MANAGEMENT FACTOR	256
SUPPORT PRACTICE FACTOR	257
TOPOGRAPHIC FACTOR	259
COARSE FRAGMENT FACTOR	259
<b>4:1.2 USLE</b>	260

RAINFALL ERODIBILITY INDEX	260
<b>4:1.3 SNOW COVER EFFECTS</b>	263
<b>4:1.4 SEDIMENT LAG IN SURFACE RUNOFF</b>	263
<b>4:1.5 SEDIMENT IN LATERAL &amp; GROUNDWATER FLOW</b>	264
<b>4:1.6 NOMENCLATURE</b>	265
<b>4:1.7 REFERENCES</b>	266

## CHAPTER 4:2

<b>EQUATIONS: NUTRIENT TRANSPORT</b>	268
<b>4:2.1 NITRATE MOVEMENT</b>	269
<b>4:2.2 ORGANIC N IN SURFACE RUNOFF</b>	271
ENRICHMENT RATIO	271
<b>4:2.3 SOLUBLE PHOSPHORUS MOVEMENT</b>	272
<b>4:2.4 ORGANIC &amp; MINERAL P ATTACHED TO SEDIMENT</b>	
IN SURFACE RUNOFF	273
ENRICHMENT RATIO	274
<b>4:2.5 NUTRIENT LAG IN SURFACE RUNOFF AND LATERAL FLOW</b>	275
<b>4:2.6 NOMENCLATURE</b>	276
<b>4:2.7 REFERENCES</b>	278

## CHAPTER 4:3

<b>EQUATIONS: PESTICIDE TRANSPORT</b>	280
<b>4:3.1 PHASE DISTRIBUTION OF PESTICIDE</b>	281
<b>4:3.2 MOVEMENT OF SOLUBLE PESTICIDE</b>	282
<b>4:3.3 TRANSPORT OF SORBED PESTICIDE</b>	285
ENRICHMENT RATIO	286
<b>4:3.4 PESTICIDE LAG IN SURFACE RUNOFF AND LATERAL FLOW</b>	287
<b>4:3.5 NOMENCLATURE</b>	288
<b>4:3.6 REFERENCES</b>	289

## CHAPTER 4:4

<b>EQUATIONS: BACTERIA TRANSPORT</b>	291
<b>4:4.1 BACTERIA IN SURFACE RUNOFF</b>	292
<b>4:4.2 BACTERIA ATTACHED TO SEDIMENT IN SURFACE RUNOFF</b>	292
ENRICHMENT RATIO	293
<b>4:4.3 BACTERIA LAG IN SURFACE RUNOFF</b>	294

<b>4:4.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>296</b>
---------------------------	------------

## **CHAPTER 4:5**

<b>EQUATIONS: WATER QUALITY PARAMETERS</b>	<b>298</b>
<b>4:5.1 ALGAE</b>	<b>299</b>
<b>4:5.2 CARBONACEOUS BIOLOGICAL OXYGEN DEMAND</b>	<b>299</b>
ENRICHMENT RATIO	300
<b>4:5.3 DISSOLVED OXYGEN</b>	<b>301</b>
OXYGEN SATURATION CONCENTRATION	301
<b>4:5.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>302</b>
<b>4:5.5 REFERENCES</b>	<b>302</b>

## ***SECTION 5: LAND COVER/PLANT***

### **CHAPTER 5:1**

<b>EQUATIONS: GROWTH CYCLE</b>	<b>304</b>
<b>5:1.1 HEAT UNITS</b>	<b>305</b>
HEAT UNIT SCHEDULING	307
<b>5:1.2 DORMANCY</b>	<b>310</b>
<b>5:1.3 PLANT TYPES</b>	<b>312</b>
<b>5:1.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>5:1.5 REFERENCES</b>	<b>314</b>

### **CHAPTER 5:2**

<b>EQUATIONS: OPTIMAL GROWTH</b>	<b>316</b>
<b>5:2.1 POTENTIAL GROWTH</b>	<b>317</b>
BIOMASS PRODUCTION	317
CANOPY COVER AND HEIGHT	321
ROOT DEVELOPMENT	324
MATURITY	325
<b>5:2.2 WATER UPTAKE BY PLANTS</b>	<b>326</b>
IMPACT OF LOW SOIL WATER CONTENT	328
ACTUAL WATER UPTAKE	329
<b>5:2.3 NUTRIENT UPTAKE BY PLANTS</b>	<b>330</b>
NITROGEN UPTAKE	330
PHOSPHORUS UPTAKE	335

<b>5:2.4 CROP YIELD</b>	338
<b>5:2.5 NOMENCLATURE</b>	340
<b>5:2.6 REFERENCES</b>	344

## **CHAPTER 5:3**

---

### **EQUATIONS: ACTUAL GROWTH**

---

<b>19.1 GROWTH CONSTRAINTS</b>	347
WATER STRESS	347
TEMPERATURE STRESS	347
NITROGEN STRESS	348
PHOSPHORUS STRESS	349
<b>19.2 ACTUAL GROWTH</b>	350
BIOMASS OVERRIDE	350
<b>19.3 ACTUAL YIELD</b>	351
HARVEST INDEX OVERRIDE	351
HARVEST EFFICIENCY	352
<b>19.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	353

## **SECTION 6: MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

---

### **CHAPTER 6:1**

---

### **EQUATIONS: GENERAL MANAGEMENT**

---

<b>6:1.1 PLANTING/BEGINNING OF GROWING SEASON</b>	356
<b>6:1.2 HARVEST OPERATION</b>	357
<b>6:1.3 GRAZING OPERATION</b>	358
<b>6:1.4 HARVEST &amp; KILL OPERATION</b>	359
<b>6:1.5 KILL/END OF GROWING SEASON</b>	360
<b>6:1.6 TILLAGE</b>	360
BIOLOGICAL MIXING	361
<b>6:1.7 FERTILIZER APPLICATION</b>	362
<b>6:1.8 AUTO-APPLICATION OF FERTILIZER</b>	365
<b>6:1.9 CONTINUOUS APPLICATION OF FERTILIZER</b>	368
<b>6:1.10 PESTICIDE APPLICATION</b>	369
<b>6:1.11 NOMENCLATURE</b>	371
<b>6:1.12 REFERENCES</b>	372

<b>CHAPTER 6:2</b>	
<b>EQUATIONS: WATER MANAGEMENT</b>	374
<hr/>	
<b>6:2.1 IRRIGATION</b>	375
MANUAL APPLICATION OF IRRIGATION	375
AUTO APPLICATION OF IRRIGATION	376
<b>6:2.2 TILE DRAINAGE</b>	377
<b>6:2.3 IMPOUNDED/DEPRESSATIONAL AREAS</b>	377
<b>6:2.4 WATER TRANSFER</b>	378
<b>6:2.5 CONSUMPTIVE WATER USE</b>	378
<b>6:2.6 POINT SOURCE LOADINGS</b>	379
<b>6:2.7 NOMENCLATURE</b>	380
<b>CHAPTER 6:3</b>	
<b>EQUATIONS: URBAN AREAS</b>	382
<hr/>	
<b>6:3.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF URBAN AREAS</b>	383
<b>6:3.2 SURFACE RUNOFF FROM URBAN AREAS</b>	384
<b>6:3.3 USGS REGRESSION EQUATIONS</b>	385
<b>6:3.4 BUILD UP/WASH OFF</b>	386
STREET CLEANING	389
<b>6:3.5 NOMENCLATURE</b>	391
<b>6:3.3 REFERENCES</b>	392
<b>CHAPTER 6:4</b>	
<b>EQUATIONS: SEPTIC SYSTEMS</b>	394
<hr/>	
<b>6:4.1 BIOZONE ALGORITHM</b>	395
BUILDUP OF LIVE BACTERIAL BIOMASS	395
FATE AND TRANSPORT OF BACTERIA BIOMASS	396
FIELD CAPACITY	397
CLOGGING EFFECT ON HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY	398
SOIL MOISTURE AND PERCOLATION	398
NITROGEN, BOD, FECAL COLIFORM	399
PHOSPHORUS REMOVAL	400
MODEL ASSUMPTIONS	401
<b>6:4.2 INTEGRATION OF BIOZONE ALGORITHM</b>	402
SIMULATING ACTIVE AND FAILING SYSTEMS	403
<b>6:4.3 NOMENCLATURE</b>	406

<b>6:4.4 REFERENCES</b>	<b>407</b>
-------------------------	------------

## **CHAPTER 6:5 EQUATIONS: FILTER STRIPS AND GRASSED WATERWAYS**

<b>6:5.1 FILTER STRIPS</b>	<b>411</b>
EMPERICAL MODEL DEVELOPMENT	411
SEDIMENT REDUCTION MODEL	414
NUTRIENT REDUCTION MODELS	416
VFS SWAT MODEL STRUCTURE	419
<b>6:5.2 GRASSED WATERWAYS</b>	<b>421</b>
<b>6:5.3 NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>423</b>
<b>6:5.4 REFERENCES</b>	<b>423</b>

## **SECTION 7: MAIN CHANNEL PROCESSES**

### **CHAPTER 7:1**

#### **EQUATIONS: WATER ROUTING**

<b>7:1.1 CHANNEL CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>429</b>
<b>7:1.2 FLOW RATE AND VELOCITY</b>	<b>431</b>
<b>7:1.3 VARIABLE STORAGE ROUTING METHOD</b>	<b>433</b>
<b>7:1.4 MUSKINGUM ROUTING METHOD</b>	<b>435</b>
<b>7:1.5 TRANSMISSION LOSSES</b>	<b>438</b>
<b>7:1.6 EVAPORATION LOSSES</b>	<b>439</b>
<b>7:1.7 BANK STORAGE</b>	<b>439</b>
<b>7:1.8 CHANNEL WATER BALANCE</b>	<b>441</b>
<b>7:1.9 NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>442</b>
<b>7:1.10 REFERENCES</b>	<b>443</b>

### **CHAPTER 7:2**

#### **EQUATIONS: SEDIMENT ROUTING**

<b>7:2.1 LANDSCAPE CONTRIBUTION TO SUBBASIN ROUTING</b>	<b>446</b>
<b>7:2.2 SEDIMENT ROUTING IN STREAM CHANNELS</b>	<b>447</b>
SIMPLIFIED BANGOLD EQUATION	447
PHYSICS BASED APPROACH FOR CHANNEL EROSION	450

<b>7:2.3 CHANNEL ERODIBILITY FACTOR</b>	459
<b>7:2.4 CHANNEL COVER FACTOR</b>	460
<b>7:2.5 CHANNEL DOWNCUTTING AND WIDENING</b>	461
<b>7:2.5 NOMENCLATURE</b>	463
<b>7:2.6 REFERENCES</b>	464

## CHAPTER 7:3

### EQUATIONS: IN-STREAM NUTRIENT PROCESSES 467

---

<b>7:3.1 ALGAE</b>	468
CHLOROPHYLL A	468
ALGAL GROWTH	468
<b>7:3.2 NITROGEN CYCLE</b>	475
ORGANIC NITROGEN	475
AMMONIUM	476
NITRITE	477
NITRATE	478
<b>7:3.3 PHOSPHORUS CYCLE</b>	479
ORGANIC PHOSPHORUS	479
INORGANIC/SOLUBLE PHOSPHORUS	480
<b>7:3.4 CARBONACEOUS BIOLOGICAL OXYGEN DEMAND</b>	482
<b>7:3.5 OXYGEN</b>	483
OXYGEN SATURATION CONCENTRATION	484
REAERATION	485
<b>7:3.6 NOMENCLATURE</b>	488
<b>7:3.7 REFERENCES</b>	490

## CHAPTER 7:4

### EQUATIONS: IN-STREAM PESTICIDE TRANSFORMATIONS 493

---

<b>7:4.1 PESTICIDE IN THE WATER</b>	494
SOLID-LIQUID PARTITIONING	494
DEGRADATION	495
VOLATILIZATION	495
SETTLING	497
OUTFLOW	497
<b>7:4.2 PESTICIDE IN THE SEDIMENT</b>	498
SOLID-LIQUID PARTITIONING	498
DEGRADATION	499

RESUSPENSION	500
DIFFUSION	500
BURIAL	501
<b>7:4.3 MASS BALANCE</b>	501
<b>7:4.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	502
<b>7:4.5 REFERENCES</b>	503

## **CHAPTER 7:5**

<b>EQUATIONS: BACTERIA ROUTING</b>	505
<b>7:5.1 BACTERIA DECAY</b>	506
<b>7:5.1 BACTERIA SEDIMENT</b>	507
<b>7:5.1 NOMENCLATURE</b>	509
<b>7:5.1 REFERENCES</b>	509

## **CHAPTER 7:6**

<b>EQUATIONS: HEAVY METAL ROUTING</b>	512
---------------------------------------	-----

# **SECTION 8: WATER BODIES**

## **CHAPTER 8:1**

<b>EQUATIONS: IMPOUNDMENT WATER ROUTING</b>	514
---	-----

<b>8:1.1 RESERVOIRS</b>	515
SURFACE AREA	516
PRECIPITATION	516
EVAPORATION	517
SEEPAGE	517
OUTFLOW	517
<b>8:1.2 PONDS/WETLANDS</b>	521
SURFACE AREA	522
PRECIPITATION	523
INFLOW	523
EVAPORATION	523
SEEPAGE	524
OUTFLOW	524
<b>8:1.3 DEPRESSIONS/POTHOLES</b>	526
SURFACE AREA	526

PRECIPITATION	527
INFLOW	527
EVAPORATION	528
SEEPAGE	528
OUTFLOW	529
<b>8:1.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	530
<b>8:1.5 REFERENCES</b>	531

## CHAPTER 8:2

### EQUATIONS: SEDIMENT IN WATER BODIES

---

<b>8:2.1 MASS BALANCE</b>	534
<b>8:2.2 SETTLING</b>	534
<b>8:2.3 SEDIMENT OUTFLOW</b>	537
<b>8:2.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	537
<b>8:2.5 REFERENCES</b>	537

## CHAPTER 8:3

### EQUATIONS: NUTRIENTS IN WATER BODIES

---

<b>8:3.1 NUTRIENT TRANSFORMATIONS</b>	540
<b>8:3.2 TOTAL BALANCE</b>	544
<b>8:3.3 EUTROPHICATION</b>	544
PHOSPHORUS/CHLOROPHYLL <i>a</i> CONCENTRATIONS	545
CHLOROPHYLL <i>a</i> /SECCHI DEPTH CORRELATIONS	546
<b>8:3.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	547
<b>8:3.5 REFERENCES</b>	547

## CHAPTER 8:4

### EQUATIONS: PESTICIDES IN WATER BODIES

---

<b>8:4.1 PESTICIDE IN THE WATER</b>	551
SOLID-LIQUID PARTITIONING	551
DEGRADATION	552
VOLATILIZATION	553
SETTLING	554
OUTFLOW	555
<b>8:4.2 PESTICIDE IN THE SEDIMENT</b>	555

SOLID-LIQUID PARTITIONING	555
DEGRADATION	557
RESUSPENSION	557
DIFFUSION	558
BURIAL	559
<b>8:4.3 MASS BALANCE</b>	559
<b>8:4.4 NOMENCLATURE</b>	560
<b>8:4.5 REFERENCES</b>	561

## **CHAPTER 8:5**

<b>EQUATIONS: BACTERIA IN WATER BODIES</b>	563
--	-----

---

<b>8:5.1 BACTERIA DECAY</b>	564
-----------------------------	-----

<b>8:5.2 NOMENCLATURE</b>	565
---------------------------	-----

<b>8:5.3 REFERENCES</b>	565
-------------------------	-----

## **APPENDIX A**

<b>LIST OF VARIABLES</b>	567
--------------------------	-----

---

## **APPENDIX B**

<b>REFERENCES</b>	597
-------------------	-----

---

# **SOIL AND WATER ASSESSMENT TOOL**

---

# **INTRODUCTION**

---

**SWAT** is the acronym for **S**oil and **W**ater **A**sessment **T**ool, a river basin, or watershed, scale model developed by Dr. Jeff Arnold for the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS). SWAT was developed to predict the impact of land management practices on water, sediment and agricultural chemical yields in large complex watersheds with varying soils, land use and management conditions over long periods of time. To satisfy this objective, the model

- ◆ is physically based. Rather than incorporating regression equations to describe the relationship between input and output variables, SWAT requires specific information about weather, soil properties, topography, vegetation, and land management practices occurring in the watershed. The physical processes associated with water

movement, sediment movement, crop growth, nutrient cycling, etc. are directly modeled by SWAT using this input data.

Benefits of this approach are

- ◆ watersheds with no monitoring data (e.g. stream gage data) can be modeled
- ◆ the relative impact of alternative input data (e.g. changes in management practices, climate, vegetation, etc.) on water quality or other variables of interest can be quantified
- ◆ uses readily available inputs. While SWAT can be used to study more specialized processes such as bacteria transport, the minimum data required to make a run are commonly available from government agencies.
- ◆ is computationally efficient. Simulation of very large basins or a variety of management strategies can be performed without excessive investment of time or money.
- ◆ enables users to study long-term impacts. Many of the problems currently addressed by users involve the gradual buildup of pollutants and the impact on downstream water bodies. To study these types of problems, results are needed from runs with output spanning several decades.

SWAT is a continuous time model, i.e. a long-term yield model. The model is not designed to simulate detailed, single-event flood routing.

## 0.1 DEVELOPMENT OF SWAT

---

SWAT incorporates features of several ARS models and is a direct outgrowth of the SWRRB<sup>1</sup> model (Simulator for Water Resources in Rural Basins) (Williams et al., 1985; Arnold et al., 1990). Specific models that contributed significantly to the development of SWAT were CREAMS<sup>2</sup> (Chemicals, Runoff, and Erosion from Agricultural Management Systems) (Knisel, 1980), GLEAMS<sup>3</sup> (Groundwater Loading Effects on Agricultural Management Systems) (Leonard et al., 1987), and EPIC<sup>4</sup> (Erosion-Productivity Impact Calculator) (Williams et al., 1984).

Development of SWRRB began with modification of the daily rainfall hydrology model from CREAMS. The major changes made to the CREAMS hydrology model were: a) the model was expanded to allow simultaneous computations on several subbasins to predict basin water yield; b) a groundwater or return flow component was added; c) a reservoir storage component was added to calculate the effect of farm ponds and reservoirs on water and sediment yield; d) a weather simulation model incorporating data for rainfall, solar radiation, and temperature was added to facilitate long-term simulations and provide temporally and spatially representative weather; e) the method for predicting the peak runoff rates was improved; f) the EPIC crop growth model was added to account for annual variation in growth; g) a simple flood routing component was added; h) sediment transport components were added to simulate sediment movement

---

<sup>1</sup> SWRRB is a continuous time step model that was developed to simulate nonpoint source loadings from watersheds.

<sup>2</sup> In response to the Clean Water Act, ARS assembled a team of interdisciplinary scientists from across the U.S. to develop a process-based, nonpoint source simulation model in the early 1970s. From that effort CREAMS was developed. CREAMS is a field scale model designed to simulate the impact of land management on water, sediment, nutrients and pesticides leaving the edge of the field. A number of other ARS models such as GLEAMS, EPIC, SWRRB and AGNPS trace their origins to the CREAMS model.

<sup>3</sup> GLEAMS is a nonpoint source model which focuses on pesticide and nutrient groundwater loadings.

<sup>4</sup> EPIC was originally developed to simulate the impact of erosion on crop productivity and has now evolved into a comprehensive agricultural management, field scale, nonpoint source loading model.

through ponds, reservoirs, streams and valleys; and i) calculation of transmission losses was incorporated.

The primary focus of model use in the late 1980s was water quality assessment and development of SWRRB reflected this emphasis. Notable modifications of SWRRB at this time included incorporation of a) the GLEAMS pesticide fate component; b) optional SCS technology for estimating peak runoff rates; and c) newly developed sediment yield equations. These modifications extended the model's capability to deal with a wide variety of watershed management problems.

In the late 1980s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs needed a model to estimate the downstream impact of water management within Indian reservation lands in Arizona and New Mexico. While SWRRB was easily utilized for watersheds up to a few hundred square kilometers in size, the Bureau also wanted to simulate stream flow for basins extending over several thousand square kilometers. For an area this extensive, the watershed under study needed to be divided into several hundred subbasins. Watershed division in SWRRB was limited to ten subbasins and the model routed water and sediment transported out of the subbasins directly to the watershed outlet. These limitations led to the development of a model called ROTO (Routing Outputs to Outlet) (Arnold et al., 1995), which took output from multiple SWRRB runs and routed the flows through channels and reservoirs. ROTO provided a reach routing approach and overcame the SWRRB subbasin limitation by "linking" multiple SWRRB runs together. Although this approach was effective, the input and output of multiple SWRRB files was cumbersome and required considerable computer storage. In addition, all SWRRB runs had to be made independently and then input to ROTO for the channel and reservoir routing. To overcome the awkwardness of this arrangement, SWRRB and ROTO were merged into a single model, SWAT. While allowing simulations of very extensive areas, SWAT retained all the features which made SWRRB such a valuable simulation model.

Since SWAT was created in the early 1990s, it has undergone continued review and expansion of capabilities. The most significant improvements of the model between releases include:

- ◆ SWAT94.2: Multiple hydrologic response units (HRUs) incorporated.
- ◆ SWAT96.2: Auto-fertilization and auto-irrigation added as management options; canopy storage of water incorporated; a CO<sub>2</sub> component added to crop growth model for climatic change studies; Penman-Monteith potential evapotranspiration equation added; lateral flow of water in the soil based on kinematic storage model incorporated; in-stream nutrient water quality equations from QUAL2E added; in-stream pesticide routing.
- ◆ SWAT98.1: Snow melt routines improved; in-stream water quality improved; nutrient cycling routines expanded; grazing, manure applications, and tile flow drainage added as management options; model modified for use in Southern Hemisphere.
- ◆ SWAT99.2: Nutrient cycling routines improved, rice/wetland routines improved, reservoir/pond/wetland nutrient removal by settling added; bank storage of water in reach added; routing of metals through reach added; all year references in model changed from last 2 digits of year to 4-digit year; urban build up/wash off equations from SWMM added along with regression equations from USGS.
- ◆ SWAT2000: Bacteria transport routines added; Green & Ampt infiltration added; weather generator improved; allow daily solar radiation, relative humidity, and wind speed to be read in or generated; allow potential ET values for watershed to be read in or calculated; all potential ET methods reviewed; elevation band processes improved; enabled simulation of unlimited number of reservoirs; Muskingum routing method added; modified dormancy calculations for proper simulation in tropical areas.

- ◆ SWAT2009: Bacteria transport routines improved; weather forecast scenarios added; subdaily precipitation generator added; the retention parameter used in the daily CN calculation may be a function of soil water content or plant evapotranspiration; update to vegetative filter strip model; wet and dry deposition of nitrate and ammonium improved; modeling of on-site wastewater systems.

In addition to the changes listed above, interfaces for the model have been developed in Windows (Visual Basic), GRASS, and ArcView. SWAT has also undergone extensive validation.

## 0.2 OVERVIEW OF SWAT

---

SWAT allows a number of different physical processes to be simulated in a watershed. These processes will be briefly summarized in this section. For more detailed discussions of the various procedures, please consult the chapter devoted to the topic of interest.




Figure 0.1: Map of the Lake Fork Watershed in Northeast Texas showing the land use distribution and stream network

For modeling purposes, a watershed may be partitioned into a number of subwatersheds or subbasins. The use of subbasins in a simulation is particularly beneficial when different areas of the watershed are dominated by land uses or soils dissimilar enough in properties to impact hydrology. By partitioning the watershed into subbasins, the user is able to reference different areas of the watershed to one another spatially. Figure 0.2 shows a subbasin delineation for the watershed shown in Figure 0.1.




Figure 0.2: Subbasin delineation of the Lake Fork Watershed.

Input information for each subbasin is grouped or organized into the following categories: climate; hydrologic response units or HRUs; ponds/wetlands; groundwater; and the main channel, or reach, draining the subbasin. Hydrologic response units are lumped land areas within the subbasin that are comprised of unique land cover, soil, and management combinations.

No matter what type of problem studied with SWAT, water balance is the driving force behind everything that happens in the watershed. To accurately predict the movement of pesticides, sediments or nutrients, the hydrologic cycle as simulated by the model must conform to what is happening in the watershed. Simulation of the hydrology of a watershed can be separated into two major divisions. The first division is the land phase of the hydrologic cycle, depicted in Figure 0.3. The land phase of the hydrologic cycle controls the amount of water, sediment, nutrient and pesticide loadings to the main channel in each subbasin. The second division is the water or routing phase of the hydrologic cycle which can be defined as the movement of water, sediments, etc. through the channel network of the watershed to the outlet.




Figure 0.3: Schematic representation of the hydrologic cycle.

### **0.2.1 LAND PHASE OF THE HYDROLOGIC CYCLE**

The hydrologic cycle as simulated by SWAT is based on the water balance equation:

$$SW_t = SW_0 + \sum_{i=1}^t (R_{day} - Q_{surf} - E_a - w_{seep} - Q_{gw})$$

where  $SW_t$  is the final soil water content (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $SW_0$  is the initial soil water content on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $t$  is the time (days),  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_a$  is the amount of evapotranspiration on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{seep}$  is the amount of water entering the vadose zone from the soil profile on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $Q_{gw}$  is the amount of return flow on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The subdivision of the watershed enables the model to reflect differences in evapotranspiration for various crops and soils. Runoff is predicted separately for each HRU and routed to obtain the total runoff for the watershed. This increases accuracy and gives a much better physical description of the water balance.




Figure 0.4: HRU/Subbasin command loop

Figure 0.4 shows the general sequence of processes used by SWAT to model the land phase of the hydrologic cycle. The different inputs and processes involved in this phase of the hydrologic cycle are summarized in the following sections.

### 0.2.1.1 CLIMATE

The climate of a watershed provides the moisture and energy inputs that control the water balance and determine the relative importance of the different components of the hydrologic cycle.

The climatic variables required by SWAT consist of daily precipitation, maximum/minimum air temperature, solar radiation, wind speed and relative humidity. The model allows values for daily precipitation, maximum/minimum air temperatures, solar radiation, wind speed and relative humidity to be input from records of observed data or generated during the simulation.

**WEATHER GENERATOR.** Daily values for weather are generated from average monthly values. The model generates a set of weather data for each subbasin. The values for any one subbasin will be generated independently and there will be no spatial correlation of generated values between the different subbasins.

**GENERATED PRECIPITATION.** SWAT uses a model developed by Nicks (1974) to generate daily precipitation for simulations which do not read in measured data. This precipitation model is also used to fill in missing data in the measured records. The precipitation generator uses a first-order Markov chain model to define a day as wet or dry by comparing a random number (0.0-1.0) generated by the model to monthly wet-dry probabilities input by the user. If the day is classified as wet, the amount of precipitation is generated from a skewed distribution or a modified exponential distribution.

**SUB-DAILY RAINFALL PATTERNS.** If sub-daily precipitation values are needed, a double exponential function is used to represent the intensity patterns within a storm. With the double exponential distribution, rainfall intensity exponentially increases with time to a maximum, or peak, intensity. Once the peak intensity is reached, the rainfall intensity exponentially decreases with time until the end of the storm.

**GENERATED AIR TEMPERATURE AND SOLAR RADIATION.** Maximum and minimum air temperatures and solar radiation are generated from a normal distribution. A continuity equation is incorporated into the generator to

account for temperature and radiation variations caused by dry vs. rainy conditions. Maximum air temperature and solar radiation are adjusted downward when simulating rainy conditions and upwards when simulating dry conditions. The adjustments are made so that the long-term generated values for the average monthly maximum temperature and monthly solar radiation agree with the input averages.

**GENERATED WIND SPEED.** A modified exponential equation is used to generate daily mean wind speed given the mean monthly wind speed.

**GENERATED RELATIVE HUMIDITY.** The relative humidity model uses a triangular distribution to simulate the daily average relative humidity from the monthly average. As with temperature and radiation, the mean daily relative humidity is adjusted to account for wet- and dry-day effects.

**SNOW.** SWAT classifies precipitation as rain or freezing rain/snow using the average daily temperature.

**SNOW COVER.** The snow cover component of SWAT has been updated from a simple, uniform snow cover model to a more complex model which allows non-uniform cover due to shading, drifting, topography and land cover. The user defines a threshold snow depth above which snow coverage will always extend over 100% of the area. As the snow depth in a subbasin decreases below this value, the snow coverage is allowed to decline non-linearly based on an areal depletion curve.

**SNOW MELT.** Snow melt is controlled by the air and snow pack temperature, the melting rate, and the areal coverage of snow. If snow is present, it is melted on days when the maximum temperature exceeds 0°C using a linear function of the difference between the average snow pack-maximum air temperature and the base or threshold temperature for snow melt. Melted snow is treated the same as rainfall for estimating runoff and percolation. For snow melt, rainfall energy is set to zero and the peak runoff rate is estimated assuming uniformly melted snow for a 24 hour duration.

**ELEVATION BANDS.** The model allows the subbasin to be split into a maximum of ten elevation bands. Snow cover and snow melt are simulated separately for each elevation band. By dividing the subbasin into elevation bands, the model is able to assess the differences in snow cover and snow melt caused by orographic variation in precipitation and temperature.

**SOIL TEMPERATURE.** Soil temperature impacts water movement and the decay rate of residue in the soil. Daily average soil temperature is calculated at the soil surface and the center of each soil layer. The temperature of the soil surface is a function of snow cover, plant cover and residue cover, the bare soil surface temperature, and the previous day's soil surface temperature. The temperature of a soil layer is a function of the surface temperature, mean annual air temperature and the depth in the soil at which variation in temperature due to changes in

climatic conditions no longer occurs. This depth, referred to as the damping depth, is dependent upon the bulk density and the soil water content.

### 0.2.1.2 HYDROLOGY

As precipitation descends, it may be intercepted and held in the vegetation canopy or fall to the soil surface. Water on the soil surface will infiltrate into the soil profile or flow overland as runoff. Runoff moves relatively quickly toward a stream channel and contributes to short-term stream response. Infiltrated water may be held in the soil and later evapotranspired or it may slowly make its way to the surface-water system via underground paths. The potential pathways of water movement simulated by SWAT in the HRU are illustrated in Figure 0.5.

**CANOPY STORAGE.** Canopy storage is the water intercepted by vegetative surfaces (the canopy) where it is held and made available for evaporation. When using the curve number method to compute surface runoff, canopy storage is taken into account in the surface runoff calculations. However, if methods such as Green & Ampt are used to model infiltration and runoff, canopy storage must be modeled separately. SWAT allows the user to input the maximum amount of water that can be stored in the canopy at the maximum leaf area index for the land cover. This value and the leaf area index are used by the model to compute the maximum storage at any time in the growth cycle of the land cover/crop. When evaporation is computed, water is first removed from canopy storage.

**INFILTRATION.** Infiltration refers to the entry of water into a soil profile from the soil surface. As infiltration continues, the soil becomes increasingly wet, causing the rate of infiltration to decrease with time until it reaches a steady value. The initial rate of infiltration depends on the moisture content of the soil prior to the introduction of water at the soil surface. The final rate of infiltration is equivalent to the saturated hydraulic conductivity of the soil. Because the curve number method used to calculate surface runoff operates on a daily time-step, it is unable to directly model infiltration. The amount of water entering the soil profile is calculated as the difference between the amount of rainfall and the amount of surface runoff. The Green & Ampt infiltration method does directly model infiltration, but it requires precipitation data in smaller time increments.

**REDISTRIBUTION.** Redistribution refers to the continued movement of water through a soil profile after input of water (via precipitation or irrigation) has ceased at the soil surface. Redistribution is caused by differences in water content in the profile. Once the water content throughout the entire profile is uniform,




Figure 1.5: Schematic of pathways available for water movement in SWAT

redistribution will cease. The redistribution component of SWAT uses a storage routing technique to predict flow through each soil layer in the root zone. Downward flow, or percolation, occurs when field capacity of a soil layer is exceeded and the layer below is not saturated. The flow rate is governed by the saturated conductivity of the soil layer. Redistribution is affected by soil temperature. If the temperature in a particular layer is 0°C or below, no redistribution is allowed from that layer.

**EVAPOTRANSPIRATION.** Evapotranspiration is a collective term for all processes by which water in the liquid or solid phase at or near the earth's surface becomes atmospheric water vapor. Evapotranspiration includes evaporation from rivers and lakes, bare soil, and vegetative surfaces; evaporation from within the leaves of plants (transpiration); and sublimation from ice and snow surfaces. The model computes evaporation from soils and plants separately as described by Ritchie (1972). Potential soil water evaporation is estimated as a function of potential evapotranspiration and leaf area index (area of plant leaves relative to the area of the HRU). Actual soil water evaporation is estimated by using exponential functions of soil depth and water content. Plant transpiration is simulated as a linear function of potential evapotranspiration and leaf area index.

**POTENTIAL EVAPOTRANSPIRATION.** Potential evapotranspiration is the rate at which evapotranspiration would occur from a large area completely and uniformly covered with growing vegetation which has access to an unlimited supply of soil water. This rate is assumed to be unaffected by micro-climatic processes such as advection or heat-storage effects. The model offers three options for estimating potential evapotranspiration: Hargreaves (Hargreaves et al., 1985), Priestley-Taylor (Priestley and Taylor, 1972), and Penman-Monteith (Monteith, 1965).

**LATERAL SUBSURFACE FLOW.** Lateral subsurface flow, or interflow, is streamflow contribution which originates below the surface but above the zone where rocks are saturated with water. Lateral subsurface flow in the soil profile (0-2m) is calculated simultaneously with redistribution. A kinematic storage model is used to predict lateral flow in each soil layer. The model accounts for variation in conductivity, slope and soil water content.

**SURFACE RUNOFF.** Surface runoff, or overland flow, is flow that occurs along a sloping surface. Using daily or subdaily rainfall amounts, SWAT simulates surface runoff volumes and peak runoff rates for each HRU.

SURFACE RUNOFF VOLUME is computed using a modification of the SCS curve number method (USDA Soil Conservation Service, 1972) or the Green & Ampt infiltration method (Green and Ampt, 1911). In the curve number method, the curve number varies non-linearly with the moisture content of the soil. The curve number drops as the soil approaches the wilting point and increases to near 100 as the soil approaches saturation. The Green & Ampt method requires sub-daily precipitation data and calculates infiltration as a function of the wetting front matric potential and effective hydraulic conductivity. Water that does not infiltrate

becomes surface runoff. SWAT includes a provision for estimating runoff from frozen soil where a soil is defined as frozen if the temperature in the first soil layer is less than 0°C. The model increases runoff for frozen soils but still allows significant infiltration when the frozen soils are dry.

PEAK RUNOFF RATE predictions are made with a modification of the rational method. In brief, the rational method is based on the idea that if a rainfall of intensity  $i$  begins instantaneously and continues indefinitely, the rate of runoff will increase until the time of concentration,  $t_c$ , when all of the subbasin is contributing to flow at the outlet. In the modified Rational Formula, the peak runoff rate is a function of the proportion of daily precipitation that falls during the subbasin  $t_c$ , the daily surface runoff volume, and the subbasin time of concentration. The proportion of rainfall occurring during the subbasin  $t_c$  is estimated as a function of total daily rainfall using a stochastic technique. The subbasin time of concentration is estimated using Manning's Formula considering both overland and channel flow.

**PONDS.** Ponds are water storage structures located within a subbasin which intercept surface runoff. The catchment area of a pond is defined as a fraction of the total area of the subbasin. Ponds are assumed to be located off the main channel in a subbasin and will never receive water from upstream subbasins. Pond water storage is a function of pond capacity, daily inflows and outflows, seepage and evaporation. Required inputs are the storage capacity and surface area of the pond when filled to capacity. Surface area below capacity is estimated as a non-linear function of storage.

**TRIBUTARY CHANNELS.** Two types of channels are defined within a subbasin: the main channel and tributary channels. Tributary channels are minor or lower order channels branching off the main channel within the subbasin. Each tributary channel within a subbasin drains only a portion of the subbasin and does not receive groundwater contribution to its flow. All flow in the tributary channels is released and routed through the main channel of the subbasin. SWAT uses the attributes of tributary channels to determine the time of concentration for the subbasin.

**TRANSMISSION LOSSES.** Transmission losses are losses of surface flow via leaching through the streambed. This type of loss occurs in ephemeral or intermittent streams where groundwater contribution occurs only at certain times of the year, or not at all. SWAT uses Lane's method described in Chapter 19 of the SCS Hydrology Handbook (USDA Soil Conservation Service, 1983) to estimate transmission losses. Water losses from the channel are a function of channel width and length and flow duration. Both runoff volume and peak rate are adjusted when transmission losses occur in tributary channels.

**RETURN FLOW.** Return flow, or base flow, is the volume of streamflow originating from groundwater. SWAT partitions groundwater into two aquifer systems: a shallow, unconfined aquifer which contributes return flow to streams

within the watershed and a deep, confined aquifer which contributes return flow to streams outside the watershed (Arnold et al., 1993). Water percolating past the bottom of the root zone is partitioned into two fractions—each fraction becomes recharge for one of the aquifers. In addition to return flow, water stored in the shallow aquifer may replenish moisture in the soil profile in very dry conditions or be directly removed by plant. Water in the shallow or deep aquifer may be removed by pumping.

### 0.2.1.3 LAND COVER/PLANT GROWTH

SWAT utilizes a single plant growth model to simulate all types of land covers. The model is able to differentiate between annual and perennial plants. Annual plants grow from the planting date to the harvest date or until the accumulated heat units equal the potential heat units for the plant. Perennial plants maintain their root systems throughout the year, becoming dormant in the winter months. They resume growth when the average daily air temperature exceeds the minimum, or base, temperature required. The plant growth model is used to assess removal of water and nutrients from the root zone, transpiration, and biomass/yield production.

**POTENTIAL GROWTH.** The potential increase in plant biomass on a given day is defined as the increase in biomass under ideal growing conditions. The potential increase in biomass for a day is a function of intercepted energy and the plant's efficiency in converting energy to biomass. Energy interception is estimated as a function of solar radiation and the plant's leaf area index.

**POTENTIAL AND ACTUAL TRANSPERSION.** The process used to calculate potential plant transpiration is described in the section on evapotranspiration. Actual transpiration is a function of potential transpiration and soil water availability.

**NUTRIENT UPTAKE.** Plant use of nitrogen and phosphorus are estimated with a supply and demand approach where the daily plant nitrogen and phosphorus demands are calculated as the difference between the actual concentration of the element in the plant and the optimal concentration. The optimal concentration of the elements varies with growth stage as described by Jones (1983).

**GROWTH CONSTRAINTS.** Potential plant growth and yield are usually not achieved due to constraints imposed by the environment. The model estimates stresses caused by water, nutrients and temperature.

### **0.2.1.4 EROSION**

Erosion and sediment yield are estimated for each HRU with the Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (MUSLE) (Williams, 1975). While the USLE uses rainfall as an indicator of erosive energy, MUSLE uses the amount of runoff to simulate erosion and sediment yield. The substitution results in a number of benefits: the prediction accuracy of the model is increased, the need for a delivery ratio is eliminated, and single storm estimates of sediment yields can be calculated. The hydrology model supplies estimates of runoff volume and peak runoff rate which, with the subbasin area, are used to calculate the runoff erosive energy variable. The crop management factor is recalculated every day that runoff occurs. It is a function of above-ground biomass, residue on the soil surface, and the minimum C factor for the plant. Other factors of the erosion equation are evaluated as described by Wischmeier and Smith (1978).

### **0.2.1.5 NUTRIENTS**

SWAT tracks the movement and transformation of several forms of nitrogen and phosphorus in the watershed. In the soil, transformation of nitrogen from one form to another is governed by the nitrogen cycle as depicted in Figure 0.6. The transformation of phosphorus in the soil is controlled by the phosphorus cycle shown in Figure 0.7. Nutrients may be introduced to the main channel and transported downstream through surface runoff and lateral subsurface flow.

**NITROGEN.** The different processes modeled by SWAT in the HRUs and the various pools of nitrogen in the soil are depicted in Figure 1.6. Plant use of nitrogen is estimated using the supply and demand approach described in the section on plant growth. In addition to plant use, nitrate and organic N may be removed from the soil via mass flow of water. Amounts of  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  contained in runoff, lateral flow and percolation are estimated as products of the volume of water and the average concentration of nitrate in the layer. Organic N transport with sediment is calculated with a loading function developed by McElroy et al. (1976) and modified by Williams and Hann (1978) for application to individual runoff events. The loading function estimates the daily organic N runoff loss based on the concentration of organic N in the top soil layer, the sediment yield, and the enrichment ratio. The enrichment ratio is the concentration of organic N in the sediment divided by that in the soil.




Figure 0.6: Partitioning of Nitrogen in SWAT

**PHOSPHORUS.** The different processes modeled by SWAT in the HRUs and the various pools of phosphorus in the soil are depicted in Figure 1.7. Plant use of phosphorus is estimated using the supply and demand approach described in the section on plant growth. In addition to plant use, soluble phosphorus and organic P may be removed from the soil via mass flow of water. Phosphorus is not a mobile nutrient and interaction between surface runoff with solution P in the top 10 mm of soil will not be complete. The amount of soluble P removed in runoff is predicted using solution P concentration in the top 10 mm of soil, the runoff volume and a partitioning factor. Sediment transport of P is simulated with a loading function as described in organic N transport.

## PHOSPHORUS




Figure 0.7: Partitioning of Phosphorus in SWAT

### 0.2.1.6 PESTICIDES

Although SWAT does not simulate stress on the growth of a plant due to the presence of weeds, damaging insects, and other pests, pesticides may be applied to an HRU to study the movement of the chemical in the watershed. SWAT simulates pesticide movement into the stream network via surface runoff (in solution and sorbed to sediment transported by the runoff), and into the soil profile and aquifer by percolation (in solution). The equations used to model the movement of pesticide in the land phase of the hydrologic cycle were adopted from GLEAMS (Leonard et al., 1987). The movement of the pesticide is controlled by its solubility, degradation half-life, and soil organic carbon adsorption coefficient. Pesticide on plant foliage and in the soil degrade exponentially according to the appropriate half-life. Pesticide transport by water and sediment is calculated for each runoff event and pesticide leaching is estimated for each soil layer when percolation occurs.

## PESTICIDES




Figure 0.8 Pesticide fate and transport in SWAT

### 0.2.1.7 MANAGEMENT

SWAT allows the user to define management practices taking place in every HRU. The user may define the beginning and the ending of the growing season, specify timing and amounts of fertilizer, pesticide and irrigation applications as well as timing of tillage operations. At the end of the growing season, the biomass may be removed from the HRU as yield or placed on the surface as residue.

In addition to these basic management practices, operations such as grazing, automated fertilizer and water applications, and incorporation of every conceivable management option for water use are available. The latest improvement to land management is the incorporation of routines to calculate sediment and nutrient loadings from urban areas.

**ROTATIONS.** The dictionary defines a rotation as the growing of different crops in succession in one field, usually in a regular sequence. A rotation in SWAT refers to a change in management practices from one year to the next. There is no limit to the number of years of different management operations specified in a rotation. SWAT also does not limit the number of land cover/crops grown within one year in the HRU. However, only one land cover can be growing at any one time.

**WATER USE.** The two most typical uses of water are for application to agricultural lands or use as a town's water supply. SWAT allows water to be applied on an HRU from any water source within or outside the watershed. Water may also be transferred between reservoirs, reaches and subbasins as well as exported from the watershed.

### **0.2.2 ROUTING PHASE OF THE HYDROLOGIC CYCLE**

Once SWAT determines the loadings of water, sediment, nutrients and pesticides to the main channel, the loadings are routed through the stream network of the watershed using a command structure similar to that of HYMO (Williams and Hann, 1972). In addition to keeping track of mass flow in the channel, SWAT models the transformation of chemicals in the stream and streambed. Figure 0.9 illustrates the different in-stream processes modeled by SWAT.




Figure 0.9: In-stream processes modeled by SWAT

### 0.2.2.1 ROUTING IN THE MAIN CHANNEL OR REACH

Routing in the main channel can be divided into four components: water, sediment, nutrients and organic chemicals.

**FLOOD ROUTING.** As water flows downstream, a portion may be lost due to evaporation and transmission through the bed of the channel. Another potential loss is removal of water from the channel for agricultural or human use. Flow may be supplemented by the fall of rain directly on the channel and/or addition of water from point source discharges. Flow is routed through the channel using a variable storage coefficient method developed by Williams (1969) or the Muskingum routing method.

**SEDIMENT ROUTING.** The transport of sediment in the channel is controlled by the simultaneous operation of two processes, deposition and degradation. Previous versions of SWAT used stream power to estimate deposition/degradation in the channels (Arnold et al, 1995). Bagnold (1977) defined stream power as the product of water density, flow rate and water surface slope. Williams (1980) used Bagnold's definition of stream power to develop a method for determining degradation as a function of channel slope and velocity. In this version of SWAT, the equations have been simplified and the maximum amount of sediment that can be transported from a reach segment is a function of the peak channel velocity. Available stream power is used to reentrain loose and deposited material until all of the material is removed. Excess stream power causes bed degradation. Bed degradation is adjusted for stream bed erodibility and cover.

**NUTRIENT ROUTING.** Nutrient transformations in the stream are controlled by the in-stream water quality component of the model. The in-stream kinetics used in SWAT for nutrient routing are adapted from QUAL2E (Brown and Barnwell, 1987). The model tracks nutrients dissolved in the stream and nutrients adsorbed to the sediment. Dissolved nutrients are transported with the water while those sorbed to sediments are allowed to be deposited with the sediment on the bed of the channel.

**CHANNEL PESTICIDE ROUTING.** While an unlimited number of pesticides may be applied to the HRUs, only one pesticide may be routed through the channel network of the watershed due to the complexity of the processes simulated. As with the nutrients, the total pesticide load in the channel is partitioned into dissolved and sediment-attached components. While the dissolved pesticide is transported with water, the pesticide attached to sediment is affected by sediment transport and deposition processes. Pesticide transformations in the dissolved and sorbed phases are governed by first-order decay relationships. The major in-stream processes simulated by the model are settling, burial, resuspension, volatilization, diffusion and transformation.

### 0.2.2.2 ROUTING IN THE RESERVOIR

The water balance for reservoirs includes inflow, outflow, rainfall on the surface, evaporation, seepage from the reservoir bottom and diversions.

**RESERVOIR OUTFLOW.** The model offers three alternatives for estimating outflow from the reservoir. The first option allows the user to input measured outflow. The second option, designed for small, uncontrolled reservoirs, requires the users to specify a water release rate. When the reservoir volume exceeds the principle storage, the extra water is released at the specified rate. Volume exceeding the emergency spillway is released within one day. The third option, designed for larger, managed reservoirs, has the user specify monthly target volumes for the reservoir.

**SEDIMENT ROUTING.** Sediment inflow may originate from transport through the upstream reaches or from surface runoff within the subbasin. The concentration of sediment in the reservoir is estimated using a simple continuity equation based on volume and concentration of inflow, outflow, and water retained in the reservoir. Settling of sediment in the reservoir is governed by an equilibrium sediment concentration and the median sediment particle size. The amount of sediment in the reservoir outflow is the product of the volume of water flowing out of the reservoir and the suspended sediment concentration in the reservoir at the time of release.

**RESERVOIR NUTRIENTS.** A simple model for nitrogen and phosphorus mass balance was taken from Chapra (1997). The model assumes: 1) the lake is completely mixed; 2) phosphorus is the limiting nutrient; and, 3) total phosphorus is a measure of the lake trophic status. The first assumption ignores lake stratification and intensification of phytoplankton in the epilimnon. The second assumption is generally valid when non-point sources dominate and the third assumption implies that a relationship exists between total phosphorus and biomass. The phosphorus mass balance equation includes the concentration in the lake, inflow, outflow and overall loss rate.

**RESERVOIR PESTICIDES.** The lake pesticide balance model is taken from Chapra (1997) and assumes well mixed conditions. The system is partitioned into a well mixed surface water layer underlain by a well mixed sediment layer. The pesticide is partitioned into dissolved and particulate phases in both the water and sediment layers. The major processes simulated by the model are loading, outflow, transformation, volatilization, settling, diffusion, resuspension and burial.

## 0.3 REFERENCES

---

- Arnold, J.G., P.M. Allen, and G. Bernhardt. 1993. A comprehensive surface-groundwater flow model. *J. Hydrol.* 142:47-69.
- Arnold, J.G., J.R. Williams, A.D. Nicks, and N.B. Sammons. 1990. SWRRB: A basin scale simulation model for soil and water resources management. Texas A&M Univ. Press, College Station, TX.
- Arnold, J.G., J.R. Williams and D.R. Maidment. 1995. Continuous-time water and sediment-routing model for large basins. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 121(2):171-183.
- Bagnold, R.A. 1977. Bedload transport in natural rivers. *Water Resources Res.* 13(2):303-312.
- Brown, L.C. and T.O. Barnwell, Jr. 1987. The enhanced water quality models QUAL2E and QUAL2E-UNCAS documentation and user manual. EPA document EPA/600/3-87/007. USEPA, Athens, GA.
- Chapra, S.C. 1997. Surface water-quality modeling. McGraw-Hill, Boston.
- Green, W.H. and G.A. Ampt. 1911. Studies on soil physics, 1. The flow of air and water through soils. *Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 4:11-24.
- Hargreaves, G.L., G.H. Hargreaves, and J.P. Riley. 1985. Agricultural benefits for Senegal River Basin. *J. Irrig. and Drain. Engr.* 111(2):113-124.
- Jones, C.A. 1983. A survey of the variability in tissue nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations in maize and grain sorghum. *Field Crops Res.* 6:133-147.
- Knisel, W.G. 1980. CREAMS, a field scale model for chemicals, runoff and erosion from agricultural management systems. USDA Conservation Research Rept. No. 26.
- Leonard, R.A. and R.D. Waughope. 1980. Chapter 5: The pesticide submodel. p. 88-112. In Knisel, W.G. (ed). CREAMS: A field-scale model for chemicals, runoff, and erosion from agricultural management systems. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Conservation research report no. 26.

- Leonard, R.A., W.G. Knisel, and D.A. Still. 1987. GLEAMS: Groundwater loading effects on agricultural management systems. *Trans. ASAE* 30(5):1403-1428.
- McElroy, A.D., S.Y. Chiu, J.W. Nebgen, A. Aleti, and F.W. Bennett. 1976. Loading functions for assessment of water pollution from nonpoint sources. EPA document EPA 600/2-76-151. USEPA, Athens, GA.
- Monteith, J.L. 1965. Evaporation and the environment. p. 205-234. *In* The state and movement of water in living organisms. 19<sup>th</sup> Symposia of the Society for Experimental Biology. Cambridge Univ. Press, London, U.K.
- Nicks, A.D. 1974. Stochastic generation of the occurrence, pattern and location of maximum amount of daily rainfall. p. 154-171. *In* Proc. Symp. Statistical Hydrology, Tucson, AZ. Aug.-Sept. 1971. USDA Misc. Publ. 1275. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.
- Priestley, C.H.B. and R.J. Taylor. 1972. On the assessment of surface heat flux and evaporation using large-scale parameters. *Mon. Weather Rev.* 100:81-92.
- Ritchie, J.T. 1972. A model for predicting evaporation from a row crop with incomplete cover. *Water Resour. Res.* 8:1204-1213.
- USDA Soil Conservation Service. 1983. National Engineering Handbook Section 4 Hydrology, Chapter 19.
- USDA Soil Conservation Service. 1972. National Engineering Handbook Section 4 Hydrology, Chapters 4-10.
- Williams, J.R. 1980. SPNM, a model for predicting sediment, phosphorus, and nitrogen yields from agricultural basins. *Water Resour. Bull.* 16(5):843-848.
- Williams, J.R. 1975. Sediment routing for agricultural watersheds. *Water Resour. Bull.* 11(5):965-974.
- Williams, J.R. 1969. Flood routing with variable travel time or variable storage coefficients. *Trans. ASAE* 12(1):100-103.
- Williams, J.R., A.D. Nicks, and J.G. Arnold. 1985. Simulator for water resources in rural basins. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 111(6): 970-986.

- Williams, J.R. and R.W. Hann. 1978. Optimal operation of large agricultural watersheds with water quality constraints. Texas Water Resources Institute, Texas A&M Univ., Tech. Rept. No. 96.
- Williams, J.R. and R.W. Hann. 1972. HYMO, a problem-oriented computer language for building hydrologic models. *Water Resour. Res.* 8(1):79-85.
- Williams, J.R., C.A. Jones and P.T. Dyke. 1984. A modeling approach to determining the relationship between erosion and soil productivity. *Trans. ASAE* 27(1):129-144.
- Wischmeier, W.H., and D.D. Smith. 1978. Predicting rainfall losses: A guide to conservation planning. USDA Agricultural Handbook No. 537. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, D. C.



# CLIMATE



The climatic inputs to the model are reviewed first because it is these inputs that provide the moisture and energy that drive all other processes simulated in the watershed. The climatic processes modeled in SWAT consist of precipitation, air temperature, soil temperature and solar radiation. Depending on the method used to calculate potential evapotranspiration, wind speed and relative humidity may also be modeled.

---

---

## **SECTION 1 CHAPTER 1**

# **EQUATIONS: ENERGY**

---

Once water is introduced to the system as precipitation, the available energy, specifically solar radiation, exerts a major control on the movement of water in the land phase of the hydrologic cycle. Processes that are greatly affected by temperature and solar radiation include snow fall, snow melt and evaporation. Since evaporation is the primary water removal mechanism in the watershed, the energy inputs become very important in reproducing or simulating an accurate water balance.

## **1:1.1 SUN-EARTH RELATIONSHIPS**

---

A number of basic concepts related to the earth's orbit around the sun are required by the model to make solar radiation calculations. This section summarizes these concepts. Iqbal (1983) provides a detailed discussion of these and other topics related to solar radiation for users who require more information.

### **1:1.1.1 DISTANCE BETWEEN EARTH AND SUN**

The mean distance between the earth and the sun is  $1.496 \times 10^8$  km and is called one astronomical unit (AU). The earth revolves around the sun in an elliptical orbit and the distance from the earth to the sun on a given day will vary from a maximum of 1.017 AU to a minimum of 0.983 AU.

An accurate value of the earth-sun distance is important because the solar radiation reaching the earth is inversely proportional to the square of its distance from the sun. The distance is traditionally expressed in mathematical form as a Fourier series type of expansion with a number of coefficients. For most engineering applications a simple expression used by Duffie and Beckman (1980) is adequate for calculating the reciprocal of the square of the radius vector of the earth, also called the eccentricity correction factor,  $E_0$ , of the earth's orbit:

$$E_0 = (r_0/r)^2 = 1 + 0.033 \cos[(2\pi d_n/365)] \quad 1:1.1.1$$

where  $r_0$  is the mean earth-sun distance (1 AU),  $r$  is the earth-sun distance for any given day of the year (AU), and  $d_n$  is the day number of the year, ranging from 1 on January 1 to 365 on December 31. February is always assumed to have 28 days, making the accuracy of the equation vary due to the leap year cycle.

### **1:1.1.2 SOLAR DECLINATION**

The solar declination is the earth's latitude at which incoming solar rays are normal to the earth's surface. The solar declination is zero at the spring and fall equinoxes, approximately  $+23\frac{1}{2}^\circ$  at the summer solstice and approximately  $-23\frac{1}{2}^\circ$  at the winter solstice.

A simple formula to calculate solar declination from Perrin de Brichambaut (1975) is:

$$\delta = \sin^{-1} \left\{ 0.4 \sin \left[ \frac{2\pi}{365} (d_n - 82) \right] \right\} \quad 1:1.1.2$$

where  $\delta$  is the solar declination reported in radians, and  $d_n$  is the day number of the year.

### **1:1.1.3 SOLAR NOON, SUNRISE, SUNSET AND DAYLENGTH**

The angle between the line from an observer on the earth to the sun and a vertical line extending upward from the observer is called the zenith angle,  $\theta_z$  (Figure 1:1-1). Solar noon occurs when this angle is at its minimum value for the day.




Figure 1:1-1: Diagram illustrating zenith angle

For a given geographical position, the relationship between the sun and a horizontal surface on the earth's surface is:

$$\cos \theta_z = \sin \delta \sin \phi + \cos \delta \cos \phi \cos \omega t \quad 1:1.1.3$$

where  $\delta$  is the solar declination in radians,  $\phi$  is the geographic latitude in radians,  $\omega$  is the angular velocity of the earth's rotation ( $0.2618 \text{ rad h}^{-1}$  or  $15^\circ \text{ h}^{-1}$ ), and  $t$  is the solar hour.  $t$  equals zero at solar noon, is a positive value in the morning and is a negative value in the evening. The combined term  $\omega t$  is referred to as the hour angle.

Sunrise,  $T_{SR}$ , and sunset,  $T_{SS}$ , occur at equal times before and after solar noon. These times can be determined by rearranging the above equation as:

$$T_{SR} = + \frac{\cos^{-1}[-\tan \delta \tan \phi]}{\omega} \quad 1:1.1.4$$

and

$$T_{SS} = - \frac{\cos^{-1}[-\tan \delta \tan \phi]}{\omega} \quad 1:1.1.5$$

Total daylength,  $T_{DL}$ , is calculated:

$$T_{DL} = \frac{2 \cos^{-1}[-\tan \delta \tan \phi]}{\omega} \quad 1:1.1.6$$

At latitudes above  $66.5^\circ$  or below  $-66.5^\circ$ , the absolute value of  $[-\tan \delta \tan \phi]$  can exceed 1 and the above equation cannot be used. When this happens, there is either no sunrise (winter) or no sunset (summer) and  $T_{DL}$  must be assigned a value of 0 or 24 hours, respectively.

To determine the minimum daylength that will occur during the year, equation 1:1.1.6 is solved with the solar declination set to  $-23.5^\circ$  (-0.4102 radians) for the northern hemisphere or  $+23.5^\circ$  (0.4102 radians) for the southern hemisphere.

The only SWAT input variable used in the calculations reviewed in Section 1:1.1 is given in Table 1:1-1.

Table 1:1-1: SWAT input variables that used in earth-sun relationship calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
SUB_LAT	Latitude of the subbasin (degrees).	.sub

## 1:1.2 SOLAR RADIATION

---

### 1:1.2.1 EXTRATERRESTRIAL RADIATION

The radiant energy from the sun is practically the only source of energy that impacts climatic processes on earth. The solar constant,  $I_{SC}$ , is the rate of total solar energy at all wavelengths incident on a unit area exposed normally to rays of the sun at a distance of 1 AU from the sun. Quantifying this value has been the

object of numerous studies through the years. The value officially adopted by the Commission for Instruments and Methods of Observation in October 1981 is

$$I_{SC} = 1367 \text{ W m}^{-2} = 4.921 \text{ MJ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$$

On any given day, the extraterrestrial irradiance (rate of energy) on a surface normal to the rays of the sun,  $I_{0n}$ , is:

$$I_{0n} = I_{SC}E_0 \quad 1:1.2.1$$

where  $E_0$  is the eccentricity correction factor of the earth's orbit, and  $I_{0n}$  has the same units as the solar constant,  $I_{SC}$ .

To calculate the irradiance on a horizontal surface,  $I_0$ ,

$$I_0 = I_{0n} \cos \theta_z = I_{SC}E_0 \cos \theta_z \quad 1:1.2.2$$

where  $\cos \theta_z$  is defined in equation 1:1.1.3.

The amount of energy falling on a horizontal surface during a day is given by

$$H_0 = \int_{sr}^{ss} I_0 dt = 2 \int_0^{ss} I_0 dt \quad 1:1.2.3$$

where  $H_0$  is the extraterrestrial daily irradiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $sr$  is sunrise, and  $ss$  is sunset. Assuming that  $E_0$  remains constant during the one day time step and converting the time  $dt$  to the hour angle, the equation can be written

$$H_0 = \frac{24}{\pi} I_{SC}E_0 \int_0^{\omega T_{SR}} (\sin \delta \sin \phi + \cos \delta \cos \phi \cos \omega t) d\omega t \quad 1:1.2.4$$

or

$$H_0 = \frac{24}{\pi} I_{SC}E_0 [\omega T_{SR} (\sin \delta \sin \phi) + (\cos \delta \cos \phi \sin(\omega T_{SR}))] \quad 1:1.2.5$$

where  $I_{SC}$  is the solar constant ( $4.921 \text{ MJ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ),  $E_0$  is the eccentricity correction factor of the earth's orbit,  $\omega$  is the angular velocity of the earth's rotation ( $0.2618 \text{ rad h}^{-1}$ ), the hour of sunrise,  $T_{SR}$ , is defined by equation 1:1.1.4,  $\delta$  is the solar declination in radians, and  $\phi$  is the geographic latitude in radians. Multiplying all the constants together gives

$$H_0 = 37.59 E_0 [\omega T_{SR} \sin \delta \sin \phi + \cos \delta \cos \phi \sin(\omega T_{SR})] \quad 1:1.2.6$$

### **1:1.2.2 SOLAR RADIATION UNDER CLOUDLESS SKIES**

When solar radiation enters the earth's atmosphere, a portion of the energy is removed by scattering and adsorption. The amount of energy lost is a function of the transmittance of the atmosphere, the composition and concentration of the constituents of air at the location, the path length the radiation travels through the air column, and the radiation wavelength.

Due to the complexity of the process and the detail of the information required to accurately predict the amount of radiant energy lost while passing through the atmosphere, SWAT makes a broad assumption that roughly 20% of the extraterrestrial radiation is lost while passing through the atmosphere under cloudless skies. Using this assumption, the maximum possible solar radiation,  $H_{MX}$ , at a particular location on the earth's surface is calculated as:

$$H_{MX} = 30.0E_0[\omega T_{SR} \sin \delta \sin \phi + \cos \delta \cos \phi \sin(\omega T_{SR})] \quad 1:1.2.7$$

where the maximum possible solar radiation,  $H_{MX}$ , is the amount of radiation reaching the earth's surface under a clear sky ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ).

### **1:1.2.3 DAILY SOLAR RADIATION**

The solar radiation reaching the earth's surface on a given day,  $H_{day}$ , may be less than  $H_{MX}$  due to the presence of cloud cover. The daily solar radiation data required by SWAT may be read from an input file or generated by the model.

The variable SLRSIM in the master watershed (file.cio) file identifies the method used to obtain solar radiation data. To read in daily solar radiation data, the variable is set to 1 and the name of the solar radiation data file and the number of solar radiation records stored in the file are set. To generate daily solar radiation values, SLRSIM is set to 2. The equations used to generate solar radiation data in SWAT are reviewed in Chapter 1:3. SWAT input variables that pertain to solar radiation are summarized in Table 1:1-2.

Table 1:1-2: SWAT input variables used in solar radiation calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
SUB_LAT	Latitude of the subbasin (degrees).	.sub
SLRSIM	Solar radiation input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
NSTOT	Number of solar radiation records within the .slr file (required if SLRSIM = 1)	file.cio
SLRFILE	Name of measured solar radiation input file (.slr) (required if SLRSIM = 1)	file.cio
ISGAGE	Number of solar radiation record used within the subbasin (required if SLRSIM = 1)	.sub
<i>see description of .slr file in the User's Manual for input and format requirements if measured daily solar radiation data is being used</i>		

### **1:1.2.4 HOURLY SOLAR RADIATION**

The extraterrestrial radiation falling on a horizontal surface during one hour is given by the equation:

$$I_0 = I_{sc}E_0(\sin \delta \sin \phi + \cos \delta \cos \phi \cos \omega t) \quad 1:1.2.8$$

where  $I_0$  is the extraterrestrial radiation for 1 hour centered around the hour angle  $\omega t$ .

An accurate calculation of the radiation for each hour of the day requires a knowledge of the difference between standard time and solar time for the location. SWAT simplifies the hourly solar radiation calculation by assuming that solar noon occurs at 12:00pm local standard time.

When the values of  $I_0$  calculated for every hour between sunrise and sunset are summed, they will equal the value of  $H_0$ . Because of the relationship between  $I_0$  and  $H_0$ , it is possible to calculate the hourly radiation values by multiplying  $H_0$  by the fraction of radiation that falls within the different hours of the day. The benefit of this alternative method is that assumptions used to estimate the difference between maximum and actual solar radiation reaching the earth's surface can be automatically incorporated in calculations of hourly solar radiation at the earth's surface.

SWAT calculates hourly solar radiation at the earth's surface with the equation:

$$I_{hr} = I_{frac} \cdot H_{day} \quad 1:1.2.9$$

where  $I_{hr}$  is the solar radiation reaching the earth's surface during a specific hour of the day ( $MJ\ m^{-2}\ hr^{-1}$ ),  $I_{frac}$  is the fraction of total daily radiation falling during

that hour, and  $H_{day}$  is the total solar radiation reaching the earth's surface on that day.

The fraction of total daily radiation falling during an hour is calculated

$$I_{frac} = \frac{\sum_{t=SR}^{SS} (\sin \delta \sin \phi + \cos \delta \cos \phi \cos \omega t_i)}{\sum_{t=SR}^{SS} (\sin \delta \sin \phi + \cos \delta \cos \phi \cos \omega t)} \quad 1:1.2.10$$

where  $t_i$  is the solar time at the midpoint of hour  $i$ .

## **1:1.2.5 DAILY NET RADIATION**

Net radiation requires the determination of both incoming and reflected short-wave radiation and net long-wave or thermal radiation. Expressing net radiation in terms of the net short-wave and long-wave components gives:

$$H_{net} = H_{day} \downarrow -\alpha \cdot H_{day} \uparrow + H_L \downarrow - H_L \uparrow \quad 1:1.2.11$$

or

$$H_{net} = (1 - \alpha) \cdot H_{day} + H_b \quad 1:1.2.12$$

where  $H_{net}$  is the net radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $H_{day}$  is the short-wave solar radiation reaching the ground ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $\alpha$  is the short-wave reflectance or albedo,  $H_L$  is the long-wave radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $H_b$  is the net incoming long-wave radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ) and the arrows indicate the direction of the radiation flux.

### **1:1.2.5.1 NET SHORT-WAVE RADIATION**

Net short-wave radiation is defined as  $(1 - \alpha) \cdot H_{day}$ . SWAT calculates a daily value for albedo as a function of the soil type, plant cover, and snow cover. When the snow water equivalent is greater than 0.5 mm,

$$\alpha = 0.8 \quad 1:1.2.13$$

When the snow water equivalent is less than 0.5 mm and no plants are growing in the HRU,

$$\alpha = \alpha_{soil} \quad 1:1.2.14$$

where  $\alpha_{soil}$  is the soil albedo. When plants are growing and the snow water equivalent is less than 0.5 mm,

$$\alpha = \alpha_{plant} \cdot (1 - cov_{sol}) + \alpha_{soil} \cdot cov_{sol} \quad 1:1.2.15$$

where  $\alpha_{plant}$  is the plant albedo (set at 0.23), and  $cov_{sol}$  is the soil cover index. The soil cover index is calculated

$$cov_{sol} = \exp(-5.0 \times 10^{-5} \cdot CV) \quad 1:1.2.16$$

where  $CV$  is the aboveground biomass and residue ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ).

### 1:1.2.5.2 NET LONG-WAVE RADIATION

Long-wave radiation is emitted from an object according to the radiation law:

$$H_R = \varepsilon \cdot \sigma \cdot T_K^4 \quad 1:1.2.17$$

where  $H_R$  is the radiant energy ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $\varepsilon$  is the emissivity,  $\sigma$  is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant ( $4.903 \times 10^{-9} \text{ MJ m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ), and  $T_K$  is the mean air temperature in Kelvin ( $273.15 + ^\circ\text{C}$ ).

Net long-wave radiation is calculated using a modified form of equation 1:1.2.17 (Jensen et al., 1990):

$$H_b = f_{cld} \cdot (\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{vs}) \cdot \sigma \cdot T_K^4 \quad 1:1.2.18$$

where  $H_b$  is the net long-wave radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $f_{cld}$  is a factor to adjust for cloud cover,  $\varepsilon_a$  is the atmospheric emittance, and  $\varepsilon_{vs}$  is the vegetative or soil emittance.

Wright and Jensen (1972) developed the following expression for the cloud cover adjustment factor,  $f_{cld}$ :

$$f_{cld} = a \cdot \frac{H_{day}}{H_{MX}} - b \quad 1:1.2.19$$

where  $a$  and  $b$  are constants,  $H_{day}$  is the solar radiation reaching the ground surface on a given day ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ), and  $H_{MX}$  is the maximum possible solar radiation to reach the ground surface on a given day ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ).

The two emittances in equation 1:1.2.18 may be combined into a single term, the net emittance  $\varepsilon'$ . The net emittance is calculated using an equation developed by Brunt (1932):

$$\varepsilon' = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{vs} = -\left(a_1 + b_1 \cdot \sqrt{e}\right) \quad 1:1.2.20$$

where  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are constants and  $e$  is the vapor pressure on a given day (kPa). The calculation of  $e$  is given in Chapter 1:2.

Combining equations 1:1.2.18, 1:1.2.19, and 1:1.2.20 results in a general equation for net long-wave radiation:

$$H_b = -\left[a \cdot \frac{H_{day}}{H_{MX}} - b\right] \cdot [a_1 + b_1 \sqrt{e}] \cdot \sigma \cdot T_K^4 \quad 1:1.2.21$$

Experimental values for the coefficients  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are presented in Table 1:1.3. The default equation in SWAT uses coefficient values proposed by Doorenbos and Pruitt (1977):

$$H_b = -\left[0.9 \cdot \frac{H_{day}}{H_{MX}} + 0.1\right] \cdot [0.34 - 0.139\sqrt{e}] \cdot \sigma \cdot T_K^4 \quad 1:1.2.22$$

Table 1:1-3: Experimental coefficients for net long-wave radiation equations (from Jensen et al., 1990)

Region	(a,	b)	(a <sub>1</sub> ,	b <sub>1</sub> )
Davis, California	(1.35,	-0.35)	(0.35,	-0.145)
Southern Idaho	(1.22,	-0.18)	(0.325,	-0.139)
England	not available		(0.47,	-0.206)
England	not available		(0.44,	-0.253)
Australia	not available		(0.35,	-0.133)
General	(1.2,	-0.2)	(0.39,	-0.158)
General-humid areas	(1.0,	0.0)		
General-semihumid areas	(1.1,	-0.1)		

Table 1:1-4: SWAT input variables used in net radiation calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
SOL_ALB	$\alpha_{soil}$ : moist soil albedo	.sol
MAX TEMP	$T_{mx}$ : Daily maximum temperature (°C)	.tmp
MIN TEMP	$T_{mn}$ : Daily minimum temperature (°C)	.tmp
SOL_RAD	$H_{day}$ : Daily solar radiation reaching the earth's surface (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )	.slr

## 1:1.3 TEMPERATURE

---

Temperature influences a number of physical, chemical and biological processes. Plant production is strongly temperature dependent, as are organic matter decomposition and mineralization. Daily air temperature may be input to the model or generated from average monthly values. Soil and water temperatures are derived from air temperature.

### **1:1.3.1 DAILY AIR TEMPERATURE**

SWAT requires daily maximum and minimum air temperature. This data may be read from an input file or generated by the model. The user is strongly recommended to obtain measured daily temperature records from gages in or near the watershed if at all possible. The accuracy of model results is significantly improved by the use of measured temperature data.

The variable TMPSIM in the master watershed (file.cio) file identifies the method used to obtain air temperature data. To read in daily maximum and minimum air temperature data, the variable is set to 1 and the name of the temperature data file(s) and the number of temperature records stored in the file are set. To generate daily air temperature values, TMPSIM is set to 2. The equations used to generate air temperature data in SWAT are reviewed in Chapter 1:3. SWAT input variables that pertain to air temperature are summarized in Table 1:1-5.

Table 1:1-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to daily air temperature.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
TMPSIM	Air temperature input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
NTGAGE	Number of temperature gage (.tmp) files used in simulation file (required if TMPSIM = 1)	file.cio
NTTOT	Number of temperature records used in simulation (required if TMPSIM = 1)	file.cio
NTFIL	Number of temperature records within each .tmp file (required if TMPSIM = 1)	file.cio
TFILE	Name of measured temperature input file (.tmp) Up to 18 files may be used. (required if TMPSIM = 1)	file.cio
ITGAGE	Number of temperature record used within the subbasin (required if TMPSIM = 1)	.sub

*see description of .tmp file in the User's Manual for input and format requirements if measured temperature data is being used*

### **1:1.3.2 HOURLY AIR TEMPERATURE**

Air temperature data are usually provided in the form of daily maximum and minimum temperature. A reasonable approximation for converting these to hourly temperatures is to assume a sinusoidal interpolation function between the minimum and maximum daily temperatures. The maximum daily temperature is assumed to occur at 1500 hours and the minimum daily temperature at 300 hours (Campbell, 1985). The temperature for the hour is then calculated with the equation:

$$T_{hr} = \bar{T}_{av} + \frac{(T_{mx} - T_{mn})}{2} \cdot \cos(0.2618 \cdot (hr - 15)) \quad 1:1.3.1$$

where  $T_{hr}$  is the air temperature during hour  $hr$  of the day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the average temperature on the day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $T_{mx}$  is the daily maximum temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $T_{mn}$  is the daily minimum temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

Table 1:1-6: SWAT input variables that pertain to hourly air temperature.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
MAX TEMP	$T_{mx}$ : Daily maximum temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.tmp
MIN TEMP	$T_{mn}$ : Daily minimum temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.tmp

### **1:1.3.3 SOIL TEMPERATURE**

Soil temperature will fluctuate due to seasonal and diurnal variations in temperature at the surface. Figure 1:1-2 plots air temperature and soil temperature at 5 cm and 300 cm below bare soil at College Station, Texas.




Figure 1:1-2: Four-year average air and soil temperature at College Station, Texas.

This figure illustrates several important attributes of temperature variation in the soil. First, the annual variation in soil temperature follows a sinusoidal function. Second, the fluctuation in temperature during the year (the amplitude of the sine wave) decreases with depth until, at some depth in the soil, the temperature remains constant throughout the year. Finally, the timing of maximum and minimum temperatures varies with depth. Note in the above graph that there is a three month difference between the recording of the minimum temperature at the surface (January) and the minimum temperature at 300 cm (March).

Carslaw and Jaeger (1959) developed an equation to quantify the seasonal variation in temperature:

$$T_{soil}(z, d_n) = \bar{T}_{AA} + A_{surf} \exp(-z/dd) \sin(\omega_{tmp} d_n - z/dd) \quad 1:1.3.2$$

where  $T_{soil}(z, d_n)$  is the soil temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) at depth  $z$  (mm) and day of the year  $d_n$ ,  $\bar{T}_{AA}$  is the average annual soil temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $A_{surf}$  is the amplitude of the surface fluctuations ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $dd$  is the damping depth (mm), and  $\omega_{tmp}$  is the angular frequency. When  $z = 0$  (soil surface), equation 1:1.3.2 reduces to  $T_{soil}(0, d_n) = \bar{T}_{AA} + A_{surf} \sin(\omega_{tmp} d_n)$ . As  $z \rightarrow \infty$ , equation 1:1.3.2 becomes  $T_{soil}(\infty, d_n) = \bar{T}_{AA}$ .

In order to calculate values for some of the variables in this equation, the heat capacity and thermal conductivity of the soil must be known. These are properties not commonly measured in soils and attempts at estimating values from other soil properties have not proven very effective. Consequently, an equation has been adopted in SWAT that calculates the temperature in the soil as a function of the previous day's soil temperature, the average annual air temperature, the current day's soil surface temperature, and the depth in the profile.

The equation used to calculate daily average soil temperature at the center of each layer is:

$$T_{soil}(z, d_n) = \ell \cdot T_{soil}(z, d_n - 1) + [1.0 - \ell] \cdot [df \cdot [\bar{T}_{AAair} - T_{ssurf}] + T_{ssurf}] \quad 1:1.3.3$$

where  $T_{soil}(z, d_n)$  is the soil temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) at depth  $z$  (mm) and day of the year  $d_n$ ,  $\ell$  is the lag coefficient (ranging from 0.0 to 1.0) that controls the influence of the previous day's temperature on the current day's temperature,  $T_{soil}(z, d_n-1)$  is the soil temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) in the layer from the previous day,  $df$  is the depth factor that quantifies the influence of depth below surface on soil temperature,  $\bar{T}_{AAair}$  is the average annual air temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $T_{ssurf}$  is the soil surface temperature on the day. SWAT sets the lag coefficient,  $\ell$ , to 0.80. The soil temperature from the previous day is known and the average annual air temperature is calculated from the long-term monthly maximum and minimum temperatures reported in the weather generator input (.wgn) file. This leaves the depth factor,  $df$ , and the soil surface temperature,  $T_{ssurf}$ , to be defined.

The depth factor is calculated using the equation:

$$df = \frac{zd}{zd + \exp(-0.867 - 2.078 \cdot zd)} \quad 1:1.3.4$$

where  $zd$  is the ratio of the depth at the center of the soil layer to the damping depth:

$$zd = \frac{z}{dd} \quad 1:1.3.5$$

where  $z$  is the depth at the center of the soil layer (mm) and  $dd$  is the damping depth (mm).

From the previous three equations (1:1.3.3, 1:1.3.4 and 1:1.3.5) one can see that at depths close to the soil surface, the soil temperature is a function of the soil surface temperature. As the depth increases, soil temperature is increasingly influenced by the average annual air temperature, until at the damping depth, the soil temperature is within 5% of  $\bar{T}_{AAair}$ .

The damping depth,  $dd$ , is calculated daily and is a function of the maximum damping depth, bulk density and soil water. The maximum damping depth,  $dd_{max}$ , is calculated:

$$dd_{max} = 1000 + \frac{2500\rho_b}{\rho_b + 686 \exp(-5.63\rho_b)} \quad 1:1.3.6$$

where  $dd_{max}$  is the maximum damping depth (mm), and  $\rho_b$  is the soil bulk density ( $Mg/m^3$ ).

The impact of soil water content on the damping depth is incorporated via a scaling factor,  $\varphi$ , that is calculated with the equation:

$$\varphi = \frac{SW}{(0.356 - 0.144\rho_b) \cdot z_{tot}} \quad 1:1.3.7$$

where  $SW$  is the amount of water in the soil profile expressed as depth of water in the profile (mm  $H_2O$ ),  $\rho_b$  is the soil bulk density ( $Mg/m^3$ ), and  $z_{tot}$  is the depth from the soil surface to the bottom of the soil profile (mm).

The daily value for the damping depth,  $dd$ , is calculated:

$$dd = dd_{max} \cdot \exp \left[ \ln \left( \frac{500}{dd_{max}} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{1-\varphi}{1+\varphi} \right)^2 \right] \quad 1:1.3.8$$

where  $dd_{max}$  is the maximum damping depth (mm), and  $\varphi$  is the scaling factor for soil water.

The soil surface temperature is a function of the previous day's temperature, the amount of ground cover and the temperature of the surface when no cover is present. The temperature of a bare soil surface is calculated with the equation:

$$T_{bare} = \bar{T}_{av} + \varepsilon_{sr} \frac{(T_{mx} - T_{mn})}{2} \quad 1:1.3.9$$

where  $T_{bare}$  is the temperature of the soil surface with no cover ( $^{\circ}C$ ),  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the average temperature on the day ( $^{\circ}C$ ),  $T_{mx}$  is the daily maximum temperature ( $^{\circ}C$ ),  $T_{mn}$  is the daily minimum temperature ( $^{\circ}C$ ), and  $\varepsilon_{sr}$  is a radiation term. The radiation term is calculated with the equation:

$$\varepsilon_{sr} = \frac{H_{day} \cdot (1-\alpha) - 14}{20} \quad 1:1.3.10$$

where  $H_{day}$  is the solar radiation reaching the ground on the current day ( $MJ\ m^{-2}\ d^{-1}$ ), and  $\alpha$  is the albedo for the day.

Any cover present will significantly impact the soil surface temperature. The influence of plant canopy or snow cover on soil temperature is incorporated with a weighting factor,  $bcv$ , calculated as:

$$bcv = \max \left\{ \frac{CV}{CV + \exp(7.563 - 1.297 \times 10^{-4} \cdot CV)}, \frac{SNO}{SNO + \exp(6.055 - 0.3002 \cdot SNO)} \right\} \quad 1:1.3.11$$

where  $CV$  is the total aboveground biomass and residue present on the current day ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and  $SNO$  is the water content of the snow cover on the current day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ). The weighting factor,  $bcv$ , is 0.0 for a bare soil and approaches 1.0 as cover increases.

The equation used to calculate the soil surface temperature is:

$$T_{ssurf} = bcv \cdot T_{soil}(1, d_n - 1) + (1 - bcv) \cdot T_{bare} \quad 1:1.3.12$$

where  $T_{ssurf}$  is the soil surface temperature for the current day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $bcv$  is the weighting factor for soil cover impacts,  $T_{soil}(1, d_n - 1)$  is the soil temperature of the first soil layer on the previous day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $T_{bare}$  is the temperature of the bare soil surface ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The influence of ground cover is to place more emphasis on the previous day's temperature near the surface.

SWAT input variables that directly impact soil temperature calculations are listed in Table 1:1-7. There are several other variables that initialize residue and snow cover in the subbasins or HRUs (SNO\_SUB and SNOEB in .sub; RSDIN in .hru). The influence of these variables will be limited to the first few months of simulation. Finally, the timing of management operations in the .mgt file will affect ground cover and consequently soil temperature.

Table 1:1-7: SWAT input variables that pertain to soil temperature.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
TMPMX	Average maximum air temperature for month (°C)	.wgn
TMPMN	Average minimum air temperature for month (°C)	.wgn
SOL_Z	$z$ : Depth from soil surface to bottom of layer (mm)	.sol
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Moist bulk density ( $Mg\ m^{-3}$ or $g\ cm^{-3}$ )	.sol
SOL_ALB	Moist soil albedo.	.sol
MAX TEMP	$T_{mx}$ : Daily maximum temperature (°C)	.tmp
MIN TEMP	$T_{mn}$ : Daily minimum temperature (°C)	.tmp

### 1:1.3.4 WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature is required to model in-stream biological and water quality processes. SWAT uses an equation developed by Stefan and Preud'homme (1993) to calculate average daily water temperature for a well-mixed stream:

$$T_{water} = 5.0 + 0.75\bar{T}_{av} \quad 1:1.3.13$$

where  $T_{water}$  is the water temperature for the day (°C), and  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the average air temperature on the day (°C).

Due to thermal inertia of the water, the response of water temperature to a change in air temperature is dampened and delayed. When water and air temperature are plotted for a stream or river, the peaks in the water temperature plots usually lag 3-7 hours behind the peaks in air temperature. As the depth of the river increases, the lag time can increase beyond this typical interval. For very large rivers, the lag time can extend up to a week. Equation 1:1.3.13 assumes that the lag time between air and water temperatures is less than 1 day.

In addition to air temperature, water temperature is influenced by solar radiation, relative humidity, wind speed, water depth, ground water inflow, artificial heat inputs, thermal conductivity of the sediments and the presence of impoundments along the stream network. SWAT assumes that the impact of these other variables on water temperature is not significant.

Table 1:1-8: SWAT input variables that pertain to water temperature.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
MAX TEMP	$T_{mx}$ : Daily maximum temperature (°C)	.tmp
MIN TEMP	$T_{mn}$ : Daily minimum temperature (°C)	.tmp

## 1:1.4 WIND SPEED

---

Wind speed is required by SWAT if the Penman-Monteith equation is used to estimate potential evapotranspiration and transpiration. SWAT assumes wind speed information is collected from gages positioned 1.7 meters above the ground surface.

When using the Penman-Monteith equation to estimate transpiration, the wind measurement used in the equation must be above the canopy. In SWAT, a minimum difference of 1 meter is specified for canopy height and wind speed measurements. When the canopy height exceeds 1 meter, the original wind measurements is adjusted to:

$$z_w = h_c + 100 \quad 1:1.4.1$$

where  $z_w$  is the height of the wind speed measurement (cm), and  $h_c$  is the canopy height (cm).

The variation of wind speed with elevation near the ground surface is estimated with the equation (Haltiner and Martin, 1957):

$$u_{z2} = u_{z1} \cdot \left[ \frac{z_2}{z_1} \right]^{aa} \quad 1:1.4.2$$

where  $u_{z1}$  is the wind speed ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) at height  $z_1$  (cm),  $u_{z2}$  is the wind speed ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) at height  $z_2$  (cm), and  $aa$  is an exponent between 0 and 1 that varies with atmospheric stability and surface roughness. Jensen (1974) recommended a value of 0.2 for  $aa$  and this is the value used in SWAT.

The daily wind speed data required by SWAT may be read from an input file or generated by the model. The variable WNDSIM in the master watershed (file.cio) file identifies the method used to obtain wind speed data. To read in daily wind speed data, the variable is set to 1 and the name of the wind speed data file and the number of different records stored in the file are set. To generate daily wind speed values, WNDSIM is set to 2. The equations used to generate wind speed data in SWAT are reviewed in Chapter 1:3.

Table 1:1-9: SWAT input variables used in wind speed calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
WNDSIM	Wind speed input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
NWTOT	Number of wind speed records within the .wnd file (required if WNDSIM = 1)	file.cio
WNDFILE	Name of measured wind speed input file (.wnd) (required if WNDSIM = 1)	file.cio
IWGAGE	Number of wind speed record used within the subbasin (required if WNDSIM = 1) <i>see description of .wnd file in the User's Manual for input and format requirements if measured daily wind speed data is being used</i>	.sub

## 1:1.5 NOMENCLATURE

---

$A_{surf}$	Amplitude of the surface fluctuations in soil temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
AU	Astronomical unit (1 AU = $1.496 \times 10^8$ km)
CV	Total aboveground biomass and residue present on current day ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )
$E_0$	Eccentricity correction factor of earth ( $r_0/r$ ) $^2$
$H_0$	Extraterrestrial daily irradiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$H_b$	Net outgoing long-wave radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$H_{day}$	Solar radiation reaching ground on current day of simulation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$H_L$	Long-wave radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$H_{MX}$	Maximum possible solar radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$H_{net}$	Net radiation on day ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$H_R$	Radiant energy ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$I_{frac}$	Fraction of daily solar radiation falling during specific hour on current day of simulation
$I_{hr}$	Solar radiation reaching ground during specific hour on current day of simulation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ )
$I_{SC}$	Solar constant ( $4.921 \text{ MJ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ )
$I_0$	Extraterrestrial daily irradiance incident on a horizontal surface ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ )
$I_{0n}$	Extraterrestrial daily irradiance incident on a normal surface ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ )
$SNO$	Water content of snow cover on current day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SW$	Amount of water in soil profile (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$T_{bare}$	Temperature of soil surface with no cover ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{DL}$	Daylength (h)
$T_{hr}$	Air temperature during hour ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_K$	Mean air temperature in Kelvin ( $273.15 + ^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{mn}$	Minimum air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{mx}$	Maximum air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{soil}$	Soil temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{ssurf}$	Soil surface temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{SR}$	Time of sunrise in solar day (h)
$T_{SS}$	Time of sunset in solar day (h)
$T_{water}$	Average daily water temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\bar{T}_{AA}$	Average annual soil temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )

$\bar{T}_{AAair}$	Average annual air temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\bar{T}_{av}$	Average air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$a$	Constant in equation used to calculate the cloud cover adjustment factor
$a_1$	Constant in equation used to calculate net emissivity
$aa$	Exponent between 0 and 1 that varies with atmospheric stability and surface roughness that is used in calculating wind speed at different heights
$b$	Constant in equation used to calculate the cloud cover adjustment factor
$b_1$	Constant in equation used to calculate net emissivity
$bcv$	weighting factor for impact of ground cover on soil surface temperature
$cov_{sol}$	Soil cover index for albedo determination
$d_n$	Day number of year, 1 on January 1 and 365 on December 31
$dd$	Damping depth (mm)
$dd_{max}$	Maximum damping depth (mm)
$df$	Depth factor used in soil temperature calculations
$e$	Vapor pressure (actual) on a given day (kPa)
$f_{cld}$	Factor to adjust for cloud cover in net long-wave radiation calculation
$h_c$	Canopy height (cm)
$hr$	Hour of day (1-24)
$r$	Actual earth-sun distance (AU)
$r_0$	Mean earth-sun distance, 1 AU
$t$	Number of hours before (+) or after (-) solar noon
$t_i$	Solar time at the midpoint of the hour $i$
$u_{z1}$	Wind speed ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) at height $z_1$ (cm)
$u_{z2}$	Wind speed ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) at height $z_2$ (cm)
$z$	Depth below soil surface (mm)
$z_1$	Height of wind speed measurement (cm)
$z_2$	Height of wind speed measurement (cm)
$z_{tot}$	Depth to bottom of soil profile (mm)
$z_w$	Height of the wind speed measurement (cm)
$zd$	Ratio of depth in soil to damping depth
$\alpha$	Short-wave reflectance or albedo
$\alpha_{plant}$	Plant albedo (set at 0.23)
$\alpha_{soil}$	Soil albedo
$\delta$	Solar declination (radians)
$\varepsilon$	Emissivity
$\varepsilon'$	Net emittance
$\varepsilon_a$	Atmospheric emittance
$\varepsilon_{sr}$	Radiation term for bare soil surface temperature calculation
$\varepsilon_{vs}$	Vegetative or soil emittance
$\ell$	Lag coefficient that controls influence of previous day's temperature on current days temperature
$\sigma$	Stefan-Boltzmann constant ( $4.903 \times 10^{-9} \text{ MJ m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$\theta_z$	Zenith angle (radians)

$\phi$	Latitude in radians
$\rho_b$	Soil bulk density ( $\text{Mg m}^{-3}$ )
$\varphi$	Scaling factor for impact of soil water on damping depth
$\omega$	Angular velocity of the earth's rotation (0.2618 radians $\text{h}^{-1}$ )
$\omega_{tmp}$	Angular frequency in soil temperature variation

## 1:1.6 REFERENCES

---

- Brunt, D. 1932. Notes on radiation in the atmosphere. Quart. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc. 58: 389-418.
- Campbell, G.S. 1985. Soil physics with BASIC: transport models for soil-plant systems. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Carslaw, H.S. and J.C. Jaeger. 1959. Conduction of heat in solids. Oxford University Press, London.
- Doorenbos, J. and W.O. Pruitt. 1977. Guidelines for predicting crop water requirements. FAO Irrig. and Drain. Paper No. 24, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. FAO, Rome.
- Duffie, J.A. and W.A. Beckman. 1980. Solar engineering of thermal processes. Wiley, N.Y.
- Haltiner, G.J. and F.L. Martin. 1957. Dynamical and physical meteorology. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Iqbal, M. 1983. An introduction to solar radiation. Academic Press, N.Y.
- Jensen, M.E. (ed.) 1974. Consumptive use of water and irrigation water requirements. Rep. Tech. Com. on Irrig. Water Requirements, Irrig. and Drain. Div., ASCE.
- Jensen, M.E., R.D. Burman, and R.G. Allen (ed). 1990. Evapotranspiration and irrigation water requirements. ASCE Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice No. 70, ASCE, N.Y.
- Perrin de Brichambaut, Chr. 1975. Cahiers A.F.E.D.E.S., supplément au no 1. Editions Européennes Thermique et Industrie, Paris.
- Stefan, H.G. and E.B. Preud'homme. 1993. Stream temperature estimation from air temperature. Water Resources Bulletin 29(1): 27-45.
- Wright, J.L. and M.E. Jensen. 1972. Peak water requirements of crops in Southern Idaho. J. Irrig. and Drain. Div., ASCE, 96(IR1):193-201.



## **SECTION 1 CHAPTER 2**

# **EQUATIONS: ATMOSPHERIC WATER**

---

---

Precipitation is the mechanism by which water enters the land phase of the hydrologic cycle. Because precipitation controls the water balance, it is critical that the amount and distribution of precipitation in space and time is accurately simulated by the model.

## 1:2.1 PRECIPITATION

---

The precipitation reaching the earth's surface on a given day,  $R_{day}$ , may be read from an input file or generated by the model. Users are strongly recommended to incorporate measured precipitation into their simulations any time the data is available. The ability of SWAT to reproduce observed stream hydrographs is greatly improved by the use of measured precipitation data.

Unfortunately, even with the use of measured precipitation the model user can expect some error due to inaccuracy in precipitation data. Measurement of precipitation at individual gages is subject to error from a number of causes and additional error is introduced when regional precipitation is estimated from point values. Typically, total or average areal precipitation estimates for periods of a year or longer have relative uncertainties of 10% (Winter, 1981).

Point measurements of precipitation generally capture only a fraction of the true precipitation. The inability of a gage to capture a true reading is primarily caused by wind eddies created by the gage. These wind eddies reduce the catch of the smaller raindrops and snowflakes. Larson and Peck (1974) found that deficiencies of 10% for rain and 30% for snow are common for gages projecting above the ground surface that are not designed to shield wind effects. Even when the gage is designed to shield for wind effects, this source of error will not be eliminated. For an in-depth discussion of this and other sources of error as well as methods for dealing with the error, please refer to Dingman (1994).

The variable PCPSIM in the master watershed file (file.cio) identifies the method used to obtain precipitation data. To read in precipitation data, the variable is set to 1 and the names of the precipitation data files and the number of precipitation records stored in the files are defined. To generate precipitation values, PCPSIM is set to 2. The equations used to generate precipitation data in SWAT are reviewed in Chapter 1:3. SWAT input variables that pertain to precipitation are summarized in Table 1:2-1.

Table 1:2-1: SWAT input variables used in precipitation calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
PCPSIM	Precipitation input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
NRGAGE	Number of precipitation gage files (.pcp) used (required if PCPSIM = 1)	file.cio
NRTOT	Total number of precipitation records used in simulation (required if PCPSIM = 1)	file.cio
NRGFIL	Number of precipitation records in each .pcp file (required if PCPSIM = 1)	file.cio
RFILE	Name of measured precipitation input file(s) (.pcp) (required if PCPSIM = 1)	file.cio
IRGAGE	Number of precipitation record used within the subbasin (required if PCPSIM = 1) <i>see description of .pcp file in the User's Manual for input and format requirements if measured daily precipitation data is being used</i>	.sub

## 1:2.2 MAXIMUM HALF-HOUR RAINFALL

The maximum half-hour rainfall is required by SWAT to calculate the peak runoff rate. The maximum half-hour rainfall is reported as a fraction of the total daily rainfall,  $\alpha_{0.5}$ . If sub-daily precipitation data is used in the model, SWAT will calculate the maximum half-hour rainfall fraction directly from the precipitation data. If daily precipitation data is used, SWAT generates a value for  $\alpha_{0.5}$  using the equations summarized in Chapter 1:3.

## 1:2.3 WATER VAPOR

Relative humidity is required by SWAT if the Penman-Monteith or Priestley-Taylor equation is used to estimate potential evapotranspiration. It is also used to calculate the vapor pressure deficit on plant growth. The Penman-Monteith equation includes terms that quantify the effect of the amount of water vapor in the air near the evaporative surface on evaporation. Both Penman-Monteith and Priestley-Taylor require the actual vapor pressure, which is calculated from the relative humidity.

Relative humidity is the ratio of an air volume's actual vapor pressure to its saturation vapor pressure:

$$R_h = \frac{e}{e^o} \quad 1:2.3.1$$

where  $R_h$  is the relative humidity on a given day,  $e$  is the actual vapor pressure on a given day (kPa), and  $e^o$  is the saturation vapor pressure on a given day (kPa).

The saturation vapor pressure is the maximum vapor pressure that is thermodynamically stable and is a function of the air temperature. SWAT calculates saturation vapor pressure using an equation presented by Tetens (1930) and Murray (1967):

$$e^o = \exp\left[\frac{16.78 \cdot \bar{T}_{av} - 116.9}{\bar{T}_{av} + 237.3}\right] \quad 1.2.3.2$$

where  $e^o$  is the saturation vapor pressure on a given day (kPa) and  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean daily air temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). When relative humidity is known, the actual vapor pressure can be calculated by rearranging equation 1.2.3.1:

$$e = R_h \cdot e^o \quad 1.2.3.3$$

The saturation vapor pressure curve is obtained by plotting equation 1.2.3.2. The slope of the saturation vapor pressure curve can be calculated by differentiating equation 1.2.3.2:

$$\Delta = \frac{4098 \cdot e^o}{(\bar{T}_{av} + 237.3)^2} \quad 1.2.3.4$$

where  $\Delta$  is the slope of the saturation vapor pressure curve (kPa  $^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$ ),  $e^o$  is the saturation vapor pressure on a given day (kPa) and  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean daily air temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

The rate of evaporation is proportional to the difference between the vapor pressure of the surface layer and the vapor pressure of the overlying air. This difference is termed the vapor pressure deficit:

$$vpd = e^o - e \quad 1.2.3.5$$

where  $vpd$  is the vapor pressure deficit (kPa),  $e^o$  is the saturation vapor pressure on a given day (kPa), and  $e$  is the actual vapor pressure on a given day (kPa). The greater the value of  $vpd$  the higher the rate of evaporation.

The latent heat of vaporization,  $\lambda$ , is the quantity of heat energy that must be absorbed to break the hydrogen bonds between water molecules in the liquid

state to convert them to gas. The latent heat of vaporization is a function of temperature and can be calculated with the equation (Harrison, 1963):

$$\lambda = 2.501 - 2.361 \times 10^{-3} \cdot \bar{T}_{av} \quad 1.2.3.6$$

where  $\lambda$  is the latent heat of vaporization ( $\text{MJ kg}^{-1}$ ) and  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean daily air temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

Evaporation involves the exchange of both latent heat and sensible heat between the evaporating body and the air. The psychrometric constant,  $\gamma$ , represents a balance between the sensible heat gained from air flowing past a wet bulb thermometer and the sensible heat converted to latent heat (Brunt, 1952) and is calculated:

$$\gamma = \frac{c_p \cdot P}{0.622 \cdot \lambda} \quad 1.2.3.7$$

where  $\gamma$  is the psychrometric constant ( $\text{kPa } ^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$ ),  $c_p$  is the specific heat of moist air at constant pressure ( $1.013 \times 10^{-3} \text{ MJ kg}^{-1} ^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$ ),  $P$  is the atmospheric pressure ( $\text{kPa}$ ), and  $\lambda$  is the latent heat of vaporization ( $\text{MJ kg}^{-1}$ ).

Calculation of the psychrometric constant requires a value for atmospheric pressure. SWAT estimates atmospheric pressure using an equation developed by Doorenbos and Pruitt (1977) from mean barometric pressure data at a number of East African sites:

$$P = 101.3 - 0.01152 \cdot EL + 0.544 \times 10^{-6} \cdot EL^2 \quad 1.2.3.8$$

where  $P$  is the atmospheric pressure ( $\text{kPa}$ ) and  $EL$  is the elevation ( $\text{m}$ ).

The daily relative humidity data required by SWAT may be read from an input file or generated by the model. The variable RHSIM in the master watershed (file.cio) file identifies the method used to obtain relative humidity data. To read in daily relative humidity data, the variable is set to 1 and the name of the relative humidity data file and the number of different records stored in the file are set. To generate daily relative humidity values, RHSIM is set to 2. The equations used to generate relative humidity data in SWAT are reviewed in Chapter 1.3.

Table 1.2-2: SWAT input variables used in relative humidity calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
RHD	$R_h$ : daily average relative humidity	.hmd
TMP_MX	$T_{mx}$ : maximum temperature for day (°C)	.tmp
TMP_MN	$T_{mn}$ : minimum temperature for day (°C)	.tmp
SUB_ELEV	$EL$ : elevation (m)	.sub
RHSIM	Relative humidity input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
NHTOT	Number of relative humidity records within the .hmd file (required if RHSIM = 1)	file.cio
RHFILE	Name of measured relative humidity input file (.hmd) (required if RHSIM = 1)	file.cio
IHGAGE	Number of relative humidity record used within the subbasin (required if RHSIM = 1)	.sub
<i>see description of .hmd file in the User's Manual for input and format requirements if measured relative humidity data is being used</i>		

## 1:2.4 SNOW COVER

SWAT classifies precipitation as rain or freezing rain/snow by the mean daily air temperature. The boundary temperature,  $T_{s-r}$ , used to categorize precipitation as rain or snow is defined by the user. If the mean daily air temperature is less than the boundary temperature, then the precipitation within the HRU is classified as snow and the water equivalent of the snow precipitation is added to the snow pack.

Snowfall is stored at the ground surface in the form of a snow pack. The amount of water stored in the snow pack is reported as a snow water equivalent. The snow pack will increase with additional snowfall or decrease with snow melt or sublimation. The mass balance for the snow pack is:

$$SNO = SNO + R_{day} - E_{sub} - SNO_{mlt} \quad 1.2.4.1$$

where  $SNO$  is the water content of the snow pack on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation on a given day (added only if  $\bar{T}_{av} \leq T_{s-r}$ ) (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_{sub}$  is the amount of sublimation on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $SNO_{mlt}$  is the amount of snow melt on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The amount of snow is expressed as depth over the total HRU area.

Due to variables such as drifting, shading and topography, the snow pack in a subbasin will rarely be uniformly distributed over the total area. This results

in a fraction of the subbasin area that is bare of snow. This fraction must be quantified to accurately compute snow melt in the subbasin.

The factors that contribute to variable snow coverage are usually similar from year to year, making it possible to correlate the areal coverage of snow with the amount of snow present in the subbasin at a given time. This correlation is expressed as an areal depletion curve, which is used to describe the seasonal growth and recession of the snow pack as a function of the amount of snow present in the subbasin (Anderson, 1976).






The areal depletion curve requires a threshold depth of snow,  $SNO_{100}$ , to be defined above which there will always be 100% cover. The threshold depth will depend on factors such as vegetation distribution, wind loading of snow, wind scouring of snow, interception and aspect, and will be unique to the watershed of interest.

The areal depletion curve is based on a natural logarithm. The areal depletion curve equation is:

$$sno_{cov} = \frac{SNO}{SNO_{100}} \cdot \left( \frac{SNO}{SNO_{100}} + \exp\left(cov_1 - cov_2 \cdot \frac{SNO}{SNO_{100}}\right) \right)^{-1} \quad 1.2.4.2$$

where  $sno_{cov}$  is the fraction of the HRU area covered by snow,  $SNO$  is the water content of the snow pack on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $SNO_{100}$  is the threshold depth of snow at 100% coverage (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $cov_1$  and  $cov_2$  are coefficients that define the shape of the curve. The values used for  $cov_1$  and  $cov_2$  are determined by solving equation 1.2.4.2 using two known points: 95% coverage at 95%  $SNO_{100}$ ; and 50% coverage at a user specified fraction of  $SNO_{100}$ .

Example areal depletion curves for various fractions of  $SNO_{100}$  at 50% coverage are shown in the following figures.

Figure 1:2-1: 10%  $SNO_{100} = 50\%$  coverageFigure 1:2-2: 30%  $SNO_{100} = 50\%$  coverageFigure 1:2-3: 50%  $SNO_{100} = 50\%$  coverageFigure 1:2-4: 70%  $SNO_{100} = 50\%$  coverageFigure 1:2-5: 90%  $SNO_{100} = 50\%$  coverage

It is important to remember that once the volume of water held in the snow pack exceeds  $SNO_{100}$  the depth of snow over the HRU is assumed to be uniform, i.e.  $sno_{cov} = 1.0$ . The areal depletion curve affects snow melt only when the snow

pack water content is between 0.0 and  $SNO_{100}$ . Consequently if  $SNO_{100}$  is set to a very small value, the impact of the areal depletion curve on snow melt will be minimal. As the value for  $SNO_{100}$  increases, the influence of the areal depletion curve will assume more importance in snow melt processes.

Table 1:2-3: SWAT input variables used in snow cover calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
SFTMP	$T_{s-r}$ : Mean air temperature at which precipitation is equally likely to be rain as snow/freezing rain (°C)	.bsn
SNOCOVMX	$SNO_{100}$ : Threshold depth of snow, above which there is 100% cover	.bsn
SNO50COV	Fraction of SNOCOV MX that provides 50% cover	.bsn
SNO_SUB	Initial snow water content in subbasin (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.sub
SNOEB	Initial snow water content in subbasin elevation band (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.sub

## 1:2.5 SNOW MELT

---

Snow melt is controlled by the air and snow pack temperature, the melting rate, and the areal coverage of snow.

Snow melt is included with rainfall in the calculations of runoff and percolation. When SWAT calculates erosion, the rainfall energy of the snow melt fraction of the water is set to zero. The water released from snow melt is assumed to be evenly distributed over the 24 hours of the day.

### 1:2.5.1 SNOW PACK TEMPERATURE

The snow pack temperature is a function of the mean daily temperature during the preceding days and varies as a dampened function of air temperature (Anderson, 1976). The influence of the previous day's snow pack temperature on the current day's snow pack temperature is controlled by a lagging factor,  $\ell_{sno}$ .

The lagging factor inherently accounts for snow pack density, snow pack depth, exposure and other factors affecting snow pack temperature. The equation used to calculate the snow pack temperature is:

$$T_{snow(d_n)} = T_{snow(d_n-1)} \cdot (1 - \ell_{sno}) + \bar{T}_{av} \cdot \ell_{sno} \quad 1:2.5.1$$

where  $T_{snow(d_n)}$  is the snow pack temperature on a given day (°C),  $T_{snow(d_n-1)}$  is the snow pack temperature on the previous day (°C),  $\ell_{sno}$  is the snow temperature lag

factor, and  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean air temperature on the current day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). As  $\ell_{sno}$  approaches 1.0, the mean air temperature on the current day exerts an increasingly greater influence on the snow pack temperature and the snow pack temperature from the previous day exerts less and less influence.

The snow pack will not melt until the snow pack temperature exceeds a threshold value,  $T_{mlt}$ . This threshold value is specified by the user.

### **1:2.5.2 SNOW MELT EQUATION**

The snow melt in SWAT is calculated as a linear function of the difference between the average snow pack-maximum air temperature and the base or threshold temperature for snow melt:

$$SNO_{mlt} = b_{mlt} \cdot sno_{cov} \cdot \left[ \frac{T_{snow} + T_{mx}}{2} - T_{mlt} \right] \quad 1:2.5.2$$

where  $SNO_{mlt}$  is the amount of snow melt on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $b_{mlt}$  is the melt factor for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $sno_{cov}$  is the fraction of the HRU area covered by snow,  $T_{snow}$  is the snow pack temperature on a given day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $T_{mx}$  is the maximum air temperature on a given day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $T_{mlt}$  is the base temperature above which snow melt is allowed ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

The melt factor is allowed a seasonal variation with maximum and minimum values occurring on summer and winter solstices:

$$b_{mlt} = \frac{(b_{mlt6} + b_{mlt12})}{2} + \frac{(b_{mlt6} - b_{mlt12})}{2} \cdot \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{365} \cdot (d_n - 81)\right) \quad 1:2.5.3$$

where  $b_{mlt}$  is the melt factor for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $b_{mlt6}$  is the melt factor for June 21 (mm H<sub>2</sub>O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $b_{mlt12}$  is the melt factor for December 21 (mm H<sub>2</sub>O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $d_n$  is the day number of the year.

In rural areas, the melt factor will vary from 1.4 to 6.9 mm H<sub>2</sub>O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$  (Huber and Dickinson, 1988). In urban areas, values will fall in the higher end of the range due to compression of the snow pack by vehicles, pedestrians, etc. Urban snow melt studies in Sweden (Bengston, 1981; Westerstrom, 1981) reported melt factors ranging from 3.0 to 8.0 mm H<sub>2</sub>O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Studies of snow

melt on asphalt (Westerstrom, 1984) gave melt factors of 1.7 to 6.5 mm H<sub>2</sub>O/day-°C.

Table 1.2-4: SWAT input variables used in snow melt calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
TIMP	$\ell_{sno}$ : Snow temperature lag factor	.bsn
SMTMP	$T_{mlt}$ : Threshold temperature for snow melt (°C)	.bsn
SMFMX	$b_{mlt6}$ : Melt factor on June 21 (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day-°C)	.bsn
SMFMN	$b_{mlt12}$ : Melt factor on December 21 (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day-°C)	.bsn

## 1:2.6 NOMENCLATURE

---

$E_{sub}$	Amount of sublimation on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$EL$	Elevation (m)
$P$	Atmospheric pressure (kPa)
$R_{day}$	Amount of rainfall on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$R_h$	Average relative humidity for the day
$SNO$	Water content of snow cover on current day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SNO_{100}$	Amount of snow above which there is 100% cover (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SNO_{mlt}$	Amount of snow melt on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$T_{mlt}$	Threshold temperature for snow melt (°C)
$T_{mx}$	Maximum air temperature for day (°C)
$T_{s-r}$	Rain/snow boundary temperature (°C)
$T_{snow}$	Snow pack temperature on a given day (°C)
$\bar{T}_{av}$	Average air temperature for day (°C)
$b_{mlt}$	Melt factor for the day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day-°C)
$b_{mlt6}$	Melt factor for June 21 (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day-°C)
$b_{mlt12}$	Melt factor for December 21 (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day-°C)
$c_p$	Specific heat of moist air at constant pressure ( $1.013 \times 10^{-3}$ MJ kg <sup>-1</sup> °C <sup>-1</sup> )
$cov_1$	Snow cover areal depletion curve shape coefficient
$cov_2$	Snow cover areal depletion curve shape coefficient
$d_n$	Day number of year, 1 on January 1 and 365 on December 31
$e$	Actual vapor pressure on a given day (kPa)
$e^o$	Saturation vapor pressure on a given day (kPa)
$sno_{cov}$	Fraction of the HRU area covered by snow
$vpd$	Vapor pressure deficit (kPa)
$\alpha_{0.5}$	Maximum half-hour rainfall expressed as a fraction of daily rainfall
$\Delta$	Slope of the saturation vapor pressure curve (kPa °C <sup>-1</sup> )
$\gamma$	Psychrometric constant (kPa °C <sup>-1</sup> )
$\lambda$	Latent heat of vaporization (MJ kg <sup>-1</sup> )

$\ell_{sno}$  Snow temperature lag factor

## 1:2.7 REFERENCES

---

- Anderson, E.A. 1976. A point energy and mass balance model of snow cover. NOAA Technical Report NWS 19, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, National Weather Service.
- Bengston, L. 1981. Snowmelt-generated runoff in urban areas. p. 444-451. In B.C. Yen (ed.) Urban stormwater hydraulics and hydrology: proceedings of the Second International Conference on Urban Storm Drainage, held at Urbana, Illinois, USA, 15-19 June 1981. Water Resources Publications, Littleton, CO.
- Brunt, D. 1952. Physical and dynamical meteorology, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. University Press, Cambridge.
- Dingman, S.L. 1994. Physical hydrology. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Doorenbos, J. and W.O. Pruitt. 1977. Guidelines for predicting crop water requirements. FAO Irrig. and Drain. Paper No. 24, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. FAO, Rome.
- Harrison, L.P. 1963. Fundamental concepts and definitions relating to humidity. In A. Wexler (ed.) Humidity and moisture, Vol. 3. Reinhold Publishing Company, N.Y.
- Huber, W.C. and R.E. Dickinson. 1988. Storm water management model, version 4: user's manual. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Athens, GA.
- Larson, L.L., and E.L. Peck. 1974. Accuracy of precipitation measurements for hydrologic modeling. Water Resources Research 10:857-863.
- Murray, F.W. 1967. On the computation of saturation vapor pressure. J. Appl. Meteor. 6:203-204.
- Tetens, O. 1930. Über einige meteorologische Begriffe. Z. Geophys. 6:297-309.
- Westerstrom, G. 1984. Snowmelt runoff from Porson residential area, Lulea, Sweden. p. 315-323. In Proceedings of the Third International Conference

on Urban Storm Drainage held at Chalmers University, Goteborg, Sweden, June 1984.

Westerstrom, G. 1981. Snowmelt runoff from urban plot. p. 452-459. In B.C. Yen (ed.) Urban stormwater hydraulics and hydrology: proceedings of the Second International Conference on Urban Storm Drainage, held at Urbana, Illinois, USA, 15-19 June 1981. Water Resources Publications, Littleton, CO.

Winter, T.C. 1981. Uncertainties in estimating the water balance of lakes. Water Resources Bulletin 17:82-115.



# SECTION 1 CHAPTER 3

## EQUATIONS: WEATHER GENERATOR

---

SWAT requires daily values of precipitation, maximum and minimum temperature, solar radiation, relative humidity and wind speed. The user may choose to read these inputs from a file or generate the values using monthly average data summarized over a number of years.

SWAT includes the WXGEN weather generator model (Sharpley and Williams, 1990) to generate climatic data or to fill in gaps in measured records. This weather generator was developed for the contiguous U.S. If the user prefers a different weather generator, daily input values for the different weather parameters may be generated with an alternative model and formatted for input to SWAT.

The occurrence of rain on a given day has a major impact on relative humidity, temperature and solar radiation for the day. The weather generator first independently generates precipitation for the day. Once the total amount of rainfall for the day is generated, the distribution of rainfall within the day is computed if

the Green & Ampt method is used for infiltration. Maximum temperature, minimum temperature, solar radiation and relative humidity are then generated based on the presence or absence of rain for the day. Finally, wind speed is generated independently.

## 1:3.1 PRECIPITATION

---

The daily precipitation generator is a Markov chain-skewed (Nicks, 1974) or Markov chain-exponential model (Williams, 1995). A first-order Markov chain is used to define the day as wet or dry. When a wet day is generated, a skewed distribution or exponential distribution is used to generate the precipitation amount. Table 1:3.1 lists SWAT input variables that are used in the precipitation generator.

### 1:3.1.1 OCCURRENCE OF WET OR DRY DAY

With the first-order Markov-chain model, the probability of rain on a given day is conditioned on the wet or dry status of the previous day. A wet day is defined as a day with 0.1 mm of rain or more.

The user is required to input the probability of a wet day on day  $i$  given a wet day on day  $i - 1$ ,  $P_i(W/W)$ , and the probability of a wet day on day  $i$  given a dry day on day  $i - 1$ ,  $P_i(W/D)$ , for each month of the year. From these inputs the remaining transition probabilities can be derived:

$$P_i(D/W) = 1 - P_i(W/W) \quad 1:3.1.1$$

$$P_i(D/D) = 1 - P_i(W/D) \quad 1:3.1.2$$

where  $P_i(D/W)$  is the probability of a dry day on day  $i$  given a wet day on day  $i - 1$  and  $P_i(D/D)$  is the probability of a dry day on day  $i$  given a dry day on day  $i - 1$ .

To define a day as wet or dry, SWAT generates a random number between 0.0 and 1.0. This random number is compared to the appropriate wet-dry probability,  $P_i(W/W)$  or  $P_i(W/D)$ . If the random number is equal to or less than the wet-dry probability, the day is defined as wet. If the random number is greater than the wet-dry probability, the day is defined as dry.

### **1.3.1.2 AMOUNT OF PRECIPITATION**

Numerous probability distribution functions have been used to describe the distribution of rainfall amounts. SWAT provides the user with two options: a skewed distribution and an exponential distribution.

The skewed distribution was proposed by Nicks (1974) and is based on a skewed distribution used by Fiering (1967) to generate representative streamflow. The equation used to calculate the amount of precipitation on a wet day is:

$$R_{day} = \mu_{mon} + 2 \cdot \sigma_{mon} \cdot \left( \frac{\left[ \left( SND_{day} - \frac{g_{mon}}{6} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{g_{mon}}{6} \right) + 1 \right]^3 - 1}{g_{mon}} \right) \quad 1.3.1.3$$

where  $R_{day}$  is the amount of rainfall on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\mu_{mon}$  is the mean daily rainfall (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) for the month,  $\sigma_{mon}$  is the standard deviation of daily rainfall (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) for the month,  $SND_{day}$  is the standard normal deviate calculated for the day, and  $g_{mon}$  is the skew coefficient for daily precipitation in the month.

The standard normal deviate for the day is calculated:

$$SND_{day} = \cos(6.283 \cdot rnd_2) \cdot \sqrt{-2 \ln(rnd_1)} \quad 1.3.1.4$$

where  $rnd_1$  and  $rnd_2$  are random numbers between 0.0 and 1.0.

The exponential distribution is provided as an alternative to the skewed distribution. This distribution requires fewer inputs and is most commonly used in areas where limited data on precipitation events is available. Daily precipitation is calculated with the exponential distribution using the equation:

$$R_{day} = \mu_{mon} \cdot (-\ln(rnd_1))^{r_{exp}} \quad 1.3.1.5$$

where  $R_{day}$  is the amount of rainfall on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\mu_{mon}$  is the mean daily rainfall (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) for the month,  $rnd_1$  is a random number between 0.0 and 1.0, and  $r_{exp}$  is an exponent that should be set between 1.0 and 2.0. As the value of  $r_{exp}$  is increased, the number of extreme rainfall events during the year will increase. Testing of this equation at locations across the U.S. have shown that a value of 1.3 gives satisfactory results.

Table 1:3-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to generation of precipitation.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
PCPSIM	Precipitation input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
PR_W(1,mon)	$P_i(W/D)$ : probability of a wet day following a dry day in month	.wgn
PR_W(2,mon)	$P_i(W/W)$ : probability of a wet day following a wet day in month	.wgn
IDIST	Rainfall distribution code: 0-skewed, 1-exponential	file.cio
REXP	$rexp$ : value of exponent (required if IDIST = 1)	file.cio
PCPMM(mon)	average amount of precipitation falling in month (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.wgn
PCPD(mon)	average number of days of precipitation in month $(\mu_{mon} = PCPMM / PCPD)$	.wgn
PCPSTD(mon)	$\sigma_{mon}$ : standard deviation for daily precipitation in month (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.wgn
PCPSKW(mon)	$g_{mon}$ : skew coefficient for daily precipitation in month	.wgn

## 1:3.2 MAXIMUM HALF-HOUR RAINFALL

Maximum half-hour rainfall is required by SWAT to calculate the peak flow rate for runoff. When daily precipitation data are used by the model, the maximum half-hour rainfall may be calculated from a triangular distribution using monthly maximum half-hour rainfall data or the user may choose to use the monthly maximum half-hour rainfall for all days in the month. The maximum half-hour rainfall is calculated only on days where surface runoff has been generated.

### 1:3.2.1 MONTHLY MAXIMUM HALF-HOUR RAIN

For each month, users provide the maximum half-hour rain observed over the entire period of record. These extreme values are used to calculate representative monthly maximum half-hour rainfall fractions.

Prior to calculating the representative maximum half-hour rainfall fraction for each month, the extreme half-hour rainfall values are smoothed by calculating three month average values:

$$R_{0.5sm(mon)} = \frac{R_{0.5x(mon-1)} + R_{0.5x(mon)} + R_{0.5x(mon+1)}}{3} \quad 1:3.2.1$$

where  $R_{0.5sm(mon)}$  is the smoothed maximum half-hour rainfall for a given month (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $R_{0.5x}$  is the extreme maximum half-hour rainfall for the specified month (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). Once the smoothed maximum half-hour rainfall is known, the representative half-hour rainfall fraction is calculated using the equation:

$$\alpha_{0.5mon} = adj_{0.5\alpha} \cdot \left[ 1 - \exp \left( \frac{R_{0.5sm(mon)}}{\mu_{mon} \cdot \ln \left( \frac{0.5}{yrs \cdot days_{wet}} \right)} \right) \right] \quad 1.3.2.2$$

where  $\alpha_{0.5mon}$  is the average half-hour rainfall fraction for the month,  $adj_{0.5\alpha}$  is an adjustment factor,  $R_{0.5sm}$  is the smoothed half-hour rainfall amount for the month (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\mu_{mon}$  is the mean daily rainfall (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) for the month,  $yrs$  is the number of years of rainfall data used to obtain values for monthly extreme half-hour rainfalls, and  $days_{wet}$  are the number of wet days in the month. The adjustment factor is included to allow users to modify estimations of half-hour rainfall fractions and peak flow rates for runoff.

### **1.3.2.2 DAILY MAXIMUM HALF-HOUR RAIN VALUE**

The user has the option of using the monthly maximum half-hour rainfall for all days in the month or generating a daily value. The variable ISED\_DET in the basin input file (.bsn) defines which option the user prefers. The randomness of the triangular distribution used to generated daily values can cause the maximum half-hour rainfall value to jump around. For small plots or microwatersheds in particular, the variability of the triangular distribution is unrealistic.

The triangular distribution used to generate the maximum half-hour rainfall fraction requires four inputs: average monthly half-hour rainfall fraction, maximum value for half-hour rainfall fraction allowed in month, minimum value for half-hour rainfall fraction allowed in month, and a random number between 0.0 and 1.0.

The maximum half-hour rainfall fraction, or upper limit of the triangular distribution, is calculated from the daily amount of rainfall with the equation:

$$\alpha_{0.5U} = 1 - \exp \left( \frac{-125}{R_{day} + 5} \right) \quad 1.3.2.3$$

where  $\alpha_{0.5U}$  is the largest half-hour fraction that can be generated on a given day, and  $R_{day}$  is the precipitation on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The minimum half-hour fraction, or lower limit of the triangular distribution,  $\alpha_{0.5L}$ , is set at 0.02083.

The triangular distribution uses one of two sets of equations to generate a

maximum half-hour rainfall fraction for the day. If  $rnd_1 \leq \left( \frac{\alpha_{0.5mon} - \alpha_{0.5L}}{\alpha_{0.5U} - \alpha_{0.5L}} \right)$  then

$$\alpha_{0.5} = \alpha_{0.5mon} \cdot \frac{\alpha_{0.5L} + [rnd_1 \cdot (\alpha_{0.5U} - \alpha_{0.5L}) \cdot (\alpha_{0.5mon} - \alpha_{0.5L})]^{0.5}}{\alpha_{0.5mean}} \quad 1:3.2.4$$

If  $rnd_1 > \left( \frac{\alpha_{0.5mon} - \alpha_{0.5L}}{\alpha_{0.5U} - \alpha_{0.5L}} \right)$  then

$$\alpha_{0.5} = \alpha_{0.5mon} \cdot \frac{\alpha_{0.5U} - (\alpha_{0.5U} - \alpha_{0.5mon}) \cdot \left[ \frac{\alpha_{0.5U}(1 - rnd_1) - \alpha_{0.5L}(1 - rnd_1)}{\alpha_{0.5U} - \alpha_{0.5mon}} \right]^{0.5}}{\alpha_{0.5mean}} \quad 1:3.2.5$$

where  $\alpha_{0.5}$  is the maximum half-hour rainfall fraction for the day,  $\alpha_{0.5mon}$  is the average maximum half-hour rainfall fraction for the month,  $rnd_1$  is a random number generated by the model each day,  $\alpha_{0.5L}$  is the smallest half-hour rainfall fraction that can be generated,  $\alpha_{0.5U}$  is the largest half-hour fraction that can be generated, and  $\alpha_{0.5mean}$  is the average of  $\alpha_{0.5L}$ ,  $\alpha_{0.5mon}$ , and  $\alpha_{0.5U}$ .

Table 1:3-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to generation of maximum half-hour rainfall.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
ISED_DET	Code governing calculation of daily maximum half-hour rainfall: 0-generate daily value 1-use monthly maximum half-hour rainfall value	.bsn
RAINHHMX(mon)	$R_{0.5x}$ : extreme half-hour rainfall for month (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.wgn
ADJ_PKR	$adj_{0.5a}$ : peak rate adjustment factor	.bsn
PCPMM(mon)	average amount of precipitation falling in month (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.wgn
PCPD(mon)	$days_{wei}$ : average number of days of precipitation in month ( $\mu_{mon} = PCPMM / PCPD$ )	.wgn
RAIN_YRS	$yrs$ : number of years of data used to obtain values for RAINHHMX	.wgn
PRECIPITATION	$R_{day}$ : amount of rain falling on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.pcp

## **1:3.3 DISTRIBUTION OF RAINFALL WITHIN DAY**

For simulations where the timing of rainfall within the day is required, the daily rainfall value must be partitioned into shorter time increments. The method used in SWAT to disaggregate storm data was taken from CLIGEN (Nicks et al., 1995).

A double exponential function is used to represent the intensity patterns within a storm. With the double exponential distribution, rainfall intensity exponentially increases with time to a maximum, or peak, intensity. Once the peak intensity is reached, the rainfall intensity exponentially decreases with time until the end of the storm.

The exponential equations governing rainfall intensity during a storm event are:

$$i(T) = \begin{cases} i_{mx} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{T - T_{peak}}{\delta_1}\right] & 0 \leq T \leq T_{peak} \\ i_{mx} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{T_{peak} - T}{\delta_2}\right] & T_{peak} < T < T_{dur} \end{cases} \quad 1:3.3.1$$

where  $i$  is the rainfall intensity at time  $T$  (mm/hr),  $i_{mx}$  is the maximum or peak rainfall intensity during the storm (mm/hr),  $T$  is the time since the beginning of the storm (hr),  $T_{peak}$  is the time from the beginning of the storm till the peak rainfall intensity occurs (hr),  $T_{dur}$  is the duration of the storm (hr), and  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  are equation coefficients (hr).

The maximum or peak rainfall intensity during the storm is calculated assuming the peak rainfall intensity is equivalent to the rainfall intensity used to calculate the peak runoff rate. The equations used to calculate the intensity are reviewed in Chapter 2:1 (section 2:1.3.3).

### **1:3.3.1 NORMALIZED INTENSITY DISTRIBUTION**

The rainfall intensity distribution given in equation 1:3.3.1 can be normalized to eliminate units. To do this, all time values are divided, or

normalized, by the storm duration and all intensity values are normalized by the average storm intensity. For example,

$$\hat{i} = \frac{i}{i_{ave}} \quad 1:3.3.2$$

$$\hat{t} = \frac{T}{T_{dur}} \quad 1:3.3.3$$

where  $\hat{i}$  is the normalized rainfall intensity at time  $\hat{t}$ ,  $i$  is the rainfall intensity at time  $T$  (mm/hr),  $i_{ave}$  is the average storm rainfall intensity (mm/hr),  $\hat{t}$  is the time during the storm expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0),  $T$  is the time since the beginning of the storm (hr), and  $T_{dur}$  is the duration of the storm (hr).

The normalized storm intensity distribution is

$$\hat{i}(\hat{t}) = \begin{cases} \hat{i}_{mx} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\hat{t} - \hat{t}_{peak}}{d_1}\right] & 0 \leq \hat{t} \leq \hat{t}_{peak} \\ \hat{i}_{mx} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\hat{t}_{peak} - \hat{t}}{d_2}\right] & \hat{t}_{peak} < \hat{t} < 1.0 \end{cases} \quad 1:3.3.4$$

where  $\hat{i}$  is the normalized rainfall intensity at time  $\hat{t}$ ,  $\hat{i}_{mx}$  is the normalized maximum or peak rainfall intensity during the storm,  $\hat{t}$  is the time during the storm expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0),  $\hat{t}_{peak}$  is the time from the beginning of the storm till the peak intensity expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0),  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are equation coefficients. The relationship between the original equation coefficients and the normalized equation coefficients is:

$$\delta_1 = d_1 \cdot T_{dur} \quad 1:3.3.5$$

$$\delta_2 = d_2 \cdot T_{dur} \quad 1:3.3.6$$

where  $\delta_1$  is the equation coefficient for rainfall intensity before peak intensity is reached (hr),  $d_1$  is the normalized equation coefficient for rainfall intensity before peak intensity is reached,  $\delta_2$  is the equation coefficient for rainfall intensity after

peak intensity is reached (hr),  $d_2$  is the normalized equation coefficient for rainfall intensity after peak intensity is reached, and  $T_{dur}$  is the storm duration (hr).

Values for the equation coefficients,  $d_1$  and  $d_2$ , can be determined by

isolating the coefficients in equation 1.3.3.4. At  $\hat{t} = 0.0$  and at  $\hat{t} = 1.0$ ,  $\frac{\hat{i}}{\hat{i}_{mx}} \approx 0.01$ .

$$d_1 = \frac{\hat{t} - \hat{t}_{peak}}{\ln\left(\frac{\hat{i}}{\hat{i}_{mx}}\right)} = \frac{0 - \hat{t}_{peak}}{\ln(0.01)} = \frac{\hat{t}_{peak}}{4.605} \quad 1.3.3.7$$

$$d_2 = \frac{\hat{t}_{peak} - \hat{t}}{\ln\left(\frac{\hat{i}}{\hat{i}_{mx}}\right)} = \frac{\hat{t}_{peak} - 1}{\ln(0.01)} = \frac{1.0 - \hat{t}_{peak}}{4.605} \quad 1.3.3.8$$

where  $d_1$  is the normalized equation coefficient for rainfall intensity before peak intensity is reached,  $d_2$  is the normalized equation coefficient for rainfall intensity after peak intensity is reached,  $\hat{t}$  is the time during the storm expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0),  $\hat{t}_{peak}$  is the time from the beginning of the storm till the peak intensity expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0),  $\hat{i}$  is the normalized rainfall intensity at time  $\hat{t}$ , and  $\hat{i}_{mx}$  is the normalized maximum or peak rainfall intensity during the storm.

### **1.3.3.2 GENERATED TIME TO PEAK INTENSITY**

The normalized time to peak intensity is calculated by SWAT using a triangular distribution. The triangular distribution used to generate the normalized time to peak intensity requires four inputs: average time to peak intensity expressed as a fraction of total storm duration ( $\hat{t}_{peakM}$ ), maximum time to peak intensity expressed as a fraction of total storm duration ( $\hat{t}_{peakU}$ ), minimum time to peak intensity expressed as a fraction of total storm duration ( $\hat{t}_{peakL}$ ), and a random number between 0.0 and 1.0.

The maximum time to peak intensity, or upper limit of the triangular distribution, is set at 0.95. The minimum time to peak intensity, or lower limit of

the triangular distribution is set at 0.05. The mean time to peak intensity is set at 0.25.

The triangular distribution uses one of two sets of equations to generate a

normalized peak intensity for the day. If  $rnd_1 \leq \left( \frac{\hat{t}_{peakM} - \hat{t}_{peakL}}{\hat{t}_{peakU} - \hat{t}_{peakL}} \right)$  then

$$\hat{t}_{peak} = \hat{t}_{peakM} \cdot \frac{\hat{t}_{peakL} + [rnd_1 \cdot (\hat{t}_{peakU} - \hat{t}_{peakL}) \cdot (\hat{t}_{peakM} - \hat{t}_{peakL})]^{0.5}}{\hat{t}_{peak,mean}} \quad 1:3.3.9$$

If  $rnd_1 > \left( \frac{\hat{t}_{peakM} - \hat{t}_{peakL}}{\hat{t}_{peakU} - \hat{t}_{peakL}} \right)$  then

$$\hat{t}_{peak} = \hat{t}_{peakM} \cdot \frac{\hat{t}_{peakU} - (\hat{t}_{peakU} - \hat{t}_{peakM}) \cdot \left[ \frac{\hat{t}_{peakU}(1 - rnd_1) - \hat{t}_{peakL}(1 - rnd_1)}{\hat{t}_{peakU} - \hat{t}_{peakM}} \right]^{0.5}}{\hat{t}_{peak,mean}} \quad 1:3.3.10$$

where  $\hat{t}_{peak}$  is the time from the beginning of the storm till the peak intensity expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0),  $\hat{t}_{peakM}$  is the average time to peak intensity expressed as a fraction of storm duration,  $rnd_1$  is a random number generated by the model each day,  $\hat{t}_{peakL}$  is the minimum time to peak intensity that can be generated,  $\hat{t}_{peakU}$  is the maximum time to peak intensity that can be generated, and  $\hat{t}_{peak,mean}$  is the mean of  $\hat{t}_{peakL}$ ,  $\hat{t}_{peakM}$ , and  $\hat{t}_{peakU}$ .

### **1:3.3.3 TOTAL RAINFALL AND DURATION**

The volume of rain is related to rainfall intensity by:

$$R_T = \int_0^T i \, dT \quad 1:3.3.11$$

where  $R_T$  is the amount of rain that has fallen at time  $T$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $i$  is the rainfall intensity at time  $T$  (mm/hr).

Using the definition for rainfall intensity given in equation 1:3.3.1, equation 1:3.3.11 can be integrated to get:

$$R_T = \begin{cases} R_{T_{peak}} - i_{mx} \cdot \delta_1 \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{(T - T_{peak})}{\delta_1} \right] \right) & 0 \leq T \leq T_{peak} \\ R_{T_{peak}} + i_{mx} \cdot \delta_2 \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{(T_{peak} - T)}{\delta_2} \right] \right) & T_{peak} < T \leq T_{dur} \end{cases} \quad 1.3.3.12$$

where  $R_T$  is the cumulative amount of rain that has fallen at time  $T$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $R_{T_{peak}}$  is the amount of rain that has fallen at time  $T_{peak}$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $i_{mx}$  is the maximum or peak rainfall intensity during the storm (mm/hr),  $\delta_1$  is the equation coefficient for rainfall intensity before peak intensity is reached (hr),  $\delta_2$  is the equation coefficient for rainfall intensity after peak intensity is reached (hr),  $T_{peak}$  is the time from the beginning of the storm till the peak rainfall intensity occurs (hr), and  $T_{dur}$  is the storm duration (hr). The time to peak intensity is defined as

$$T_{peak} = \hat{t}_{peak} \cdot T_{dur} \quad 1.3.3.13$$

where  $T_{peak}$  is the time from the beginning of the storm till the peak rainfall intensity occurs (hr),  $\hat{t}_{peak}$  is the time from the beginning of the storm till the peak intensity expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0), and  $T_{dur}$  is the storm duration (hr). The cumulative volume of rain that has fallen at  $T_{peak}$  is

$$R_{T_{peak}} = \hat{t}_{peak} \cdot R_{day} \quad 1.3.3.14$$

where  $R_{T_{peak}}$  is the amount of rain that has fallen at time  $T_{peak}$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\hat{t}_{peak}$  is the time from the beginning of the storm till the peak intensity expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0), and  $R_{day}$  is the total rainfall on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The total rainfall for the day can be defined mathematically by integrating equation 1.3.3.11 and solving for the entire storm duration:

$$R_{day} = i_{mx} \cdot (\delta_1 + \delta_2) = i_{mx} \cdot T_{dur} \cdot (d_1 + d_2) \quad 1.3.3.15$$

where  $R_{day}$  is the rainfall on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $i_{mx}$  is the maximum or peak rainfall intensity during the storm (mm/hr),  $\delta_1$  is the equation coefficient for rainfall intensity before peak intensity is reached (hr),  $\delta_2$  is the equation coefficient for rainfall intensity after peak intensity is reached (hr),  $d_1$  is the normalized equation coefficient for rainfall intensity before peak intensity is reached,  $d_2$  is the

normalized equation coefficient for rainfall intensity after peak intensity is reached, and  $T_{dur}$  is the storm duration (hr). This equation can be rearranged to calculate the storm duration:

$$T_{dur} = \frac{R_{day}}{i_{mx} \cdot (d_1 + d_2)} \quad 1:3.3.16$$

Table 1:3-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to generation of maximum half-hour rainfall.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
PRECIPITATION	$R_{day}$ : amount of rain falling on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.pcp

## 1:3.4 SOLAR RADIATION & TEMPERATURE

---

The procedure used to generate daily values for maximum temperature, minimum temperature and solar radiation (Richardson, 1981; Richardson and Wright, 1984) is based on the weakly stationary generating process presented by Matalas (1967).

### 1:3.4.1 DAILY RESIDUALS

Residuals for maximum temperature, minimum temperature and solar radiation are required for calculation of daily values. The residuals must be serially correlated and cross-correlated with the correlations being constant at all locations. The equation used to calculate residuals is:

$$\chi_i(j) = A\chi_{i-1}(j) + B\varepsilon_i(j) \quad 1:3.4.1$$

where  $\chi_i(j)$  is a  $3 \times 1$  matrix for day  $i$  whose elements are residuals of maximum temperature ( $j = 1$ ), minimum temperature ( $j = 2$ ) and solar radiation ( $j = 3$ ),  $\chi_{i-1}(j)$  is a  $3 \times 1$  matrix of the previous day's residuals,  $\varepsilon_i$  is a  $3 \times 1$  matrix of independent random components, and  $A$  and  $B$  are  $3 \times 3$  matrices whose elements are defined such that the new sequences have the desired serial-correlation and cross-correlation coefficients. The  $A$  and  $B$  matrices are given by

$$A = M_1 \cdot M_0^{-1} \quad 1:3.4.2$$

$$B \cdot B^T = M_0 - M_1 \cdot M_0^{-1} \cdot M_1^T \quad 1:3.4.3$$

where the superscript  $-1$  denotes the inverse of the matrix and the superscript  $T$  denotes the transpose of the matrix.  $M_0$  and  $M_1$  are defined as

$$M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho_0(1,2) & \rho_0(1,3) \\ \rho_0(1,2) & 1 & \rho_0(2,3) \\ \rho_0(1,3) & \rho_0(2,3) & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad 1.3.4.4$$

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_1(1,1) & \rho_1(1,2) & \rho_1(1,3) \\ \rho_1(2,1) & \rho_1(2,2) & \rho_1(2,3) \\ \rho_1(3,1) & \rho_1(3,2) & \rho_1(3,3) \end{bmatrix} \quad 1.3.4.5$$

$\rho_0(j,k)$  is the correlation coefficient between variables  $j$  and  $k$  on the same day where  $j$  and  $k$  may be set to 1 (maximum temperature), 2 (minimum temperature) or 3 (solar radiation) and  $\rho_1(j,k)$  is the correlation coefficient between variable  $j$  and  $k$  with variable  $k$  lagged one day with respect to variable  $j$ .

Correlation coefficients were determined for 31 locations in the United States using 20 years of temperature and solar radiation data (Richardson, 1982).

Using the average values of these coefficients, the  $M_0$  and  $M_1$  matrices become

$$M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.000 & 0.633 & 0.186 \\ 0.633 & 1.000 & -0.193 \\ 0.186 & -0.193 & 1.000 \end{bmatrix} \quad 1.3.4.6$$

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.621 & 0.445 & 0.087 \\ 0.563 & 0.674 & -0.100 \\ 0.015 & -0.091 & 0.251 \end{bmatrix} \quad 1.3.4.7$$

Using equations 1.3.4.2 and 1.3.4.3, the  $A$  and  $B$  matrices become

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.567 & 0.086 & -0.002 \\ 0.253 & 0.504 & -0.050 \\ -0.006 & -0.039 & 0.244 \end{bmatrix} \quad 1.3.4.8$$

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.781 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.328 & 0.637 & 0 \\ 0.238 & -0.341 & 0.873 \end{bmatrix} \quad 1.3.4.9$$

The  $A$  and  $B$  matrices defined in equations 1.3.4.8 and 1.3.4.9 are used in conjunction with equation 1.3.4.1 to generate daily sequences of residuals of maximum temperature, minimum temperature and solar radiation.

### **1:3.4.2 GENERATED VALUES**

The daily generated values are determined by multiplying the residual elements generated with equation 1:3.4.1 by the monthly standard deviation and adding the monthly average value.

$$T_{mx} = \mu mx_{mon} + \chi_i(1) \cdot \sigma mx_{mon} \quad 1:3.4.10$$

$$T_{mn} = \mu mn_{mon} + \chi_i(2) \cdot \sigma mn_{mon} \quad 1:3.4.11$$

$$H_{day} = \mu rad_{mon} + \chi_i(3) \cdot \sigma rad_{mon} \quad 1:3.4.12$$

where  $T_{mx}$  is the maximum temperature for the day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $\mu mx_{mon}$  is the average daily maximum temperature for the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $\chi_i(1)$  is the residual for maximum temperature on the given day,  $\sigma mx_{mon}$  is the standard deviation for daily maximum temperature during the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $T_{mn}$  is the minimum temperature for the day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $\mu mn_{mon}$  is the average daily minimum temperature for the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $\chi_i(2)$  is the residual for minimum temperature on the given day,  $\sigma mn_{mon}$  is the standard deviation for daily minimum temperature during the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $H_{day}$  is the solar radiation for the day ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ),  $\mu rad_{mon}$  is the average daily solar radiation for the month ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ),  $\chi_i(3)$  is the residual for solar radiation on the given day, and  $\sigma rad_{mon}$  is the standard deviation for daily solar radiation during the month ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ).

The user is required to input standard deviation for maximum and minimum temperature. For solar radiation the standard deviation is estimated as  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the difference between the extreme and mean value for each month.

$$\sigma rad_{mon} = \frac{H_{mx} - \mu rad_{mon}}{4} \quad 1:3.4.13$$

where  $\sigma rad_{mon}$  is the standard deviation for daily solar radiation during the month ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ),  $H_{mx}$  is the maximum solar radiation that can reach the earth's surface on a given day ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ), and  $\mu rad_{mon}$  is the average daily solar radiation for the month ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ).

### **1.3.4.3 ADJUSTMENT FOR CLEAR/OVERCAST CONDITIONS**

Maximum temperature and solar radiation will be lower on overcast days than on clear days. To incorporate the influence of wet/dry days on generated values of maximum temperature and solar radiation, the average daily maximum temperature,  $\mu mx_{mon}$ , and average daily solar radiation,  $\mu rad_{mon}$ , in equations 1.3.4.10 and 1.3.4.12 are adjusted for wet or dry conditions.

#### **1.3.4.3.1 MAXIMUM TEMPERATURE**

The continuity equation relates average daily maximum temperature adjusted for wet or dry conditions to the average daily maximum temperature for the month:

$$\mu mx_{mon} \cdot days_{tot} = \mu Wmx_{mon} \cdot days_{wet} + \mu Dmx_{mon} \cdot days_{dry} \quad 1.3.4.14$$

where  $\mu mx_{mon}$  is the average daily maximum temperature for the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $days_{tot}$  are the total number of days in the month,  $\mu Wmx_{mon}$  is the average daily maximum temperature of the month on wet days ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $days_{wet}$  are the number of wet days in the month,  $\mu Dmx_{mon}$  is the average daily maximum temperature of the month on dry days ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $days_{dry}$  are the number of dry days in the month.

The wet day average maximum temperature is assumed to be less than the dry day average maximum temperature by some fraction of ( $\mu mx_{mon} - \mu mn_{mon}$ ):

$$\mu Wmx_{mon} = \mu Dmx_{mon} - b_T \cdot (\mu mx_{mon} - \mu mn_{mon}) \quad 1.3.4.15$$

where  $\mu Wmx_{mon}$  is the average daily maximum temperature of the month on wet days ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $\mu Dmx_{mon}$  is the average daily maximum temperature of the month on dry days ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $b_T$  is a scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in temperature caused by the presence or absence of precipitation,  $\mu mx_{mon}$  is the average daily maximum temperature for the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $\mu mn_{mon}$  is the average daily minimum temperature for the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The scaling factor,  $b_T$ , is set to 0.5 in SWAT.

To calculate the dry day average maximum temperature, equations 1:3.4.14 and 1:3.4.15 are combined and solved for  $\mu Dmx_{mon}$ :

$$\mu Dmx_{mon} = \mu mnx_{mon} + b_T \cdot \frac{days_{wet}}{days_{tot}} \cdot (\mu mnx_{mon} - \mu mn_{mon}) \quad 1:3.4.16$$

Incorporating the modified values into equation 1:3.4.10, SWAT calculates the maximum temperature for a wet day using the equation:

$$T_{mx} = \mu Wmx_{mon} + \chi_i(1) \cdot \sigma mx_{mon} \quad 1:3.4.17$$

and the maximum temperature for a dry day using the equation:

$$T_{mx} = \mu Dmx_{mon} + \chi_i(1) \cdot \sigma mx_{mon} \quad 1:3.4.18$$

### 1:3.4.3.2 SOLAR RADIATION

The continuity equation relates average daily solar radiation adjusted for wet or dry conditions to the average daily solar radiation for the month:

$$\mu rad_{mon} \cdot days_{tot} = \mu Wrad_{mon} \cdot days_{wet} + \mu Drad_{mon} \cdot days_{dry} \quad 1:3.4.19$$

where  $\mu rad_{mon}$  is the average daily solar radiation for the month ( $MJ\ m^{-2}$ ),  $days_{tot}$  are the total number of days in the month,  $\mu Wrad_{mon}$  is the average daily solar radiation of the month on wet days ( $MJ\ m^{-2}$ ),  $days_{wet}$  are the number of wet days in the month,  $\mu Drad_{mon}$  is the average daily solar radiation of the month on dry days ( $MJ\ m^{-2}$ ), and  $days_{dry}$  are the number of dry days in the month.

The wet day average solar radiation is assumed to be less than the dry day average solar radiation by some fraction:

$$\mu Wrad_{mon} = b_R \cdot \mu Drad_{mon} \quad 1:3.4.20$$

where  $\mu Wrad_{mon}$  is the average daily solar radiation of the month on wet days ( $MJ\ m^{-2}$ ),  $\mu Drad_{mon}$  is the average daily solar radiation of the month on dry days ( $MJ\ m^{-2}$ ), and  $b_R$  is a scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in solar radiation caused by the presence or absence of precipitation. The scaling factor,  $b_R$ , is set to 0.5 in SWAT.

To calculate the dry day average solar radiation, equations 1:3.4.19 and 1:3.4.20 are combined and solved for  $\mu Drad_{mon}$ :

$$\mu Drad_{mon} = \frac{\mu rad_{mon} \cdot days_{tot}}{b_R \cdot days_{wet} + days_{dry}} \quad 1:3.4.21$$

Incorporating the modified values into equation 1:3.4.12, SWAT calculated the solar radiation on a wet day using the equation:

$$H_{day} = \mu Wrad_{mon} + \chi_i(3) \cdot \sigma rad_{mon} \quad 1:3.4.22$$

and the solar radiation on a dry day using the equation:

$$H_{day} = \mu Drad_{mon} + \chi_i(3) \cdot \sigma rad_{mon} \quad 1:3.4.23$$

Table 1:3-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to generation of temperature and solar radiation.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
TMPSIM	Temperature input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
SLRSIM	Solar radiation input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
TM PM X(mon)	$\mu mx_{mon}$ : average maximum air temperature for month (°C)	.wgn
TMPSTD MX(mon)	$\sigma mx_{mon}$ : standard deviation for maximum air temperature in month (°C)	.wgn
TM PM N(mon)	$\mu mn_{mon}$ : average minimum air temperature for month (°C)	.wgn
TMPSTD MN(mon)	$\sigma mn_{mon}$ : standard deviation for minimum air temperature in month (°C)	.wgn
SOLARAV(mon)	$\mu rad_{mon}$ : average daily solar radiation for month (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> )	.wgn
PCPD(mon)	$days_{wet}$ : average number of days of precipitation in month	.wgn

## 1:3.5 RELATIVE HUMIDITY

Relative humidity is required by SWAT when the Penman-Monteith equation is used to calculate potential evapotranspiration. It is also used to calculate the vapor pressure deficit on plant growth. Daily average relative humidity values are calculated from a triangular distribution using average monthly relative humidity. This method was developed by J.R. Williams for the EPIC model (Sharpley and Williams, 1990).

### 1:3.5.1 MEAN MONTHLY RELATIVE HUMIDITY

Relative humidity is defined as the ratio of the actual vapor pressure to the saturation vapor pressure at a given temperature:

$$R_{hmon} = \frac{e_{mon}}{e_{mon}^o} \quad 1:3.5.1$$

where  $R_{hmon}$  is the average relative humidity for the month,  $e_{mon}$  is the actual vapor pressure at the mean monthly temperature (kPa), and  $e_{mon}^o$  is the saturation vapor pressure at the mean monthly temperature (kPa). The saturation vapor pressure,  $e_{mon}^o$ , is related to the mean monthly air temperature with the equation:

$$e_{mon}^o = \exp \left[ \frac{16.78 \cdot \mu tmp_{mon} - 116.9}{\mu tmp_{mon} + 237.3} \right] \quad 1:3.5.2$$

where  $e_{mon}^o$  is the saturation vapor pressure at the mean monthly temperature (kPa), and  $\mu tmp_{mon}$  is the mean air temperature for the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The mean air temperature for the month is calculated by averaging the mean maximum monthly temperature,  $\mu mx_{mon}$ , and the mean minimum monthly temperature,  $\mu mn_{mon}$ .

The dew point temperature is the temperature at which the actual vapor pressure present in the atmosphere is equal to the saturation vapor pressure. Therefore, by substituting the dew point temperature in place of the average monthly temperature in equation 1:3.5.2, the actual vapor pressure may be calculated:

$$e_{mon} = \exp \left[ \frac{16.78 \cdot \mu dew_{mon} - 116.9}{\mu dew_{mon} + 237.3} \right] \quad 1:3.5.3$$

where  $e_{mon}$  is the actual vapor pressure at the mean month temperature (kPa), and  $\mu dew_{mon}$  is the average dew point temperature for the month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

### **1:3.5.2 GENERATED DAILY VALUE**

The triangular distribution used to generate daily relative humidity values requires four inputs: mean monthly relative humidity, maximum relative humidity value allowed in month, minimum relative humidity value allowed in month, and a random number between 0.0 and 1.0.

The maximum relative humidity value, or upper limit of the triangular distribution, is calculated from the mean monthly relative humidity with the equation:

$$R_{hUmon} = R_{hmon} + (1 - R_{hmon}) \cdot \exp(R_{hmon} - 1) \quad 1.3.5.4$$

where  $R_{hUmon}$  is the largest relative humidity value that can be generated on a given day in the month, and  $R_{hmon}$  is the average relative humidity for the month.

The minimum relative humidity value, or lower limit of the triangular distribution, is calculated from the mean monthly relative humidity with the equation:

$$R_{hLmon} = R_{hmon} \cdot (1 - \exp(-R_{hmon})) \quad 1.3.5.5$$

where  $R_{hLmon}$  is the smallest relative humidity value that can be generated on a given day in the month, and  $R_{hmon}$  is the average relative humidity for the month.

The triangular distribution uses one of two sets of equations to generate a

relative humidity value for the day. If  $rnd_1 \leq \left( \frac{R_{hmon} - R_{hLmon}}{R_{hUmon} - R_{hLmon}} \right)$  then

$$R_h = R_{hmon} \cdot \frac{R_{hLmon} + [rnd_1 \cdot (R_{hUmon} - R_{hLmon}) \cdot (R_{hmon} - R_{hLmon})]^{0.5}}{R_{hmon,mean}} \quad 1.3.5.6$$

If  $rnd_1 > \left( \frac{R_{hmon} - R_{hLmon}}{R_{hUmon} - R_{hLmon}} \right)$  then

$$R_h = R_{hmon} \cdot \frac{R_{hUmon} - (R_{hUmon} - R_{hmon}) \cdot \left[ \frac{R_{hUmon}(1 - rnd_1) - R_{hLmon}(1 - rnd_1)}{R_{hUmon} - R_{hmon}} \right]^{0.5}}{R_{hmon,mean}} \quad 1.3.5.7$$

where  $R_h$  is the average relative humidity calculated for the day,  $rnd_1$  is a random number generated by the model each day,  $R_{hmon}$  is the average relative humidity for the month,  $R_{hLmon}$  is the smallest relative humidity value that can be generated on a given day in the month,  $R_{hUmon}$  is the largest relative humidity value that can be generated on a given day in the month, and  $R_{hmon,mean}$  is the mean of  $R_{hLmon}$ ,  $R_{hmon}$ , and  $R_{hUmon}$ .

### **1.3.5.3 ADJUSTMENT FOR CLEAR/OVERCAST CONDITIONS**

To incorporate the effect of clear and overcast weather on generated values of relative humidity, monthly average relative humidity values can be adjusted for wet or dry conditions.

The continuity equation relates average relative humidity adjusted for wet or dry conditions to the average relative humidity for the month:

$$R_{hmon} \cdot days_{tot} = R_{hWmon} \cdot days_{wet} + R_{hDmon} \cdot days_{dry} \quad 1:3.5.8$$

where  $R_{hmon}$  is the average relative humidity for the month,  $days_{tot}$  are the total number of days in the month,  $R_{hWmon}$  is the average relative humidity for the month on wet days,  $days_{wet}$  are the number of wet days in the month,  $R_{hDmon}$  is the average relative humidity of the month on dry days, and  $days_{dry}$  are the number of dry days in the month.

The wet day average relative humidity is assumed to be greater than the dry day average relative humidity by some fraction:

$$R_{hWmon} = R_{hDmon} + b_H \cdot (1 - R_{hDmon}) \quad 1:3.5.9$$

where  $R_{hWmon}$  is the average relative humidity of the month on wet days,  $R_{hDmon}$  is the average relative humidity of the month on dry days, and  $b_H$  is a scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in relative humidity caused by the presence or absence of precipitation. The scaling factor,  $b_H$ , is set to 0.9 in SWAT.

To calculate the dry day relative humidity, equations 1:3.5.8 and 1:3.5.9 are combined and solved for  $R_{hDmon}$ :

$$R_{hDmon} = \left( R_{hmon} - b_H \cdot \frac{days_{wet}}{days_{tot}} \right) \cdot \left( 1.0 - b_H \cdot \frac{days_{wet}}{days_{tot}} \right)^{-1} \quad 1:3.5.10$$

To reflect the impact of wet or dry conditions, SWAT will replace  $R_{hmon}$  with  $R_{hWmon}$  on wet days or  $R_{hDmon}$  on dry days in equations 1:3.5.4 through 1:3.5.7.

Table 1:3-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to generation of relative humidity.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
RHSIM	Relative humidity input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
TMPMN(mon)	$\mu mn_{mon}$ : average minimum air temperature for month (°C)	.wgn
TMPMX(mon)	$\mu mx_{mon}$ : average maximum air temperature for month (°C)	.wgn
DEWPT(mon)	$\mu dew_{mon}$ : average dew point temperature for month (°C)	.wgn
PCPD(mon)	$days_{wet}$ : average number of days of precipitation in month	.wgn

## 1:3.6 WIND SPEED

---

Wind speed is required by SWAT when the Penman-Monteith equation is used to calculate potential evapotranspiration. Mean daily wind speed is generated in SWAT using a modified exponential equation:

$$\mu_{10m} = \mu_{wind_{mon}} \cdot (-\ln(rnd_1))^{0.3} \quad 1:3.6.1$$

where  $\mu_{10m}$  is the mean wind speed for the day ( $m s^{-1}$ ),  $\mu_{wind_{mon}}$  is the average wind speed for the month ( $m s^{-1}$ ), and  $rnd_1$  is a random number between 0.0 and 1.0.

Table 1:3-6: SWAT input variables that pertain to generation of wind speed.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
WNDSIM	Wind speed input code: 1-measured, 2-generated	file.cio
WNDAV(mon)	$\mu_{wind_{mon}}$ : Average wind speed in month (m/s)	.wgn

## 1:3.7 NOMENCLATURE

---

- A  $3 \times 3$  matrix of elements defined to ensure serial and cross correlation of generated temperature and radiation values  $A = M_1 \cdot M_0^{-1}$
- B  $3 \times 3$  matrix of elements defined to ensure serial and cross correlation of generated temperature and radiation values  $B \cdot B^T = M_0 - M_1 \cdot M_0^{-1} \cdot M_1^T$
- $H_{day}$  Solar radiation reaching ground on current day of simulation ( $MJ m^{-2} d^{-1}$ )
- $H_{MX}$  Maximum possible solar radiation ( $MJ m^{-2} d^{-1}$ )
- $M_0$   $3 \times 3$  matrix of correlation coefficients between maximum temperature, minimum temperature and solar radiation on same day
- $M_1$   $3 \times 3$  matrix of correlation coefficients between maximum temperature, minimum temperature and solar radiation on consecutive days
- $P_i(D/D)$  Probability of a dry day on day  $i$  given a dry day on day  $i - 1$
- $P_i(D/W)$  Probability of a dry day on day  $i$  given a wet day on day  $i - 1$
- $P_i(W/D)$  Probability of a wet day on day  $i$  given a dry day on day  $i - 1$
- $P_i(W/W)$  Probability of a wet day on day  $i$  given a wet day on day  $i - 1$
- $R_{0.5sm}$  Smoothed maximum half-hour rainfall for a given month (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)
- $R_{0.5x}$  Extreme maximum half-hour rainfall for the specified month (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)
- $R_{day}$  Amount of rainfall on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)
- $R_h$  Average relative humidity for the day
- $R_{hDmon}$  Average relative humidity of the month on dry days
- $R_{hLmon}$  Smallest relative humidity value that can be generated on a given day in the month
- $R_{hUmon}$  Largest relative humidity value that can be generated on a given day in the month
- $R_{hWmon}$  Average relative humidity for the month on wet days

$R_{hmon}$	Average relative humidity for the month
$R_{hmon,mean}$	Mean of $R_{hLmon}$ , $R_{hmon}$ , and $R_{hUmon}$
$SND_{day}$	Standard normal deviate for the day
$T$	Time since the beginning of the storm (hr)
$T_{dur}$	Duration of the storm (hr)
$T_{mn}$	Minimum air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}$ C)
$T_{mx}$	Maximum air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}$ C)
$T_{peak}$	Time from the beginning of the storm till the peak rainfall intensity occurs (hr)
$adj_{0.5\alpha}$	Peak rate adjustment factor
$b_H$	Scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in relative humidity caused by the presence or absence of precipitation
$b_R$	Scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in solar radiation caused by the presence or absence of precipitation
$b_T$	Scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in temperature caused by the presence or absence of precipitation
$d_1$	Equation coefficient for normalized rainfall intensity distribution before peak intensity is reached
$d_2$	Equation coefficient for normalized rainfall intensity distribution after peak intensity is reached
$days_{dry}$	Number of dry days in the month
$days_{tot}$	Total number of days in the month
$days_{wet}$	Number of wet days in the month
$e_{mon}$	Actual vapor pressure at the mean monthly temperature (kPa)
$e_{mon}^o$	Saturation vapor pressure at the mean monthly temperature (kPa)
$g_{mon}$	Skew coefficient for daily precipitation in the month
$\hat{i}$	Normalized rainfall intensity at time $\hat{t}$
$\hat{i}_{mx}$	Normalized maximum or peak rainfall intensity during the storm
$rexp$	Exponent for exponential precipitation distribution
$rnd_1$	Random number between 0.0 and 1.0
$rnd_2$	Random number between 0.0 and 1.0
$\hat{t}$	Time during the storm expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0)
$\hat{t}_{peak}$	Time from the beginning of the storm till the peak intensity expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0)
$\hat{t}_{peak,mean}$	Mean of $\hat{t}_{peakL}$ , $\hat{t}_{peakM}$ , and $\hat{t}_{peakU}$
$\hat{t}_{peakL}$	Minimum time to peak intensity that can be generated
$\hat{t}_{peakM}$	Average time to peak intensity expressed as a fraction of storm duration
$\hat{t}_{peakU}$	Maximum time to peak intensity that can be generated
$yrs$	Number of years of rainfall data used to obtain values for monthly extreme half-hour rainfalls
$\alpha_{0.5}$	Maximum half-hour rainfall expressed as a fraction of daily rainfall
$\alpha_{0.5L}$	Smallest half-hour rainfall fraction that can be generated on a given day

- $\alpha_{0.5mon}$  Average maximum half-hour rainfall fraction for the month
- $\alpha_{0.5mean}$  Mean of  $\alpha_{0.5L}$ ,  $\alpha_{0.5mon}$ ,  $\alpha_{0.5U}$
- $\alpha_{0.5U}$  Largest half-hour rainfall fraction that can be generated on a given day
- $\delta_1$  Equation coefficient for rainfall intensity before peak intensity is reached (hr)
- $\delta_2$  Equation coefficient for rainfall intensity after peak intensity is reached (hr)
- $\varepsilon_i$   $3 \times 1$  matrix of independent random components
- $\sigma_{mon}$  Standard deviation of daily rainfall (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) for the month
- $\sigma_{mn}_{mon}$  Standard deviation for daily minimum temperature during the month (°C)
- $\sigma_{mx}_{mon}$  Standard deviation for daily maximum temperature during the month (°C)
- $\sigma_{rad}_{mon}$  Standard deviation for daily solar radiation during the month (MJ m<sup>-2</sup>)
- $\rho_0(j,k)$  Correlation coefficient between variables  $j$  and  $k$  on the same day where  $j$  and  $k$  may be set to 1 (maximum temperature), 2 (minimum temperature) or 3 (solar radiation)
- $\rho_1(j,k)$  Correlation coefficient between variable  $j$  and  $k$  with variable  $k$  lagged one day with respect to variable  $j$
- $\mu_{mon}$  Mean daily rainfall (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) for the month
- $\mu Dmx_{mon}$  Average daily maximum temperature of the month on dry days (°C)
- $\mu Drad_{mon}$  Average daily solar radiation of the month on dry days (MJ m<sup>-2</sup>)
- $\mu Wmx_{mon}$  Average daily maximum temperature of the month on wet days (°C)
- $\mu Wradi_{mon}$  Average daily solar radiation of the month on wet days (MJ m<sup>-2</sup>)
- $\mu dew_{mon}$  Average dew point temperature for the month (°C)
- $\mu mn_{mon}$  Average daily minimum temperature for the month (°C)
- $\mu mx_{mon}$  Average daily maximum temperature for the month (°C)
- $\mu rad_{mon}$  Average daily solar radiation for the month (MJ m<sup>-2</sup>)
- $\mu tmp_{mon}$  Mean air temperature for the month (°C)
- $\mu wnd_{mon}$  Average wind speed for the month (m s<sup>-1</sup>)
- $\mu_{10m}$  Mean wind speed for the day at height of 10 meters (m s<sup>-1</sup>)
- $\chi_i(j)$   $3 \times 1$  matrix for day  $i$  whose elements are residuals of maximum temperature ( $j = 1$ ), minimum temperature ( $j = 2$ ) and solar radiation ( $j = 3$ ),

## 1:3.8 REFERENCES

---

- Fiering, M.B. 1967. Streamflow synthesis. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Matalas, N.C. 1967. Mathematical assessment of synthetic hydrology. Water Resources Res. 3(4):937-945.
- Nicks, A.D. 1974. Stochastic generation of the occurrence, pattern, and location of maximum amount of daily rainfall. p. 154-171. In Proc. Symp. Statistical Hydrology, Aug.-Sept. 1971, Tuscon, AZ. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Misc. Publ. No. 1275.

- Nicks, A.D., L.J. Lane, and G.A. Gander. 1995. Chapter 2: Weather generator. p. 2.1-2.22. *In* D.C. Flanagan and M.A. Nearing (ed.) USDA-Water Erosion Prediction Project: Hillslope profile and watershed model documentation. NSERL Report #10, National Soil Erosion Research Laboratory, West Lafayette, IN.
- Richardson, C.W. 1982. Dependence structure of daily temperature and solar radiation. *Trans. ASAE* 25(3):735-739.
- Richardson, C.W. 1981. Stochastic simulation of daily precipitation, temperature, and solar radiation. *Water Resources Res.* 17(1):182-190.
- Richardson, C.W. and D.A. Wright. 1984. WGEN: a model for generating daily weather variables. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, ARS-8.
- Sharpley, A.N. and J.R. Williams, eds. 1990. EPIC-Erosion Productivity Impact Calculator, 1. model documentation. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Tech. Bull. 1768.
- Williams, J.R. 1995. Chapter 25. The EPIC Model. p. 909-1000. *In* Computer Models of Watershed Hydrology. Water Resources Publications. Highlands Ranch, CO.



# **SECTION 1 CHAPTER 4**

## **EQUATIONS:**

## **CLIMATE CUSTOMIZATION**

---

SWAT is capable of simulating a number of climate customization options. Orographic impacts on temperature and precipitation for watersheds in mountainous regions can be simulated. The model will also modify climate inputs for simulations that are looking at the impact of climatic change in a given watershed. Finally, SWAT allows a weather forecast period to be incorporated into a simulation to study the effects of predicted weather in a watershed.

## 1:4.1 ELEVATION BANDS

---

Orographic precipitation is a significant phenomenon in certain areas of the world. To account for orographic effects on both precipitation and temperature, SWAT allows up to 10 elevation bands to be defined in each subbasin. Precipitation and maximum and minimum temperatures are calculated for each band as a function of the respective lapse rate and the difference between the gage elevation and the average elevation specified for the band. For precipitation,

$$R_{band} = R_{day} + (EL_{band} - EL_{gage}) \cdot \frac{plaps}{days_{pcp, yr} \cdot 1000} \quad \text{when } R_{day} > 0.01 \quad 1:4.1.1$$

where  $R_{band}$  is the precipitation falling in the elevation band (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $R_{day}$  is the precipitation recorded at the gage or generated from gage data (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $EL_{band}$  is the mean elevation in the elevation band (m),  $EL_{gage}$  is the elevation at the recording gage (m),  $plaps$  is the precipitation lapse rate (mm H<sub>2</sub>O/km),  $days_{pcp, yr}$  is the average number of days of precipitation in the subbasin in a year, and 1000 is a factor needed to convert meters to kilometers. For temperature,

$$T_{mx,band} = T_{mx} + (EL_{band} - EL_{gage}) \cdot \frac{tlaps}{1000} \quad 1:4.1.2$$

$$T_{mn,band} = T_{mn} + (EL_{band} - EL_{gage}) \cdot \frac{tlaps}{1000} \quad 1:4.1.3$$

$$\bar{T}_{av,band} = \bar{T}_{av} + (EL_{band} - EL_{gage}) \cdot \frac{tlaps}{1000} \quad 1:4.1.4$$

where  $T_{mx,band}$  is the maximum daily temperature in the elevation band (°C),  $T_{mn,band}$  is the minimum daily temperature in the elevation band (°C),  $\bar{T}_{av,band}$  is the mean daily temperature in the elevation band (°C),  $T_{mx}$  is the maximum daily temperature recorded at the gage or generated from gage data (°C),  $T_{mn}$  is the minimum daily temperature recorded at the gage or generated from gage data (°C),  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean daily temperature recorded at the gage or generated from gage data (°C),  $EL_{band}$  is the mean elevation in the elevation band (m),  $EL_{gage}$  is

the elevation at the recording gage (m),  $tlaps$  is the temperature lapse rate ( $^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{km}$ ), and 1000 is a factor needed to convert meters to kilometers.

Once the precipitation and temperature values have been calculated for each elevation band in the subbasin, new average subbasin precipitation and temperature values are calculated:

$$R_{day} = \sum_{bnd=1}^b R_{band} \cdot fr_{bnd} \quad 1:4.1.5$$

$$T_{mx} = \sum_{bnd=1}^b T_{mx,band} \cdot fr_{bnd} \quad 1:4.1.6$$

$$T_{mn} = \sum_{bnd=1}^b T_{mn,band} \cdot fr_{bnd} \quad 1:4.1.7$$

$$\bar{T}_{av} = \sum_{bnd=1}^b \bar{T}_{av,band} \cdot fr_{bnd} \quad 1:4.1.8$$

where  $R_{day}$  is the daily average precipitation adjusted for orographic effects (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $T_{mx}$  is the daily maximum temperature adjusted for orographic effects ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $T_{mn}$  is the daily minimum temperature adjusted for orographic effects ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the daily mean temperature adjusted for orographic effects ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $R_{band}$  is the precipitation falling in elevation band  $bnd$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $T_{mx,band}$  is the maximum daily temperature in elevation band  $bnd$  ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $T_{mn,band}$  is the minimum daily temperature in elevation band  $bnd$  ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $fr_{bnd}$  is the fraction of subbasin area within the elevation band, and  $b$  is the total number of elevation bands in the subbasin.

The only processes modeled separately for each individual elevation band are the accumulation, sublimation and melting of snow. As with the initial precipitation and temperature data, after amounts of sublimation and snow melt are determined for each elevation band, subbasin average values are calculated. These average values are the values that are used in the remainder of the simulation and reported in the output files.

Table 1:4-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to orographic effects.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
ELEV_B	$EL_{band}$ : Elevation at center of the elevation band (m)	.sub
ELEV_B_FR	$fr_{bnd}$ : Fraction of subbasin area within the elevation band.	.sub
WELEV	$EL_{gage}$ : Elevation of recording gage whose data is used to calculate values in .wgn file (m)	.wgn
ELEVATION	$EL_{gage}$ : Elevation of precipitation recording gage (m)	.pcp
ELEVATION	$EL_{gage}$ : Elevation of temperature recording gage (m)	.tmp
PLAPS	$plaps$ : Precipitation lapse rate (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/km)	.sub
PCPD(mon)	average number of days of precipitation in month $days_{pcp,yr} = \Sigma (PCPD(mon))$ for a subbasin	.wgn
TLAPS	$tlaps$ : Temperature lapse rate (°C/km)	.sub
PRECIPITATION	$R_{day}$ : Daily precipitation (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.pcp
MAX TEMP	$T_{mx}$ : Daily maximum temperature (°C)	.tmp
MIN TEMP	$T_{mn}$ : Daily minimum temperature (°C)	.tmp

## 1:4.2 CLIMATE CHANGE

---

The impact of global climate change on water supply is a major area of research. Climate change can be simulated with SWAT by manipulating the climatic input that is read into the model (precipitation, temperature, solar radiation, relative humidity, wind speed, potential evapotranspiration and weather generator parameters). A less time-consuming method is to set adjustment factors for the various climatic inputs.

SWAT will allow users to adjust precipitation, temperature, solar radiation, relative humidity, and carbon dioxide levels in each subbasin. The alteration of precipitation, temperature, solar radiation and relative humidity are straightforward:

$$R_{day} = R_{day} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{adj_{pcp}}{100}\right) \quad 1:4.2.1$$

where  $R_{day}$  is the precipitation falling in the subbasin on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $adj_{pcp}$  is the % change in rainfall.

$$T_{mx} = T_{mx} + adj_{tmp} \quad 1:4.2.2$$

where  $T_{mx}$  is the daily maximum temperature (°C), and  $adj_{tmp}$  is the change in temperature (°C).

$$T_{mn} = T_{mn} + adj_{tmp} \quad 1:4.2.3$$

where  $T_{mn}$  is the daily minimum temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $adj_{tmp}$  is the change in temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

$$\bar{T}_{av} = \bar{T}_{av} + adj_{tmp} \quad 1:4.2.4$$

where  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the daily mean temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $adj_{tmp}$  is the change in temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

$$H_{day} = H_{day} + adj_{rad} \quad 1:4.2.5$$

where  $H_{day}$  is the daily solar radiation reaching the earth's surface ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ), and  $adj_{rad}$  is the change in radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ ).

$$R_h = R_h + adj_{hmd} \quad 1:4.2.6$$

where  $R_h$  is the relative humidity for the day expressed as a fraction, and  $adj_{hmd}$  is the change in relative humidity expressed as a fraction.

SWAT allows the adjustment terms to vary from month to month so that the user is able to simulate seasonal changes in climatic conditions.

Changes in carbon dioxide levels impact plant growth. As carbon dioxide levels increase, plant productivity increases and plant water requirements go down. The equations used to account for the impact of carbon dioxide levels on plant water requirements are reviewed in Chapters 2:2 and 5:2. When carbon dioxide climate change effects are being simulated, the Penman-Monteith equation must be used to calculate potential evapotranspiration. This method has been modified to account for CO<sub>2</sub> impacts on potential evapotranspiration levels.

Table 1:4-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to climate change.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
RFINC(mon)	$adj_{pcp}$ : % change in rainfall for month	.sub
TMPINC(mon)	$adj_{tmp}$ : increase or decrease in temperature for month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.sub
RADINC(mon)	$adj_{rad}$ : increase or decrease in solar radiation reaching earth's surface for month ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ )	.sub
HUMINC(mon)	$adj_{hmd}$ : increase or decrease in relative humidity for month	.sub
CO2	CO <sub>2</sub> : carbon dioxide level in subbasin (ppmv)	.sub
IPET	Potential evapotranspiration method	.bsn

## 1:4.3 WEATHER FORECAST INCORPORATION

---

Being able to assess the impact of predicted weather in a watershed is useful for some applications. For example, reservoir management can better time needed water releases if they know the impact of storms in the near future.

SWAT allows a forecast period to be defined in a simulation. The simulation is split into two parts. During the first portion of the simulation, climatic data is read in from input files or generated using the long-term averages input by the user in the weather generator (.wgn) file. When the simulation reaches the first day of the forecast period (defined by FCSTDAY and FCSTYR in file.cio) the model replaces the long-term weather generator averages with averages provided for the forecast period. All climatic data required by SWAT is generated during the forecast period.

Forecast data provided by the U.S. National Weather Service is summarized by region. SWAT allows the user to incorporate data for multiple regions within one simulation. The forecast region number assigned to a subbasin must correspond to a forecast region number given for a specific dataset in the forecast input file (.cst).

SWAT allows the user to define alternative temperature and precipitation averages for the forecast period to generate daily precipitation and temperature values. For temperature, the user specifies the average maximum and minimum air temperature and the standard deviation for these averages. For precipitation, the user specifies the average amount of precipitation falling by month along with the standard deviation and skew coefficient for that average. The user must also define the wet/dry day probabilities and the average number of days of precipitation expected.

The forecast period must be simulated a number of times to obtain a distribution of possible weather scenarios. The user defines the number of model runs made (FCSTCYCLES in file.cio). A minimum of 20 cycles is recommended. The only difference between forecast scenarios is the value of the random number seeds used to generate daily weather values.

Table 1:4-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to forecast incorporation.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
FCSTDAY	First day of forecast period (julian date).	file.cio
FCSTYR	Year that forecast period begins.	file.cio
FCSTCYCLES	Number of times forecast period is simulated.	file.cio
FCSTFILE	Name of input file containing forecast data.	file.cio
FCST_REG	Forecast region number	.sub, .cst
FCST_REGTOT	Total number of forecast regions used in watershed	.cst
FTMPMX(mon)	$\mu_{mx_{mon}}$ : average maximum air temperature for month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.cst
FTMPMN(mon)	$\mu_{mn_{mon}}$ : average minimum air temperature for month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.cst
FTMPSTDMX(mon)	$\sigma_{mx_{mon}}$ : standard deviation for maximum air temperature in month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.cst
FTMPSTDMN(mon)	$\sigma_{mn_{mon}}$ : standard deviation for minimum air temperature in month ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.cst
FPCPMM(mon)	average amount of precipitation falling in month (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )	.cst
FPCPSTD(mon)	$\sigma_{mon}$ : standard deviation for daily precipitation in month (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )	.cst
FPCPSKW(mon)	$g_{mon}$ : skew coefficient for daily precipitation in month	.cst
FPR_W(1,mon)	$P_i(W/D)$ : probability of a wet day following a dry day in month	.cst
FPR_W(2,mon)	$P_i(W/W)$ : probability of a wet day following a wet day in month	.cst
FPCPD(mon)	average number of days of precipitation in month	.cst

## 1:4.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$CO_2$	Concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (ppmv)
$EL_{band}$	Mean elevation in the elevation band (m)
$EL_{gage}$	Elevation at the precipitation, temperature, or weather generator data recording gage (m)
$H_{day}$	Solar radiation reaching ground on current day of simulation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ )
$R_{band}$	Precipitation falling in the elevation band (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_{day}$	Amount of rainfall on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_h$	Average relative humidity for the day
$T_{mn}$	Minimum air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{mn,band}$	Minimum daily temperature in the elevation band ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{mx}$	Maximum air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_{mx,band}$	Maximum daily temperature in the elevation band ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\bar{T}_{av}$	Mean air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\bar{T}_{av,band}$	Mean daily temperature in the elevation band ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$adj_{hmd}$	Change in relative humidity expressed as a fraction
$adj_{pcp}$	% change in rainfall
$adj_{rad}$	Change in radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ )
$adj_{tmp}$	Change in temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$days_{pcp,yr}$	Average number of days of precipitation in the subbasin in a year
$fr_{bnd}$	Fraction of subbasin area within the elevation band
$plaps$	Precipitation lapse rate (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}/\text{km}$ )
$tlaps$	Temperature lapse rate ( $^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{km}$ )



# HYDROLOGY



The land phase of the hydrologic cycle is based on the water balance equation:

$$SW_t = SW_0 + \sum_{i=1}^t (R_{day} - Q_{surf} - E_a - w_{seep} - Q_{gw})$$

where  $SW_t$  is the final soil water content (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $SW_0$  is the initial soil water content (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $t$  is the time (days),  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_a$  is the amount of evapotranspiration on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{seep}$  is the amount of percolation and bypass flow exiting the soil profile bottom on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $Q_{gw}$  is the amount of return flow on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

---

---

## **SECTION 2 CHAPTER 1**

# **EQUATIONS: SURFACE RUNOFF**

---

Surface runoff occurs whenever the rate of water application to the ground surface exceeds the rate of infiltration. When water is initially applied to a dry soil, the infiltration rate is usually very high. However, it will decrease as the soil becomes wetter. When the application rate is higher than the infiltration rate, surface depressions begin to fill. If the application rate continues to be higher than the infiltration rate once all surface depressions have filled, surface runoff will commence.

SWAT provides two methods for estimating surface runoff: the SCS curve number procedure (SCS, 1972) and the Green & Ampt infiltration method (1911).

## 2:1.1 RUNOFF VOLUME: SCS CURVE NUMBER PROCEDURE

---

The SCS runoff equation is an empirical model that came into common use in the 1950s. It was the product of more than 20 years of studies involving rainfall-runoff relationships from small rural watersheds across the U.S. The model was developed to provide a consistent basis for estimating the amounts of runoff under varying land use and soil types (Rallison and Miller, 1981).

The SCS curve number equation is (SCS, 1972):

$$Q_{surf} = \frac{(R_{day} - I_a)^2}{(R_{day} - I_a + S)} \quad 2:1.1.1$$

where  $Q_{surf}$  is the accumulated runoff or rainfall excess (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $R_{day}$  is the rainfall depth for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $I_a$  is the initial abstractions which includes surface storage, interception and infiltration prior to runoff (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $S$  is the retention parameter (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The retention parameter varies spatially due to changes in soils, land use, management and slope and temporally due to changes in soil water content. The retention parameter is defined as:

$$S = 25.4 \left( \frac{1000}{CN} - 10 \right) \quad 2:1.1.2$$

where  $CN$  is the curve number for the day. The initial abstractions,  $I_a$ , is commonly approximated as  $0.2S$  and equation 2:1.1.1 becomes

$$Q_{surf} = \frac{(R_{day} - 0.2S)^2}{(R_{day} + 0.8S)} \quad 2:1.1.3$$

Runoff will only occur when  $R_{day} > I_a$ . A graphical solution of equation 2:1.1.3 for different curve number values is presented in Figure 2:1-1.




Figure 2:1-1: Relationship of runoff to rainfall in SCS curve number method.

### 2:1.1.1 SCS CURVE NUMBER

The SCS curve number is a function of the soil's permeability, land use and antecedent soil water conditions. Typical curve numbers for moisture condition II are listed in tables 2:1-1, 2:1-2 and 2:1-3 for various land covers and soil types (SCS Engineering Division, 1986). These values are appropriate for a 5% slope.

Table 2:1-1: Runoff curve numbers for cultivated agricultural lands (from SCS Engineering Division, 1986)

Land Use	Treatment or practice	Cover	Hydrologic condition	Hydrologic Soil Group			
				A	B	C	D
Fallow	Bare soil		Poor	77	86	91	94
	Crop residue cover*		Good	76	85	90	93
Row crops	Straight row		Poor	74	83	88	90
	Straight row w/ residue		Good	72	81	88	91
	Contoured		Poor	67	78	85	89
	Contoured w/ residue		Good	71	80	87	90
	Contoured & terraced		Poor	64	75	82	85
	Contoured & terraced w/ residue		Good	70	79	84	88
Small grains	Straight row		Poor	65	75	82	86
	Straight row w/ residue		Good	69	78	83	87
	Contoured & terraced		Poor	64	74	81	85
	Contoured & terraced w/ residue		Good	66	74	80	82
	Contoured & terraced w/ residue		Poor	62	71	78	81
	Contoured & terraced w/ residue		Good	65	73	79	81
	Contoured & terraced w/ residue		Poor	61	70	77	80
	Contoured & terraced w/ residue		Good	63	75	83	87
	Contoured & terraced w/ residue		Poor	64	75	83	86

\* Crop residue cover applies only if residue is on at least 5% of the surface throughout the year.

Table 2:1-1, cont.: Runoff curve numbers for cultivated agricultural lands

Land Use	Treatment or practice	Hydrologic condition	Hydrologic Soil Group			
			A	B	C	D
		Good	60	72	80	84
Contoured		Poor	63	74	82	85
		Good	61	73	81	84
Contoured w/ residue		Poor	62	73	81	84
		Good	60	72	80	83
Contoured & terraced		Poor	61	72	79	82
		Good	59	70	78	81
Contoured & terraced w/ residue		Poor	60	71	78	81
		Good	58	69	77	80
Close-seeded or broadcast legumes or rotation	Straight row	Poor	66	77	85	89
		Good	58	72	81	85
	Contoured	Poor	64	75	83	85
		Good	55	69	78	83
	Contoured & terraced	Poor	63	73	80	83
		Good	51	67	76	80

Table 2:1-2: Runoff curve numbers for other agricultural lands (from SCS Engineering Division, 1986)

Cover Type	Hydrologic condition	Hydrologic Soil Group			
		A	B	C	D
Pasture, grassland, or range—continuous forage for grazing <sup>1</sup>	Poor	68	79	86	89
	Fair	49	69	79	84
	Good	39	61	74	80
Meadow—continuous grass, protected from grazing and generally mowed for hay	----	30	58	71	78
Brush—brush-weed-grass mixture with brush the major element <sup>2</sup>	Poor	48	67	77	83
	Fair	35	56	70	77
	Good	30	48	65	73
Woods—grass combination (orchard or tree farm)	Poor	57	73	82	86
	Fair	43	65	76	82
	Good	32	58	72	79
Woods <sup>3</sup>	Poor	45	66	77	83
	Fair	36	60	73	79
	Good	30	55	70	77
Farmsteads—buildings, lanes, driveways, and surrounding lots.	----	59	74	82	86

Table 2:1-3: Runoff curve numbers for urban areas<sup>§</sup> (from SCS Engineering Division, 1986)

Cover Type	Hydrologic condition	Average % impervious area	Hydrologic Soil Group			
			A	B	C	D
<i>Fully developed urban areas</i>						
Open spaces (lawns, parks, golf courses, cemeteries, etc.) <sup>†</sup>	Poor	68	79	86	89	
	Fair	49	69	79	84	
	Good	39	61	74	80	
<i>Impervious areas:</i>						
Paved parking lots, roofs, driveways, etc. (excl. right-of-way)	----	98	98	98	98	
Paved streets and roads; open ditches (incl. right-of-way)	----	83	89	92	93	
Gravel streets and roads (including right-of-way)	----	76	85	89	91	
Dirt streets and roads (including right-of-way)	----	72	82	87	89	

<sup>1</sup> Poor: <50% ground cover or heavily grazed with no mulch; Fair: 50 to 75% ground cover and not heavily grazed; Good: >75% ground cover and lightly or only occasionally grazed

<sup>2</sup> Poor: <50% ground cover; Fair: 50 to 75% ground cover; Good: >75% ground cover

<sup>3</sup> Poor: Forest litter, small trees, and brush are destroyed by heavy grazing or regular burning; Fair: Woods are grazed but not burned, and some forest litter covers the soil; Good: Woods are protected from grazing, and litter and brush adequately cover the soil.

<sup>§</sup> SWAT will automatically adjust curve numbers for impervious areas when IURBAN and URBLU are defined in the .hru file. Curve numbers from Table 6-3 should **not** be used in this instance.

<sup>†</sup> Poor: grass cover <50%; Fair: grass cover 50 to 75%; Good: grass cover >75%

Table 2:1-3, continued: Runoff curve number for urban areas

<b>Cover Type</b>	<b>Cover</b>	<b>Hydrologic condition</b>	<b>Average % impervious area</b>	<b>Hydrologic Soil Group</b>			
				<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<i>Urban districts:</i>							
Commercial and business		85%	89	92	94	95	
Industrial		72%	81	88	91	93	
<i>Residential Districts by average lot size:</i>							
1/8 acre (0.05 ha) or less (town houses)		65%	77	85	90	92	
1/4 acre (0.10 ha)		38%	61	75	83	87	
1/3 acre (0.13 ha)		30%	57	72	81	86	
1/2 acre (0.20 ha)		25%	54	70	80	85	
1 acre (0.40 ha)		20%	51	68	79	84	
2 acres (0.81 ha)		12%	46	65	77	82	
<i>Developing urban areas:</i>							
Newly graded areas (pervious areas only, no vegetation)				77	86	91	94

### 2:1.1.1.1 SOIL HYDROLOGIC GROUPS

The U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) classifies soils into four hydrologic groups based on infiltration characteristics of the soils. NRCS Soil Survey Staff (1996) defines a hydrologic group as a group of soils having similar runoff potential under similar storm and cover conditions. Soil properties that influence runoff potential are those that impact the minimum rate of infiltration for a bare soil after prolonged wetting and when not frozen. These properties are depth to seasonally high water table, saturated hydraulic conductivity, and depth to a very slowly permeable layer. Soil may be placed in one of four groups, A, B, C, and D, or three dual classes, A/D, B/D, and C/D. Definitions of the classes are:

- A: (Low runoff potential). The soils have a high infiltration rate even when thoroughly wetted. They chiefly consist of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravels. They have a high rate of water transmission.
- B: The soils have a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted. They chiefly are moderately deep to deep, moderately well-drained to well-drained soils that have moderately fine to moderately coarse textures. They have a moderate rate of water transmission.
- C: The soils have a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted. They chiefly have a layer that impedes downward movement of water or have moderately fine to fine texture. They have a slow rate of water transmission.

D. (High runoff potential). The soils have a very slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted. They chiefly consist of clay soils that have a high swelling potential, soils that have a permanent water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and shallow soils over nearly impervious material. They have a very slow rate of water transmission.

Dual hydrologic groups are given for certain wet soils that can be adequately drained. The first letter applies to the drained condition, the second to the undrained. Only soils that are rated D in their natural condition are assigned to dual classes.

#### **2:1.1.1.2 ANTECEDENT SOIL MOISTURE CONDITION**

SCS defines three antecedent moisture conditions: I—dry (wilting point), II—average moisture, and III—wet (field capacity). The moisture condition I curve number is the lowest value the daily curve number can assume in dry conditions. The curve numbers for moisture conditions I and III are calculated with the equations:

$$CN_1 = CN_2 - \frac{20 \cdot (100 - CN_2)}{(100 - CN_2 + \exp[2.533 - 0.0636 \cdot (100 - CN_2)])} \quad 2:1.1.4$$

$$CN_3 = CN_2 \cdot \exp[0.00673 \cdot (100 - CN_2)] \quad 2:1.1.5$$

where  $CN_1$  is the moisture condition I curve number,  $CN_2$  is the moisture condition II curve number, and  $CN_3$  is the moisture condition III curve number.

#### **2:1.1.1.3 RETENTION PARAMETER**

With SWAT2009, users are allowed to select between two methods for calculating the retention parameter. The traditional method is to allow the retention parameter to vary with soil profile water content. An alternative added in SWAT2009 allows the retention parameter to vary with accumulated plant evapotranspiration. Calculation of the daily CN value as a function of plant evapotranspiration was added because the soil moisture method was predicting too much runoff in shallow soils. By calculating daily CN as a function of plant evapotranspiration, the value is less dependent on soil storage and more dependent on antecedent climate.

When the retention parameter varies with soil profile water content, the following equation is used:

$$S = S_{\max} \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{SW}{[SW + \exp(w_1 - w_2 \cdot SW)]} \right) \quad 2:1.1.6$$

where  $S$  is the retention parameter for a given day (mm),  $S_{\max}$  is the maximum value the retention parameter can achieve on any given day (mm),  $SW$  is the soil water content of the entire profile excluding the amount of water held in the profile at wilting point (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are shape coefficients. The maximum retention parameter value,  $S_{\max}$ , is calculated by solving equation 2:1.1.2 using  $CN_1$ .

The shape coefficients are determined by solving equation 2:1.1.6 assuming that

- 1) the retention parameter for moisture condition I curve number corresponds to wilting point soil profile water content,
- 2) the retention parameter for moisture condition III curve number corresponds to field capacity soil profile water content, and
- 3) the soil has a curve number of 99 ( $S = 2.54$ ) when completely saturated.

$$w_1 = \ln \left( \frac{FC}{1 - S_3 \cdot S_{\max}^{-1}} - FC \right) + w_2 \cdot FC \quad 2:1.1.7$$

$$w_2 = \frac{\left( \ln \left( \frac{FC}{1 - S_3 \cdot S_{\max}^{-1}} - FC \right) - \ln \left( \frac{SAT}{1 - 2.54 \cdot S_{\max}^{-1}} - SAT \right) \right)}{(SAT - FC)} \quad 2:1.1.8$$

where  $w_1$  is the first shape coefficient,  $w_2$  is the second shape coefficient,  $FC$  is the amount of water in the soil profile at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $S_3$  is the retention parameter for the moisture condition III curve number,  $S_{\max}$  is the retention parameter for the moisture condition I curve number,  $SAT$  is the amount of water in the soil profile when completely saturated (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and 2.54 is the retention parameter value for a curve number of 99.

When the retention parameter varies with plant evapotranspiration, the following equation is used to update the retention parameter at the end of every day:

$$S = S_{prev} + E_o * \exp\left(\frac{-cncoef * S_{prev}}{S_{max}}\right) - R_{day} + Q_{surf} \quad 2:1.1.9$$

where  $S$  is the retention parameter for a given day (mm),  $S_{prev}$  is the retention parameter for the previous day (mm),  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration for the day ( $\text{mm d}^{-1}$ ),  $cncoef$  is the weighting coefficient used to calculate the retention coefficient for daily curve number calculations dependent on plant evapotranspiration,  $S_{max}$  is the maximum value the retention parameter can achieve on any given day (mm),  $R_{day}$  is the rainfall depth for the day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ). The initial value of the retention parameter is defined as  $S = 0.9 * S_{max}$ .

When the top layer of the soil is frozen, the retention parameter is modified using the following equation:

$$S_{frz} = S_{max} \cdot [1 - \exp(-0.000862 \cdot S)] \quad 2:1.1.10$$

where  $S_{frz}$  is the retention parameter adjusted for frozen conditions (mm),  $S_{max}$  is the maximum value the retention parameter can achieve on any given day (mm), and  $S$  is the retention parameter for a given moisture content calculated with equation 2:1.1.6 (mm).

The daily curve number value adjusted for moisture content is calculated by rearranging equation 2:1.1.2 and inserting the retention parameter calculated for that moisture content:

$$CN = \frac{25400}{(S + 254)} \quad 2:1.1.11$$

where  $CN$  is the curve number on a given day and  $S$  is the retention parameter calculated for the moisture content of the soil on that day.

### 2:1.1.4 SLOPE ADJUSTMENTS

The moisture condition II curve numbers provided in the tables are assumed to be appropriate for 5% slopes. Williams (1995) developed an equation to adjust the curve number to a different slope:

$$CN_{2s} = \frac{(CN_3 - CN_2)}{3} \cdot [1 - 2 \cdot \exp(-13.86 \cdot slp)] + CN_2 \quad 2.1.1.12$$

where  $CN_{2s}$  is the moisture condition II curve number adjusted for slope,  $CN_3$  is the moisture condition III curve number for the default 5% slope,  $CN_2$  is the moisture condition II curve number for the default 5% slope, and  $slp$  is the average fraction slope of the subbasin. SWAT does not adjust curve numbers for slope. If the user wishes to adjust the curve numbers for slope effects, the adjustment must be done prior to entering the curve numbers in the management input file.

Table 2:1-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to surface runoff calculated with the SCS curve number method.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
IEVENT	Rainfall, runoff, routing option.	.bsn
ICN	Daily curve number calculation method: 0 calculate daily CN value as a function of soil moisture; 1 calculate daily CN value as a function of plant evapotranspiration	.bsn
CNCOEF	<i>cncoef</i> : Weighting coefficient used to calculate the retention coefficient for daily curve number calculations dependent on plant evapotranspiration	.bsn
PRECIPITATION	$R_{day}$ : Daily precipitation (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.pcp
CN2	$CN_2$ : Moisture condition II curve number	.mgt
CNOP	$CN_2$ : Moisture condition II curve number	.mgt

## 2:1.2 RUNOFF VOLUME: GREEN & AMPT INFILTRATION METHOD

The Green & Ampt equation was developed to predict infiltration assuming excess water at the surface at all times (Green & Ampt, 1911). The equation assumes that the soil profile is homogenous and antecedent moisture is uniformly distributed in the profile. As water infiltrates into the soil, the model assumes the soil above the wetting front is completely saturated and there is a sharp break in moisture content at the wetting front. Figure 2:1-2 graphically illustrates the difference between the moisture distribution with depth modeled by the Green & Ampt equation and what occurs in reality.




Figure 2:1-2: Comparison of moisture content distribution modeled by Green & Ampt and a typical observed distribution.

Mein and Larson (1973) developed a methodology for determining ponding time with infiltration using the Green & Ampt equation. The Green-Ampt Mein-Larson excess rainfall method was incorporated into SWAT to provide an alternative option for determining surface runoff. This method requires sub-daily precipitation data supplied by the user.

The Green-Ampt Mein-Larson infiltration rate is defined as:

$$f_{inf,t} = K_e \cdot \left( 1 + \frac{\Psi_{wf} \cdot \Delta\theta_v}{F_{inf,t}} \right) \quad 2:1.2.1$$

where  $f_{inf}$  is the infiltration rate at time  $t$  (mm/hr),  $K_e$  is the effective hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr),  $\Psi_{wf}$  is the wetting front matric potential (mm),  $\Delta\theta_v$  is the change in volumetric moisture content across the wetting front (mm/mm) and  $F_{inf}$  is the cumulative infiltration at time  $t$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

When the rainfall intensity is less than the infiltration rate, all the rainfall will infiltrate during the time period and the cumulative infiltration for that time period is calculated:

$$F_{inf,t} = F_{inf,t-1} + R_{\Delta t} \quad 2:1.2.2$$

where  $F_{inf,t}$  is the cumulative infiltration for a given time step (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $F_{inf,t-1}$  is the cumulative infiltration for the previous time step (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $R_{\Delta t}$  is the amount of rain falling during the time step (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The infiltration rate defined by equation 2:1.2.1 is a function of the infiltrated volume, which in turn is a function of the infiltration rates in previous time steps. To avoid numerical errors over long time steps,  $f_{inf}$  is replaced by  $dF_{inf}/dt$  in equation 2:1.2.1 and integrated to obtain

$$F_{inf,t} = F_{inf,t-1} + K_e \cdot \Delta t + \Psi_{wf} \cdot \Delta\theta_v \cdot \ln \left| \frac{F_{inf,t} + \Psi_{wf} \cdot \Delta\theta_v}{F_{inf,t-1} + \Psi_{wf} \cdot \Delta\theta_v} \right| \quad 2:1.2.3$$

Equation 2:1.2.3 must be solved iteratively for  $F_{inf,t}$ , the cumulative infiltration at the end of the time step. A successive substitution technique is used.

The Green-Ampt effective hydraulic conductivity parameter,  $K_e$ , is approximately equivalent to one-half the saturated hydraulic conductivity of the soil,  $K_{sat}$  (Bouwer, 1969). Nearing et al. (1996) developed an equation to calculate the effective hydraulic conductivity as a function of saturated hydraulic conductivity and curve number. This equation incorporates land cover impacts into the calculated effective hydraulic conductivity. The equation for effective hydraulic conductivity is:

$$K_e = \frac{56.82 \cdot K_{sat}^{0.286}}{1 + 0.051 \cdot \exp(0.062 \cdot CN)} - 2 \quad 2:1.2.4$$

where  $K_e$  is the effective hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr),  $K_{sat}$  is the saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr), and  $CN$  is the curve number.

Wetting front matric potential,  $\Psi_{wf}$ , is calculated as a function of porosity, percent sand and percent clay (Rawls and Brakensiek, 1985):

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{wf} = 10 \cdot \exp & [6.5309 - 7.32561 \cdot \phi_{soil} + 0.001583 \cdot m_c^2 + 3.809479 \cdot \phi_{soil}^2 + \\ & 0.000344 \cdot m_s \cdot m_c - 0.049837 \cdot m_s \cdot \phi_{soil} + 0.001608 \cdot m_s^2 \cdot \phi_{soil}^2 + \\ & 0.001602 \cdot m_c^2 \cdot \phi_{soil}^2 - 0.0000136 \cdot m_s^2 \cdot m_c - 0.003479 \cdot m_c^2 \cdot \phi_{soil} - \\ & 0.000799 \cdot m_s^2 \cdot \phi_{soil}] \end{aligned} \quad 2:1.2.5$$

where  $\phi_{soil}$  is the porosity of the soil (mm/mm),  $m_c$  is the percent clay content, and  $m_s$  is the percent sand content.

The change in volumetric moisture content across the wetting front is calculated at the beginning of each day as:

$$\Delta\theta_v = \left(1 - \frac{SW}{FC}\right) * (0.95 * \phi_{soil}) \quad 2:1.2.6$$

where  $\Delta\theta_v$  is the change in volumetric moisture content across the wetting front (mm/mm),  $SW$  is the soil water content of the entire profile excluding the amount of water held in the profile at wilting point (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $FC$  is the amount of water in the soil profile at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $\phi_{soil}$  is the porosity of the soil (mm/mm). If a rainfall event is in progress at midnight,  $\Delta\theta_v$  is then calculated:

$$\Delta\theta_v = 0.001 * (0.95 * \phi_{soil}) \quad 2:1.2.7$$

For each time step, SWAT calculates the amount of water entering the soil. The water that does not infiltrate into the soil becomes surface runoff.

Table 2:1-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to Green & Ampt infiltration calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
IEVENT	Rainfall, runoff, routing option.	.bsn
IDT	Length of time step (min): $\Delta t = IDT/60$	file.cio
PRECIPITATION	$R_{\Delta t}$ : Precipitation during time step (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.pcp
SOL_K	$K_{sat}$ : Saturated hydraulic conductivity of first layer (mm/hr)	.sol
CN2	$CN$ : Moisture condition II curve number	.mgt
CNOP	$CN$ : Moisture condition II curve number	.mgt
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Moist bulk density (Mg/m <sup>3</sup> ): $\phi_{oil} = 1 - \rho_b / 2.65$	.sol
CLAY	$m_c$ : % clay content	.sol
SAND	$m_s$ : % sand content	.sol

## 2:1.3 PEAK RUNOFF RATE

---

The peak runoff rate is the maximum runoff flow rate that occurs with a given rainfall event. The peak runoff rate is an indicator of the erosive power of a storm and is used to predict sediment loss. SWAT calculates the peak runoff rate with a modified rational method.

The rational method is widely used in the design of ditches, channels and storm water control systems. The rational method is based on the assumption that if a rainfall of intensity  $i$  begins at time  $t = 0$  and continues indefinitely, the rate of runoff will increase until the time of concentration,  $t = t_{conc}$ , when the entire subbasin area\* is contributing to flow at the outlet. The rational formula is:

$$q_{peak} = \frac{C \cdot i \cdot Area}{3.6} \quad 2:1.3.1$$

where  $q_{peak}$  is the peak runoff rate ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ),  $C$  is the runoff coefficient,  $i$  is the rainfall intensity ( $\text{mm/hr}$ ),  $Area$  is the subbasin area ( $\text{km}^2$ ) and 3.6 is a unit conversion factor.

### 2:1.3.1 TIME OF CONCENTRATION

The time of concentration is the amount of time from the beginning of a rainfall event until the entire subbasin area is contributing to flow at the outlet. In other words, the time of concentration is the time for a drop of water to flow from the remotest point in the subbasin to the subbasin outlet. The time of concentration is calculated by summing the overland flow time (the time it takes for flow from the remotest point in the subbasin to reach the channel) and the channel flow time (the time it takes for flow in the upstream channels to reach the outlet):

$$t_{conc} = t_{ov} + t_{ch} \quad 2:1.3.2$$

---

\* The equations in section 2:1.3 use the subbasin area rather than the HRU area. Unlike HRUs, subbasins are geographically contiguous areas. Using the subbasin area makes the equations for time of concentration and peak runoff rate easier to conceptualize.

In the model, these calculations are performed at the HRU level. Two modifications are made to adapt the equations to HRUs. First, the area of the subbasin is replaced by the area of the HRU. Second, the channel length term,  $L$ , used in the channel flow time of concentration calculation is multiplied by the fraction of the subbasin area with the HRU of interest.

where  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for a subbasin (hr),  $t_{ov}$  is the time of concentration for overland flow (hr), and  $t_{ch}$  is the time of concentration for channel flow (hr).

### 2:1.3.1.1 OVERLAND FLOW TIME OF CONCENTRATION

The overland flow time of concentration,  $t_{ov}$ , can be computed using the equation

$$t_{ov} = \frac{L_{slp}}{3600 \cdot v_{ov}} \quad 2:1.3.3$$

where  $L_{slp}$  is the subbasin slope length (m),  $v_{ov}$  is the overland flow velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) and 3600 is a unit conversion factor.

The overland flow velocity can be estimated from Manning's equation by considering a strip 1 meter wide down the sloping surface:

$$v_{ov} = \frac{q_{ov}^{0.4} \cdot slp^{0.3}}{n^{0.6}} \quad 2:1.3.4$$

where  $q_{ov}$  is the average overland flow rate ( $\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$ ),  $slp$  is the average slope in the subbasin ( $\text{m m}^{-1}$ ), and  $n$  is Manning's roughness coefficient for the subbasin. Assuming an average flow rate of 6.35 mm/hr and converting units

$$v_{ov} = \frac{0.005 \cdot L_{slp}^{0.4} \cdot slp^{0.3}}{n^{0.6}} \quad 2:1.3.5$$

Substituting equation 2:1.3.5 into equation 2:1.3.3 gives

$$t_{ov} = \frac{L_{slp}^{0.6} \cdot n^{0.6}}{18 \cdot slp^{0.3}} \quad 2.1.3.6$$

Table 6-3: Values of Manning's roughness coefficient,  $n$ , for overland flow (Engman, 1983).

Characteristics of Land Surface	Median	Range
Fallow, no residue	0.010	0.008-0.012
Conventional tillage, no residue	0.090	0.060-0.120
Conventional tillage, residue	0.190	0.160-0.220
Chisel plow, no residue	0.090	0.060-0.120
Chisel plow, residue	0.130	0.100-0.160
Fall disking, residue	0.400	0.300-0.500
No till, no residue	0.070	0.040-0.100
No till, 0.5-1 t/ha residue	0.120	0.070-0.170
No till, 2-9 t/ha residue	0.300	0.170-0.470
Rangeland, 20% cover	0.600	
Short grass prairie	0.150	0.100-0.200
Dense grass	0.240	0.170-0.300
Bermudagrass	0.410	0.300-0.480

### 2:1.3.1.2 CHANNEL FLOW TIME OF CONCENTRATION

The channel flow time of concentration,  $t_{ch}$ , can be computed using the equation:

$$t_{ch} = \frac{L_c}{3.6 \cdot v_c} \quad 2:1.3.7$$

where  $L_c$  is the average flow channel length for the subbasin (km),  $v_c$  is the average channel velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ), and 3.6 is a unit conversion factor.

The average channel flow length can be estimated using the equation

$$L_c = \sqrt{L \cdot L_{cen}} \quad 2:1.3.8$$

where  $L$  is the channel length from the most distant point to the subbasin outlet (km), and  $L_{cen}$  is the distance along the channel to the subbasin centroid (km). Assuming  $L_{cen} = 0.5 \cdot L$ , the average channel flow length is

$$L_c = 0.71 \cdot L \quad 2:1.3.9$$

The average velocity can be estimated from Manning's equation assuming a trapezoidal channel with 2:1 side slopes and a 10:1 bottom width-depth ratio.

$$v_c = \frac{0.489 \cdot q_{ch}^{0.25} \cdot slp_{ch}^{0.375}}{n^{0.75}} \quad 2:1.3.10$$

where  $v_c$  is the average channel velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ),  $q_{ch}$  is the average channel flow rate ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ),  $slp_{ch}$  is the channel slope ( $\text{m m}^{-1}$ ), and  $n$  is Manning's roughness coefficient for the channel. To express the average channel flow rate in units of mm/hr, the following expression is used

$$q_{ch}^* = \frac{q_{ch}^* \cdot Area}{3.6} \quad 2:1.3.11$$

where  $q_{ch}^*$  is the average channel flow rate ( $\text{mm hr}^{-1}$ ),  $Area$  is the subbasin area ( $\text{km}^2$ ), and 3.6 is a unit conversion factor. The average channel flow rate is related to the unit source area flow rate (unit source area = 1 ha)

$$q_{ch}^* = q_0^* \cdot (100 \cdot Area)^{-0.5} \quad 2:1.3.12$$

where  $q_0^*$  is the unit source area flow rate ( $\text{mm hr}^{-1}$ ),  $\text{Area}$  is the subbasin area ( $\text{km}^2$ ), and 100 is a unit conversion factor. Assuming the unit source area flow rate is 6.35 mm/hr and substituting equations 2:1.3.11 and 2:1.3.12 into 2:1.3.10 gives

$$v_c = \frac{0.317 \cdot \text{Area}^{0.125} \cdot \text{slp}_{ch}^{0.375}}{n^{0.75}} \quad 2:1.3.13$$

Substituting equations 2:1.3.9 and 2:1.3.13 into 2:1.3.7 gives

$$t_{ch} = \frac{0.62 \cdot L \cdot n^{0.75}}{\text{Area}^{0.125} \cdot \text{slp}_{ch}^{0.375}} \quad 2:1.3.14$$

where  $t_{ch}$  is the time of concentration for channel flow (hr),  $L$  is the channel length from the most distant point to the subbasin outlet (km),  $n$  is Manning's roughness coefficient for the channel,  $\text{Area}$  is the subbasin area ( $\text{km}^2$ ), and  $\text{slp}_{ch}$  is the channel slope ( $\text{m m}^{-1}$ ).

Table 2:1-4: Values of Manning's roughness coefficient,  $n$ , for channel flow (Chow, 1959).<sup>1</sup>

Characteristics of Channel	Median	Range
Excavated or dredged		
Earth, straight and uniform	0.025	0.016-0.033
Earth, winding and sluggish	0.035	0.023-0.050
Not maintained, weeds and brush	0.075	0.040-0.140
Natural streams		
Few trees, stones or brush	0.050	0.025-0.065
Heavy timber and brush	0.100	0.050-0.150

<sup>1</sup> Chow (1959) has a very extensive list of Manning's roughness coefficients. These values represent only a small portion of those he lists in his book.

Although some of the assumptions used in developing equations 2:1.3.6 and 2:1.3.14 may appear liberal, the time of concentration values obtained generally give satisfactory results for homogeneous subbasins. Since equations 2:1.3.6 and 2:1.3.14 are based on hydraulic considerations, they are more reliable than purely empirical equations.

## **2:1.3.2 RUNOFF COEFFICIENT**

The runoff coefficient is the ratio of the inflow rate,  $i \cdot \text{Area}$ , to the peak discharge rate,  $q_{peak}$ . The coefficient will vary from storm to storm and is calculated with the equation:

$$C = \frac{Q_{surf}}{R_{day}} \quad 2:1.3.15$$

where  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $R_{day}$  is the rainfall for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

### **2:1.3.3 RAINFALL INTENSITY**

The rainfall intensity is the average rainfall rate during the time of concentration. Based on this definition, it can be calculated with the equation:

$$i = \frac{R_{tc}}{t_{conc}} \quad 2.1.3.16$$

where  $i$  is the rainfall intensity (mm/hr),  $R_{tc}$  is the amount of rain falling during the time of concentration (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for the subbasin (hr).

An analysis of rainfall data collected by Hershfield (1961) for different durations and frequencies showed that the amount of rain falling during the time of concentration was proportional to the amount of rain falling during the 24-hr period.

$$R_{tc} = \alpha_{tc} \cdot R_{day} \quad 2:1.3.17$$

where  $R_{tc}$  is the amount of rain falling during the time of concentration (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\alpha_{tc}$  is the fraction of daily rainfall that occurs during the time of concentration, and  $R_{day}$  is the amount of rain falling during the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

For short duration storms, all or most of the rain will fall during the time of concentration, causing  $\alpha_{tc}$  to approach its upper limit of 1.0. The minimum value of  $\alpha_{tc}$  would be seen in storms of uniform intensity ( $i_{24} = i$ ). This minimum value can be defined by substituting the products of time and rainfall intensity into equation 2:1.3.17

$$\alpha_{tc,min} = \frac{R_{tc}}{R_{day}} = \frac{i \cdot t_{conc}}{i_{24} \cdot 24} = \frac{t_{conc}}{24} \quad 2:1.3.18$$

Thus,  $\alpha_{tc}$  falls in the range  $t_{conc}/24 \leq \alpha_{tc} \leq 1.0$ .

SWAT estimates the fraction of rain falling in the time of concentration as a function of the fraction of daily rain falling in the half-hour of highest intensity rainfall.

$$\alpha_{tc} = 1 - \exp[2 \cdot t_{conc} \cdot \ln(1 - \alpha_{0.5})] \quad 2:1.3.19$$

where  $\alpha_{0.5}$  is the fraction of daily rain falling in the half-hour highest intensity rainfall, and  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for the subbasin (hr). The determination of a value for  $\alpha_{0.5}$  is discussed in Chapters 1:2 and 1:3.

#### **2:1.3.4 MODIFIED RATIONAL FORMULA**

The modified rational formula used to estimate peak flow rate is obtained by substituting equations 2:1.3.15, 2:1.3.16, and 2:1.3.17 into equation 2:1.3.1

$$q_{peak} = \frac{\alpha_{tc} \cdot Q_{surf} \cdot Area}{3.6 \cdot t_{conc}} \quad 2:1.3.20$$

where  $q_{peak}$  is the peak runoff rate ( $m^3 s^{-1}$ ),  $\alpha_{tc}$  is the fraction of daily rainfall that occurs during the time of concentration,  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Area$  is the subbasin area (km<sup>2</sup>),  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for the subbasin (hr) and 3.6 is a unit conversion factor.

Table 2:1-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to peak rate calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SUB_KM	Area of the subbasin (km <sup>2</sup> )	.sub
HRU_FR	Fraction of subbasin area contained in HRU	.hru
SLSUBBSN	$L_{slp}$ : Average slope length (m)	.hru
HRU_SLP	$slp$ : Average slope steepness (m/m)	.hru
OV_N	$n$ : Manning's "n" value for overland flow	.hru
CH_L(1)	$L$ : Longest tributary channel length in subbasin (km)	.sub
CH_S(1)	$slp_{ch}$ : Average slope of tributary channels (m/m)	.sub
CH_N(1)	$n$ : Manning's "n" value for tributary channels	.sub

#### **2:1.4 SURFACE RUNOFF LAG**

In large subbasins with a time of concentration greater than 1 day, only a portion of the surface runoff will reach the main channel on the day it is generated. SWAT incorporates a surface runoff storage feature to lag a portion of the surface runoff release to the main channel.

Once surface runoff is calculated with the curve number or Green & Ampt method, the amount of surface runoff released to the main channel is calculated:

$$Q_{surf} = (Q'_{surf} + Q_{stor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 2:1.4.1$$

where  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff discharged to the main channel on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q'_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff generated in the subbasin on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{stor,i-1}$  is the surface runoff stored or lagged from the previous day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $surlag$  is the surface runoff lag coefficient, and  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for the subbasin (hrs).

The expression  $\left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right)$  in equation 2:1.4.1 represents the fraction of the total available water that will be allowed to enter the reach on any one day. Figure 2:1-3 plots values for this expression at different values for  $surlag$  and  $t_{conc}$ .




Figure 2:1-3: Influence of  $surlag$  and  $t_{conc}$  on fraction of surface runoff released.

Note that for a given time of concentration, as  $surlag$  decreases in value more water is held in storage. The delay in release of surface runoff will smooth the streamflow hydrograph simulated in the reach.

Table 2:1-6: SWAT input variables that pertain to surface runoff lag calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SURLAG	$surlag$ : surface runoff lag coefficient	.bsn

## 2:1.5 TRANSMISSION LOSSES

---

Many semiarid and arid watersheds have ephemeral channels that abstract large quantities of streamflow (Lane, 1982). The abstractions, or transmission losses, reduce runoff volume as the flood wave travels downstream. Chapter 19 of the SCS Hydrology Handbook (Lane, 1983) describes a procedure for estimating transmission losses for ephemeral streams which has been incorporated into SWAT. This method was developed to estimate transmission losses in the absence of observed inflow-outflow data and assumes no lateral inflow or out-of-bank flow contributions to runoff.

The prediction equation for runoff volume after transmission losses is

$$vol_{Qsurf,f} = \begin{cases} 0 & vol_{Qsurf,i} \leq vol_{thr} \\ a_x + b_x \cdot vol_{Qsurf,i} & vol_{Qsurf,i} > vol_{thr} \end{cases} \quad 2:1.5.1$$

where  $vol_{Qsurf,f}$  is the volume of runoff after transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3$ ),  $a_x$  is the regression intercept for a channel of length  $L$  and width  $W$  ( $\text{m}^3$ ),  $b_x$  is the regression slope for a channel of length  $L$  and width  $W$ ,  $vol_{Qsurf,i}$  is the volume of runoff prior to transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3$ ), and  $vol_{thr}$  is the threshold volume for a channel of length  $L$  and width  $W$  ( $\text{m}^3$ ). The threshold volume is

$$vol_{thr} = -\frac{a_x}{b_x} \quad 2:1.5.2$$

The corresponding equation for peak runoff rate is

$$q_{peak,f} = \frac{1}{(3600 \cdot dur_{flw})} \cdot [a_x - (1 - b_x) \cdot vol_{Qsurf,i}] + b_x \cdot q_{peak,i} \quad 2:1.5.3$$

where  $q_{peak,f}$  is the peak rate after transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ),  $dur_{flw}$  is the duration of flow (hr),  $a_x$  is the regression intercept for a channel of length  $L$  and width  $W$  ( $\text{m}^3$ ),  $b_x$  is the regression slope for a channel of length  $L$  and width  $W$ ,  $vol_{Qsurf,i}$  is the volume of runoff prior to transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3$ ),  $q_{peak,i}$  is the peak rate before accounting for transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ). The duration of flow is calculated with the equation:

$$dur_{flw} = \frac{Q_{surf} \cdot Area}{3.6 \cdot q_{peak}} \quad 2:1.5.4$$

where  $dur_{flw}$  is the duration of runoff flow (hr),  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Area$  is the area of the subbasin (km<sup>2</sup>),  $q_{peak}$  is the peak runoff rate (m<sup>3</sup>/s), and 3.6 is a conversion factor.

In order to calculate the regression parameters for channels of differing lengths and widths, the parameters of a unit channel are needed. A unit channel is defined as a channel of length  $L = 1$  km and width  $W = 1$  m. The unit channel parameters are calculated with the equations:

$$k_r = -2.22 \cdot \ln \left[ 1 - 2.6466 \cdot \frac{K_{ch} \cdot dur_{flw}}{vol_{Qsurf,i}} \right] \quad 2:1.5.5$$

$$a_r = -0.2258 \cdot K_{ch} \cdot dur_{flw} \quad 2:1.5.6$$

$$b_r = \exp[-0.4905 \cdot k_r] \quad 2:1.5.7$$

where  $k_r$  is the decay factor (m<sup>-1</sup> km<sup>-1</sup>),  $a_r$  is the unit channel regression intercept (m<sup>3</sup>),  $b_r$  is the unit channel regression slope,  $K_{ch}$  is the effective hydraulic conductivity of the channel alluvium (mm/hr),  $dur_{flw}$  is the duration of runoff flow (hr), and  $vol_{Qsurf,i}$  is the initial volume of runoff (m<sup>3</sup>). The regression parameters are

$$b_x = \exp[-k_r \cdot L \cdot W] \quad 2:1.5.8$$

$$a_x = \frac{a_r}{(1 - b_r)} \cdot (1 - b_x) \quad 2:1.5.9$$

where  $a_x$  is the regression intercept for a channel of length  $L$  and width  $W$  (m<sup>3</sup>),  $b_x$  is the regression slope for a channel of length  $L$  and width  $W$ ,  $k_r$  is the decay factor (m<sup>-1</sup> km<sup>-1</sup>),  $L$  is the channel length from the most distant point to the subbasin outlet (km),  $W$  is the average width of flow, i.e. channel width (m)  $a_r$  is the unit channel regression intercept (m<sup>3</sup>), and  $b_r$  is the unit channel regression slope.

Transmission losses from surface runoff are assumed to percolate into the shallow aquifer.

Table 2:1-7: SWAT input variables that pertain to transmission loss calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SUB_KM	Area of the subbasin ( $\text{km}^2$ )	.sub
HRU_FR	Fraction of total subbasin area contained in HRU	.hru
CH_K(1)	$K_{ch}$ : effective hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)	.sub
CH_W(1)	W: average width of tributary channel (m)	.sub
CH_L(1)	L: Longest tributary channel length in subbasin (km)	.sub

## 2:1.6 NOMENCLATURE

---

<i>Area</i>	Subbasin area ( $\text{km}^2$ )
<i>C</i>	Runoff coefficient in peak runoff rate calculation
<i>CN</i>	Curve number
<i>CN</i> <sub>1</sub>	Moisture condition I curve number
<i>CN</i> <sub>2</sub>	Moisture condition II curve number
<i>CN</i> <sub>2s</sub>	Moisture condition II curve number adjusted for slope
<i>CN</i> <sub>3</sub>	Moisture condition III curve number
<i>E</i> <sub>o</sub>	Potential evapotranspiration ( $\text{mm d}^{-1}$ )
<i>F</i> <sub>inf</sub>	Cumulative infiltration at time <i>t</i> ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>FC</i>	Water content of soil profile at field capacity ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>I</i> <sub>a</sub>	Initial abstractions which includes surface storage, interception and infiltration prior to runoff ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>K</i> <sub>ch</sub>	Effective hydraulic conductivity of the channel alluvium (mm/hr)
<i>K</i> <sub>e</sub>	Effective hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
<i>K</i> <sub>sat</sub>	Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
<i>L</i>	Channel length from the most distant point to the subbasin outlet (km)
<i>L</i> <sub>c</sub>	Average flow channel length for the subbasin (km)
<i>L</i> <sub>cen</sub>	Distance along the channel to the subbasin centroid (km)
<i>L</i> <sub>slp</sub>	Subbasin slope length (m)
<i>Q</i> <sub>stor</sub>	Surface runoff stored or lagged ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>Q</i> <sub>surf</sub>	Accumulated runoff or rainfall excess ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>R</i> <sub>At</sub>	Amount of rain falling during the time step ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>R</i> <sub>day</sub>	Amount of rainfall on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>R</i> <sub>tc</sub>	Amount of rain falling during the time of concentration ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>S</i>	Retention parameter in SCS curve number equation (mm)
<i>S</i> <sub>3</sub>	Retention parameter for the moisture condition III curve number
<i>S</i> <sub>froz</sub>	Retention parameter adjusted for frozen conditions (mm)
<i>S</i> <sub>max</sub>	Maximum value the retention parameter can achieve on any given day (mm)
<i>S</i> <sub>prev</sub>	Retention parameter in SCS curve number equation from previous day (mm)
<i>SAT</i>	Amount of water in the soil profile when completely saturated ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),
<i>SW</i>	Amount of water in soil profile ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>W</i>	Average width of flow, i.e. channel width (m)
<i>a</i> <sub>r</sub>	Unit channel regression intercept ( $\text{m}^3$ )

$a_x$	Regression intercept for a channel of length $L$ and width $W$ ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$b_r$	Unit channel regression slope
$b_x$	Regression slope for a channel of length $L$ and width $W$
$cnccoef$	Weighting coefficient used to calculate the retention coefficient for daily curve number calculations dependent on plant evapotranspiration
$dur_{flw}$	Duration of flow (hr)
$f_{inf}$	Infiltration rate (mm/hr)
$i$	Rainfall intensity (mm/hr)
$k_r$	Decay factor ( $\text{m}^{-1} \text{ km}^{-1}$ )
$m_c$	Percent clay content
$m_s$	Percent sand content
$n$	Manning's roughness coefficient for the subbasin or channel
$q_0^*$	Unit source area flow rate ( $\text{mm hr}^{-1}$ )
$q_{ch}$	Average channel flow rate ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ )
$q_{ch}^*$	Average channel flow rate ( $\text{mm hr}^{-1}$ )
$q_{ov}$	Average overland flow rate ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ )
$q_{peak}$	Peak runoff rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
$q_{peak,f}$	Peak rate after transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
$q_{peak,i}$	Peak rate before accounting for transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
$slp$	Average slope of the subbasin (%) or m/m)
$slp_{ch}$	Average channel slope ( $\text{m m}^{-1}$ )
$surlag$	Surface runoff lag coefficient
$t_{ch}$	Time of concentration for channel flow (hr)
$t_{conc}$	Time of concentration for a subbasin (hr)
$t_{ov}$	Time of concentration for overland flow (hr)
$v_c$	Average channel velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$v_{ov}$	Overland flow velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$vol_{Qsurf,f}$	Volume of runoff after transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$vol_{Qsurf,i}$	Volume of runoff prior to transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$vol_{thr}$	Threshold volume for a channel of length $L$ and width $W$ ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$w_1$	Shape coefficient in retention parameter adjustments for soil moisture content
$w_2$	Shape coefficient in retention parameter adjustments for soil moisture content
$\alpha_{0.5}$	Fraction of daily rain falling in the half-hour highest intensity rainfall,
$\alpha_{tc}$	Fraction of daily rainfall that occurs during the time of concentration
$\phi_{soil}$	Porosity of the soil (mm/mm)
$\Psi_{wf}$	Wetting front matric potential (mm)
$\theta_v$	Volumetric moisture content (mm/mm)

## 2:1.7 REFERENCES

---

Bouwer, H. 1969. Infiltration of water into nonuniform soil. Journal Irrigation and Drainage Div., ASCE 95(IR4):451-462.

- Chow, V.T. 1959. Open-channel hydraulics. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Engman, E.T. 1983. Roughness coefficients for routing surface runoff. Proc. Spec. Conf. Frontiers of Hydraulic Engineering.
- Green, W.H. and G.A. Ampt. 1911. Studies on soil physics, 1. The flow of air and water through soils. Journal of Agricultural Sciences 4:11-24.
- Hershfield, D.M. 1961. Rainfall frequency atlas of the United States for durations from 30 minutes to 24 hours and return periods from 1 to 100 years. U.S. Dept. Commerce Tech. Paper No. 40.
- Lane, L.J. 1983. Chapter 19: Transmission Losses. p.19-1–19-21. In Soil Conservation Service. National engineering handbook, section 4: hydrology. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Lane, L.J. 1982. Distributed model for small semi-arid watersheds. J. Hydraulic Eng., ASCE, 108(HY10):1114-1131.
- Mein, R.G. and C.L. Larson. 1973. Modeling infiltration during a steady rain. Water Resources Research 9(2):384-394.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey Staff. 1996. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Nearing, M.A., B.Y. Liu, L.M. Risso, and X. Zhang. 1996. Curve number and Green-Ampt effective hydraulic conductivities. Water Resources Bulletin 32:125-136.
- Rallison, R.E. and N. Miller. 1981. Past, present and future SCS runoff procedure. p. 353-364. In V.P. Singh (ed.). Rainfall runoff relationship. Water Resources Publication, Littleton, CO.
- Rawls, W.J. and D.L. Brakensiek. 1985. Prediction of soil water properties for hydrologic modeling. p. 293-299. In E.B. Jones and T.J. Ward (eds). Watershed management in the 80's. ASCE, New York, N.Y.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1972. Section 4: Hydrology In National Engineering Handbook. SCS.
- Soil Conservation Service Engineering Division. 1986. Urban hydrology for small watersheds. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Technical Release 55.
- Williams, J.R. 1995. Chapter 25: The EPIC model. p. 909-1000. In V.P. Singh (ed). Computer models of watershed hydrology. Water Resources Publications, Highlands Ranch, CO.



## **SECTION 2 CHAPTER 2**

# **EQUATIONS: EVAPOTRANSPIRATION**

---

Evapotranspiration is a collective term that includes all processes by which water at the earth's surface is converted to water vapor. It includes evaporation from the plant canopy, transpiration, sublimation and evaporation from the soil.

Evapotranspiration is the primary mechanism by which water is removed from a watershed. Roughly 62% of the precipitation that falls on the continents is evapotranspired. Evapotranspiration exceeds runoff in most river basins and on all continents except Antarctica (Dingman, 1994).

The difference between precipitation and evapotranspiration is the water available for human use and management. An accurate estimation of evapotranspiration is critical in the assessment of water resources and the impact of climate and land use change on those resources.

## 2:2.1 CANOPY STORAGE

---

The plant canopy can significantly affect infiltration, surface runoff and evapotranspiration. As rain falls, canopy interception reduces the erosive energy of droplets and traps a portion of the rainfall within the canopy. The influence the canopy exerts on these processes is a function of the density of plant cover and the morphology of the plant species.

When calculating surface runoff, the SCS curve number method lumps canopy interception in the term for initial abstractions. This variable also includes surface storage and infiltration prior to runoff and is estimated as 20% of the retention parameter value for a given day (see Chapter 2:1). When the Green and Ampt infiltration equation is used to calculate surface runoff and infiltration, the interception of rainfall by the canopy must be calculated separately.

SWAT allows the maximum amount of water that can be held in canopy storage to vary from day to day as a function of the leaf area index:

$$can_{day} = can_{mx} \cdot \frac{LAI}{LAI_{mx}} \quad 2:2.1.1$$

where  $can_{day}$  is the maximum amount of water that can be trapped in the canopy on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $can_{mx}$  is the maximum amount of water that can be trapped in the canopy when the canopy is fully developed ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $LAI$  is the leaf area index for a given day, and  $LAI_{mx}$  is the maximum leaf area index for the plant.

When precipitation falls on any given day, the canopy storage is filled before any water is allowed to reach the ground:

$$R_{INT(f)} = R_{INT(i)} + R'_{day} \quad \text{and} \quad R_{day} = 0 \quad \text{when } R'_{day} \leq can_{day} - R_{INT(i)} \quad 2:2.1.2$$

$$R_{INT(f)} = can_{day} \quad \text{and} \quad R_{day} = R'_{day} - (can_{day} - R_{INT(i)}) \quad \text{when } R'_{day} > can_{day} - R_{INT(i)} \quad 2:2.1.3$$

where  $R_{INT(i)}$  is the initial amount of free water held in the canopy on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $R_{INT(f)}$  is the final amount of free water held in the canopy on a given

day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $R'_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation on a given day before canopy interception is removed ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation on a given day that reaches the soil surface ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $can_{day}$  is the maximum amount of water that can be trapped in the canopy on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ).

Table 2:2-1: SWAT input variables used in canopy storage calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
CANMX	$can_{mx}$ : maximum canopy storage	.hru

## 2:2.2 POTENTIAL EVAPOTRANSPIRATION

Potential evapotranspiration (PET) was a concept originally introduced by Thornthwaite (1948) as part of a climate classification scheme. He defined PET is the rate at which evapotranspiration would occur from a large area uniformly covered with growing vegetation that has access to an unlimited supply of soil water and that was not exposed to advection or heat storage effects. Because the evapotranspiration rate is strongly influenced by a number of vegetative surface characteristics, Penman (1956) redefined PET as “the amount of water transpired ... by a short green crop, completely shading the ground, of uniform height and never short of water”. Penman used grass as his reference crop, but later researchers (Jensen, et al., 1990) have suggested that alfalfa at a height of 30 to 50 cm may be a more appropriate choice.

Numerous methods have been developed to estimate PET. Three of these methods have been incorporated into SWAT: the Penman-Monteith method (Monteith, 1965; Allen, 1986; Allen et al., 1989), the Priestley-Taylor method (Priestley and Taylor, 1972) and the Hargreaves method (Hargreaves et al., 1985). The model will also read in daily PET values if the user prefers to apply a different potential evapotranspiration method.

The three PET methods included in SWAT vary in the amount of required inputs. The Penman-Monteith method requires solar radiation, air temperature, relative humidity and wind speed. The Priestley-Taylor method requires solar radiation, air temperature and relative humidity. The Hargreaves method requires air temperature only.

### **2:2.2.1 PENMAN-MONTEITH METHOD**

The Penman-Monteith equation combines components that account for energy needed to sustain evaporation, the strength of the mechanism required to remove the water vapor and aerodynamic and surface resistance terms. The Penman-Monteith equation is:

$$\lambda E = \frac{\Delta \cdot (H_{net} - G) + \rho_{air} \cdot c_p \cdot [e_z^o - e_z] / r_a}{\Delta + \gamma \cdot (1 + r_c / r_a)} \quad 2:2.2.1$$

where  $\lambda E$  is the latent heat flux density ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $E$  is the depth rate evaporation ( $\text{mm d}^{-1}$ ),  $\Delta$  is the slope of the saturation vapor pressure-temperature curve,  $de/dT$  ( $\text{kPa} \text{ } ^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$ ),  $H_{net}$  is the net radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $G$  is the heat flux density to the ground ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ),  $\rho_{air}$  is the air density ( $\text{kg m}^{-3}$ ),  $c_p$  is the specific heat at constant pressure ( $\text{MJ kg}^{-1} \text{ } ^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$ ),  $e_z^o$  is the saturation vapor pressure of air at height  $z$  (kPa),  $e_z$  is the water vapor pressure of air at height  $z$  (kPa),  $\gamma$  is the psychrometric constant ( $\text{kPa} \text{ } ^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$ ),  $r_c$  is the plant canopy resistance ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ ), and  $r_a$  is the diffusion resistance of the air layer (aerodynamic resistance) ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ ).

For well-watered plants under neutral atmospheric stability and assuming logarithmic wind profiles, the Penman-Monteith equation may be written (Jensen et al., 1990):

$$\lambda E_t = \frac{\Delta \cdot (H_{net} - G) + \gamma \cdot K_1 \cdot (0.622 \cdot \lambda \cdot \rho_{air} / P) \cdot (e_z^o - e_z) / r_a}{\Delta + \gamma \cdot (1 + r_c / r_a)} \quad 2:2.2.2$$

where  $\lambda$  is the latent heat of vaporization ( $\text{MJ kg}^{-1}$ ),  $E_t$  is the maximum transpiration rate ( $\text{mm d}^{-1}$ ),  $K_1$  is a dimension coefficient needed to ensure the two terms in the numerator have the same units (for  $u_z$  in  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ,  $K_1 = 8.64 \times 10^4$ ), and  $P$  is the atmospheric pressure (kPa).

The calculation of net radiation,  $H_{net}$ , is reviewed in Chapter 1:1. The calculations for the latent heat of vaporization,  $\lambda$ , the slope of the saturation vapor pressure-temperature curve,  $\Delta$ , the psychrometric constant,  $\gamma$ , and the saturation and actual vapor pressure,  $e_z^o$  and  $e_z$ , are reviewed in Chapter 1:2. The remaining

undefined terms are the soil heat flux,  $G$ , the combined term  $K|0.622\lambda\rho/P$ , the aerodynamic resistance,  $r_a$ , and the canopy resistance,  $r_c$ .

### 2:2.2.1.1 SOIL HEAT FLUX

Soil heat storage or release can be significant over a few hours, but is usually small from day to day because heat stored as the soil warms early in the day is lost when the soil cools late in the day or at night. Since the magnitude of daily soil heat flux over a 10- to 30-day period is small when the soil is under a crop cover, it can normally be ignored for most energy balance estimates. SWAT assumes the daily soil heat flux,  $G$ , is always equal to zero.

### 2:2.2.1.2 AERODYNAMIC RESISTANCE

The aerodynamic resistance to sensible heat and vapor transfer,  $r_a$ , is calculated:

$$r_a = \frac{\ln[(z_w - d)/z_{om}]\ln[(z_p - d)/z_{ov}]}{k^2 u_z} \quad 2:2.2.3$$

where  $z_w$  is the height of the wind speed measurement (cm),  $z_p$  is the height of the humidity (psychrometer) and temperature measurements (cm),  $d$  is the zero plane displacement of the wind profile (cm),  $z_{om}$  is the roughness length for momentum transfer (cm),  $z_{ov}$  is the roughness length for vapor transfer (cm),  $k$  is the von Kármán constant, and  $u_z$  is the wind speed at height  $z_w$  ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ).

The von Kármán constant is considered to be a universal constant in turbulent flow. Its value has been calculated to be near 0.4 with a range of 0.36 to 0.43 (Jensen et al., 1990). A value of 0.41 is used by SWAT for the von Kármán constant.

Brutsaert (1975) determined that the surface roughness parameter,  $z_o$ , is related to the mean height ( $h_c$ ) of the plant canopy by the relationship  $h_c/z_o = 3e$  or 8.15 where  $e$  is the natural log base. Based on this relationship, the roughness length for momentum transfer is estimated as:

$$z_{om} = h_c / 8.15 = 0.123 \cdot h_c \quad h_c \leq 200\text{cm} \quad 2:2.2.4$$

$$z_{om} = 0.058 \cdot (h_c)^{1.19} \quad h_c > 200\text{cm} \quad 2:2.2.5$$

where mean height of the plant canopy ( $h_c$ ) is reported in centimeters.

The roughness length for momentum transfer includes the effects of bluff-body forces. These forces have no impact on heat and vapor transfer, and the roughness length for vapor transfer is only a fraction of that for momentum transfer. To estimate the roughness length for vapor transfer, Stricker and Brutsaert (1978) recommended using:

$$z_{ov} = 0.1 \cdot z_{om} \quad 2:2.2.6$$

The displacement height for a plant can be estimated using the following relationship (Monteith, 1981; Plate, 1971):

$$d = 2/3 \cdot h_c \quad 2:2.2.7$$

The height of the wind speed measurement,  $z_w$ , and the height of the humidity (psychrometer) and temperature measurements,  $z_p$ , are always assumed to be 170 cm.

### 2:2.2.1.3 CANOPY RESISTANCE

Studies in canopy resistance have shown that the canopy resistance for a well-watered reference crop can be estimated by dividing the minimum surface resistance for a single leaf by one-half of the canopy leaf area index (Jensen et. al, 1990):

$$r_c = r_\ell / (0.5 \cdot LAI) \quad 2:2.2.8$$

where  $r_c$  is the canopy resistance ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ ),  $r_\ell$  is the minimum effective stomatal resistance of a single leaf ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ ), and  $LAI$  is the leaf area index of the canopy.

The distribution of stomates on a plant leaf will vary between species. Typically, stomates are distributed unequally on the top and bottom of plant leaves. Plants with stomates located on only one side are classified as hypostomatous while plants with an equal number of stomates on both sides of the leaf are termed amphistomatous. The effective leaf stomatal resistance is determined by considering the stomatal resistance of the top (adaxial) and bottom (abaxial) sides to be

connected in parallel (Rosenburg, et al., 1983). When there are unequal numbers of stomates on the top and bottom, the effective stomatal resistance is calculated:

$$r_\ell = \frac{r_{\ell-ad} \cdot r_{\ell-ab}}{r_{\ell-ab} + r_{\ell-ad}} \quad 2:2.2.9$$

where  $r_\ell$  is the minimum effective stomatal resistance of a single leaf ( $s\ m^{-1}$ ),  $r_{\ell-ad}$  is the minimum adaxial stomatal leaf resistance ( $s\ m^{-1}$ ), and  $r_{\ell-ab}$  is the minimum abaxial stomatal leaf resistance ( $s\ m^{-1}$ ). For amphistomatous leaves, the effective stomatal resistance is:

$$r_\ell = \frac{r_{\ell-ad}}{2} = \frac{r_{\ell-ab}}{2} \quad 2:2.2.10$$

For hypostomatous leaves the effective stomatal resistance is:

$$r_\ell = r_{\ell-ad} = r_{\ell-ab} \quad 2:2.2.11$$

Leaf conductance is defined as the inverse of the leaf resistance:

$$g_\ell = \frac{1}{r_\ell} \quad 2:2.2.12$$

where  $g_\ell$  is the maximum effective leaf conductance ( $m\ s^{-1}$ ). When the canopy resistance is expressed as a function of leaf conductance instead of leaf resistance, equation 2:2.2.8 becomes:

$$r_c = (0.5 \cdot g_\ell \cdot LAI)^{-1} \quad 2:2.2.13$$

where  $r_c$  is the canopy resistance ( $s\ m^{-1}$ ),  $g_\ell$  is the maximum conductance of a single leaf ( $m\ s^{-1}$ ), and  $LAI$  is the leaf area index of the canopy.

For climate change simulations, the canopy resistance term can be modified to reflect the impact of change in  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration on leaf conductance. The influence of increasing  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations on leaf conductance was reviewed by Morison (1987). Morison found that at  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations between 330 and 660 ppmv, a doubling in  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration resulted in a 40% reduction in leaf conductance. Within the specified range, the reduction in conductance is linear (Morison and

Gifford, 1983). Easterling et al. (1992) proposed the following modification to the leaf conductance term for simulating carbon dioxide concentration effects on evapotranspiration:

$$g_{\ell,CO_2} = g_{\ell} \cdot [1.4 - 0.4 \cdot (CO_2/330)] \quad 2:2.2.14$$

where  $g_{\ell,CO_2}$  is the leaf conductance modified to reflect CO<sub>2</sub> effects (m s<sup>-1</sup>) and CO<sub>2</sub> is the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (ppmv).

Incorporating this modification into equation 2:2.2.8 gives

$$r_c = r_{\ell} \cdot \left[ (0.5 \cdot LAI) \cdot \left( 1.4 - 0.4 \cdot \frac{CO_2}{330} \right) \right]^{-1} \quad 2:2.2.15$$

SWAT will default the value of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration to 330 ppmv if no value is entered by the user. With this default, the term  $\left( 1.4 - 0.4 \cdot \frac{CO_2}{330} \right)$  reduces to 1.0 and the canopy resistance equation becomes equation 2:2.2.8.

When calculating actual evapotranspiration, the canopy resistance term is modified to reflect the impact of high vapor pressure deficit on leaf conductance (Stockle et al, 1992). For a plant species, a threshold vapor pressure deficit is defined at which the plant's leaf conductance begins to drop in response to the vapor pressure deficit. The adjusted leaf conductance is calculated:

$$g_{\ell} = g_{\ell,mx} \cdot [1 - \Delta g_{\ell,dcl} (vpd - vpd_{thr})] \quad \text{if } vpd > vpd_{thr} \quad 2:2.2.16$$

$$g_{\ell} = g_{\ell,mx} \quad \text{if } vpd \leq vpd_{thr} \quad 2:2.2.17$$

where  $g_{\ell}$  is the conductance of a single leaf (m s<sup>-1</sup>),  $g_{\ell,mx}$  is the maximum conductance of a single leaf (m s<sup>-1</sup>),  $\Delta g_{\ell,dcl}$  is the rate of decline in leaf conductance per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit (m s<sup>-1</sup> kPa<sup>-1</sup>),  $vpd$  is the vapor pressure deficit (kPa), and  $vpd_{thr}$  is the threshold vapor pressure deficit above which a plant will exhibit reduced leaf conductance (kPa). The rate of decline in leaf conductance per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit is calculated by solving equation 2:2.2.16 using measured values for stomatal conductance at two different vapor pressure deficits:

$$\Delta g_{\ell,dcl} = \frac{(1 - fr_{g,mx})}{(vpd_{fr} - vpd_{thr})} \quad 2:2.2.18$$

where  $\Delta g_{\ell,dcl}$  is the rate of decline in leaf conductance per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit ( $m s^{-1} kPa^{-1}$ ),  $fr_{g,mx}$  is the fraction of the maximum stomatal conductance,  $g_{\ell,mx}$ , achieved at the vapor pressure deficit  $vpd_{fr}$ , and  $vpd_{thr}$  is the threshold vapor pressure deficit above which a plant will exhibit reduced leaf conductance (kPa). The threshold vapor pressure deficit is assumed to be 1.0 kPa for all plant species.

#### 2:2.2.1.4 COMBINED TERM

For wind speed in  $m s^{-1}$ , Jensen et al. (1990) provided the following relationship to calculate  $K_1 0.622 \lambda \rho / P$ :

$$K_1 \cdot 0.622 \cdot \lambda \cdot \rho / P = 1710 - 6.85 \cdot \bar{T}_{av} \quad 2:2.2.19$$

where  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean air temperature for the day ( $^{\circ}C$ ).

To calculate potential evapotranspiration, the Penman-Monteith equation must be solved for a reference crop. SWAT uses alfalfa at a height of 40 cm with a minimum leaf resistance of  $100 s m^{-1}$  for the reference crop. Using this canopy height, the equation for aerodynamic resistance (2:2.2.3) simplifies to:

$$r_a = \frac{114.}{u_z} \quad 2:2.2.20$$

The equation for canopy resistance requires the leaf area index. The leaf area index for the reference crop is estimated using an equation developed by Allen et al. (1989) to calculate  $LAI$  as a function of canopy height. For nonclipped grass and alfalfa greater than 3 cm in height:

$$LAI = 1.5 \cdot \ln(h_c) - 1.4 \quad 2:2.2.21$$

where  $LAI$  is the leaf area index and  $h_c$  is the canopy height (cm). For alfalfa with a 40 cm canopy height, the leaf area index is 4.1. Using this value, the equation for canopy resistance simplifies to:

$$r_c = 49 \left/ \left( 1.4 - 0.4 \cdot \frac{CO_2}{330} \right) \right. \quad 2:2.2.22$$

The most accurate estimates of evapotranspiration with the Penman-Monteith equation are made when evapotranspiration is calculated on an hourly basis and summed to obtain the daily values. Mean daily parameter values have been shown to provide reliable estimates of daily evapotranspiration values and this is the approach used in SWAT. However, the user should be aware that calculating evapotranspiration with the Penman-Monteith equation using mean daily values can potentially lead to significant errors. These errors result from diurnal distributions of wind speed, humidity, and net radiation that in combination create conditions which the daily averages do not replicate.

### **2:2.2.2 PRIESTLEY-TAYLOR METHOD**

Priestley and Taylor (1972) developed a simplified version of the combination equation for use when surface areas are wet. The aerodynamic component was removed and the energy component was multiplied by a coefficient,  $\alpha_{pet} = 1.28$ , when the general surroundings are wet or under humid conditions

$$\lambda E_o = \alpha_{pet} \cdot \frac{\Delta}{\Delta + \gamma} \cdot (H_{net} - G) \quad 2:2.2.23$$

where  $\lambda$  is the latent heat of vaporization ( $\text{MJ kg}^{-1}$ ),  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration ( $\text{mm d}^{-1}$ ),  $\alpha_{pet}$  is a coefficient,  $\Delta$  is the slope of the saturation vapor pressure-temperature curve,  $de/dT$  ( $\text{kPa } ^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$ ),  $\gamma$  is the psychrometric constant ( $\text{kPa } ^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$ ),  $H_{net}$  is the net radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ ), and  $G$  is the heat flux density to the ground ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ ).

The Priestley-Taylor equation provides potential evapotranspiration estimates for low advective conditions. In semiarid or arid areas where the advection component of the energy balance is significant, the Priestley-Taylor equation will underestimate potential evapotranspiration.

### **2:2.2.3 HARGREAVES METHOD**

The Hargreaves method was originally derived from eight years of cool-season Alta fescue grass lysimeter data from Davis, California (Hargreaves,

1975). Several improvements were made to the original equation (Hargreaves and Samani, 1982 and 1985) and the form used in SWAT was published in 1985 (Hargreaves et al., 1985):

$$\lambda E_o = 0.0023 \cdot H_0 \cdot (T_{mx} - T_{mn})^{0.5} \cdot (\bar{T}_{av} + 17.8) \quad 2:2.2.24$$

where  $\lambda$  is the latent heat of vaporization ( $\text{MJ kg}^{-1}$ ),  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration ( $\text{mm d}^{-1}$ ),  $H_0$  is the extraterrestrial radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ ),  $T_{mx}$  is the maximum air temperature for a given day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $T_{mn}$  is the minimum air temperature for a given day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean air temperature for a given day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

Table 2:2-2: SWAT input variables used in potential evapotranspiration calculations summarized in this section.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
IPET	Potential evapotranspiration method	.bsn
WND_SP	$u_z$ : Daily wind speed (m/s)	.wnd
CO2	$CO_2$ : Carbon dioxide concentration (ppmv)	.sub
MAX TEMP	$T_{mx}$ : Daily maximum temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.tmp
MIN TEMP	$T_{mn}$ : Daily minimum temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	.tmp
GSI	$g_{\ell,mx}$ : maximum leaf conductance ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )	crop.dat
FRGMAX	$fr_{g,mx}$ : Fraction of maximum leaf conductance achieved at the vapor pressure deficit specified by $vpd_{fr}$	crop.dat
VPDFR	$vpd_{fr}$ : Vapor pressure deficit corresponding to value given for $fr_{g,mx}$ (kPa)	crop.dat

## 2:2.3 ACTUAL EVAPOTRANSPIRATION

---

Once total potential evapotranspiration is determined, actual evaporation must be calculated. SWAT first evaporates any rainfall intercepted by the plant canopy. Next, SWAT calculates the maximum amount of transpiration and the maximum amount of sublimation/soil evaporation using an approach similar to that of Richtie (1972). The actual amount of sublimation and evaporation from the soil is then calculated. If snow is present in the HRU, sublimation will occur. Only when no snow is present will evaporation from the soil take place.

### 2:2.3.1 EVAPORATION OF INTERCEPTED RAINFALL

Any free water present in the canopy is readily available for removal by evapotranspiration. The amount of actual evapotranspiration contributed by intercepted rainfall is especially significant in forests where in some instances evaporation of intercepted rainfall is greater than transpiration.

SWAT removes as much water as possible from canopy storage when calculating actual evaporation. If potential evapotranspiration,  $E_o$ , is less than the amount of free water held in the canopy,  $R_{INT}$ , then

$$E_a = E_{can} = E_o \quad 2:2.3.1$$

$$R_{INT(f)} = R_{INT(i)} - E_{can} \quad 2:2.3.2$$

where  $E_a$  is the actual amount of evapotranspiration occurring in the watershed on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_{can}$  is the amount of evaporation from free water in the canopy on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $R_{INT(i)}$  is the initial amount of free water held in the canopy on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $R_{INT(f)}$  is the final amount of free water held in the canopy on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). If potential evapotranspiration,  $E_o$ , is greater than the amount of free water held in the canopy,  $R_{INT}$ , then

$$E_{can} = R_{INT(i)} \quad 2:2.3.3$$

$$R_{INT(f)} = 0 \quad 2:2.3.4$$

Once any free water in the canopy has been evaporated, the remaining evaporative water demand ( $E'_o = E_o - E_{can}$ ) is partitioned between the vegetation and snow/soil.

### **2:2.3.2 TRANSPIRATION**

If the Penman-Monteith equation is selected as the potential evapotranspiration method, transpiration is also calculated with the equations summarized in Section 2:2.2.1. For the other potential evapotranspiration methods, transpiration is calculated as:

$$E_t = \frac{E'_o \cdot LAI}{3.0} \quad 0 \leq LAI \leq 3.0 \quad 2:2.3.5$$

$$E_t = E'_o \quad LAI > 3.0 \quad 2:2.3.6$$

where  $E_t$  is the maximum transpiration on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E'_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration adjusted for evaporation of free water in the canopy (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $LAI$  is the leaf area index. The value for transpiration calculated by equations 2:2.3.5 and 2:2.3.6 is the amount of transpiration that will occur on a given day when the plant is growing under ideal conditions. The actual amount of transpiration may be less than this due to lack of available water in the soil profile. Calculation of actual plant water uptake and transpiration is reviewed in Chapters 5:2 and 5:3.

### **2:2.3.3 SUBLIMATION AND EVAPORATION FROM THE SOIL**

The amount of sublimation and soil evaporation will be impacted by the degree of shading. The maximum amount of sublimation/soil evaporation on a given day is calculated as:

$$E_s = E'_o \cdot cov_{sol} \quad 2:2.3.7$$

where  $E_s$  is the maximum sublimation/soil evaporation on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E'_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration adjusted for evaporation of free water in the canopy (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $cov_{sol}$  is the soil cover index. The soil cover index is calculated

$$cov_{sol} = \exp(-5.0 \times 10^{-5} \cdot CV) \quad 2:2.3.8$$

where  $CV$  is the aboveground biomass and residue ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ). If the snow water content is greater than 0.5 mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , the soil cover index is set to 0.5.

The maximum amount of sublimation/soil evaporation is reduced during periods of high plant water use with the relationship:

$$E'_s = \min \left[ E_s, \frac{E_s \cdot E'_o}{E_s + E_t} \right] \quad 2:2.3.9$$

where  $E'_s$  is the maximum sublimation/soil evaporation adjusted for plant water use on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $E_s$  is the maximum sublimation/soil evaporation on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $E'_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration adjusted for evaporation of free water in the canopy (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $E_t$  is the transpiration on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ). When  $E_t$  is low  $E'_s \rightarrow E_s$ . However, as  $E_t$  approaches  $E'_o$ ,

$$E'_s \rightarrow \frac{E_s}{1 + cov_{sol}}.$$

### 2:2.3.3.1 SUBLIMATION

Once the maximum amount of sublimation/soil evaporation for the day is calculated, SWAT will first remove water from the snow pack to meet the evaporative demand. If the water content of the snow pack is greater than the maximum sublimation/soil evaporation demand, then

$$E_{sub} = E'_s \quad 2:2.3.10$$

$$SNO_{(f)} = SNO_{(i)} - E'_s \quad 2:2.3.11$$

$$E''_s = 0. \quad 2:2.3.12$$

where  $E_{sub}$  is the amount of sublimation on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $E'_s$  is the maximum sublimation/soil evaporation adjusted for plant water use on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $SNO_{(i)}$  is the amount of water in the snow pack on a given day prior to accounting for sublimation (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $SNO_{(f)}$  is the amount of water in the snow pack on a given day after accounting for sublimation (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $E''_s$  is the maximum soil water evaporation on

a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). If the water content of the snow pack is less than the maximum sublimation/soil evaporation demand, then

$$E_{sub} = SNO_{(i)} \quad 2:2.3.13$$

$$SNO_{(f)} = 0. \quad 2:2.3.14$$

$$E''_s = E'_s - E_{sub} \quad 2:2.3.15$$

### 2:2.3.3.2 SOIL WATER EVAPORATION

When an evaporation demand for soil water exists, SWAT must first partition the evaporative demand between the different layers. The depth distribution used to determine the maximum amount of water allowed to be evaporated is:

$$E_{soil,z} = E''_s \cdot \frac{z}{z + \exp(2.374 - 0.00713 \cdot z)} \quad 2:2.3.16$$

where  $E_{soil,z}$  is the evaporative demand at depth  $z$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E''_s$  is the maximum soil water evaporation on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $z$  is the depth below the surface. The coefficients in this equation were selected so that 50% of the evaporative demand is extracted from the top 10 mm of soil and 95% of the evaporative demand is extracted from the top 100 mm of soil.

The amount of evaporative demand for a soil layer is determined by taking the difference between the evaporative demands calculated at the upper and lower boundaries of the soil layer:

$$E_{soil,ly} = E_{soil,zl} - E_{soil,zu} \quad 2:2.3.16$$

where  $E_{soil,ly}$  is the evaporative demand for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_{soil,zl}$  is the evaporative demand at the lower boundary of the soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $E_{soil,zu}$  is the evaporative demand at the upper boundary of the soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Figure 2:2-1 graphs the depth distribution of the evaporative demand for a soil that has been partitioned into 1 mm layers assuming a total soil evaporation demand of 100 mm.




Figure 2.2-1: Soil evaporative demand distribution with depth.

As mentioned previously, the depth distribution assumes 50% of the evaporative demand is met by soil water stored in the top 10 mm of the soil profile. With our example of a 100 mm total evaporative demand, 50 mm of water is 50%. This is a demand that the top layer cannot satisfy.

SWAT does not allow a different layer to compensate for the inability of another layer to meet its evaporative demand. The evaporative demand not met by a soil layer results in a reduction in actual evapotranspiration for the HRU.

A coefficient has been incorporated into equation 2:2.3.16 to allow the user to modify the depth distribution used to meet the soil evaporative demand. The modified equation is:

$$E_{soil,ly} = E_{soil,zl} - E_{soil,zu} \cdot esco \quad 2:2.3.17$$

where  $E_{soil,ly}$  is the evaporative demand for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_{soil,zl}$  is the evaporative demand at the lower boundary of the soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_{soil,zu}$  is the evaporative demand at the upper boundary of the soil layer

(mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and *esco* is the soil evaporation compensation coefficient. Solutions to this equation for different values of *esco* are graphed in Figure 7-2. The plot for *esco* = 1.0 is that shown in Figure 2:2-1.




Figure 2:2-2: Soil evaporative demand distribution with depth

As the value for *esco* is reduced, the model is able to extract more of the evaporative demand from lower levels.

When the water content of a soil layer is below field capacity, the evaporative demand for the layer is reduced according to the following equations:

$$E'_{soil,ly} = E_{soil,ly} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2.5 \cdot (SW_{ly} - FC_{ly})}{FC_{ly} - WP_{ly}}\right) \text{ when } SW_{ly} < FC_{ly} \quad 2:2.3.18$$

$$E'_{soil,ly} = E_{soil,ly} \quad \text{when } SW_{ly} \geq FC_{ly} \quad 2:2.3.19$$

where  $E'_{soil,ly}$  is the evaporative demand for layer *ly* adjusted for water content (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_{soil,ly}$  is the evaporative demand for layer *ly* (mm

$\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $SW_{ly}$  is the soil water content of layer  $ly$  (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  at field capacity (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $WP_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  at wilting point (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ).

In addition to limiting the amount of water removed by evaporation in dry conditions, SWAT defines a maximum value of water that can be removed at any time. This maximum value is 80% of the plant available water on a given day where the plant available water is defined as the total water content of the soil layer minus the water content of the soil layer at wilting point (-1.5 MPa).

$$E''_{soil,ly} = \min(E'_{soil,ly}, 0.8 \cdot (SW_{ly} - WP_{ly})) \quad 2:2.3.20$$

where  $E''_{soil,ly}$  is the amount of water removed from layer  $ly$  by evaporation (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $E'_{soil,ly}$  is the evaporative demand for layer  $ly$  adjusted for water content (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $SW_{ly}$  is the soil water content of layer  $ly$  (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $WP_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  at wilting point (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ).

Table 2:2-3: SWAT input variables used in soil evaporation calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
ESCO	esco: soil evaporation compensation coefficient	.bsn, .hru

## 2:2.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$CO_2$	Concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (ppmv)
$CV$	Total aboveground biomass and residue present on current day (kg $\text{ha}^{-1}$ )
$E$	Depth rate evaporation (mm $\text{d}^{-1}$ )
$E_a$	Actual amount of evapotranspiration on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$E_{can}$	Amount of evaporation from free water in the canopy on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$E_o$	Potential evapotranspiration (mm $\text{d}^{-1}$ )
$E'_o$	Potential evapotranspiration adjusted for evaporation of free water in the canopy (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$E_s$	Maximum sublimation/soil evaporation on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$E'_s$	Maximum sublimation/soil evaporation adjusted for plant water use on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$E''_s$	Maximum soil water evaporation on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$E''_{soil,ly}$	Evaporative demand for layer $ly$ (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )

$E'_{soil,ly}$	Evaporative demand for layer $ly$ adjusted for water content (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E''_{soil,ly}$	Amount of water removed from layer $ly$ by evaporation (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_{soil,z}$	Evaporative demand at depth $z$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_{sub}$	Amount of sublimation on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_t$	Transpiration rate (mm d <sup>-1</sup> )
$FC_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at field capacity (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$G$	Heat flux density to the ground (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_0$	Extraterrestrial daily irradiation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_{net}$	Net radiation on day (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$K_1$	Dimension coefficient in Penman-Monteith equation
$LAI$	Leaf area index of the canopy
$LAI_{mx}$	Maximum leaf area index for the plant
$P$	Atmospheric pressure (kPa)
$R_{day}$	Amount of rainfall on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$R'_{day}$	Amount of precipitation on a given day before canopy interception is removed (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$R_{INT}$	Amount of free water held in the canopy on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SNO$	Water content of snow cover on current day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SW_{ly}$	Soil water content of layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$T_{mn}$	Minimum air temperature for day (°C)
$T_{mx}$	Maximum air temperature for day (°C)
$\bar{T}_{av}$	Mean air temperature for day (°C)
$WP_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at wilting point (mm H <sub>2</sub> O).
$c_p$	Specific heat of moist air at constant pressure ( $1.013 \times 10^{-3}$ MJ kg <sup>-1</sup> °C <sup>-1</sup> )
$can_{day}$	Maximum amount of water that can be trapped in the canopy on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$can_{mx}$	Maximum amount of water that can be trapped in the canopy when the canopy is fully developed (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$cov_{sol}$	Soil cover index
$d$	Zero plane displacement of the wind profile (cm)
$e$	Actual vapor pressure on a given day (kPa)
$e^o$	Saturation vapor pressure on a given day (kPa)
$esco$	Soil evaporation compensation coefficient
$fr_{g,mx}$	Fraction of the maximum stomatal conductance, $g_{\ell,mx}$ , achieved at the vapor pressure deficit, $vpd_f$
$g_\ell$	Leaf conductance (m s <sup>-1</sup> )
$g_{\ell,mx}$	Maximum conductance of a single leaf (m s <sup>-1</sup> )
$h_c$	Canopy height (cm)
$k$	Von Kármán constant
$r_a$	Diffusion resistance of the air layer (aerodynamic resistance) (s m <sup>-1</sup> )
$r_c$	Plant canopy resistance (s m <sup>-1</sup> )
$r_\ell$	Minimum effective resistance of a single leaf (s m <sup>-1</sup> )

$r_{\ell-ab}$	Minimum abaxial stomatal leaf resistance ( $\text{m}^{-1}$ )
$r_{\ell-ad}$	Minimum adaxial stomatal leaf resistance ( $\text{m}^{-1}$ )
$u_z$	Wind speed at height $z_w$ ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$vpd$	Vapor pressure deficit (kPa)
$vpd_{fr}$	Vapor pressure deficit corresponding to $fr_{g,mx}$ (kPa)
$vpd_{thr}$	Threshold vapor pressure deficit above which a plant will exhibit reduced leaf conductance (kPa)
$z$	Depth below soil surface (mm)
$z_{om}$	Roughness length for momentum transfer (cm)
$z_{ov}$	Roughness length for vapor transfer (cm)
$z_p$	Height of the humidity (psychrometer) and temperature measurements (cm)
$z_w$	Height of the wind speed measurement (cm)
$\alpha_{pet}$	Coefficient in Priestley-Taylor equation
$\Delta$	Slope of the saturation vapor pressure curve (kPa $^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$ )
$\Delta g_{\ell,dcl}$	Rate of decline in leaf conductance per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit ( $\text{m s}^{-1} \text{kPa}^{-1}$ )
$\rho_{air}$	Air density ( $\text{kg m}^{-3}$ )
$\gamma$	Psychrometric constant (kPa $^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$ )
$\lambda$	Latent heat of vaporization (MJ $\text{kg}^{-1}$ )

## 2:2.5 REFERENCES

---

- Allen, R.G. 1986. A Penman for all seasons. *J. Irrig. and Drain Engng.*, ASCE, 112(4): 348-368.
- Allen, R.G., M.E. Jensen, J.L. Wright, and R.D. Burman. 1989. Operational estimates of evapotranspiration. *Agron. J.* 81:650-662.
- Brutsaert, W. 1975. Comments on surface roughness parameters and the height of dense vegetation. *J. Meterol. Soc. Japan* 53:96-97.
- Dingman, S.L. 1994. Physical hydrology. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Easterling, W.E., N.J. Rosenberg, M.S. McKenney, C.A. Jones, P.T. Dyke, and J.R. Williams. 1992. Preparing the erosion productivity impact calculator (EPIC) model to simulate crop response to climate change and the direct effects of CO<sub>2</sub>. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 59:17-34.

- Hargreaves, G.H. 1975. Moisture availability and crop production. *Trans. ASAE* 18: 980-984.
- Hargreaves, G.H. and Z.A. Samani. 1985. Reference crop evapotranspiration from temperature. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture* 1:96-99.
- Hargreaves, G.H. and Z.A. Samani. 1982. Estimating potential evapotranspiration. *Tech. Note, J. Irrig. and Drain. Engr.* 108(3):225-230.
- Hargreaves, G.L., G.H. Hargreaves, and J.P. Riley. 1985. Agricultural benefits for Senegal River Basin. *J. Irrig. and Drain. Engr.* 111(2):113-124.
- Jensen, M.E., R.D. Burman, and R.G. Allen (ed). 1990. *Evapotranspiration and irrigation water requirements*. ASCE Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice No. 70, ASCE, N.Y. 332 pp.
- Monteith, J.L. 1965. Evaporation and the environment. p. 205-234. *In The state and movement of water in living organisms, XIXth Symposium. Soc. for Exp. Biol.*, Swansea, Cambridge University Press.
- Monteith, J.L. 1981. Evaporation and surface temperature. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.* 107:1-27.
- Morison, J.I.L. 1987. Intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentration and stomatal response to CO<sub>2</sub>. p. 229-251. *In E. Zeiger, G.D. Farquhar and I.R. Cowan (ed.) Stomatal function*. Standford University Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Morison, J.I.L. and R.M. Gifford. 1983. Stomatal sensitivity to carbon dioxide and humidity. *Plant Physiol.* 71:789-796.
- Penman, H.L. 1956. Evaporation: An introductory survey. *Netherlands Journal of Agricultural Science* 4:7-29.
- Plate, E.J. 1971. Aerodynamic characteristics of atmospheric boundary layers. U.S. Atomic Energy Comm., Critical Review Series, TID-25465. 190 pp.
- Priestley, C.H.B. and R.J. Taylor. 1972. On the assessment of surface heat flux and evaporation using large-scale parameters. *Mon. Weather. Rev.* 100:81-92.
- Ritchie, J.T. 1972. Model for predicting evaporation from a row crop with incomplete cover. *Water Resour. Res.* 8:1204-1213.

- Rosenburg, N.J., B.L. Blad, and S.B. Verma. 1983. Microclimate: the biological environment, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Stockle, C.O., J.R. Williams, N.J. Rosenberg, and C.A. Jones. 1992. A method for estimating the direct and climatic effects of rising atmospheric carbon dioxide on growth and yield of crops: Part 1—Modification of the EPIC model for climate change analysis. Agricultural Systems 38:225-238.
- Stricker, H. and W. Brutsaert. 1978. Actual evapotranspiration over summer period in the 'Hupsel Catchment.' J. Hydrol. 39:139-157.
- Thornthwaite, C.W. 1948. An approach toward a rational classification of climate. Geographical Review 38:55-94.



## **SECTION 2 CHAPTER 3**

# **EQUATIONS: SOIL WATER**

---

Water that enters the soil may move along one of several different pathways. The water may be removed from the soil by plant uptake or evaporation. It can percolate past the bottom of the soil profile and ultimately become aquifer recharge. A final option is that water may move laterally in the profile and contribute to streamflow. Of these different pathways, plant uptake of water removes the majority of water that enters the soil profile.

## 2:3.1 SOIL STRUCTURE

---

Soil is comprised of three phases—solid, liquid and gas. The solid phase consists of minerals and/or organic matter that forms the matrix or skeleton of the soil. Between the solid particles, soil pores are formed that hold the liquid and gas phases. The soil solution may fill the soil pores completely (saturated) or partially (unsaturated). When the soil is unsaturated, the soil solution is found as thin films along particle surfaces, as annular wedges around contact points of particles and as isolated bodies in narrow pore passages.

The soil's bulk density defines the relative amounts of pore space and soil matrix. Bulk density is calculated:

$$\rho_b = \frac{M_s}{V_t} \quad 2:3.1.1$$

where  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density ( $\text{Mg m}^{-3}$ ),  $M_s$  is the mass of the solids ( $\text{Mg}$ ), and  $V_t$  is the total volume ( $\text{m}^3$ ). The total volume is defined as

$$V_t = V_A + V_W + V_S \quad 2:3.1.2$$

where  $V_A$  is the volume of air ( $\text{m}^3$ ),  $V_W$  is the volume of water ( $\text{m}^3$ ), and  $V_S$  is the volume of solids ( $\text{m}^3$ ). The relationship between soil porosity and soil bulk density is

$$\phi_{soil} = 1 - \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_s} \quad 2:3.1.3$$

where  $\phi_{soil}$  is the soil porosity expressed as a fraction of the total soil volume,  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density ( $\text{Mg m}^{-3}$ ), and  $\rho_s$  is the particle density ( $\text{Mg m}^{-3}$ ). The particle density, or density of the solid fraction, is a function of the mineral composition of the soil matrix. Based on research, a default value of  $2.65 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  is used for particle density.

Storage, transport and availability of soil solution and soil air are not nearly as dependent on the total amount of porosity as they are on the arrangement of pore space. Soil pores vary in size and shape due to textural and structural arrangement. Based on the diameter of the pore at the narrowest point, the pores may be classified as macropores (narrowest diameter  $> 100 \mu\text{m}$ ),

mesopores (narrowest diameter 30-100  $\mu\text{m}$ ), and micropores (narrowest diameter  $< 30 \mu\text{m}$ ) (Koorevaar et al, 1983). Macropores conduct water only during flooding or ponding rain and drainage of water from these pores is complete soon after cessation of the water supply. Macropores control aeration and drainage processes in the soil. Mesopores conduct water even after macropores have emptied, e.g. during non-ponding rain and redistribution. Micropores retain soil solution or conduct it very slowly.

When comparing soils of different texture, clay soils contain a greater fraction of mesopores and micropores while sand soils contain mostly macropores. This is evident when the hydraulic conductivities of clay and sand soils are compared. The conductivity of a sand soil can be several orders of magnitude greater than that for a clay soil.

The water content of a soil can range from zero when the soil is oven dried to a maximum value ( $\phi_{soil}$ ) when the soil is saturated. For plant-soil interactions, two intermediate stages are recognized: field capacity and permanent wilting point. Field capacity is the water content found when a thoroughly wetted soil has drained for approximately two days. Permanent wilting point is the water content found when plants growing in the soil wilt and do not recover if their leaves are kept in a humid atmosphere overnight. To allow these two stages to be quantified more easily, they have been redefined in terms of tensions at which water is held by the soil. Field capacity is the amount of water held in the soil at a tension of 0.033 MPa and the permanent wilting point is the amount of water held in the soil at a tension of 1.5 MPa. The amount of water held in the soil between field capacity and permanent wilting point is considered to be the water available for plant extraction.

Table 2:3-1: Water contents for various soils at different moisture conditions.

Texture	Clay Content (% Solids)	Water content (fraction total soil volume)		
		Saturation	Field capacity	Permanent wilting point
Sand	3 %	0.40	0.06	0.02
Loam	22 %	0.50	0.29	0.05
Clay	47 %	0.60	0.41	0.20

Table 2:3-1 lists the water content for three soils as a fraction of the total volume for different moisture conditions. Note that the total porosity, given by the water content at saturation, is lowest for the sand soil and highest for the clay soil.

The sand soil drains more quickly than the loam and clay. Only 15% of the water present in the sand soil at saturation remains at field capacity. 58% of the water present at saturation in the loam remains at field capacity while 68% of the water present at saturation in the clay soil remains at field capacity. The reduction of water loss with increase in clay content is caused by two factors. As mentioned previously, clay soils contain more mesopores and micropores than sand soils. Also, unlike sand and silt particles, clay particles possess a net negative charge. Due to the polar nature of water molecules, clay particles are able to attract and retain water molecules. The higher water retention of clay soils is also seen in the fraction of water present at permanent wilting point. In the soils listed in Table 2:3-1, the volumetric water content of the clay is 0.20 at the wilting point while the sand and loam have a volumetric water content of 0.02 and 0.05 respectively.

The plant available water, also referred to as the available water capacity, is calculated by subtracting the fraction of water present at permanent wilting point from that present at field capacity.

$$AWC = FC - WP \quad 2:3.1.4$$

where  $AWC$  is the plant available water content,  $FC$  is the water content at field capacity, and  $WP$  is the water content at permanent wilting point. For the three soil textures listed in Table 2:3-1, the sand has an available water capacity of 0.04, the loam has an available water capacity of 0.24 and the clay has an available water capacity of 0.21. Even though the clay contains a greater amount of water than the loam at all three tensions, the loam has a larger amount of water available for plant uptake than the clay. This characteristic is true in general.

SWAT estimates the permanent wilting point volumetric water content for each soil layer as:

$$WP_{ly} = 0.40 \cdot \frac{m_c \cdot \rho_b}{100} \quad 2:3.1.5$$

where  $WP_{ly}$  is the water content at wilting point expressed as a fraction of the total soil volume,  $m_c$  is the percent clay content of the layer (%), and  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density for the soil layer ( $Mg\ m^{-3}$ ). Field capacity water content is estimated

$$FC_{ly} = WP_{ly} + AWC_{ly} \quad 2:3.1.6$$

where  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content at field capacity expressed as a fraction of the total soil volume,  $WP_{ly}$  is the water content at wilting point expressed as a fraction of the total soil volume, and  $AWC_{ly}$  is the available water capacity of the soil layer expressed as a fraction of the total soil volume.  $AWC_{ly}$  is input by the user.

Water in the soil can flow under saturated or unsaturated conditions. In saturated soils, flow is driven by gravity and usually occurs in the downward direction. Unsaturated flow is caused by gradients arising due to adjacent areas of high and low water content. Unsaturated flow may occur in any direction.

SWAT directly simulates saturated flow only. The model records the water contents of the different soil layers but assumes that the water is uniformly distributed within a given layer. This assumption eliminates the need to model unsaturated flow in the horizontal direction. Unsaturated flow between layers is indirectly modeled with the depth distribution of plant water uptake (equation 5:2.2.1) and the depth distribution of soil water evaporation (equation 2:2.3.16).

Saturated flow occurs when the water content of a soil layer surpasses the field capacity for the layer. Water in excess of the field capacity water content is available for percolation, lateral flow or tile flow drainage unless the temperature of the soil layer is below 0°C. When the soil layer is frozen, no water movement is calculated.

Table 2:3-1: SWAT input variables used in percolation calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
CLAY	$m_c$ : Percent clay content	.sol
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density ( $Mg\ m^{-3}$ )	.sol
SOL_AWC	$AWC_{ly}$ : available water capacity	.sol

## 2:3.2 PERCOLATION

---

Percolation is calculated for each soil layer in the profile. Water is allowed to percolate if the water content exceeds the field capacity water content for that layer and the layer below is not saturated. When the soil layer is frozen, no water flow out of the layer is calculated.

The volume of water available for percolation in the soil layer is calculated:

$$SW_{ly,excess} = SW_{ly} - FC_{ly} \quad \text{if } SW_{ly} > FC_{ly} \quad 2:3.2.1$$

$$SW_{ly,excess} = 0 \quad \text{if } SW_{ly} \leq FC_{ly} \quad 2:3.2.2$$

where  $SW_{ly,excess}$  is the drainable volume of water in the soil layer on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $SW_{ly}$  is the water content of the soil layer on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ) and  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content of the soil layer at field capacity ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ).

The amount of water that moves from one layer to the underlying layer is calculated using storage routing methodology. The equation used to calculate the amount of water that percolates to the next layer is:

$$w_{perc,ly} = SW_{ly,excess} \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-\Delta t}{TT_{perc}} \right] \right) \quad 2:3.2.3$$

where  $w_{perc,ly}$  is the amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $SW_{ly,excess}$  is the drainable volume of water in the soil layer on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $\Delta t$  is the length of the time step (hrs), and  $TT_{perc}$  is the travel time for percolation (hrs). If the HRU has a seasonal high water table, percolation is not allowed when  $SW_{ly+1} \leq FC_{ly+1} + 0.5 \cdot (SAT_{ly+1} - FC_{ly+1})$  where  $SW_{ly+1}$  is the water content of the underlying soil layer ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $FC_{ly+1}$  is the water content of the underlying soil layer at field capacity ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $SAT_{ly+1}$  is the amount of water in the underlying soil layer when completely saturated ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ). The water will instead stay ponded in the upper layer.

The travel time for percolation is unique for each layer. It is calculate

$$TT_{perc} = \frac{SAT_{ly} - FC_{ly}}{K_{sat}} \quad 2:3.2.4$$

where  $TT_{perc}$  is the travel time for percolation (hrs),  $SAT_{ly}$  is the amount of water in the soil layer when completely saturated (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content of the soil layer at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $K_{sat}$  is the saturated hydraulic conductivity for the layer (mm·h<sup>-1</sup>).

Water that percolates out of the lowest soil layer enters the vadose zone. The vadose zone is the unsaturated zone between the bottom of the soil profile and the top of the aquifer. Movement of water through the vadose zone and into the aquifers is reviewed in Chapter 2:4.

Table 2:3-2: SWAT input variables used in percolation calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
SOL_K	$K_{sat}$ : Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)	.sol
IWATABLE	High water table code: 0-no water table in soil profile 1-seasonal high water table present in profile	.hru

## 2:3.3 BYPASS FLOW

One of the most unique soil orders is the Vertisols. These soils are characterized by a propensity to shrink when dried and swell when moistened. When the soil is dry, large cracks form at the soil surface. This behavior is a result of the type of soil material present and the climate. Vertisols contain at least 30% clay with the clay fraction dominated by smectitic mineralogy and occur in areas with cyclical wet and dry periods.

Vertisols are found worldwide (Figure 2:3-1). They have a number of local names, some of which are listed in Table 2:3-3.




Figure 2:3-1: Soil associations of Vertisols (After Dudal and Eswaran, 1988)

Table 2:3-3: Alternative names for Vertisols or soils with Vertic properties (Dudal and Eswaran, 1988).

Names	Countries
<i>Names that include the word "black"</i>	
Barros pretos	Portugal
Black clays	South Africa, Australia
Black cotton soils	Africa, India
Black cracking clays	Uganda
Black earths	Australia, Africa
Black turf soils	South Africa
Dark clay soils	United States
Subtropical black clays	Africa
Sols noirs tropicaux	Africa
Terra nera	Italy
Terres noires tropicales	Africa
Terras negras tropicais	Mozambique
Tierras negras de Andalucia	Spain
Tropical black earths	Angola, Ghana
Tropical black clays	Africa
<i>Names that reflect the black color</i>	
Karail	India
Melanites	Ghana
Teen Suda	Sudan
Tropical Chernozems	Africa, India
Impact Chernozems	Russia
<i>Vernacular names</i>	
Adobe soils	United States, Philippines
Badobes	Sudan
Dian Pere	French West Africa
Gilgai soils	Australia
Firki	Nigeria
Mbuga	Tanzania
Kahamba	Congo
Makande	Malawi
Morogan	Romania
Regur	India
Rendzina	United States
Shachiang soils	China
Smolnitza	Bulgaria, Romania

Table 2:3-3 Cont.

Names	Countries
Smonitzia	Austria, Yugoslavia
Sols de paluds	France
Tirs	Morocco, North Africa
Vlei grond	South Africa
Sonsocuite	Nicaragua
<i>Coined names</i>	
Densinigra soils	Angola
Gravinigra soils	Angola
Grumusols	United States
Margalite soils	Indonesia
Vertisols	United States

One criteria used to classify a soil as a Vertisol is the formation of shrinkage cracks in the dry season that penetrate to a depth of more than 50 cm and are at least 1 cm wide at 50 cm depth. The cracks can be considerably wider at the surface—30 cm cracks at the surface are not unusual although 6-15 cm cracks are more typical.

To accurately predict surface runoff and infiltration in areas dominated by soils that exhibit Vertic properties, the temporal change in soil volume must be quantified. Bouma and Loveday (1988) identified three soil moisture conditions for which infiltration needs to be defined (Figure 2:3-2).




Figure 2:3-2: Diagram showing the effect of wetting and drying on cracking in Vertisols (After Bouma and Loveday, 1988)

Traditional models of infiltration are applicable to soils in which cracks have been closed by swelling and the soil acts as a relatively homogenous porous medium (Condition 3 in Figure 2:3-2). Condition 1 in Figure 2:3-2 represents the

driest state with cracks at maximum width, a condition present at the end of the dry season/beginning of the rainy season. Condition 2 in Figure 2:3-2 represents the crack development typical with an actively growing crop requiring multiple irrigation or rainfall events to sustain growth. Bypass flow, the vertical movement of free water along macropores through unsaturated soil horizons, will occur in conditions 1 and 2. Bypass flow ( $f_{inf,2}$  in Figure 2:3-2) occurs when the rate of rainfall or irrigation exceeds the vertical infiltration rate into the soil peds ( $f_{inf,1}$  in Figure 2:3-2).

When bypass flow is modeled, SWAT calculates the crack volume of the soil matrix for each day of simulation by layer. On days in which precipitation events occur, infiltration and surface runoff is first calculated for the soil peds ( $f_{inf,1}$  in Figure 2:3-2) using the curve number or Green & Ampt method. If any surface runoff is generated, it is allowed to enter the cracks. A volume of water equivalent to the total crack volume for the soil profile may enter the profile as bypass flow. Surface runoff in excess of the crack volume remains overland flow.

Water that enters the cracks fills the soil layers beginning with the lowest layer of crack development. After cracks in one layer are filled, the cracks in the overlying layer are allowed to fill.

The crack volume initially estimated for a layer is calculated:

$$crk_{ly,i} = crk_{max,ly} \cdot \frac{coef_{crk} \cdot FC_{ly} - SW_{ly}}{coef_{crk} \cdot FC_{ly}} \quad 2:3.3.1$$

where  $crk_{ly,i}$  is the initial crack volume calculated for the soil layer on a given day expressed as a depth (mm),  $crk_{max,ly}$  is the maximum crack volume possible for the soil layer (mm),  $coef_{crk}$  is an adjustment coefficient for crack flow,  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content of the soil layer at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $SW_{ly}$  is the water content of the soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The adjustment coefficient for crack flow,  $coef_{crk}$ , is set to 0.10.

When the moisture content of the entire profile falls below 90% of the field capacity water content for the profile during the drying stage, the crack volume for a given day is a function of the crack volume estimated with equation

2:3.3.1 and the crack volume of the layer on the previous day. When the soil is wetting and/or when the moisture content of the profile is above 90% of the field capacity water content, the crack volume for a given day is equal to the volume calculated with equation 2:3.3.1.

$$\text{crk}_{ly} = \ell_{\text{crk}} \cdot \text{crk}_{ly,d-1} + (1.0 - \ell_{\text{crk}}) \cdot \text{crk}_{ly,i} \quad \text{when } SW < 0.90 \cdot FC \text{ and } \text{crk}_{ly,i} > \text{crk}_{ly,d-1} \quad 2:3.3.2$$

$$\text{crk}_{ly} = \text{crk}_{ly,i} \quad \text{when } SW \geq 0.90 \cdot FC \text{ or } \text{crk}_{ly,i} \leq \text{crk}_{ly,d-1} \quad 2:3.3.3$$

where  $\text{crk}_{ly}$  is the crack volume for the soil layer on a given day expressed as a depth (mm),  $\ell_{\text{crk}}$  is the lag factor for crack development during drying,  $\text{crk}_{ly,d-1}$  is the crack volume for the soil layer on the previous day (mm),  $\text{crk}_{ly,i}$  is the initial crack volume calculated for the soil layer on a given day using equation 2:3.3.1 (mm),  $SW$  is the water content of the soil profile on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $FC$  is the water content of the soil profile at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

As the tension at which water is held by the soil particles increases, the rate of water diffusion slows. Because the rate of water diffusion is analogous to the coefficient of consolidation in classical consolidation theory (Mitchell, 1992), the reduction in diffusion will affect crack formation. The lag factor is introduced during the drying stage to account for the change in moisture redistribution dynamics that occurs as the soil dries. The lag factor,  $\ell_{\text{crk}}$ , is set to a value of 0.99.

The maximum crack volume for the layer,  $\text{crk}_{max,ly}$ , is calculated:

$$\text{crk}_{max,ly} = 0.916 \cdot \text{crk}_{max} \cdot \exp[-0.0012 \cdot z_{l,ly}] \cdot \text{depth}_{ly} \quad 2:3.3.4$$

where  $\text{crk}_{max,ly}$  is the maximum crack volume possible for the soil layer (mm),  $\text{crk}_{max}$  is the potential crack volume for the soil profile expressed as a fraction of the total volume,  $z_{l,ly}$  is the depth from the soil surface to the bottom of the soil layer (mm), and  $\text{depth}_{ly}$  is the depth of the soil layer (mm). The potential crack volume for the soil profile,  $\text{crk}_{max}$ , is input by the user. Those needing information on the measurement of this parameter are referred to Bronswijk (1989; 1990).

Once the crack volume for each layer is calculated, the total crack volume for the soil profile is determined.

$$crk = \sum_{ly=1}^n crk_{ly} \quad 2:3.3.5$$

where  $crk$  is the total crack volume for the soil profile on a given day (mm),  $crk_{ly}$  is the crack volume for the soil layer on a given day expressed as a depth (mm),  $ly$  is the layer, and  $n$  is the number of layers in the soil profile.

After surface runoff is calculated for rainfall events using the curve number or Green & Ampt method, the amount of runoff is reduced by the volume of cracks present that day:

$$Q_{surf} = Q_{surf,i} - crk \quad \text{if } Q_{surf,i} > crk \quad 2:3.3.6$$

$$Q_{surf} = 0 \quad \text{if } Q_{surf,i} \leq crk \quad 2:3.3.7$$

where  $Q_{surf}$  is the accumulated runoff or rainfall excess for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{surf,i}$  is the initial accumulated runoff or rainfall excess determined with the Green & Ampt or curve number method (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $crk$  is the total crack volume for the soil profile on a given day (mm). The total amount of water entering the soil is then calculated:

$$w_{inf} = R_{day} - Q_{surf} \quad 2:3.3.8$$

where  $w_{inf}$  is the amount of water entering the soil profile on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $R_{day}$  is the rainfall depth for the day adjusted for canopy interception (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the accumulated runoff or rainfall excess for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Bypass flow past the bottom of the profile is calculated:

$$w_{crk,btm} = 0.5 \cdot crk \cdot \left( \frac{crk_{ly=nn}}{depth_{ly=nn}} \right) \quad 2:3.3.9$$

where  $w_{crk,btm}$  is the amount of water flow past the lower boundary of the soil profile due to bypass flow (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $crk$  is the total crack volume for the soil profile on a given day (mm),  $crk_{ly=nn}$  is the crack volume for the deepest soil layer ( $ly=nn$ ) on a given day expressed as a depth (mm), and  $depth_{ly=nn}$  is the depth of the deepest soil layer ( $ly=nn$ ) (mm).

After  $w_{crk,btm}$  is calculated, each soil layer is filled to field capacity water content beginning with the lowest layer and moving upward until the total amount of water entering the soil,  $w_{inf}$ , has been accounted for.

Table 2:3-4: SWAT input variables used in bypass flow calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
ICRK	Bypass flow code: 0-do not model bypass flow; 1-model bypass flow	.bsn
SOL_CRK	$crk_{max}$ : Potential crack volume for soil profile	.sol

## 2:3.4 PERCHED WATER TABLE

For an HRU with a seasonal high water table, if the soil profile becomes saturated to the point that percolation for upper soil layers to lower soil layers is inhibited, water will pond in the soil profile and create a perched water table.

SWAT allows the user to define the depth to an impervious layer for the HRU. If the depth to the impervious layer is in the soil profile, no water is allowed to percolate out of the soil profile. If the impervious layer is defined below the soil profile, percolation out of the soil profile is adjusted from the value determined with equation 2:3.2.3 using:

$$w_{perc,btm} = w_{perc,btm,orig} \cdot \frac{depth_{diff}}{depth_{diff} + \exp[8.833 - 2.598 \cdot depth_{diff}]} \quad 2:3.4.1$$

where  $w_{perc,btm}$  is the amount of water percolating out of the soil profile on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{perc,btm,orig}$  is the amount of water percolating out of the soil profile on a given day calculated with equation 2:3.2.3 (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $depth_{diff}$  is the distance from the bottom of the soil profile to the impervious layer (m).

Water builds up in the soil profile from the bottom of the profile. After the bottom layer of the profile reaches saturation, any water exceeding the storage capacity of the bottom layer is allowed to fill the overlying layer. This continues upward until all the excess water has been distributed.

The height of the perched water table is calculated:

$$h_{wtbl} = \frac{SW - FC}{(POR - FC) \cdot (1 - \phi_{air})} \cdot depth_{imp} \quad 2:3.4.2$$

where  $h_{wtbl}$  is the height of the water table (mm),  $SW$  is the water content of the soil profile (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $FC$  is the water content of the soil profile at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $POR$  is the porosity of the soil profile (mm),  $\phi_{air}$  is the air-filled porosity expressed as a fraction, and  $depth_{imp}$  is the depth to the impervious layer (mm).

Table 2:3-5: SWAT input variables used in perched water table calculations.

<b>Variable name</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>File Name</b>
DEP_IMP	$depth_{imp}$ : Depth to impervious layer (mm)	hru
DEPIMP_BSN	$depth_{imp}$ : Depth to impervious layer (mm)	bsn

## 2:3.5 LATERAL FLOW

Lateral flow will be significant in areas with soils having high hydraulic conductivities in surface layers and an impermeable or semipermeable layer at a shallow depth. In such a system, rainfall will percolate vertically until it encounters the impermeable layer. The water then ponds above the impermeable layer forming a saturated zone of water, i.e. a perched water table. This saturated zone is the source of water for lateral subsurface flow.

SWAT incorporates a kinematic storage model for subsurface flow developed by Sloan et al. (1983) and summarized by Sloan and Moore (1984). This model simulates subsurface flow in a two-dimensional cross-section along a flow path down a steep hillslope. The kinematic approximation was used in its derivation.

This model is based on the mass continuity equation, or mass water balance, with the entire hillslope segment used as the control volume. The hillslope segment has a permeable soil surface layer of depth  $D_{perm}$  and length  $L_{hill}$  with an impermeable soil layer or boundary below it as shown in Figure 2:3-3. The hillslope segment is oriented at an angle  $\alpha_{hill}$  to the horizontal.




Figure 2:3-3: Conceptual representation of the hillslope segment.

The kinematic wave approximation of saturated subsurface or lateral flow assumes that the lines of flow in the saturated zone are parallel to the impermeable boundary and the hydraulic gradient equals the slope of the bed.




Figure 2:3-4: Behavior of the water table as assumed in the kinematic storage model.

From Figure 2:3-4, the drainable volume of water stored in the saturated zone of the hillslope segment per unit area,  $SW_{ly,excess}$ , is

$$SW_{ly,excess} = \frac{1000 \cdot H_o \cdot \phi_d \cdot L_{hill}}{2} \quad 2:3.5.1$$

where  $SW_{ly,excess}$  is the drainable volume of water stored in the saturated zone of the hillslope per unit area (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $H_o$  is the saturated thickness normal to the hillslope at the outlet expressed as a fraction of the total thickness (mm/mm),  $\phi_d$  is the drainable porosity of the soil (mm/mm),  $L_{hill}$  is the hillslope length (m), and 1000 is a factor needed to convert meters to millimeters. This equation can be rearranged to solve for  $H_o$ :

$$H_o = \frac{2 \cdot SW_{ly,excess}}{1000 \cdot \phi_d \cdot L_{hill}} \quad 2:3.5.2$$

The drainable porosity of the soil layer is calculated:

$$\phi_d = \phi_{soil} - \phi_{fc} \quad 2:3.5.3$$

where  $\phi_d$  is the drainable porosity of the soil layer (mm/mm),  $\phi_{soil}$  is the total porosity of the soil layer (mm/mm), and  $\phi_{fc}$  is the porosity of the soil layer filled with water when the layer is at field capacity water content (mm/mm).

A soil layer is considered to be saturated whenever the water content of the layer exceeds the layer's field capacity water content. The drainable volume of water stored in the saturated layer is calculated:

$$SW_{ly,excess} = SW_{ly} - FC_{ly} \quad \text{if } SW_{ly} > FC_{ly} \quad 2:3.5.4$$

$$SW_{ly,excess} = 0 \quad \text{if } SW_{ly} \leq FC_{ly} \quad 2:3.5.5$$

where  $SW_{ly}$  is the water content of the soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content of the soil layer at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The net discharge at the hillslope outlet,  $Q_{lat}$ , is given by

$$Q_{lat} = 24 \cdot H_o \cdot v_{lat} \quad 2:3.5.6$$

where  $Q_{lat}$  is the water discharged from the hillslope outlet (mm H<sub>2</sub>O/day),  $H_o$  is the saturated thickness normal to the hillslope at the outlet expressed as a fraction of the total thickness (mm/mm),  $v_{lat}$  is the velocity of flow at the outlet (mm·h<sup>-1</sup>), and 24 is a factor to convert hours to days.

Velocity of flow at the outlet is defined as

$$v_{lat} = K_{sat} \cdot \sin(\alpha_{hill}) \quad 2:3.5.7$$

where  $K_{sat}$  is the saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm·h<sup>-1</sup>) and  $\alpha_{hill}$  is the slope of the hillslope segment. The slope is input to SWAT as the increase in elevation per unit distance ( $slp$ ) which is equivalent to  $\tan(\alpha_{hill})$ . Because  $\tan(\alpha_{hill}) \approx \sin(\alpha_{hill})$ , equation 2:3.5.3 is modified to use the value for the slope as input to the model:

$$v_{lat} = K_{sat} \cdot \tan(\alpha_{hill}) = K_{sat} \cdot slp \quad 2:3.5.8$$

Combining equations 2:3.5.2 and 2:3.5.8 with equation 2:3.5.6 yields the equation

$$Q_{lat} = 0.024 \cdot \left( \frac{2 \cdot SW_{ly,excess} \cdot K_{sat} \cdot slp}{\phi_d \cdot L_{hill}} \right) \quad 2:3.5.9$$

where all terms are previously defined.

### **2:3.7.1 LATERAL FLOW LAG**

In large subbasins with a time of concentration greater than 1 day, only a portion of the lateral flow will reach the main channel on the day it is generated.

SWAT incorporates a lateral flow storage feature to lag a portion of lateral flow release to the main channel.

Once lateral flow is calculated, the amount of lateral flow released to the main channel is calculated:

$$Q_{lat} = (Q'_{lat} + Q_{latstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-1}{TT_{lag}} \right] \right) \quad 2:3.5.10$$

where  $Q_{lat}$  is the amount of lateral flow discharged to the main channel on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q'_{lat}$  is the amount of lateral flow generated in the subbasin on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{latstor,i-1}$  is the lateral flow stored or lagged from the previous day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $TT_{lag}$  is the lateral flow travel time (days).

The model will calculate lateral flow travel time or utilize a user-defined travel time. In the majority of cases, the user should allow the model to calculate the travel time. If drainage tiles are present in the HRU, lateral flow travel time is calculated:


$$TT_{lag} = \frac{tile_{lag}}{24} \quad 2:3.5.11$$

where  $TT_{lag}$  is the lateral flow travel time (days) and  $tile_{lag}$  is the drain tile lag time (hrs). In HRUs without drainage tiles, lateral flow travel time is calculated:

$$TT_{lag} = 10.4 \cdot \frac{L_{hill}}{K_{sat,mx}} \quad 2:3.4.12$$

where  $TT_{lag}$  is the lateral flow travel time (days),  $L_{hill}$  is the hillslope length (m), and  $K_{sat,mx}$  is the highest layer saturated hydraulic conductivity in the soil profile (mm/hr).

The expression  $\left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-1}{TT_{lag}} \right] \right)$  in equation 2:3.5.10 represents the fraction of the total available water that will be allowed to enter the reach on any one day. Figure 2:3-5 plots values for this expression at different values of  $TT_{lag}$ .

Figure 2:3-5: Influence of  $TT_{lag}$  on fraction of lateral flow released.

The delay in release of lateral flow will smooth the streamflow hydrograph simulated in the reach.

Table 2:3-6: SWAT input variables used in lateral flow calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
SLSOIL	$L_{hill}$ : Hillslope length (m)	.hru
SOL_K	$K_{sat}$ : Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)	.sol
HRU_SLP	$slp$ : Average slope of the subbasin (m/m)	.hru
LAT_TTIME	$TT_{lag}$ : Lateral flow travel time (days)	.mgt
GDRAIN	$tile_{lag}$ : Drain tile lag time (hrs)	.mgt

## 2:3.6 NOMENCLATURE

$AWC$	Available water capacity (fraction or mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$AWC_{ly}$	Available water capacity of soil layer (fraction or mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$FC$	Water content of soil profile at field capacity (fraction or mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$FC_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at field capacity (fraction or mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$H_o$	Saturated thickness normal to the hillslope at the outlet expressed as a fraction of the total thickness (mm/mm)
$K_{sat}$	Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
$L_{hill}$	Hillslope length (m)
$M_s$	Mass of the solids (Mg)
$POR$	Porosity of the soil profile (mm)

$Q_{lat}$	Lateral flow; water discharged from the hillslope outlet (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day)
$Q_{latstor,i-1}$	Lateral flow stored or lagged from the previous day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$Q_{surf}$	Accumulated runoff or rainfall excess (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$R_{day}$	Amount of rainfall on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SAT_{ly}$	Amount of water in the soil layer when completely saturated (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SW$	Amount of water in soil profile (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SW_{ly}$	Soil water content of layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SW_{ly,excess}$	Drainable volume of water stored layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$TT_{lag}$	Lateral flow travel time (days)
$TT_{perc}$	Travel time for percolation (hrs)
$V_A$	Volume of air (m <sup>3</sup> )
$V_S$	Volume of solids (m <sup>3</sup> )
$V_T$	Total soil volume (m <sup>3</sup> )
$V_W$	Volume of water (m <sup>3</sup> )
$WP$	Water content at wilting point (fraction or mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$WP_{ly}$	Water content of the soil layer at wilting point (fraction or mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$coef_{crk}$	Adjustment coefficient for crack flow
$crk$	Total crack volume for the soil profile on a given day (mm)
$crk_{ly}$	Crack volume for the soil layer on a given day expressed as a depth (mm)
$crk_{ly,d-1}$	Crack volume for the soil layer on the previous day (mm)
$crk_{ly,i}$	Initial crack volume calculated for the soil layer on a given day expressed as a depth (mm)
$crk_{max}$	Potential crack volume for the soil profile expressed as a fraction of the total volume
$crk_{max,ly}$	Maximum crack volume possible for the soil layer (mm)
$depth_{diff}$	Distance from the bottom of the soil profile to the impervious layer (m)
$depth_{imp}$	Depth to the impervious layer (mm)
$depth_{ly}$	Depth of the soil layer (mm)
$h_{wtbl}$	Water table height (m)
$m_c$	Percent clay content
$slp$	Average slope of the subbasin (%) or m/m)
$tile_{lag}$	Drain tile lag time (hrs).
$v_{lat}$	Velocity of flow at the hillslope outlet (mm·h <sup>-1</sup> )
$w_{crk,btm}$	Amount of water flow past the lower boundary of the soil profile due to bypass flow (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{inf}$	Amount of water entering the soil profile on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{perc,ly}$	Amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$z_{l,ly}$	Depth from the surface to the bottom of the soil layer (mm)
$\alpha_{hill}$	Slope of the hillslope segment (degrees)
$\Delta t$	Length of the time step (hrs)
$\ell_{crk}$	Lag factor for crack development during drying
$\rho_b$	Bulk density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )
$\rho_s$	Particle density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )

$\phi_{air}$	Air-filled porosity expressed as a fraction
$\phi_d$	Drainable porosity of the soil (mm/mm)
$\phi_{fc}$	Porosity of the soil layer filled with water when the layer is at field capacity water content (mm/mm)
$\phi_{soil}$	Porosity of the soil (mm/mm)

## 2:3.7 REFERENCES

---

- Bouma, J. and J. Loveday. 1988. Chapter 5: Characterizing soil water regimes in swelling clay soils. p. 83-96. *In* L.P. Wilding and R. Puentes (ed). Vertisols: their distribution, properties, classification and management. Texas A&M University Printing Center, College Station, TX.
- Bronswijk, J.J.B. 1989. Prediction of actual cracking and subsidence in clay soils. *Soil Science* 148:87-93.
- Bronswijk, J.J.B. 1990. Shrinkage geometry of a heavy clay soil at various stresses. *Soil Science Soc. Am. J.* 54:1500-1502.
- Dudal, R. and H. Eswaran. 1988. Chapter 1: Distribution, properties and classification of vertisols. p. 1-22. *In* L.P. Wilding and R. Puentes (ed). Vertisols: their distribution, properties, classification and management. Texas A&M University Printing Center, College Station, TX.
- Koorevaar, P., G. Menelik, and C. Dirksen. 1983. Elements of Soil Physics. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Mitchell, A.R. 1992. Shrinkage terminology: escape from ‘normalcy’. *Soil. Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 56:993-994.
- Sloan, P.G. and I.D. Moore. 1984. Modeling subsurface stormflow on steeply sloping forested watersheds. *Water Resources Research*. 20(12): 1815-1822.
- Sloan, P.G., I.D. Morre, G.B. Coltharp, and J.D. Eigel. 1983. Modeling surface and subsurface stormflow on steeply-sloping forested watersheds. *Water Resources Inst. Report* 142. Univ. Kentucky, Lexington.



## **SECTION 2 CHAPTER 4**

# **EQUATIONS: GROUNDWATER**

---


Groundwater is water in the saturated zone of earth materials under pressure greater than atmospheric, i.e. positive pressure. Remember that in the soil profile water is held at a negative pressure due to the attraction between negatively charged clay particles and water. The groundwater table is the depth at which the pressure between water and the surrounding soil matrix is equal to atmospheric pressure. Water enters groundwater storage primarily by infiltration/percolation, although recharge by seepage from surface water bodies may occur. Water leaves groundwater storage primarily by discharge into rivers or lakes, but it is also possible for water to move upward from the water table into the capillary fringe, a zone above the groundwater table that is saturated.

## 2:4.1 GROUNDWATER SYSTEMS

Within the saturated zone of groundwater, regions of high conductivity and low conductivity will be found. The regions of high conductivity are made up of coarse-grained particles with a large percentage of macropores that allow water to move easily. The regions of low conductivity are made up of fine-grained particles with a large percentage of mesopores and micropores that restrict the rate of water movement.

An aquifer is “a geologic unit that can store enough water and transmit it at a rate fast enough to be hydrologically significant” (Dingman, 1994). An unconfined aquifer is an aquifer whose upper boundary is the water table. A confined aquifer is an aquifer bounded above and below by geologic formations whose hydraulic conductivity is significantly lower than that of the aquifer. Figure 2:4-1 illustrates the two types of aquifers.

Figure 2:4-1: Unconfined and confined aquifers (After Dingman, 1994).



Recharge to unconfined aquifers occurs via percolation to the water table from a significant portion of the land surface. In contrast, recharge to confined aquifers by percolation from the surface occurs only at the upstream end of the confined aquifer, where the geologic formation containing the aquifer is exposed at the earth’s surface, flow is not confined, and a water table is present.

Topography exerts an important influence on groundwater flow. The flow of groundwater in an idealized hilly upland area is depicted in Figure 2:4-2. The landscape can be divided into areas of recharge and areas of discharge. A recharge area is defined as a portion of a drainage basin where ground water flow is directed away from the water table. A discharge area is defined as a portion of the drainage basin where ground water flow is directed toward the water table. The water table is at or near the surface in discharge areas and surface water bodies are normally located in discharge areas.




Figure 2:4-2: Groundwater flow net in an idealized hilly region with homogenous permeable material resting on an impermeable base (After Hubbert, 1940)

Streams may be categorized by their relationship to the groundwater system. A stream located in a discharge area that receives groundwater flow is a gaining or effluent stream (Figure 2:4-3a). This type of stream is characterized by an increase in discharge downstream. A stream located in a recharge area is a losing or influent stream. This type of stream is characterized by a decrease in discharge downstream. A losing stream may be connected to (Figure 2:4-3b) or perched above (Figure 2:4-3c) the groundwater flow area. A stream that simultaneously receives and loses groundwater is a flow-through stream (Figure 2:4-3d).




Figure 2:4-3: Stream-groundwater relationships: a) gaining stream receiving water from groundwater flow; b) losing stream connected to groundwater system; c) losing stream perched above groundwater system; and d) flow-through stream (After Dingman, 1994).

SWAT simulates two aquifers in each subbasin. The shallow aquifer is an unconfined aquifer that contributes to flow in the main channel or reach of the subbasin. The deep aquifer is a confined aquifer. Water that enters the deep aquifer is assumed to contribute to streamflow somewhere outside of the watershed (Arnold et al., 1993).

## 2:4.2 SHALLOW AQUIFER

---

The water balance for the shallow aquifer is:

$$aq_{sh,i} = aq_{sh,i-1} + w_{rchrg,sh} - Q_{gw} - w_{revap} - w_{pump,sh} \quad 2:4.2.1$$

where  $aq_{sh,i}$  is the amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $aq_{sh,i-1}$  is the amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer on day  $i-1$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{rchrg,sh}$  is the amount of recharge entering the shallow aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{gw}$  is the groundwater flow, or base flow, into the main channel on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{revap}$  is the amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{pump,sh}$  is the amount of water removed from the shallow aquifer by pumping on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

### **2:4.2.1 RECHARGE**

Water that moves past the lowest depth of the soil profile by percolation or bypass flow enters and flows through the vadose zone before becoming shallow and/or deep aquifer recharge. The lag between the time that water exits the soil profile and enters the shallow aquifer will depend on the depth to the water table and the hydraulic properties of the geologic formations in the vadose and groundwater zones.

An exponential decay weighting function proposed by Venetis (1969) and used by Sangrey et al. (1984) in a precipitation/groundwater response model is utilized in SWAT to account for the time delay in aquifer recharge once the water exits the soil profile. The delay function accommodates situations where the recharge from the soil zone to the aquifer is not instantaneous, i.e. 1 day or less.

The recharge to both aquifers on a given day is calculated:

$$w_{rchg,i} = (1 - \exp[-1/\delta_{gw}]) \cdot w_{seep} + \exp[-1/\delta_{gw}] \cdot w_{rchg,i-1} \quad 2:4.2.2$$

where  $w_{rchg,i}$  is the amount of recharge entering the aquifers on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\delta_{gw}$  is the delay time or drainage time of the overlying geologic formations (days),  $w_{seep}$  is the total amount of water exiting the bottom of the soil profile on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{rchg,i-1}$  is the amount of recharge entering the aquifers on day  $i-1$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The total amount of water exiting the bottom of the soil profile on day  $i$  is calculated:

$$w_{seep} = w_{perc,ly=n} + w_{crk,btn} \quad 2:4.2.3$$

where  $w_{seep}$  is the total amount of water exiting the bottom of the soil profile on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{perc,ly=n}$  is the amount of water percolating out of the lowest layer,  $n$ , in the soil profile on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{crk,btn}$  is the amount of water flow past the lower boundary of the soil profile due to bypass flow on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The delay time,  $\delta_{gw}$ , cannot be directly measured. It can be estimated by simulating aquifer recharge using different values for  $\delta_{gw}$  and comparing the simulated variations in water table level with observed values. Johnson (1977) developed a simple program to iteratively test and statistically evaluate different

delay times for a watershed. Sangrey et al. (1984) noted that monitoring wells in the same area had similar values for  $\delta_{gw}$ , so once a delay time value for a geomorphic area is defined, similar delay times can be used in adjoining watersheds within the same geomorphic province.

### **2:4.2.2 PARTITIONING OF RECHARGE BETWEEN SHALLOW AND DEEP AQUIFER**

A fraction of the total daily recharge can be routed to the deep aquifer. The amount of water than will be diverted from the shallow aquifer due to percolation to the deep aquifer on a given day is:

$$w_{deep} = \beta_{deep} \cdot w_{rchrg} \quad 2:4.2.4$$

where  $w_{deep}$  is the amount of water moving into the deep aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\beta_{deep}$  is the aquifer percolation coefficient, and  $w_{rchrg}$  is the amount of recharge entering both aquifers on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The amount of recharge to the shallow aquifer is:

$$w_{rchrg,sh} = w_{rchrg} - w_{deep} \quad 2:4.2.5$$

where  $w_{rchrg,sh}$  is the amount of recharge entering the shallow aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

### **2:4.2.3 GROUNDWATER/BASE FLOW**

The shallow aquifer contributes base flow to the main channel or reach within the subbasin. Base flow is allowed to enter the reach only if the amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer exceeds a threshold value specified by the user,  $aq_{shthr,q}$ .

The steady-state response of groundwater flow to recharge is (Hooghoudt, 1940):

$$Q_{gw} = \frac{8000 \cdot K_{sat}}{L_{gw}^2} \cdot h_{wtbl} \quad 2:4.2.6$$

where  $Q_{gw}$  is the groundwater flow, or base flow, into the main channel on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $K_{sat}$  is the hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (mm/day),  $L_{gw}$  is the distance from the ridge or subbasin divide for the groundwater system to the main channel (m), and  $h_{wtbl}$  is the water table height (m).

Water table fluctuations due to non-steady-state response of groundwater flow to periodic recharge is calculated (Smedema and Rycroft, 1983):

$$\frac{dh_{wtbl}}{dt} = \frac{w_{rchrg,sh} - Q_{gw}}{800 \cdot \mu} \quad 2:4.2.7$$

where  $\frac{dh_{wtbl}}{dt}$  is the change in water table height with time (mm/day),  $w_{rchrg,sh}$  is the amount of recharge entering the shallow aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{gw}$  is the groundwater flow into the main channel on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $\mu$  is the specific yield of the shallow aquifer (m/m).

Assuming that variation in groundwater flow is linearly related to the rate of change in water table height, equations 2:4.2.7 and 2:4.2.6 can be combined to obtain:

$$\frac{dQ_{gw}}{dt} = 10 \cdot \frac{K_{sat}}{\mu \cdot L_{gw}} \cdot (w_{rchrg,sh} - Q_{gw}) = \alpha_{gw} \cdot (w_{rchrg,sh} - Q_{gw}) \quad 2:4.2.8$$

where  $Q_{gw}$  is the groundwater flow into the main channel on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $K_{sat}$  is the hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (mm/day),  $\mu$  is the specific yield of the shallow aquifer (m/m),  $L_{gw}$  is the distance from the ridge or subbasin divide for the groundwater system to the main channel (m),  $w_{rchrg,sh}$  is the amount of recharge entering the shallow aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $\alpha_{gw}$  is the baseflow recession constant or constant of proportionality. Integration of equation 2:4.2.8 and rearranging to solve for  $Q_{gw}$  yields:

$$Q_{gw,i} = Q_{gw,i-1} \cdot \exp[-\alpha_{gw} \cdot \Delta t] + w_{rchrg,sh} \cdot (1 - \exp[-\alpha_{gw} \cdot \Delta t]) \quad \text{if } aq_{sh} > aq_{shthr,q} \quad 2:4.2.9$$

$$Q_{gw,i} = 0 \quad \text{if } aq_{sh} \leq aq_{shthr,q} \quad 2:4.2.10$$

where  $Q_{gw,i}$  is the groundwater flow into the main channel on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{gw,i-1}$  is the groundwater flow into the main channel on day  $i-1$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\alpha_{gw}$  is the baseflow recession constant,  $\Delta t$  is the time step (1 day),  $w_{rchrg,sh}$  is the amount of recharge entering the shallow aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $aq_{sh}$  is the amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer at the beginning of day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and

$aq_{shthr,q}$  is the threshold water level in the shallow aquifer for groundwater contribution to the main channel to occur (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The baseflow recession constant,  $\alpha_{gw}$ , is a direct index of groundwater flow response to changes in recharge (Smedema and Rycroft, 1983). Values vary from 0.1-0.3 for land with slow response to recharge to 0.9-1.0 for land with a rapid response. Although the baseflow recession constant may be calculated, the best estimates are obtained by analyzing measured streamflow during periods of no recharge in the watershed.

When the shallow aquifer receives no recharge, equation 2:4.2.9 simplifies to:

$$Q_{gw} = Q_{gw,0} \cdot \exp[-\alpha_{gw} \cdot t] \quad \text{if } aq_{sh} > aq_{shthr,q} \quad 2:4.2.11$$

$$Q_{gw,i} = 0 \quad \text{if } aq_{sh} \leq aq_{shthr,q} \quad 2:4.2.12$$

where  $Q_{gw}$  is the groundwater flow into the main channel at time  $t$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{gw,0}$  is the groundwater flow into the main channel at the beginning of the recession (time  $t=0$ ) (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\alpha_{gw}$  is the baseflow recession constant, and  $t$  is the time lapsed since the beginning of the recession (days),  $aq_{sh}$  is the amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer at the beginning of day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $aq_{shthr,q}$  is the threshold water level in the shallow aquifer for groundwater contribution to the main channel to occur (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The baseflow recession constant is measured by rearranging equation 2:4.2.11.

$$\alpha_{gw} = \frac{1}{N} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{Q_{gw,N}}{Q_{gw,0}} \right] \quad 2:4.2.13$$

where  $\alpha_{gw}$  is the baseflow recession constant,  $N$  is the time lapsed since the start of the recession (days),  $Q_{gw,N}$  is the groundwater flow on day  $N$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{gw,0}$  is the groundwater flow at the start of the recession (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

It is common to find the baseflow days reported for a stream gage or watershed. This is the number of days for base flow recession to decline through one log cycle. When baseflow days are used, equation 2:4.2.13 can be further simplified:

$$\alpha_{gw} = \frac{1}{N} \cdot \ln \left\lfloor \frac{Q_{gw,N}}{Q_{gw,0}} \right\rfloor = \frac{1}{BFD} \cdot \ln[10] = \frac{2.3}{BFD} \quad 2:4.2.14$$

where  $\alpha_{gw}$  is the baseflow recession constant, and  $BFD$  is the number of baseflow days for the watershed.

#### **2:4.2.4 REVAP**

Water may move from the shallow aquifer into the overlying unsaturated zone. In periods when the material overlying the aquifer is dry, water in the capillary fringe that separates the saturated and unsaturated zones will evaporate and diffuse upward. As water is removed from the capillary fringe by evaporation, it is replaced by water from the underlying aquifer. Water may also be removed from the aquifer by deep-rooted plants which are able to uptake water directly from the aquifer.

SWAT models the movement of water into overlying unsaturated layers as a function of water demand for evapotranspiration. To avoid confusion with soil evaporation and transpiration, this process has been termed „revap“. This process is significant in watersheds where the saturated zone is not very far below the surface or where deep-rooted plants are growing. Because the type of plant cover will affect the importance of revap in the water balance, the parameters governing revap are usually varied by land use. Revap is allowed to occur only if the amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer exceeds a threshold value specified by the user,  $aq_{shthr,rvp}$ .

The maximum amount of water than will be removed from the aquifer via „revap“ on a given day is:

$$w_{revap,mx} = \beta_{rev} \cdot E_o \quad 2:4.2.15$$

where  $w_{revap,mx}$  is the maximum amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\beta_{rev}$  is the revap coefficient, and  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The actual amount of revap that will occur on a given day is calculated:

$$w_{revap} = 0 \quad \text{if } aq_{sh} \leq aq_{shthr,rvp} \quad 2:4.2.16$$

$$w_{revap} = w_{revap,mx} - aq_{shthr,rvp} \quad \text{if } aq_{shthr,rvp} < aq_{sh} < (aq_{shthr,rvp} + w_{revap,mx}) \quad 2:4.2.17$$

$$w_{revap} = w_{revap,mx} \quad \text{if } aq_{sh} \geq (aq_{shthr,rvp} + w_{revap,mx}) \quad 2:4.2.18$$

where  $w_{revap}$  is the actual amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{revap,mx}$  is the maximum amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $aq_{sh}$  is the amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer at the beginning of day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $aq_{shthr,rvp}$  is the threshold water level in the shallow aquifer for revap to occur (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

### **2:4.2.5 PUMPING**

If the shallow aquifer is specified as the source of irrigation water or water removed for use outside the watershed, the model will allow an amount of water up to the total volume of the shallow aquifer to be removed on any given day. Detailed information on water management may be found in Chapter 6:2.

### **2:4.2.6 GROUNDWATER HEIGHT**

Although SWAT does not currently print groundwater height in the output files, the water table height is updated daily by the model. Groundwater height is related to groundwater flow by equation 2:4.2.6.

$$Q_{gw} = \frac{8000 \cdot K_{sat}}{L_{gw}^2} \cdot h_{wtbl} = \frac{8000 \cdot \mu}{10} \cdot \frac{10 \cdot K_{sat}}{\mu \cdot L_{gw}^2} \cdot h_{wtbl} = 800 \cdot \mu \cdot \alpha_{gw} \cdot h_{wtbl} \quad 2:4.2.19$$

where  $Q_{gw}$  is the groundwater flow into the main channel on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $K_{sat}$  is the hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (mm/day),  $L_{gw}$  is the distance from the ridge or subbasin divide for the groundwater system to the main channel (m),  $h_{wtbl}$  is the water table height (m),  $\mu$  is the specific yield of the shallow aquifer (m/m), and  $\alpha_{gw}$  is the baseflow recession constant. Substituting this definition for  $Q_{gw}$  into equation 2:4.2.9 gives

$$h_{wtbl,i} = h_{wtbl,i-1} \cdot \exp[-\alpha_{gw} \cdot \Delta t] + \frac{w_{rchrg} \cdot (1 - \exp[-\alpha_{gw} \cdot \Delta t])}{800 \cdot \mu \cdot \alpha_{gw}} \quad 2:4.2.20$$

where  $h_{wtbl,i}$  is the water table height on day  $i$  (m),  $h_{wtbl,i-1}$  is the water table height on day  $i-1$  (m),  $\alpha_{gw}$  is the baseflow recession constant,  $\Delta t$  is the time step (1 day),  $w_{rchrg}$  is the amount of recharge entering the aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $\mu$  is the specific yield of the shallow aquifer (m/m).

Table 2:4-1: SWAT input variables used in shallow aquifer calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
GW_DELAY	$\delta_{gw}$ : Delay time for aquifer recharge (days)	.gw
GWQMN	$aq_{shthr,q}$ : Threshold water level in shallow aquifer for base flow (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.gw
ALPHA_BF	$\alpha_{gw}$ : Baseflow recession constant	.gw
REVAPMN	$aq_{shthr,rvp}$ : Threshold water level in shallow aquifer for revap (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.gw
GW_REVAP	$\beta_{rev}$ : Revap coefficient	.gw
RCHRG_DP	$\beta_{deep}$ : Aquifer percolation coefficient	.gw
GW_SPYLD	$\mu$ : Specific yield of the shallow aquifer (m/m)	.gw

## 2:4.3 DEEP AQUIFER

---

The water balance for the deep aquifer is:

$$aq_{dp,i} = aq_{dp,i-1} + w_{deep} - w_{pump,dp} \quad 2:4.3.1$$

where  $aq_{dp,i}$  is the amount of water stored in the deep aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $aq_{dp,i-1}$  is the amount of water stored in the deep aquifer on day  $i-1$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{deep}$  is the amount of water percolating from the shallow aquifer into the deep aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{pump,dp}$  is the amount of water removed from the deep aquifer by pumping on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The amount of water percolating into the deep aquifer is calculated with the equations reviewed in section 2:4.2.4. If the deep aquifer is specified as the source of irrigation water or water removed for use outside the watershed, the model will allow an amount of water up to the total volume of the deep aquifer to be removed on any given day.

Water entering the deep aquifer is not considered in future water budget calculations and can be considered to be lost from the system.

## 2:4.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$BFD$	Number of baseflow days for the watershed
$E_o$	Potential evapotranspiration (mm d <sup>-1</sup> )
$K_{sat}$	Hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (mm/day)
$L_{gw}$	Distance from the ridge or subbasin divide for the groundwater system to the main channel (m)
$N$	Time lapsed since the start of the recession (days)
$Q_{gw}$	Groundwater flow, or base flow, into the main channel (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$Q_{gw,0}$	Groundwater flow at the start of the recession (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$Q_{gw,N}$	Groundwater flow on day $N$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$aq_{dp}$	Amount of water stored in the deep aquifer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$aq_{sh}$	Amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$aq_{shthr,q}$	Threshold water level in shallow aquifer for base flow (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$aq_{shthr,rvp}$	Threshold water level in shallow aquifer for revap or percolation to deep aquifer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$h_{wtbl}$	Water table height (m)
$w_{crk,btm}$	Amount of water flow past the lower boundary of the soil profile due to bypass flow (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{deep}$	Amount of water percolating from the shallow aquifer into the deep aquifer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{pump,dp}$	Amount of water removed from the deep aquifer by pumping (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{pump,sh}$	Amount of water removed from the shallow aquifer by pumping (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{rchrg}$	Amount of water entering the aquifer via recharge (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{rchrg,sh}$	Amount of water entering the shallow aquifer via recharge (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{revap}$	Amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{revap,mx}$	Maximum amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies on day $i$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{seep}$	Total amount of water exiting the bottom of the soil profile (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$\alpha_{gw}$	Baseflow recession constant
$\beta_{deep}$	Aquifer percolation coefficient
$\beta_{rev}$	Revap coefficient
$\delta_{gw}$	Delay time or drainage time for aquifer recharge (days)
$\mu$	Specific yield of the shallow aquifer (m/m)

## 2:4.5 REFERENCES

---

- Arnold, J.G., P.M. Allen, and G. Bernhardt. 1993. A comprehensive surface-groundwater flow model. *Journal of Hydrology* 142: 47-69.
- Dingman, S.L. 1994. Physical hydrology. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Hooghoudt, S.B. 1940. Bijdrage tot de kennis van enige natuurkundige grootheden van de grond. *Versl. Landbouwk. Onderz.* 46: 515-707.
- Hubbert, M.K. 1940. The theory of groundwater motion. *Journal of Geology* 48: 785-944.
- Johnson, K.H. 1977. A predictive method for ground water levels. Master's Thesis, Cornell University, Ithica, N.Y.
- Sangrey, D.A., K.O. Harrop-Williams, and J.A. Klaiber. 1984. Predicting ground-water response to precipitation. *ASCE J. Geotech. Eng.* 110(7): 957-975.
- Smedema, L.K. and D.W. Rycroft. 1983. Land drainage—planning and design of agricultural drainage systems, Cornell University Press, Ithica, N.Y.
- Venetis, C. 1969. A study of the recession of unconfined aquifers. *Bull. Int. Assoc. Sci. Hydrol.* 14(4): 119-125.



# NUTRIENTS & PESTICIDES



The fate and transport of nutrients and pesticides in a watershed depend on the transformations the compounds undergo in the soil environment. SWAT models the complete nutrient cycle for nitrogen and phosphorus as well as the degradation of any pesticides applied in an HRU.

The following three chapters review the methodology used by SWAT to simulate nutrient and pesticide processes in the soil.

---

---

## SECTION 3 CHAPTER 1

# EQUATIONS: NITROGEN

---

The complexity of the nitrogen cycle and nitrogen's importance in plant growth have made this element the subject of much research. The nitrogen cycle is a dynamic system that includes the water, atmosphere and soil. Plants require nitrogen more than any other essential element, excluding carbon, oxygen and hydrogen. Nitrogen is modeled by SWAT in the soil profile and in the shallow aquifer.

## 3:3B NITROGEN CYCLE IN THE SOIL

The three major forms of nitrogen in mineral soils are organic nitrogen associated with humus, mineral forms of nitrogen held by soil colloids, and mineral forms of nitrogen in solution. Nitrogen may be added to the soil by fertilizer, manure or residue application, fixation by symbiotic or nonsymbiotic bacteria, and rain. Nitrogen is removed from the soil by plant uptake, leaching, volatilization, denitrification and erosion. Figure 3:1-1 shows the major components of the nitrogen cycle.




Figure 3:1-1: The nitrogen cycle

Nitrogen is considered to be an extremely reactive element. The highly reactive nature of nitrogen results from its ability to exist in a number of valence states. The valence state or oxidation state describes the number of electrons orbiting the nucleus of the nitrogen atom relative to the number present in an

electronically neutral atom. The valence state will be positive as the atom loses electrons and will be negative as the atom gains electrons. Examples of nitrogen in different valence states are:

most oxidized	+5	$\text{NO}_3^-$	nitrate
	+4	$\text{NO}_2$	nitrogen dioxide
	+3	$\text{NO}_2^-$	nitrite
	+2	NO	nitrogen monoxide (gas)
	+1	$\text{N}_2\text{O}$	nitrous oxide (laughing gas)
	0	$\text{N}_2$	$\text{N}_2$ gas or elemental N
	-1	$\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$	hydroxylamine
	-2	$\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$	hydrazine
most reduced	-3	$\text{NH}_3$ or $\text{NH}_4^+$	ammonia gas or ammonium

The ability of nitrogen to vary its valence state makes it a highly mobile element. Predicting the movement of nitrogen between the different pools in the soil is critical to the successful management of this element in the environment.

SWAT monitors five different pools of nitrogen in the soil (Figure 3:1-2).

Two pools are inorganic forms of nitrogen,  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , while the other three pools are organic forms of nitrogen. Fresh organic N is associated with crop residue and microbial biomass while the active and stable organic N pools are associated with the soil humus. The organic nitrogen associated with humus is partitioned into two pools to account for the variation in availability of humic substances to mineralization.




Figure 3:1-2: SWAT soil nitrogen pools and processes that move nitrogen in and out of pools.

### **3:1.1.1 INITIALIZATION OF SOIL NITROGEN LEVELS**

Users may define the amount of nitrate and organic nitrogen contained in humic substances for all soil layers at the beginning of the simulation. If the user does not specify initial nitrogen concentrations, SWAT will initialize levels of nitrogen in the different pools.

Initial nitrate levels in the soil are varied by depth using the relationship:

$$NO_3_{conc,z} = 7 \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-z}{1000}\right) \quad 3:1.1.1$$

where  $NO_3_{conc,z}$  is the concentration of nitrate in the soil at depth  $z$  (mg/kg or ppm), and  $z$  is the depth from the soil surface (mm). The nitrate concentration with depth calculated from equation 3:1.1.1 is displayed in Figure 3:1-3. The nitrate concentration for a layer is calculated by solving equation 3:1.1.1 for the horizon's lower boundary depth.




Figure 3:1-3: Nitrate concentration with depth.

Organic nitrogen levels are assigned assuming that the C:N ratio for humic materials is 14:1. The concentration of humic organic nitrogen in a soil layer is calculated:

$$orgN_{hum,ly} = 10^4 \cdot \left( \frac{orgC_{ly}}{14} \right) \quad 3:1.1.2$$

where  $orgN_{hum,ly}$  is the concentration of humic organic nitrogen in the layer (mg/kg or ppm), and  $orgC_{ly}$  is the amount of organic carbon in the layer (%). The humic organic N is partitioned between the active and stable pools using the following equations:

$$orgN_{act,ly} = orgN_{hum,ly} \cdot fr_{actN} \quad 3:1.1.3$$

$$orgN_{sta,ly} = orgN_{hum,ly} \cdot (1 - fr_{actN}) \quad 3:1.1.4$$

where  $orgN_{act,ly}$  is the concentration of nitrogen in the active organic pool (mg/kg),  $orgN_{hum,ly}$  is the concentration of humic organic nitrogen in the layer (mg/kg),  $fr_{actN}$  is the fraction of humic nitrogen in the active pool, and  $orgN_{sta,ly}$  is the concentration of nitrogen in the stable organic pool (mg/kg). The fraction of humic nitrogen in the active pool,  $fr_{actN}$ , is set to 0.02.

Nitrogen in the fresh organic pool is set to zero in all layers except the top 10 mm of soil. In the top 10 mm, the fresh organic nitrogen pool is set to 0.15% of the initial amount of residue on the soil surface.

$$orgN_{frsh,surf} = 0.0015 \cdot rsd_{surf} \quad 3:1.1.5$$

where  $orgN_{frsh,surf}$  is the nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in the top 10 mm (kg N/ha), and  $rsd_{surf}$  is material in the residue pool for the top 10 mm of soil (kg/ha).

The ammonium pool for soil nitrogen,  $NH4_{ly}$ , is initialized to 0 ppm.

While SWAT allows nutrient levels to be input as concentrations, it performs all calculations on a mass basis. To convert a concentration to a mass, the concentration is multiplied by the bulk density and depth of the layer and divided by 100:

$$\frac{conc_N \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly}}{100} = \frac{\text{kg N}}{\text{ha}} \quad 3:1.1.6$$

where  $conc_N$  is the concentration of nitrogen in a layer (mg/kg or ppm),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the layer ( $Mg/m^3$ ), and  $depth_{ly}$  is the depth of the layer (mm).


Table 3:1-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to nitrogen pools.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_NO3	$NO_3^{conc,ly}$ : Initial $NO_3$ concentration in soil layer (mg/kg or ppm)	.chm
SOL_ORGN	$orgN_{hum,ly}$ : Initial humic organic nitrogen in soil layer (mg/kg or ppm)	.chm
RSDIN	$rsd_{surf}$ : Material in the residue pool for the top 10mm of soil ( $kg\ ha^{-1}$ )	.hru
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density of the layer ( $Mg/m^3$ )	.sol
SOL_CBN	$orgC_{ly}$ : Amount of organic carbon in the layer (%)	.sol

## 3:1.2 MINERALIZATION & DECOMPOSITION / IMMOBILIZATION

Decomposition is the breakdown of fresh organic residue into simpler organic components. Mineralization is the microbial conversion of organic, plant-unavailable nitrogen to inorganic, plant-available nitrogen. Immobilization is the microbial conversion of plant-available inorganic soil nitrogen to plant-unavailable organic nitrogen.

Bacteria decompose organic material to obtain energy for growth processes. Plant residue is broken down into glucose which is then converted to energy:



The energy released by the conversion of glucose to carbon dioxide and water is used for various cell processes, including protein synthesis. Protein synthesis requires nitrogen. If the residue from which the glucose is obtained contains enough nitrogen, the bacteria will use nitrogen from the organic material to meet the demand for protein synthesis. If the nitrogen content of the residue is too low to meet the bacterial demand for nitrogen, the bacteria will use  $NH_4^+$  and  $NO_3^-$  from the soil solution to meet its needs. If the nitrogen content of the residue exceeds the bacterial demand for nitrogen, the bacterial will release the excess nitrogen into soil solution as  $NH_4^+$ . A general relationship between C:N ratio and mineralization/immobilization is:

$C:N > 30:1$  immobilization occurs, a net decrease in soil  $NH_4^+$  and  $NO_3^-$

$20:1 \leq C:N \leq 30:1$  expect no net change; immobilization and mineralization processes are at equilibrium

C:N < 20:1 mineralization occurs, a net gain in soil NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>

The nitrogen mineralization algorithms in SWAT are **net** mineralization algorithms which incorporate immobilization into the equations. The algorithms were adapted from the PAPRAN mineralization model (Seligman and van Keulen, 1981). Two sources are considered for mineralization: the fresh organic N pool associated with crop residue and microbial biomass and the active organic N pool associated with soil humus. Mineralization and decomposition are allowed to occur only if the temperature of the soil layer is above 0°C.

Mineralization and decomposition are dependent on water availability and temperature. Two factors are used in the mineralization and decomposition equations to account for the impact of temperature and water on these processes.

The nutrient cycling temperature factor is calculated:

$$\gamma_{tmp,ly} = 0.9 \cdot \frac{T_{soil,ly}}{T_{soil,ly} + \exp[9.93 - 0.312 \cdot T_{soil,ly}]} + 0.1 \quad 3:1.2.1$$

where  $\gamma_{tmp,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer  $ly$ , and  $T_{soil,ly}$  is the temperature of layer  $ly$  (°C). The nutrient cycling temperature factor is never allowed to fall below 0.1.

The nutrient cycling water factor is calculated:

$$\gamma_{sw,ly} = \frac{SW_{ly}}{FC_{ly}} \quad 3:1.2.2$$

where  $\gamma_{sw,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling water factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $SW_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The nutrient cycling water factor is never allowed to fall below 0.05.

### **3:1.2.1 HUMUS MINERALIZATION**

Nitrogen is allowed to move between the active and stable organic pools in the humus fraction. The amount of nitrogen transferred from one pool to the other is calculated:

$$N_{trns,ly} = \beta_{trns} \cdot orgN_{act,ly} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{fr_{actN}} - 1 \right) - orgN_{sta,ly} \quad 3:1.2.3$$

$N_{trns,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen transferred between the active and stable organic pools (kg N/ha),  $\beta_{trns}$  is the rate constant ( $1 \times 10^{-5}$ ),  $orgN_{act,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen in the active organic pool (kg N/ha),  $fr_{actN}$  is the fraction of humic nitrogen in the active pool (0.02), and  $orgN_{sta,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen in the stable organic pool (kg N/ha). When  $N_{trns,ly}$  is positive, nitrogen is moving from the active organic pool to the stable organic pool. When  $N_{trns,ly}$  is negative, nitrogen is moving from the stable organic pool to the active organic pool.

Mineralization from the humus active organic N pool is calculated:

$$N_{mina,ly} = \beta_{min} \cdot (\gamma_{tmp,ly} \cdot \gamma_{sw,ly})^{1/2} \cdot orgN_{act,ly} \quad 3:1.2.4$$

where  $N_{mina,ly}$  is the nitrogen mineralized from the humus active organic N pool (kg N/ha),  $\beta_{min}$  is the rate coefficient for mineralization of the humus active organic nutrients,  $\gamma_{tmp,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $\gamma_{sw,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling water factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $orgN_{act,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen in the active organic pool (kg N/ha).

Nitrogen mineralized from the humus active organic pool is added to the nitrate pool in the layer.

### **3:1.2.2 RESIDUE DECOMPOSITION & MINERALIZATION**

Decomposition and mineralization of the fresh organic nitrogen pool is allowed only in the first soil layer. Decomposition and mineralization are controlled by a decay rate constant that is updated daily. The decay rate constant is calculated as a function of the C:N ratio and C:P ratio of the residue, temperature and soil water content.

The C:N ratio of the residue is calculated:

$$\varepsilon_{C:N} = \frac{0.58 \cdot rsd_{ly}}{orgN_{frsh,ly} + NO3_{ly}} \quad 3:1.2.5$$

where  $\varepsilon_{C:N}$  is the C:N ratio of the residue in the soil layer,  $rsd_{ly}$  is the residue in layer  $ly$  (kg/ha), 0.58 is the fraction of residue that is carbon,  $orgN_{frsh,ly}$  is the nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha), and  $NO3_{ly}$  is the amount of nitrate in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha).

The C:P ratio of the residue is calculated:

$$\varepsilon_{C:P} = \frac{0.58 \cdot rsd_{ly}}{orgP_{frsh,ly} + P_{solution,ly}} \quad 3:1.2.6$$

where  $\varepsilon_{C:P}$  is the C:P ratio of the residue in the soil layer,  $rsd_{ly}$  is the residue in layer  $ly$  (kg/ha), 0.58 is the fraction of residue that is carbon,  $orgP_{frsh,ly}$  is the phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha), and  $P_{solution,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in solution in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha).

The decay rate constant defines the fraction of residue that is decomposed.

The decay rate constant is calculated:

$$\delta_{ntr,ly} = \beta_{rsd} \cdot \gamma_{ntr,ly} \cdot (\gamma_{tmp,ly} \cdot \gamma_{sw,ly})^{1/2} \quad 3:1.2.7$$

where  $\delta_{ntr,ly}$  is the residue decay rate constant,  $\beta_{rsd}$  is the rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients,  $\gamma_{ntr,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling residue composition factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $\gamma_{tmp,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer  $ly$ , and  $\gamma_{sw,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling water factor for layer  $ly$ .

The nutrient cycling residue composition factor is calculated:

$$\gamma_{ntr,ly} = \min \begin{cases} \exp \left[ -0.693 \cdot \frac{(\varepsilon_{C:N} - 25)}{25} \right] \\ \exp \left[ -0.693 \cdot \frac{(\varepsilon_{C:P} - 200)}{200} \right] \\ 1.0 \end{cases} \quad 3:1.2.8$$

where  $\gamma_{ntr,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling residue composition factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $\varepsilon_{C:N}$  is the C:N ratio on the residue in the soil layer, and  $\varepsilon_{C:P}$  is the C:P ratio on the residue in the soil layer.

Mineralization from the residue fresh organic N pool is then calculated:

$$N_{minf,ly} = 0.8 \cdot \delta_{ntr,ly} \cdot orgN_{frsh,ly} \quad 3:1.2.9$$

where  $N_{minf,ly}$  is the nitrogen mineralized from the fresh organic N pool (kg N/ha),  $\delta_{ntr,ly}$  is the residue decay rate constant, and  $orgN_{frsh,ly}$  is the nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha). Nitrogen mineralized from the fresh organic pool is added to the nitrate pool in the layer.

Decomposition from the residue fresh organic N pool is calculated:

$$N_{dec,ly} = 0.2 \cdot \delta_{ntr,ly} \cdot orgN_{frsh,ly} \quad 3:1.2.9$$


where  $N_{dec,ly}$  is the nitrogen decomposed from the fresh organic N pool (kg N/ha),  $\delta_{ntr,ly}$  is the residue decay rate constant, and  $orgN_{frsh,ly}$  is the nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha). Nitrogen decomposed from the fresh organic pool is added to the humus active organic pool in the layer.

Table 3:1-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to mineralization.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
CMN	$\beta_{min}$ : Rate coefficient for mineralization of the humus active organic nutrients	.bsn
RSDCO	$\beta_{rsd}$ : Rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients	.bsn
RSDCO_PL	$\beta_{rsd}$ : Rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients	crop.dat


### 3:1.3 NITRIFICATION & AMMONIA VOLATILIZATION

Nitrification is the two-step bacterial oxidation of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  to  $\text{NO}_3^-$ .




Ammonia volatilization is the gaseous loss of  $\text{NH}_3$  that occurs when ammonium,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ , is surface applied to a calcareous soil or when urea,  $(\text{NH}_2)_2\text{CO}$ , is surface applied to any soil.

$\text{NH}_4^+$  surface applied to a calcareous soil:



Urea surface applied to any soil:



SWAT simulates nitrification and ammonia volatilization using a combination of the methods developed by Reddy et al. (1979) and Godwin et al. (1984). The total amount of nitrification and ammonia volatilization is calculated, and then partitioned between the two processes. Nitrification is a function of soil

temperature and soil water content while ammonia volatilization is a function of soil temperature, depth and cation exchange capacity. Four coefficients are used in the nitrification/volatilization algorithms to account for the impact of these parameters. Nitrification/volatilization occurs only when the temperature of the soil layer exceeds 5°C.

The nitrification/volatilization temperature factor is calculated:

$$\eta_{tmp,ly} = 0.41 \cdot \frac{(T_{soil,ly} - 5)}{10} \quad \text{if } T_{soil,ly} > 5 \quad 3:1.3.1$$

where  $\eta_{tmp,ly}$  is the nitrification/volatilization temperature factor, and  $T_{soil,ly}$  is the temperature of layer  $ly$  (°C).

The nitrification soil water factor is calculated:

$$\eta_{sw,ly} = \frac{SW_{ly} - WP_{ly}}{0.25 \cdot (FC_{ly} - WP_{ly})} \quad \text{if } SW_{ly} < 0.25 \cdot FC_{ly} - 0.75 \cdot WP_{ly} \quad 3:1.3.2$$

$$\eta_{sw,ly} = 1.0 \quad \text{if } SW_{ly} \geq 0.25 \cdot FC_{ly} - 0.75 \cdot WP_{ly} \quad 3:1.3.3$$

where  $\eta_{sw,ly}$  is the nitrification soil water factor,  $SW_{ly}$  is the soil water content of layer  $ly$  on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $WP_{ly}$  is the amount of water held in the soil layer at wilting point water content (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $FC_{ly}$  is the amount of water held in the soil layer at field capacity water content (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The volatilization depth factor is calculated:

$$\eta_{midz,ly} = 1 - \frac{z_{mid,ly}}{z_{mid,ly} + \exp[4.706 - 0.0305 \cdot z_{mid,ly}]} \quad 3:1.3.4$$

where  $\eta_{midz,ly}$  is the volatilization depth factor, and  $z_{mid,ly}$  is the depth from the soil surface to the middle of the layer (mm).

SWAT does not require the user to provide information about soil cation exchange capacity. The volatilization cation exchange factor is set to a constant value:

$$\eta_{cec,ly} = 0.15 \quad 3:1.3.5$$

The impact of environmental factors on nitrification and ammonia volatilization in a given layer is defined by the nitrification regulator and volatilization regulator. The nitrification regulator is calculated:

$$\eta_{nit,ly} = \eta_{tmp,ly} \cdot \eta_{sw,ly} \quad 3:1.3.6$$

and the volatilization regulator is calculated:

$$\eta_{vol,ly} = \eta_{tmp,ly} \cdot \eta_{midz,ly} \cdot \eta_{cec,ly} \quad 3:1.3.7$$

where  $\eta_{nit,ly}$  is the nitrification regulator,  $\eta_{vol,ly}$  is the volatilization regulator,  $\eta_{tmp,ly}$  is the nitrification/volatilization temperature factor,  $\eta_{sw,ly}$  is the nitrification soil water factor, and  $\eta_{midz,ly}$  is the volatilization depth factor.

The total amount of ammonium lost to nitrification and volatilization is calculated using a first-order kinetic rate equation (Reddy et al., 1979):

$$N_{nit|vol,ly} = NH4_{ly} \cdot (1 - \exp[-\eta_{nit,ly} - \eta_{vol,ly}]) \quad 3:1.3.8$$

where  $N_{nit|vol,ly}$  is the amount of ammonium converted via nitrification and volatilization in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha),  $NH4_{ly}$  is the amount of ammonium in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha),  $\eta_{nit,ly}$  is the nitrification regulator, and  $\eta_{vol,ly}$  is the volatilization regulator.

To partition  $N_{nit|vol,ly}$  between nitrification and volatilization, the expression by which  $NH4_{ly}$  is multiplied in equation 3:1.3.8, is solved using each regulator individually to obtain a fraction of ammonium removed by each process:

$$fr_{nit,ly} = 1 - \exp[-\eta_{nit,ly}] \quad 3:1.3.9$$

$$fr_{vol,ly} = 1 - \exp[-\eta_{vol,ly}] \quad 3:1.3.10$$

where  $fr_{nit,ly}$  is the estimated fraction of nitrogen lost by nitrification,  $fr_{vol,ly}$  is the estimated fraction of nitrogen lost by volatilization,  $\eta_{nit,ly}$  is the nitrification regulator, and  $\eta_{vol,ly}$  is the volatilization regulator.

The amount of nitrogen removed from the ammonium pool by nitrification is then calculated:

$$N_{nit,ly} = \frac{fr_{nit,ly}}{(fr_{nit,ly} + fr_{vol,ly})} \cdot N_{nit|vol,ly} \quad 3:1.3.11$$

and the amount of nitrogen removed from the ammonium pool by volatilization is:

$$N_{vol,ly} = \frac{fr_{vol,ly}}{(fr_{nit,ly} + fr_{vol,ly})} \cdot N_{nit|vol,ly} \quad 3:1.3.12$$

where  $N_{nit,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen converted from  $\text{NH}_4^+$  to  $\text{NO}_3^-$  in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha),  $N_{vol,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen converted from  $\text{NH}_4^+$  to  $\text{NH}_3$  in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha),  $fr_{nit,ly}$  is the estimated fraction of nitrogen lost by nitrification,  $fr_{vol,ly}$  is the estimated fraction of nitrogen lost by volatilization, and  $N_{nit|vol,ly}$  is the amount of ammonium converted via nitrification and volatilization in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha)

## 3:1.4 DENITRIFICATION

---

Denitrification is the bacterial reduction of nitrate,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , to  $\text{N}_2$  or  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  gases under anaerobic (reduced) conditions. Denitrification is a function of water content, temperature, presence of a carbon source and nitrate.

In general, when the water-filled porosity is greater than 60% denitrification will be observed in a soil. As soil water content increases, anaerobic conditions develop due to the fact that oxygen diffuses through water 10,000 times slower than through air. Because the rate of oxygen diffusion through water slows as the water temperature increases, temperature will also influence denitrification.

Cropping systems where water is ponded, such as rice, can lose a large fraction of fertilizer by denitrification. For a regular cropping system, an estimated 10-20% of nitrogen fertilizer may be lost to denitrification. Under a rice cropping system, 50% of nitrogen fertilizer may be lost to denitrification. In a flooded cropping system, the depth of water plays an important role because it controls the amount of water oxygen has to diffuse through to reach the soil.

SWAT determines the amount of nitrate lost to denitrification with the equation:

$$N_{denit,ly} = NO3_{ly} \cdot (1 - \exp[-\beta_{denit} \cdot \gamma_{tmp,ly} \cdot orgC_{ly}]) \text{ if } \gamma_{sw,ly} \geq \gamma_{sw,thr} \quad 3:1.4.1$$

$$N_{denit,ly} = 0.0 \quad \text{if } \gamma_{sw,ly} < \gamma_{sw,thr} \quad 3:1.4.2$$

where  $N_{denit,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen lost to denitrification (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{ly}$  is the amount of nitrate in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha),  $\beta_{denit}$  is the rate coefficient for

denitrification,  $\gamma_{mp,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer  $ly$  calculated with equation 3:1.2.1,  $\gamma_{sw,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling water factor for layer  $ly$  calculated with equation 3:1.2.2,  $orgC_{ly}$  is the amount of organic carbon in the layer (%), and  $\gamma_{sw,thr}$  is the threshold value of nutrient cycling water factor for denitrification to occur.

Table 3:1-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to denitrification.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_CBN	$orgC_{ly}$ : Amount of organic carbon in the layer (%)	.sol
CDN	$\beta_{denit}$ : Rate coefficient for denitrification	.bsn
SDNCO	$\gamma_{sw,thr}$ : Threshold value of nutrient cycling water factor for denitrification to occur	.bsn

## 3:1.5 ATMOSPHERIC DEPOSITION

Atmospheric deposition occurs when airborne chemical compounds settle onto the land or water surface. Some of the most important chemical pollutants are those containing nitrogen or phosphorus. Nitrogen compounds can be deposited onto water and land surfaces through both wet and dry deposition mechanisms. Wet deposition occurs through the absorption of compounds by precipitation as it falls carrying mainly nitrate ( $NO_3^-$ ) and ammonium ( $NH_4^+$ ). Dry deposition is the direct adsorption of compounds to water or land surfaces and involves complex interactions between airborne nitrogen compounds and plant, water, soil, rock, or building surfaces.



The relative contribution of atmospheric deposition to total nutrient loading is difficult to measure or indirectly assess and many deposition mechanisms are not fully understood. Most studies and relatively extended data sets are available on wet deposition of nitrogen, while dry deposition rates are not well defined. Phosphorus loadings due to atmospheric deposition have not been extensively studied and nation-wide extended data set were unavailable at the time of data preparation for the CEAP project. While research continues in these areas, data records generated by modeling approaches appear to be still under scrutiny.

A number of regional and local monitoring networks are operating in the U.S. mainly to address information regarding regional environmental issues. For example, the Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network (IADN) (Galarneau et al., 2006) that estimates deposition of toxic organic substances to the Great Lakes. Over the CONUS (conterminous United States), the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) National Trends Network (NTN) (NADP/NTN, 1995; NADP/NTN, 2000; Lamb and Van Bowersox, 2000) measures and ammonium in one-week rain and snow samples at nearly 240 regionally representative sites in the CONUS and is considered the nation's primary source for wet deposition data.

The U.S. EPA Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET), developed from the National Dry Deposition Network (NDDN), operates a total of 86 operational sites (as of December 2007) located in or near rural areas and sensitive ecosystems collecting data on ambient levels of pollutants where urban influences are minimal (CASTNET, 2007). As part of an interagency agreement, the National Park Service (NPS) sponsors 27 sites which are located in national parks and other Class-I areas designated as deserving special protection from air pollution.

### **3:1.5.1 NITROGEN IN RAINFALL**

Lightning discharge converts atmospheric N<sub>2</sub> to nitric acid which can then be transferred to the soil with precipitation. The chemical steps involved are:



More nitrogen will be added to the soil with rainfall in areas with a high amount of lightning activity than in areas with little lightning.

The amount of nitrate added to the soil in rainfall is calculated:

$$NO_{3rain} = 0.01 \cdot R_{NO3} \cdot R_{day} \quad 3:1.5.1$$

where  $NO_{3rain}$  is nitrate added by rainfall (kg N/ha),  $R_{NO3}$  is the concentration of nitrate in the rain (mg N/L), and  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation on a given day

(mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The nitrogen in rainfall is added to the nitrate pool in the top 10 mm of soil.

The amount of ammonia added to the soil in rainfall is calculated:

$$NH_4_{rain} = 0.01 \cdot R_{NH4} \cdot R_{day} \quad 3:1.5.2$$

where  $NH_4_{rain}$  is nitrate added by rainfall (kg N/ha),  $R_{NH4}$  is the concentration of ammonia in the rain (mg N/L), and  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The nitrogen in rainfall is added to the ammonia pool in the top 10 mm of soil.

Table 3:1-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to nitrogen in rainfall.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
RCN	$R_{NO3}$ : Concentration of nitrogen in the rain (mg/L)	.bsn
rammo_sub	Atmospheric deposition of ammonium (mg/L) values for entire watershed	.atm
Rcn_sub	Atmospheric deposition of nitrate (mg/L) for entire watershed	.atm

### **3.1.5.2 NITROGEN DRY DEPOSITION**

Dry deposition of nitrate and ammonia is input to the model for each subbasin. Average daily deposition is added to the appropriate surface soil pool.

$$NO_{3ly=1} = NO_{3ly=1} + NO_{3drydep} \quad 3:1.5.3$$

$$NH_{4ly=1} = NH_{4ly=1} + NH_{4drydep} \quad 3:1.5.4$$

where  $NO_{3ly=1}$  is the NO<sub>3</sub> in the surface soil layer,  $NH_{4ly=1}$  is the ammonium in the surface soil layer,  $NO_{3drydep}$  is the daily nitrate dry deposition rate (kg/ha) and  $NH_{4drydep}$  is the daily ammonium dry deposition rate (kg/ha).

Table 3:1-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to dry deposition.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
drydep_no3	Daily nitrate dry deposition rate (kg/ha)	.atm
drydep_nh4	Daily ammonia dry deposition rate (kg/ha)	.atm

## 3:1.6 FIXATION

---

Legumes are able to obtain a portion of their nitrogen demand through fixation of atmospheric N<sub>2</sub> performed by rhizobia living in association with the plant. In exchange for nitrogen, the plant supplies the bacteria with carbohydrates.

SWAT simulates nitrogen fixation by legumes when the soil does not supply the plant with the amount of nitrogen needed for growth. The nitrogen obtained by fixation is incorporated directly into the plant biomass and never enters the soil (unless plant biomass is added to the soil as residue after the plant is killed). The equations for nitrogen fixation by legumes are reviewed in Chapter 5:2.

## 3:1.7 UPWARD MOVEMENT OF NITRATE IN WATER

---

As water evaporates from the soil surface, the water content at the surface drops, creating a gradient in the profile. Water from lower in the profile will move upward in response to the gradient, carrying dissolved nutrients with it. SWAT allows nitrate to be transported from the first soil layer defined in the .sol file to the surface top 10 mm of soil with the equation:

$$N_{evap} = 0.1 \cdot NO3_{ly} \cdot \frac{E''_{soil,ly}}{SW_{ly}} \quad 3:1.7.1$$

where  $N_{evap}$  is the amount of nitrate moving from the first soil layer to the soil surface zone (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{ly}$  is the nitrate content of the first soil layer (kg N/ha),  $E''_{soil,ly}$  is the amount of water removed from the first soil layer as a result of evaporation (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $SW_{ly}$  is the soil water content of the first soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

## 3:1.8 LEACHING

---

The majority of plant-essential nutrients are cations which are attracted and sorbed to negatively-charged soil particles. As plants extract these cations from soil solution, the soil particles release bound cations into soil solution to

bring the ratio of nutrients in solution and on soil particles back into equilibrium. In effect, the soil buffers the concentration of cations in solution.

In contrast, nitrate is an anion and is not attracted to or sorbed by soil particles. Because retention of nitrate by soils is minimal, nitrate is very susceptible to leaching. The algorithms used by SWAT to calculate nitrate leaching simultaneously solve for loss of nitrate in surface runoff and lateral flow also. These algorithms are reviewed in Chapter 4:2.

### **3:1.9 NITRATE IN THE SHALLOW AQUIFER**

---

Groundwater flow entering the main channel from the shallow aquifer can contain nitrate. With SWAT2009 the nitrate pool in the shallow aquifer is modeled, allowing for fluctuations in nitrate loadings in the groundwater over time.

Nitrate enters the shallow aquifer in recharge from the soil profile. Water that moves past the lowest depth of the soil profile by percolation or bypass flow enters and flows through the vadose zone before becoming shallow and/or deep aquifer recharge. SWAT assumes there is no change in nitrate concentration of the recharge as it moves through the vadose zone.

An exponential decay weighting function proposed by Venetis (1969) and used by Sangrey et al. (1984) in a precipitation/groundwater response model is utilized in SWAT to account for the time delay in aquifer recharge once the water exits the soil profile. The delay function accommodates situations where the recharge from the soil zone to the aquifer is not instantaneous, i.e. 1 day or less. This same relationship is used to account for the delay in nitrate movement from the soil profile to the aquifers.

The nitrate in recharge to both aquifers on a given day is calculated:

$$NO3_{rchg,i} = (1 - \exp[-1/\delta_{gw}]) \cdot NO3_{perc} + \exp[-1/\delta_{gw}] \cdot NO3_{rchg,i-1} \quad 3:1.9.1$$

where  $NO3_{rchg,i}$  is the amount of nitrate in recharge entering the aquifers on day  $i$  (kg N/ha),  $\delta_{gw}$  is the delay time or drainage time of the overlying geologic formations (days),  $NO3_{perc}$  is the total amount of nitrate exiting the bottom of the soil profile on day  $i$  (kg N/ha), and  $NO3_{rchg,i-1}$  is the amount of nitrate in recharge

entering the aquifers on day  $i-1$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The total amount of nitrate exiting the bottom of the soil profile on day  $i$  is calculated using the percolation equation given in Chapter 4:2.

Nitrate in the shallow aquifer may be remain in the aquifer, move with recharge to the deep aquifer, move with groundwater flow into the main channel, or be transported out of the shallow aquifer with water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies. The amount of nitrate in the shallow aquifer after all these processes are taken into account is:

$$NO3_{sh,i} = (NO3_{sh,i-1} + NO3_{rchrg,i}) \cdot aq_{sh,i} / (aq_{sh,i} + Q_{gw} + w_{revap} + w_{rchrg,dp}) \quad 3:1.9.2$$

while the amount of nitrate lost in groundwater flow is

$$NO3_{gw} = (NO3_{sh,i-1} + NO3_{rchrg,i}) \cdot Q_{gw} / (aq_{sh,i} + Q_{gw} + w_{revap} + w_{rchrg,dp}) \quad 3:1.9.3$$

the amount of nitrate lost in revap to the soil profile is

$$NO3_{revap} = (NO3_{sh,i-1} + NO3_{rchrg,i}) \cdot w_{revap} / (aq_{sh,i} + Q_{gw} + w_{revap} + w_{rchrg,dp}) \quad 3:1.9.4$$

and the amount of nitrate transported to the deep aquifer is

$$NO3_{dp} = (NO3_{sh,i-1} + NO3_{rchrg,i}) \cdot w_{rchrg,dp} / (aq_{sh,i} + Q_{gw} + w_{revap} + w_{rchrg,dp}) \quad 3:1.9.5$$

where  $NO3_{sh,i}$  is the amount of nitrate in the shallow aquifer at the end of day  $i$  (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{sh,i-1}$  is the amount of nitrate in the shallow aquifer at the end of day  $i - 1$  (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{rchrg,i}$  is the amount of nitrate in recharge entering the aquifers on day  $i$  (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{gw}$  is the amount of nitrate in groundwater flow from the shallow aquifer on day  $i$  (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{revap}$  is the amount of nitrate in revap to the soil profile from the shallow aquifer on day  $i$  (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{dp}$  is the amount of nitrate in recharge entering the deep aquifer on day  $i$  (kg N/ha),  $aq_{sh,i}$  is the amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer at the end of day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{rchrg}$  is the amount of recharge entering the aquifers on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{gw}$  is the groundwater flow, or base flow, into the main channel on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{revap}$  is the amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{rchrg,dp}$  is the amount of recharge entering the deep aquifer on day  $i$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Because nitrogen is a very reactive element, nitrate in the shallow aquifer may be lost due to uptake by bacteria present in the aquifer, chemical

transformations driven by a change in redox potential of the aquifer, and other processes. To account for losses of nitrate due to biological and chemical processes, a half-life for nitrate in the aquifer may be defined that specifies the number of days required for a given nitrate concentration to be reduced by one-half. The half-life entered for nitrate in the shallow aquifer is a lumped parameter that includes the net effect of all reactions occurring in the aquifer.

Nitrate removal in the shallow aquifer is governed by first-order kinetics:

$$NO_3_{sh,t} = NO_3_{sh,o} \cdot \exp[-k_{NO_3,sh} \cdot t] \quad 3:1.9.6$$

where  $NO_3_{sh,t}$  is the amount of nitrate in the shallow aquifer at time  $t$  (kg N/ha),  $NO_3_{sh,o}$  is the initial amount of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (kg N/ha),  $k_{NO_3,sh}$  is the rate constant for removal of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (1/day), and  $t$  is the time elapsed since the initial nitrate amount was determined (days). The rate constant is related to the half-life as follows:

$$t_{1/2,NO_3,sh} = \frac{0.693}{k_{NO_3,sh}} \quad 3:1.9.6$$

where  $t_{1/2,NO_3,sh}$  is the half-life of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (days).

Table 3:1-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to nitrogen in the shallow aquifer.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
GW_DELAY	$\delta_{gw}$ : Delay time for aquifer recharge (days)	.gw
SHALLST_N	$NO_3_{sh}$ : Amount of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (kg N/ha)	.gw
HLIFE_NGW	$t_{1/2,NO_3,sh}$ : Half-life of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (days)	.gw

## 3:1.10 NOMENCLATURE

- $E''_{soil,ly}$  Amount of water removed from layer  $ly$  by evaporation (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)
- $FC_{ly}$  Water content of layer  $ly$  at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)
- $N_{dec,ly}$  Nitrogen decomposed from the fresh organic N pool (kg N/ha)
- $N_{denit,ly}$  Amount of nitrogen lost to denitrification (kg N/ha)
- $N_{evap}$  Amount of nitrate moving from the first soil layer to the soil surface zone (kg N/ha)
- $N_{mina,ly}$  Nitrogen mineralized from the humus active organic N pool (kg N/ha)
- $N_{minf,ly}$  Nitrogen mineralized from the fresh organic N pool (kg N/ha)
- $N_{nit,ly}$  Amount of nitrogen converted from NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> to NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha)

$N_{nit vol,ly}$	Amount of ammonium converted via nitrification and volatilization in layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{rain}$	Nitrate added by rainfall (kg N/ha)
$N_{trns,ly}$	Amount of nitrogen transferred between the active and stable organic pools (kg N/ha)
$N_{vol,ly}$	Amount of nitrogen converted from $\text{NH}_4^+$ to $\text{NH}_3$ in layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$NH_4_{drydep}$	Daily ammonium dry deposition rate (kg/ha)
$NH_4_{ly}$	Ammonium content of layer $ly$ (kg $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}/\text{ha}$ )
$NH_4_{rain}$	Ammonium added by rainfall (kg N/ha)
$NO_3_{conc,z}$	Concentration of nitrate in the soil at depth $z$ (mg/kg or ppm)
$NO_3_{drydep}$	Daily nitrate dry deposition rate (kg/ha)
$NO_3_{dp}$	Amount of nitrate in recharge entering the deep aquifer (kg N/ha)
$NO_3_{gw}$	Amount of nitrate in groundwater flow from the shallow aquifer (kg N/ha)
$NO_3_{ly}$	Nitrate content of soil layer $ly$ (kg $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}/\text{ha}$ )
$NO_3_{rain}$	Nitrate added by rainfall (kg N/ha)
$NO_3_{perc}$	Total amount of nitrate exiting the bottom of the soil profile (kg N/ha)
$NO_3_{rchrg}$	Amount of nitrate in recharge entering the aquifers (kg N/ha)
$NO_3_{revap}$	Amount of nitrate in revap to the soil profile from the shallow aquifer (kg N/ha)
$NO_3_{sh}$	Amount of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (kg N/ha)
$P_{solution,ly}$	Solution phosphorus content of soil layer $ly$ (kg P/ha)
$R_{day}$	Amount of rainfall on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_{NO_3}$	Concentration of nitrogen in the rain (mg N/L)
$SW_{ly}$	Soil water content of layer $ly$ (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$T_{soil,ly}$	Temperature of layer $ly$ ( $^\circ\text{C}$ )
$WP_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at wilting point (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$conc_N$	Concentration of nitrogen in a layer (mg/kg or ppm)
$depth_{ly}$	Depth of the layer (mm)
$fr_{actN}$	Fraction of humic nitrogen in the active pool
$fr_{nit,ly}$	Estimated fraction of nitrogen lost by nitrification
$fr_{vol,ly}$	Estimated fraction of nitrogen lost by volatilization
$k_{NO_3,sh}$	Rate constant for removal of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (1/day)
$orgC_{ly}$	Amount of organic carbon in the layer (%)
$orgN_{act,ly}$	Nitrogen in the active organic pool in layer $ly$ (mg/kg or kg N/ha)
$orgN_{frsh,ly}$	Nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$orgN_{hum,ly}$	Concentration of humic organic nitrogen in the layer (mg/kg or ppm)
$orgN_{sta,ly}$	Nitrogen in the stable organic pool in layer $ly$ (mg/kg or kg N/ha)
$orgP_{frsh,ly}$	Phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in layer $ly$ (kg P/ha)
$rsd_{ly}$	Residue in layer $ly$ (kg/ha)
$t_{1/2,NO_3,sh}$	Half-life of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (days)
$z$	Depth below soil surface (mm)
$z_{mid,ly}$	Depth from the soil surface to the middle of the layer (mm)
$\beta_{denit}$	Rate coefficient for denitrification
$\beta_{min}$	Rate coefficient for mineralization of the humus active organic nutrients

$\beta_{rsd}$	Rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients
$\beta_{trns}$	Rate constant for nitrogen transfer between active and stable organic pools ( $1 \times 10^{-5}$ )
$\delta_{gw}$	Delay time or drainage time of the overlying geologic formations (days)
$\delta_{ntr,ly}$	Residue decay rate constant
$\varepsilon_{C:N}$	Residue C:N ratio in the soil layer
$\varepsilon_{C:P}$	Residue C:P ratio in the soil layer
$\gamma_{ntr,ly}$	Nutrient cycling residue composition factor for layer $ly$
$\gamma_{sw,ly}$	Nutrient cycling water factor for layer $ly$
$\gamma_{sw,thr}$	Threshold value of nutrient cycling water factor for denitrification to occur
$\gamma_{tmp,ly}$	Nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer $ly$
$\eta_{cec,ly}$	Volatilization cation exchange capacity factor
$\eta_{midz,ly}$	Volatilization depth factor
$\eta_{nit,ly}$	Nitrification regulator
$\eta_{sw,ly}$	Nitrification soil water factor
$\eta_{tmp,ly}$	Nitrification/volatilization temperature factor
$\eta_{vol,ly}$	Volatilization regulator
$\rho_b$	Bulk density of the layer (Mg/m <sup>3</sup> )

## 3:1.11 REFERENCES

---

Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET), 2007.

[http://www.epa.gov/castnet/docs/CASTNET\\_factsheet\\_2007.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/castnet/docs/CASTNET_factsheet_2007.pdf)

Galarneau, E.; Bidleman, T. F.; Blanchard, P. Seasonality and interspecies differences in particle/gas partitioning of PAHs observed by the Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network (IADN). *Atmos. Environ.* 2006, 40, 182-197.

Godwin, D.C., C.A. Jones, J.T. Ritchie, P.L.G. Vlek, and L.G. Youngdahl. 1984. The water and nitrogen components of the CERES models. p. 95-100. In Proc. Intl. Symp. on Minimum Data Sets for Agrotechnology Transfer, March 1983, Patancheru, India. Intl. Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics.

Holland, E. A., B. H. Braswell, J. M. Sulzman, and J.-F. Lamarque. 2005a. Nitrogen Deposition onto the United States and Western Europe. Data set. Available on-line [<http://www.daac.ornl.gov>] from Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, U.S.A. doi:10.3334/ORNLDaac/730.

- Holland, E. A., B. H. Braswell, J.M. Sulzman, and J.-F, Lamarque. 2005b. Nitrogen Deposition onto the United States and Western Europe: Synthesis of Observations and Models. *Ecological Applications* 15(1): 38-57..
- Lamb, D. and Van Bowersox, 2000. The national atmospheric deposition program: an overview. *Atmospheric Environment* 34:1661-1663.
- Lehmann, Christopher M.B. and Van Bowersox. 2003. National Atmospheric Deposition Program Quality Management Plan. National Atmospheric Deposition Program Office at the Illinois State Water Survey. NADP QA Plan 2003-01. Champaign, IL
- NADP/NTN, 1995 and 2000. National Atmospheric Deposition Program / National Trends Network, <http://nadp.sws.uiuc.edu>.
- Reddy, K.R., R. Khaleel, M.R. Overcash, and P.W. Westerman. 1979. A nonpoint source model for land areas receiving animal wastes: II. Ammonia volatilization. *Trans. ASAE* 22:1398-1404.
- Seligmand, N.G. and H. van Keulen. 1981. PAPRAN: A simulation model of annual pasture production limited by rainfall and nitrogen. p. 192-221. In M.J. Frissel and J.A. van Velds. (eds) Simulation of nitrogen behaviour of soil-plant systems, Proc. Workshop. Wageningen, Jan.-Feb. 1980.
- USGS, 1994: 1:250,000-scale Hydrologic Units of the United States. USGS Open-File Rep. 94-0236 [Available on line at <http://water.usgs.gov/GIS/metadata/usgswrd/XML/huc250k.xml>]



## **SECTION 3 CHAPTER 2**

# **EQUATIONS: PHOSPHORUS**

---

Although plant phosphorus demand is considerably less than nitrogen demand, phosphorus is required for many essential functions. The most important of these is its role in energy storage and transfer. Energy obtained from photosynthesis and metabolism of carbohydrates is stored in phosphorus compounds for later use in growth and reproductive processes.

### 3:2.1 PHOSPHORUS CYCLE

The three major forms of phosphorus in mineral soils are organic phosphorus associated with humus, insoluble forms of mineral phosphorus, and plant-available phosphorus in soil solution. Phosphorus may be added to the soil by fertilizer, manure or residue application. Phosphorus is removed from the soil by plant uptake and erosion. Figure 3:2-1 shows the major components of the phosphorus cycle.




Figure 3:2-1: The phosphorus cycle

Unlike nitrogen which is highly mobile, phosphorus solubility is limited in most environments. Phosphorus combines with other ions to form a number of insoluble compounds that precipitate out of solution. These characteristics contribute to a build-up of phosphorus near the soil surface that is readily available for transport in surface runoff. Sharpley and Syers (1979) observed that

surface runoff is the primary mechanism by which phosphorus is exported from most catchments.

SWAT monitors six different pools of phosphorus in the soil (Figure 3:2-2). Three pools are inorganic forms of phosphorus while the other three pools are organic forms of phosphorus. Fresh organic P is associated with crop residue and microbial biomass while the active and stable organic P pools are associated with the soil humus. The organic phosphorus associated with humus is partitioned into two pools to account for the variation in availability of humic substances to mineralization. Soil inorganic P is divided into solution, active, and stable pools. The solution pool is in rapid equilibrium (several days or weeks) with the active pool. The active pool is in slow equilibrium with the stable pool.

## PHOSPHORUS




Figure 3:2-2: SWAT soil phosphorus pools and processes that move P in and out of pools.

### **3:2.1.1 INITIALIZATION OF SOIL PHOSPHORUS LEVELS**

Users may define the amount of soluble P and organic phosphorus contained in humic substances for all soil layers at the beginning of the simulation. If the user does not specify initial phosphorus concentrations, SWAT will initialize levels of phosphorus in the different pools.

The concentration of solution phosphorus in all layers is initially set to 5 mg/kg soil. This concentration is representative of unmanaged land under native vegetation. A concentration of 25 mg/kg soil in the plow layer is considered representative of cropland (Cope et al., 1981).

The concentration of phosphorus in the active mineral pool is initialized to (Jones et al., 1984):

$$\min P_{act,ly} = P_{solution,ly} \cdot \frac{1 - pai}{pai} \quad 3:2.1.1$$

where  $\min P_{act,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the active mineral pool (mg/kg),  $P_{solution,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in solution (mg/kg), and  $pai$  is the phosphorus availability index.

The concentration of phosphorus in the stable mineral pool is initialized to (Jones et al., 1984):

$$\min P_{sta,ly} = 4 \cdot \min P_{act,ly} \quad 3:2.1.2$$

where  $\min P_{sta,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the stable mineral pool (mg/kg), and  $\min P_{act,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the active mineral pool (mg/kg).

Organic phosphorus levels are assigned assuming that the N:P ratio for humic materials is 8:1. The concentration of humic organic phosphorus in a soil layer is calculated:

$$orgP_{hum,ly} = 0.125 \cdot orgN_{hum,ly} \quad 3:2.1.3$$

where  $orgP_{hum,ly}$  is the concentration of humic organic phosphorus in the layer (mg/kg) and  $orgN_{hum,ly}$  is the concentration of humic organic nitrogen in the layer (mg/kg).

Phosphorus in the fresh organic pool is set to zero in all layers except the top 10mm of soil. In the top 10 mm, the fresh organic phosphorus pool is set to 0.03% of the initial amount of residue on the soil surface.

$$orgP_{frsh,surf} = 0.0003 \cdot rsd_{surf} \quad 3:2.1.4$$

where  $orgP_{frsh,surf}$  is the phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in the top 10mm (kg P/ha), and  $rsd_{surf}$  is material in the residue pool for the top 10mm of soil (kg/ha).

While SWAT allows nutrient levels to be input as concentrations, it performs all calculations on a mass basis. To convert a concentration to a mass, the concentration is multiplied by the bulk density and depth of the layer and divided by 100:

$$\frac{conc_P \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly}}{100} = \frac{\text{kg P}}{\text{ha}} \quad 3:2.1.5$$

where  $conc_P$  is the concentration of phosphorus in a layer (mg/kg or ppm),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the layer ( $Mg/m^3$ ), and  $depth_{ly}$  is the depth of the layer (mm).

Table 3:2-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to nitrogen pools.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_SOLP	$P_{solution,ly}$ : Initial soluble P concentration in soil layer (mg/kg or ppm)	.chm
SOL_ORGP	$orgP_{hum,ly}$ : Initial humic organic phosphorus in soil layer (mg/kg or ppm)	.chm
PSP	$pai$ : Phosphorus availability index	.bsn
RSDIN	$rsd_{surf}$ : Material in the residue pool for the top 10mm of soil ( $kg ha^{-1}$ )	.hru
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density of the layer ( $Mg/m^3$ )	.sol

## 3:2.2 MINERALIZATION & DECOMPOSITION / IMMOBILIZATION

Decomposition is the breakdown of fresh organic residue into simpler organic components. Mineralization is the microbial conversion of organic, plant-unavailable phosphorus to inorganic, plant-available phosphorus. Immobilization is the microbial conversion of plant-available inorganic soil phosphorus to plant-unavailable organic phosphorus.

The phosphorus mineralization algorithms in SWAT are **net** mineralization algorithms which incorporate immobilization into the equations. The phosphorus mineralization algorithms developed by Jones et al. (1984) are similar in structure to the nitrogen mineralization algorithms. Two sources are considered for mineralization: the fresh organic P pool associated with crop residue and microbial biomass and the active organic P pool associated with soil humus. Mineralization and decomposition are allowed to occur only if the temperature of the soil layer is above 0°C.

Mineralization and decomposition are dependent on water availability and temperature. Two factors are used in the mineralization and decomposition equations to account for the impact of temperature and water on these processes.

The nutrient cycling temperature factor is calculated:

$$\gamma_{tmp,ly} = 0.9 \cdot \frac{T_{soil,ly}}{T_{soil,ly} + \exp[9.93 - 0.312 \cdot T_{soil,ly}]} + 0.1 \quad 3:2.2.1$$

where  $\gamma_{tmp,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer  $ly$ , and  $T_{soil,ly}$  is the temperature of layer  $ly$  ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The nutrient cycling temperature factor is never allowed to fall below 0.1.

The nutrient cycling water factor is calculated:

$$\gamma_{sw,ly} = \frac{SW_{ly}}{FC_{ly}} \quad 3:2.2.2$$

where  $\gamma_{sw,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling water factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $SW_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  at field capacity (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ). The nutrient cycling water factor is never allowed to fall below 0.05.

### **3:2.2.1 HUMUS MINERALIZATION**

Phosphorus in the humus fraction is partitioned between the active and stable organic pools using the ratio of humus active organic N to stable organic N. The amount of phosphorus in the active and stable organic pools is calculated:

$$orgP_{act,ly} = orgP_{hum,ly} \cdot \frac{orgN_{act,ly}}{orgN_{act,ly} + orgN_{sta,ly}} \quad 3:2.2.3$$

$$orgP_{sta,ly} = orgP_{hum,ly} \cdot \frac{orgN_{sta,ly}}{orgN_{act,ly} + orgN_{sta,ly}} \quad 3:2.2.4$$

where  $orgP_{act,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the active organic pool (kg P/ha),  $orgP_{sta,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the stable organic pool (kg P/ha),  $orgP_{hum,ly}$  is the concentration of humic organic phosphorus in the layer (kg P/ha),  $orgN_{act,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen in the active organic pool (kg N/ha), and  $orgN_{sta,ly}$  is the amount of nitrogen in the stable organic pool (kg N/ha).

Mineralization from the humus active organic P pool is calculated:

$$P_{mina,ly} = 1.4 \cdot \beta_{min} \cdot (\gamma_{tmp,ly} \cdot \gamma_{sw,ly})^{1/2} \cdot orgP_{act,ly} \quad 3:2.2.5$$

where  $P_{mina,ly}$  is the phosphorus mineralized from the humus active organic P pool (kg P/ha),  $\beta_{min}$  is the rate coefficient for mineralization of the humus active organic nutrients,  $\gamma_{tmp,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $\gamma_{sw,ly}$

is the nutrient cycling water factor for layer  $ly$ , and  $orgP_{act,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the active organic pool (kg P/ha).

Phosphorus mineralized from the humus active organic pool is added to the solution P pool in the layer.

### **3:2.2.2 RESIDUE DECOMPOSITION & MINERALIZATION**

Decomposition and mineralization of the fresh organic phosphorus pool is allowed only in the first soil layer. Decomposition and mineralization are controlled by a decay rate constant that is updated daily. The decay rate constant is calculated as a function of the C:N ratio and C:P ratio of the residue, temperature and soil water content.

The C:N ratio of the residue is calculated:

$$\varepsilon_{C:N} = \frac{0.58 \cdot rsd_{ly}}{orgN_{frsh,ly} + NO3_{ly}} \quad 3:2.2.6$$

where  $\varepsilon_{C:N}$  is the C:N ratio of the residue in the soil layer,  $rsd_{ly}$  is the residue in layer  $ly$  (kg/ha), 0.58 is the fraction of residue that is carbon,  $orgN_{frsh,ly}$  is the nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha), and  $NO3_{ly}$  is the amount of nitrate in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha).

The C:P ratio of the residue is calculated:

$$\varepsilon_{C:P} = \frac{0.58 \cdot rsd_{ly}}{orgP_{frsh,ly} + P_{solution,ly}} \quad 3:2.2.7$$

where  $\varepsilon_{C:P}$  is the C:P ratio of the residue in the soil layer,  $rsd_{ly}$  is the residue in layer  $ly$  (kg/ha), 0.58 is the fraction of residue that is carbon,  $orgP_{frsh,ly}$  is the phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha), and  $P_{solution,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in solution in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha).

The decay rate constant defines the fraction of residue that is decomposed.

The decay rate constant is calculated:

$$\delta_{ntr,ly} = \beta_{rsd} \cdot \gamma_{ntr,ly} \cdot (\gamma_{tmp,ly} \cdot \gamma_{sw,ly})^{1/2} \quad 3:2.2.8$$

where  $\delta_{ntr,ly}$  is the residue decay rate constant,  $\beta_{rsd}$  is the rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients,  $\gamma_{ntr,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling

residue composition factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $\gamma_{tmp,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer  $ly$ , and  $\gamma_{sw,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling water factor for layer  $ly$ .

The nutrient cycling residue composition factor is calculated:

$$\gamma_{ntr,ly} = \min \begin{cases} \exp \left[ -0.693 \cdot \frac{(\varepsilon_{C:N} - 25)}{25} \right] \\ \exp \left[ -0.693 \cdot \frac{(\varepsilon_{C:P} - 200)}{200} \right] \\ 1.0 \end{cases} \quad 3:2.2.9$$

where  $\gamma_{ntr,ly}$  is the nutrient cycling residue composition factor for layer  $ly$ ,  $\varepsilon_{C:N}$  is the C:N ratio on the residue in the soil layer, and  $\varepsilon_{C:P}$  is the C:P ratio on the residue in the soil layer.

Mineralization from the residue fresh organic P pool is then calculated:

$$P_{minf,ly} = 0.8 \cdot \delta_{ntr,ly} \cdot orgP_{frsh,ly} \quad 3:2.2.10$$

where  $P_{minf,ly}$  is the phosphorus mineralized from the fresh organic P pool (kg P/ha),  $\delta_{ntr,ly}$  is the residue decay rate constant, and  $orgP_{frsh,ly}$  is the phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha). Phosphorus mineralized from the fresh organic pool is added to the solution P pool in the layer.

Decomposition from the residue fresh organic P pool is calculated:

$$P_{dec,ly} = 0.2 \cdot \delta_{ntr,ly} \cdot orgP_{frsh,ly} \quad 3:2.2.11$$

where  $P_{dec,ly}$  is the phosphorus decomposed from the fresh organic P pool (kg P/ha),  $\delta_{ntr,ly}$  is the residue decay rate constant, and  $orgP_{frsh,ly}$  is the phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha). Phosphorus decomposed from the fresh organic pool is added to the humus organic pool in the layer.

Table 3:2-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to mineralization.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
CMN	$\beta_{min}$ : Rate coefficient for mineralization of the humus active organic nutrients	.bsn
RSDCO	$\beta_{rsd}$ : Rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients	.bsn
RSDCO_PL	$\beta_{rsd}$ : Rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients	crop.dat

### 3:2.3 SORPTION OF INORGANIC P

---

Many studies have shown that after an application of soluble P fertilizer, solution P concentration decreases rapidly with time due to reaction with the soil. This initial “fast” reaction is followed by a much slower decrease in solution P that may continue for several years (Barrow and Shaw, 1975; Munns and Fox, 1976; Rajan and Fox, 1972; Sharpley, 1982). In order to account for the initial rapid decrease in solution P, SWAT assumes a rapid equilibrium exists between solution P and an “active” mineral pool. The subsequent slow reaction is simulated by the slow equilibrium assumed to exist between the “active” and “stable” mineral pools. The algorithms governing movement of inorganic phosphorus between these three pools are taken from Jones et al. (1984).

Equilibration between the solution and active mineral pool is governed by the phosphorus availability index. This index specifies the fraction of fertilizer P which is in solution after an incubation period, i.e. after the rapid reaction period.

A number of methods have been developed to measure the phosphorus availability index. Jones et al. (1984) recommends a method outlined by Sharpley et al. (1984) in which various amounts of phosphorus are added in solution to the soil as  $K_2HPO_4$ . The soil is wetted to field capacity and then dried slowly at 25°C. When dry, the soil is rewetted with deionized water. The soil is exposed to several wetting and drying cycles over a 6-month incubation period. At the end of the incubation period, solution phosphorus is determined by extraction with anion exchange resin.

The P availability index is then calculated:

$$pai = \frac{P_{solution,f} - P_{solution,i}}{fert_{minP}} \quad 3:2.3.1$$

where  $pai$  is the phosphorus availability index,  $P_{solution,f}$  is the amount of phosphorus in solution after fertilization and incubation,  $P_{solution,i}$  is the amount of phosphorus in solution before fertilization, and  $fert_{minP}$  is the amount of soluble P fertilizer added to the sample.

The movement of phosphorus between the solution and active mineral pools is governed by the equilibration equations:

$$P_{sol|act,ly} = 0.1 \left( P_{solution,ly} - \min P_{act,ly} \cdot \left( \frac{pai}{1-pai} \right) \right)$$

if  $P_{solution,ly} > \min P_{act,ly} \cdot \left( \frac{pai}{1-pai} \right)$  3:2.3.2

$$P_{sol|act,ly} = 0.6 \cdot \left( P_{solution,ly} - \min P_{act,ly} \cdot \left( \frac{pai}{1-pai} \right) \right)$$

if  $P_{solution,ly} < \min P_{act,ly} \cdot \left( \frac{pai}{1-pai} \right)$  3:2.3.3

where  $P_{sol|act,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus transferred between the soluble and active mineral pool (kg P/ha),  $P_{solution,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in solution (kg P/ha),  $\min P_{act,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the active mineral pool (kg P/ha), and  $pai$  is the phosphorus availability index. When  $P_{sol|act,ly}$  is positive, phosphorus is being transferred from solution to the active mineral pool. When  $P_{sol|act,ly}$  is negative, phosphorus is being transferred from the active mineral pool to solution. Note that the rate of flow from the active mineral pool to solution is 1/10<sup>th</sup> the rate of flow from solution to the active mineral pool.

SWAT simulates slow phosphorus sorption by assuming the active mineral phosphorus pool is in slow equilibrium with the stable mineral phosphorus pool. At equilibrium, the stable mineral pool is 4 times the size of the active mineral pool.

When not in equilibrium, the movement of phosphorus between the active and stable mineral pools is governed by the equations:

$$P_{act|sta,ly} = \beta_{eqP} \cdot (4 \cdot \min P_{act,ly} - \min P_{sta,ly})$$

if  $\min P_{sta,ly} < 4 \cdot \min P_{act,ly}$  3:2.3.4

$$P_{act|sta,ly} = 0.1 \cdot \beta_{eqP} \cdot (4 \cdot \min P_{act,ly} - \min P_{sta,ly})$$

if  $\min P_{sta,ly} > 4 \cdot \min P_{act,ly}$  3:2.3.5

where  $P_{act|sta,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus transferred between the active and stable mineral pools (kg P/ha),  $\beta_{eqP}$  is the slow equilibration rate constant (0.0006 d<sup>-1</sup>),  $minP_{act,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the active mineral pool (kg P/ha), and  $minP_{sta,ly}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the stable mineral pool (kg P/ha). When  $P_{act|sta,ly}$  is positive, phosphorus is being transferred from the active mineral pool to the stable mineral pool. When  $P_{act|sta,ly}$  is negative, phosphorus is being transferred from the stable mineral pool to the active mineral pool. Note that the rate of flow from the stable mineral pool to the active mineral pool is 1/10<sup>th</sup> the rate of flow from the active mineral pool to the stable mineral pool.

Table 3:2-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to inorganic P sorption processes.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
PSP	pai: Phosphorus availability index	bsn

## 3:2.4 LEACHING

The primary mechanism of phosphorus movement in the soil is by diffusion. Diffusion is the migration of ions over small distances (1-2 mm) in the soil solution in response to a concentration gradient. The concentration gradient is created when plant roots remove soluble phosphorus from soil solution, depleting solution P in the root zone.

Due to the low mobility of phosphorus, SWAT allows soluble P to leach only from the top 10 mm of soil into the first soil layer. The amount of solution P moving from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer is:

$$P_{perc} = \frac{P_{solution,surf} \cdot w_{perc,surf}}{10 \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{surf} \cdot k_{d,perc}} \quad 3:2.4.1$$

where  $P_{perc}$  is the amount of phosphorus moving from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer (kg P/ha),  $P_{solution,surf}$  is the amount of phosphorus in solution in the top 10 mm (kg P/ha),  $w_{perc,surf}$  is the amount of water percolating to the first soil layer from the top 10 mm on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the top 10 mm (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>) (assumed to be equivalent to bulk density of first soil layer),

$depth_{surf}$  is the depth of the “surface” layer (10 mm), and  $k_{d,perc}$  is the phosphorus percolation coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{Mg}$ ). The phosphorus percolation coefficient is the ratio of the phosphorus concentration in the surface 10 mm of soil to the concentration of phosphorus in percolate.

Table 3:2-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to phosphorus leaching.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density of the layer ( $\text{Mg}/\text{m}^3$ )	.sol
PPERCO	$k_{d,perc}$ : Phosphorus percolation coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{Mg}$ )	.bsn

## 3:2.5 PHOSPHORUS IN THE SHALLOW AQUIFER

Groundwater flow entering the main channel from the shallow aquifer can contain soluble phosphorus. With SWAT2009 the soluble phosphorus pool in the shallow aquifer is not directly modeled. However, a concentration of soluble phosphorus in the shallow aquifer and groundwater flow can be specified to account for loadings of phosphorus with groundwater. This concentration remains constant throughout the simulation period.

Table 3:2-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to phosphorus in groundwater.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
GWSOLP	Soluble phosphorus concentration in groundwater flow (mg P/L)	gw

## 3:2.6 NOMENCLATURE

$FC_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at field capacity (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$NO_3_{ly}$	Nitrate content of soil layer $ly$ (kg NO <sub>3</sub> -N/ha)
$P_{act sta,ly}$	Amount of phosphorus transferred between the active and stable mineral pools (kg P/ha)
$P_{dec,ly}$	Phosphorus decomposed from the fresh organic P pool (kg P/ha)
$P_{mina,ly}$	Phosphorus mineralized from the humus active organic P pool (kg P/ha)
$P_{minf,ly}$	Phosphorus mineralized from the fresh organic P pool (kg P/ha),
$P_{perc}$	Amount of phosphorus moving from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer (kg P/ha)
$P_{solution,ly}$	Amount of phosphorus in solution (mg/kg)
$P_{sol act,ly}$	Amount of phosphorus transferred between the soluble and active mineral pool (kg P/ha)
$SW_{ly}$	Soil water content of layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)

$T_{soil,ly}$  Temperature of layer  $ly$  ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )

$conc_P$  Concentration of phosphorus in a layer (mg/kg or ppm)  
 $depth_{ly}$  Depth of the layer (mm)  
 $k_{d,perc}$  Phosphorus percolation coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{Mg}$ )  
 $minP_{act,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in the active mineral pool (mg/kg or kg P/ha)  
 $minP_{sta,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in the stable mineral pool (mg/kg or kg P/ha)  
 $orgN_{act,ly}$  Nitrogen in the active organic pool in layer  $ly$  (mg/kg or kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{frsh,ly}$  Nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{hum,ly}$  Amount of nitrogen in humic organic pool in the layer (mg/kg or kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{sta,ly}$  Nitrogen in the stable organic pool in layer  $ly$  (mg/kg or kg N/ha)  
 $orgP_{act,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in the active organic pool (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{frsh,ly}$  Phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{hum,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in humic organic pool in the layer (mg/kg or kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{sta,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in the stable organic pool (kg P/ha)  
 $pai$  Phosphorus availability index  
 $rsd_{ly}$  Residue in layer  $ly$  (kg/ha)  
 $w_{perc,ly}$  Amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)

$\beta_{eqP}$  Slow equilibration rate constant ( $0.0006 \text{ d}^{-1}$ )  
 $\beta_{min}$  Rate coefficient for mineralization of the humus active organic nutrients  
 $\beta_{rsd}$  Rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients  
 $\delta_{ntr,ly}$  Residue decay rate constant  
 $\varepsilon_{C:N}$  Residue C:N ratio in the soil layer  
 $\varepsilon_{C:P}$  Residue C:P ratio in the soil layer  
 $\gamma_{ntr,ly}$  Nutrient cycling residue composition factor for layer  $ly$   
 $\gamma_{sw,ly}$  Nutrient cycling water factor for layer  $ly$   
 $\gamma_{tmp,ly}$  Nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer  $ly$   
 $\rho_b$  Bulk density of the layer ( $\text{Mg/m}^3$ )

## 3:2.7 REFERENCES

---

- Barrow, N.J. and T.C. Shaw. 1975. The slow reactions between soil and anions. 2. Effect of time and temperature on the decrease in phosphate concentration in soil solution. Soil Sci. 119:167-177.
- Cope, J.T., C.E. Evans, and H.C. Williams. 1981. Soil test fertility recommendations for Alabama crops. Alabama Agric. Station Circular No. 251.

- Jones, C.A. C.V. Cole, A.N. Sharpley, and J.R. Williams. 1984. A simplified soil and plant phosphorus model. I. Documentation. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 48:800-805.
- Munns, D.N. and R.L. Fox. 1976. The slow reaction which continues after phosphate adsorption: Kinetics and equilibrium in some tropical soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 40:46-51.
- Rajan, S.S.S. and R.L. Fox. 1972. Phosphate adsorption by soils. 1. Influence of time and ionic environment on phosphate adsorption. *Commun. Soil. Sci. Plant Anal.* 3:493-504.
- Sharpley, A.N. 1982. A prediction of the water extractable phosphorus content of soil following a phosphorus addition. *J. Environ. Qual.* 11:166-170.
- Sharpley, A.N., C. Gray, C.A. Jones, and C.V. Cole. 1984. A simplified soil and plant phosphorus model. II. Prediction of labile, organic, and sorbed P amounts. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 48:805-809.
- Sharpley, A.N. and J.K. Syers. 1979. Phosphorus inputs into a stream draining an agricultural watershed: II. Amounts and relative significance of runoff types. *Water, Air and Soil Pollution* 11:417-428.



## SECTION 3 CHAPTER 3

# EQUATIONS: PESTICIDES

---

One of the primary purposes of tillage and harvesting practices in early farming systems was to remove as much plant residue from the field as possible so that pests had no food source to sustain them until the next growing season. As research linked erosion to lack of soil cover, farmers began to perform fewer tillage operations and altered harvesting methods to leave more residue. As mechanical methods of pest control were minimized or eliminated, chemical methods of pest control began to assume a key role in the management of unwanted organisms.

Pesticides are toxic by design, and there is a natural concern about the impact of their presence in the environment on human health and environmental quality. The fate and transport of a pesticide are governed by properties such as solubility in water, volatility and ease of degradation. The algorithms in SWAT

used to model pesticide movement and fate are adapted from GLEAMS (Leonard et al., 1987).

Pesticide may be aerially applied to an HRU with some fraction intercepted by plant foliage and some fraction reaching the soil. Pesticide may also be incorporated into the soil through tillage. SWAT monitors pesticide amounts on foliage and in all soil layers. Figure 3:3-1 shows the potential pathways and processes simulated in SWAT.




Figure 3:3-1: Pesticide fate and transport in SWAT.

### 3:3.1 WASH-OFF

A portion of the pesticide on plant foliage may be washed off during rain events. The fraction washed off is a function of plant morphology, pesticide solubility, and the timing and intensity of the rainfall event. Wash-off will occur when the amount of precipitation on a given day exceeds 2.54 mm.

The amount of pesticide washing off plant foliage during a precipitation event on a given day is calculated:

$$pst_{f,wsh} = fr_{wsh} \cdot pst_f \quad 3:3.1.1$$

where  $pst_{f,wsh}$  is the amount of pesticide on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day (kg pst/ha),  $fr_{wsh}$  is the wash-off fraction for the pesticide, and  $pst_f$  is the amount of pesticide on the foliage (kg pst/ha). The wash-off fraction represents the portion of the pesticide on the foliage that is dislodgable.

Table 3:3-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to pesticide wash-off.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
WOF	$fr_{wsh}$ : Wash-off fraction for the pesticide	pest.dat

### 3:3.2 DEGRADATION

Degradation is the conversion of a compound into less complex forms. A compound in the soil may degrade upon exposure to light (photo degradation), reaction with chemicals present in the soil (chemical degradation) or through use as a substrate for organisms (biodegradation).

The majority of pesticides in use today are organic compounds. Because organic compounds contain carbon, which is used by microbes in biological reactions to produce energy, organic pesticides may be susceptible to microbial degradation. In contrast, pesticides that are inorganic are not susceptible to microbial degradation. Examples of pesticides that will not degrade are lead arsenate, a metallic salt commonly applied in orchards before DDT was invented, and arsenic acid, a compound formerly used to defoliate cotton.

Pesticides vary in their susceptibility to degradation. Compounds with chain structures are easier to break apart than compounds containing aromatic rings or other complex structures. The susceptibility of a pesticide to degradation is quantified by the pesticide's half-life.

The half-life for a pesticide defines the number of days required for a given pesticide concentration to be reduced by one-half. The soil half-life entered for a pesticide is a lumped parameter that includes the net effect of volatilization, photolysis, hydrolysis, biological degradation and chemical reactions in the soil.

Because pesticide on foliage degrades more rapidly than pesticide in the soil, SWAT allows a different half-life to be defined for foliar degradation.

Pesticide degradation or removal in all soil layers is governed by first-order kinetics:

$$pst_{s,ly,t} = pst_{s,ly,o} \cdot \exp[-k_{p,soil} \cdot t] \quad 3:3.2.1$$

where  $pst_{s,ly,t}$  is the amount of pesticide in the soil layer at time  $t$  (kg pst/ha),  $pst_{s,ly,o}$  is the initial amount of pesticide in the soil layer (kg pst/ha),  $k_{p,soil}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of the pesticide in soil (1/day), and  $t$  is the time elapsed since the initial pesticide amount was determined (days). The rate constant is related to the soil half-life as follows:

$$t_{1/2,s} = \frac{0.693}{k_{p,soil}} \quad 3:3.2.2$$

where  $t_{1/2,s}$  is the half-life of the pesticide in the soil (days).

The equation governing pesticide degradation on foliage is:

$$pst_{f,t} = pst_{f,o} \cdot \exp[-k_{p,foliar} \cdot t] \quad 3:3.2.3$$

where  $pst_{f,t}$  is the amount of pesticide on the foliage at time  $t$  (kg pst/ha),  $pst_{f,o}$  is the initial amount of pesticide on the foliage (kg pst/ha),  $k_{p,foliar}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of the pesticide on foliage (1/day), and  $t$  is the time elapsed since the initial pesticide amount was determined (days). The rate constant is related to the foliar half-life as follows:

$$t_{1/2,f} = \frac{0.693}{k_{p,foliar}} \quad 3:3.2.4$$

where  $t_{1/2,f}$  is the half-life of the pesticide on foliage (days).

Table 3:3-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to pesticide degradation.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
HLIFE_S	$t_{1/2,s}$ : Half-life of the pesticide in the soil (days)	pest.dat
HLIFE_F	$t_{1/2,f}$ : Half-life of the pesticide on foliage (days)	pest.dat

### 3:3.3 LEACHING

---

Highly water-soluble pesticides can be transported with percolation deep into the soil profile and potentially pollute shallow groundwater systems. The algorithms used by SWAT to calculate pesticide leaching simultaneously solve for loss of pesticide in surface runoff and lateral flow also. These algorithms are reviewed in Chapter 4:3.

### 3:3.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$fr_{wsh}$	Wash-off fraction for the pesticide
$k_{p,foliar}$	Rate constant for degradation or removal of the pesticide on foliage (1/day)
$k_{p,soil}$	Rate constant for degradation or removal of the pesticide in soil (1/day)
$pst_f$	Amount of pesticide on the foliage (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{f,wsh}$	Amount of pesticide on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{s,ly}$	Amount of pesticide in the soil (kg pst/ha)
$t$	Time elapsed since the initial pesticide amount was determined (days)
$t_{1/2,f}$	Half-life of the pesticide on foliage (days)
$t_{1/2,s}$	Half-life of the pesticide in the soil (days)

### 3:3.5 REFERENCES

---

- Leonard, R.A., W.G. Knisel., and D.A. Still. 1987. GLEAMS: Groundwater loading effects of agricultural management systems. Trans. ASAE. 30:1403-1418.



## SECTION 3 CHAPTER 4

# EQUATIONS: BACTERIA

---

Contamination of drinking water by pathogenic organisms is a major environmental concern. Similar to water pollution by excess nutrients, water pollution by microbial pathogens can also be caused by point and nonpoint sources. Point source water contamination normally results from a direct entry of wastewater from municipal or water treatment systems into a drinking water supply. Nonpoint sources of bacterial pollution can be difficult to identify as they can originate from animal production units, land application of different manure types, and wildlife.

Although there are many potential sources of pathogenic loadings to streams, agronomic practices that utilize animal manures contaminated with pathogenic or parasitic organisms appear to be the major source of nonpoint contamination in watersheds. In recent years, a concentration of animal feeding operations has occurred in the cattle, swine and poultry production industries.

These operations generate substantial amounts of animal manure that are normally applied raw to relatively limited land areas. Even though animal manure can be considered a beneficial fertilizer and soil amendment, high rates of land applied raw manure increase the risk of surface or groundwater contamination, both from excess nutrients and pathogenic organisms such as *Cryptosporidium*, *Salmonella*, or *Escherichia coli* 0157:H7.

Fecal coliforms (generic forms of bacteria) have customarily been used as indicators of potential pathogen contamination for both monitoring and modeling purposes (Baudart et al., 2000; Hunter et al., 2000; Pasquarell and Boyer, 1995; Walker et al., 1990; Stoddard et al., 1998; Moore et al., 1988). However, recent studies have documented waterborne disease outbreaks caused by *Cryptosporidium*, Norwalk and hepatitis A viruses, and *salmonella* despite acceptably low levels of indicator bacteria (Field et al., 1996).

SWAT considers fecal coliform an indicator of pathogenic organism contamination. However, to account for the presence of serious pathogens that may follow different growth/die-off patterns, SWAT allows two species or strains of pathogens with distinctly different die-off/re-growth rates to be defined. The two-population modeling approach is used to account for the long-term impacts of persistent bacteria applied to soils, whose population density when initially applied may be insignificant compared to that of less persistent bacteria.

One or two bacteria populations may be introduced into an HRU through one of the three types of fertilizer applications reviewed in Chapter 6:1. When bacteria in manure are applied to an HRU, some fraction is intercepted by plant foliage with the remainder reaching the soil. SWAT monitors the two bacteria populations on foliage and in the top 10 mm of soil that interacts with surface runoff. Bacteria in the surface soil layer may be in solution or associated with the solid phase. Bacteria incorporated deeper into the soil through tillage or transport with percolating water is assumed to die.

## 3:4.1 WASH-OFF

---

A portion of the bacteria on plant foliage may be washed off during rain events. The fraction washed off is a function of plant morphology, bacteria characteristics, and the timing and intensity of the rainfall event. Wash-off will occur when the amount of precipitation on a given day exceeds 2.54 mm.

The amount of bacteria washing off plant foliage during a precipitation event on a given day is calculated:

$$bact_{lp,wsh} = fr_{wsh,lp} \cdot bact_{lp,fol} \quad 3:4.1.1$$

$$bact_{p,wsh} = fr_{wsh,p} \cdot bact_{p,fol} \quad 3:4.1.2$$

where  $bact_{lp,wsh}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,wsh}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $fr_{wsh,lp}$  is the wash-off fraction for the less persistent bacteria,  $fr_{wsh,p}$  is the wash-off fraction for the persistent bacteria,  $bact_{lp,fol}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria attached to the foliage (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>), and  $bact_{p,fol}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria attached to the foliage (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>). The wash-off fraction represents the portion of the bacteria on the foliage that is dislodgable.

Bacteria that washes off the foliage is assumed to remain in solution in the soil surface layer.

Table 3:4-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to bacteria wash-off.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
WOF_P	$fr_{wsh,p}$ : Wash-off fraction for persistent bacteria	.bsn
WOF_LP	$fr_{wsh,lp}$ : Wash-off fraction for less persistent bacteria	.bsn

## 3:4.2 BACTERIA DIE-OFF/RE-GROWTH

---

Chick's Law first order decay equation is used to determine the quantity of bacteria removed from the system through die-off and added to the system by regrowth. The equation for die-off/re-growth was taken from Reddy et al. (1981) as modified by Crane and Moore (1986) and later by Moore et al. (1989). The

equation was modified in SWAT to include a user-defined minimum daily loss. Die-off/re-growth is modeled for the two bacteria populations on foliage, in the surface soil solution and sorbed to surface soil particles. The equations used to calculate daily bacteria levels in the different pools are:

$$bact_{lpfol,i} = bact_{lpfol,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{lpfol,net}) - bact_{min,lp} \quad 3:4.2.1$$

$$bact_{pfol,i} = bact_{pfol,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{pfol,net}) - bact_{min,p} \quad 3:4.2.2$$

$$bact_{lpsol,i} = bact_{lpsol,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{lpsol,net}) - bact_{min,lp} \quad 3:4.2.3$$

$$bact_{psol,i} = bact_{psol,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{psol,net}) - bact_{min,p} \quad 3:4.2.4$$

$$bact_{lpsorb,i} = bact_{lpsorb,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{lpsorb,net}) - bact_{min,lp} \quad 3:4.2.5$$

$$bact_{psorb,i} = bact_{psorb,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{psorb,net}) - bact_{min,p} \quad 3:4.2.6$$

where  $bact_{lpfol,i}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present on foliage on day  $i$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lpfol,i-1}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present on foliage on day  $i-1$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $\mu_{lpfol,net}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage (1/day),  $bact_{min,lp}$  is the minimum daily loss of less persistent bacteria (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{pfol,i}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present on foliage on day  $i$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{pfol,i-1}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present on foliage on day  $i-1$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $\mu_{pfol,net}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage (1/day),  $bact_{min,p}$  is the minimum daily loss of persistent bacteria (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lpsol,i}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present in soil solution on day  $i$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lpsol,i-1}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present in soil solution on day  $i-1$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $\mu_{lpsol,net}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution (1/day),  $bact_{psol,i}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present in soil solution on day  $i$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{psol,i-1}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present in soil solution on day  $i-1$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $\mu_{psol,net}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution (1/day),  $bact_{lpsorb,i}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil on day  $i$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lpsorb,i-1}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil on day  $i-1$  (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $\mu_{lpsorb,net}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (1/day),  $bact_{psorb,i}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria sorbed to

the soil on day  $i$  ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ ),  $bact_{psorb,i-1}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil on day  $i-1$  ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ ), and  $\mu_{psorb,net}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (1/day).

The overall rate constants define the net change in bacterial population for the different pools modeled. The impact of temperature effects on bacteria die-off/re-growth were accounted for using equations proposed by Mancini (1978). The user defines the die-off and growth factors for the two bacterial populations in the different pools at  $20^\circ\text{C}$ . The overall rate constants at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  are then calculated:

$$\mu_{lpfol,net,20} = \mu_{lpfol,die,20} - \mu_{lpfol,grw,20} \quad 3:4.2.7$$

$$\mu_{pfol,net,20} = \mu_{pfol,die,20} - \mu_{pfol,grw,20} \quad 3:4.2.8$$

$$\mu_{lpsol,net,20} = \mu_{lpsol,die,20} - \mu_{lpsol,grw,20} \quad 3:4.2.9$$

$$\mu_{psol,net,20} = \mu_{psol,die,20} - \mu_{psol,grw,20} \quad 3:4.2.10$$

$$\mu_{lpsorb,net,20} = \mu_{lpsorb,die,20} - \mu_{lpsorb,grw,20} \quad 3:4.2.11$$

$$\mu_{psorb,net,20} = \mu_{psorb,die,20} - \mu_{psorb,grw,20} \quad 3:4.2.12$$

where  $\mu_{lpfol,net,20}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{lpfol,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria on foliage at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{lpfol,grw,20}$  is the rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{pfol,net,20}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{pfol,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria on foliage at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{pfol,grw,20}$  is the rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsol,net,20}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsol,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsol,grw,20}$  is the rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{psol,net,20}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{psol,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in soil solution at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{psol,grw,20}$  is the rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsorb,net,20}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsorb,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsorb,grw,20}$  is the rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{psorb,net,20}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day),  $\mu_{psorb,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day), and  $\mu_{psorb,grw,20}$  is the rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  (1/day).

rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsorb,net,20}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsorb,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day),  $\mu_{lpsorb,grw,20}$  is the rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day),  $\mu_{psorb,net,20}$  is the overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day),  $\mu_{psorb,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day), and  $\mu_{psorb,grw,20}$  is the rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day).

The overall rate constants are adjusted for temperature using the equations:

$$\mu_{lpfol,net} = \mu_{lpfol,net,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(\bar{T}_{av}-20)} \quad 3:4.2.13$$

$$\mu_{pfol,net} = \mu_{pfol,net,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(\bar{T}_{av}-20)} \quad 3:4.2.14$$

$$\mu_{lpsol,net} = \mu_{lpsol,net,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(\bar{T}_{av}-20)} \quad 3:4.2.15$$

$$\mu_{psol,net} = \mu_{psol,net,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(\bar{T}_{av}-20)} \quad 3:4.2.16$$

$$\mu_{lpsorb,net} = \mu_{lpsorb,net,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(\bar{T}_{av}-20)} \quad 3:4.2.17$$

$$\mu_{psorb,net} = \mu_{psorb,net,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(\bar{T}_{av}-20)} \quad 3:4.2.18$$

where  $\theta_{bact}$  is the temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/re-growth,  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean daily air temperature, and all other terms are as previously defined.

Table 3:4-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to bacteria die-off/re-growth.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
WDPQ	$\mu_{psol,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WGPQ	$\mu_{psol,grw,20}$ : Growth factor for persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WDLPQ	$\mu_{lpsol,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for less persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WGLPQ	$\mu_{lpsol,grw,20}$ : Growth factor for less persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WDPS	$\mu_{psorb,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for persistent bacteria adsorbed to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WGPS	$\mu_{psorb,grw,20}$ : Growth factor for persistent bacteria adsorbed to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WDLPS	$\mu_{lpsorb,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for less persistent bacteria adsorbed to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WGLPS	$\mu_{lpsorb,grw,20}$ : Growth factor for less persistent bacteria adsorbed to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WDPF	$\mu_{pfol,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WGPF	$\mu_{pfol,grw,20}$ : Growth factor for persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WDLPF	$\mu_{lpfol,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for less persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WGLPF	$\mu_{lpfol,grw,20}$ : Growth factor for less persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
THBACT	$\theta_{baci}$ : Temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/growth	.bsn
BACTMINLP	$bact_{min,lp}$ : Minimum daily loss of less persistent bacteria (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )	.bsn
BACTMINP	$bact_{min,p}$ : Minimum daily loss of persistent bacteria (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )	.bsn

### 3:4.3 LEACHING

Bacteria can be transported with percolation into the soil profile. Only bacteria present in the soil solution is susceptible to leaching. Bacteria removed from the surface soil layer by leaching are assumed to die in the deeper soil layers.

The amount of bacteria transported from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer is:

$$bact_{lp,perc} = \frac{bact_{lpsol} \cdot w_{perc,surf}}{10 \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{surf} \cdot k_{bact,perc}} \quad 3:4.3.1$$

$$bact_{p,perc} = \frac{bact_{psol} \cdot w_{perc,surf}}{10 \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{surf} \cdot k_{bact,perc}} \quad 3:4.3.2$$

where  $bact_{lp,perc}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria transported from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ ),  $bact_{psol}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present in soil solution ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ ),  $w_{perc,surf}$  is the amount of water percolating to the first soil layer from the top 10 mm on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the top 10 mm ( $\text{Mg}/\text{m}^3$ ) (assumed to be equivalent to bulk density of first soil layer),  $depth_{surf}$  is the depth of the “surface” layer (10 mm),  $k_{bact,perc}$  is the bacteria percolation coefficient ( $10 \text{ m}^3/\text{Mg}$ ),  $bact_{p,perc}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria transported from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ ), and  $bact_{psol}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present in soil solution ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ ).

Table 3:4-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to bacteria transport in percolate.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density of the layer ( $\text{Mg}/\text{m}^3$ )	.sol
BACTMIX	$k_{bact,perc}$ : Bacteria percolation coefficient ( $10 \text{ m}^3/\text{Mg}$ )	.bsn

## 3:4.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

- $\bar{T}_{av}$  Mean air temperature for day ( $^\circ\text{C}$ )
- $bact_{lp,fol}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria attached to the foliage ( $\# \text{ cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{lp,perc}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria transported from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{psol}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria present in soil solution ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{psorb}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{lp,wsh}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{min}$  Minimum daily loss of bacteria ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{p,fol}$  Amount of persistent bacteria attached to the foliage ( $\# \text{ cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{p,perc}$  Amount of persistent bacteria transported from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{psol}$  Amount of persistent bacteria present in soil solution ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{psorb}$  Amount of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $bact_{p,wsh}$  Amount of persistent bacteria on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day ( $\# \text{cfu}/\text{m}^2$ )
- $depth_{ly}$  Depth of the layer (mm)
- $fr_{wsh,lp}$  Wash-off fraction for the less persistent bacteria
- $fr_{wsh,p}$  Wash-off fraction for the persistent bacteria
- $k_{bact,perc}$  Bacteria percolation coefficient ( $10 \text{ m}^3/\text{Mg}$ )

$w_{perc,ly}$  Amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)

$\rho_b$  Bulk density of the layer (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>)

$\mu_{lpfol,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{lpfol,grw,20}$  Rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{lpfol,net}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage (1/day)

$\mu_{lpfol,net,20}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{lpsol,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{lpsol,grw,20}$  Rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{lpsol,net}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution (1/day)

$\mu_{lpsol,net,20}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{lpsorb,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{lpsorb,grw,20}$  Rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{lpsorb,net}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (1/day)

$\mu_{lpsorb,net,20}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{pfol,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{pfol,grw,20}$  Rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{pfol,net}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage (1/day)

$\mu_{pfol,net,20}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{psol,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{psol,grw,20}$  Rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{psol,net}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution (1/day)

$\mu_{psol,net,20}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{psorb,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{psorb,grw,20}$  Rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{psorb,net}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (1/day)

- $\mu_{psorb,net,20}$  Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)
- $\theta_{bact}$  Temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/re-growth

## 3:4.5 REFERENCES

---

- Baudart, J., J. Grabulos, J.P. Barusseau, and P. Lebaron. 2000. *Salmonella spp.* and fecal coliform loads in coastal waters from point vs. nonpoint sources of pollution. *J. Environ. Qual.* 29:241-250.
- Crane, S.R. and J.A. Moore. 1986. Modeling enteric bacterial die-off: a review. *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution* 27: 411-439.
- Field, R., M. Borst, M. Stinson, C. Fan, J. Perdek, D. Sullivan, and T. O'Conner. 1996. Risk management research plan for wet weather flows. National Risk Management Research Laboratory, EPA/600/R-96/140. Cincinnati.
- Hunter, C., J. Perkins, J. Tranter, and P. Hardwick. 2000. Fecal bacteria in the waters of an upland area in Derbyshire, England: The influence of agricultural land use. *J. Environ. Qual.* 29: 1253-1261.
- Mancini, J.L. 1978. Numerical estimates of coliform mortality rates under various conditions. *J. Water Poll. Cont. Fed.* 50: 2477-2484.
- Moore, J.A., J.D. Smyth, E.S. Baker, and J.R. Miner. 1988. Evaluating coliform concentrations in runoff from various animal waste management systems. Special Report 817. Agricultural Experiment Stations, Oregon State University, Corvallis.
- Moore, J.A., J.D. Smyth, E.S. Baker, J.R. Miner, and D.C. Moffit. 1989. Modeling bacteria movement in livestock manure systems. *Trans. ASAE* 32: 1049-1053.
- Pasquarell, G.C. and D.G. Boyer. 1995. Agricultural impacts on bacterial water quality in karst groundwater. *J. Environ. Qual.* 24: 959-969.
- Reddy, K.R., R. Khaleel, and M.R. Overcash. 1981. Behavior and transport of microbial pathogens and indicator organisms in soils treated with organic wastes. *J. Environ. Qual.* 10: 255-266.
- Stoddard, C.S., M.S. Coyne, and J.H. Grove. 1998. Fecal bacteria survival and infiltration through a shallow agricultural soil: Timing and tillage effects. *J. Environ. Qual.* 27: 1516-1523.
- Walker, S.E., S. Mostaghimi, T.A. Dillaha, and F.E. Woeste. 1990. Modeling animal waste management practices: Impacts on bacteria levels in runoff from agricultural lands. *Trans. ASAE* 33: 807-817.



## **SECTION 3 CHAPTER 5**

# **EQUATIONS: CARBON**

---

Land use changes and the intensification of agricultural production have dramatically altered the flow of nutrients resulting in unprecedented transcontinental inter-watershed and intra-watershed transfers of nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and other nutrients with fertilizer, harvest product, and pollutant flow (Galloway et al., 2008). Nutrient cycling in soils plays a major role in the control of these flows. Carbon (C), N, and P cycling are intimately linked through soil, plant and microbial processes. These processes affect the level of inorganic N and P and the C:N and C:P ratios of SOM. To realistically represent these C, N, and P transfers in river-basin scale models such as the Soil Water Assessment Tool (SWAT, Arnold et al., 1998), a comprehensive integration of the cycling of these nutrients through soil organic matter (SOM) is required.

Most conceptual and quantitative SOM cycling models compartmentalize soil C and N in pools with different, yet stable, turnover rates and C:N ratios (Paul

et al., 2006, McGill et al., 1981; Parton et al., 1988; Verberne et al., 1990). Incubation experiments also suggest the existence of pools with varying turnover rates (e.g. Collins et al., 2000); however, Six et al. (2002) indicated after an extensive literature review that the success at matching measurable and modelable SOM pools has been minimal. Furthermore, the division of SOM in pools has been criticized on mathematical grounds, as continuous turnover rates distributions can be artificially represented by discrete pools (Bruun and Luxhoi, 2006). These criticisms do not deny the existence of pools but rather emphasize the difficulty in establishing generalized methods to measure or predict their size and turnover rate. This unpredictability can limit the applicability of multi-pool SOM sub-models if the parameterization for different agricultural soils, pasturelands, forestlands and organic soils is uncertain or requires intensive calibration.

In this chapter, we describe the one-pool SOM sub-model implemented in SWAT. This sub-model is conceptually based on the model described in Kemanian and Stockle (2010), and was adapted to the SWAT algorithms and integrated to the cycling of N and P.

### **3:5.1 SUB-MODEL DESCRIPTION**

---

The sub-model described here pertains to soil processes at the hydrologic unit response level. The new sub-model has one pool for soil organic C, N, and P ( $S_C$ ,  $S_N$ ,  $S_P$ , respectively,  $\text{kg m}^{-2}$ ), and separate pools for residue and manure C, N, and P ( $R_C$ ,  $R_N$ ,  $R_P$  and  $M_C$ ,  $M_N$ ,  $M_P$ , respectively,  $\text{kg m}^{-2}$ ). The pools are not separated in active and stable pools. Microbial activity on SOM, manure, and residues decomposes simultaneously the organic C, N, and P. Decomposition of residues may add to (mineralization) or subtract from (immobilization) the inorganic N and P pools, depending on the C:N and C:P ratio of the decomposing pools ( $R_{CN}$ ,  $R_{CP}$ ,  $M_{CN}$ , and  $M_{CP}$ , respectively) and those of the SOM or destiny pool ( $S_{CN}$ ,  $S_{CP}$ ), and on the humification rate ( $h$ ). The humification rate represents the fraction of C in the decomposing residues that are effectively incorporated in

the  $S_C$  pool, the remainder being respiration as  $\text{CO}_2$ . The balance equations for each soil layer for the organic residue, manure, and soil pools are as follows.

Residue and manure pools (represented as R and M) gain mass through additions ( $I_R$  and  $I_M$  for residue and manure, respectively) and lose mass from decomposition following first order kinetics:

$$\frac{dR_C}{dt} = I_{RC} - f_E k_R R_C, \quad 3:5.1.1a$$

$$\frac{dM_C}{dt} = I_{MC} - f_E k_M M_C, \quad 3:5.1.1b$$

$$f_E = (f_T f_W f_O)^{f_p}, \quad 3:5.1.1c$$

where  $f_E$  is the combined effect of the soil factors temperature ( $f_T$ ), moisture ( $f_W$ ), and aeration ( $f_O$ ),  $f_p$  (0.67) is a power regulating the multiplicative effect of the three environmental factors, and  $k_R$  ( $0.05 \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) and  $k_M$  ( $0.025 \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) are the optimum decomposition rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ ) for residues and manure, respectively. The addition of residues (or manures) from different sources are bulked with the existing pool and not tracked separately, with rates shown above assumed to apply to all sources. If these decomposition rates are made residue- or manure-specific, every time there is an addition of residues or manure the effective decomposition rates would have to be calculated as weighted averages of the rate of the already decomposing pools and that attributed to the newly added materials, with a weighting function that should change over time, or each pool tracked separately, both rather impractical propositions.

For the soil pools, the differential equations are as follows:

$$\frac{dS_C}{dt} = h_R f_E k_R R_C + h_M f_E k_M M_C - k_S S_C, \quad 3:5.1.2a$$

$$\frac{dS_N}{dt} = \frac{h_R f_E k_R R_C + h_M f_E k_M M_C}{S_{CN}} - k_S S_N, \quad 3:5.1.2b$$

where  $h_R$  and  $h_M$  are the residue and manure humification rates ( $\text{kg kg}^{-1}$ ) and  $k_S$  is the apparent organic matter decomposition rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ ). The humification rates depend on the current  $S_C$  and a reference  $S_C$  ( $S_{CC}$ ):

$$h_R = h_x \left( 1 - \left( \frac{S_C}{S_{CC}} \right)^\alpha \right), \quad 3:5.1.3a$$

$$h_x = 0.09 (2 - e^{-5.5clay}),$$

$$h_M = 1.6 h_R, \quad 3:5.1.3b$$

$$S_{CC} = S_{BD} Z_l (0.021 + 0.038clay) \quad 3:5.1.4$$

Clay is the soil layer clay fraction ( $\text{kg clay kg}^{-1}$  dry soil),  $S_{BD}$  is the soil layer bulk density ( $\text{kg m}^{-3}$ ), and  $Z_l$  is the soil layer thickness (m). The constant  $\alpha$  (default  $\alpha = 6$ ) modulates the response of the humification the current  $S_C$ . The maximum attainable residue humification is approximately  $0.18 \text{ kg kg}^{-1}$ . The same humification is used for below and aboveground residues. The humification of C from manure was assumed to be 60% higher than that of fresh residues (approximately  $0.29 \text{ kg kg}^{-1}$ ). The reference  $S_C$  or  $S_{CC}$  depends linearly on the soil layer clay fraction (Eq. 3:5.1.4) as proposed by Hassink and Whitmore (1997). When  $S_C = S_{CC}$  then the humification is 0 and no accumulation of  $S_C$  above  $S_{CC}$  can occur (Kemanian and Stockle, 2010). In addition, this approach assumes a dependence of humification on the clay fraction, a dependence represented in many different ways in other models (e.g. Jenkinson, 1990; Bradbury et al., 1993). The control of  $h_R$  and  $h_M$  in Eq. [3.5.1.3] with  $\alpha = 6$  implies a non-linear response of  $h_R$  and  $h_M$  to  $S_C$ . It is likely that a better formulation is needed for these functional equations to apply in organic horizons, tropical soils, or soils with a high proportion of volcanic ashes.

The C:N ratio of the newly formed organic matter or  $S_{CN}$  ranges from 8.5 to 14. The  $R_{CN}$  and  $M_{CN}$  determine how high  $S_{CN}$  can be when there is no mineral N available that can be an N source for the soil microbes. This estimate of  $S_{CN}$  is reduced depending on the mineral N availability, as follows:

$$S_{CN} = 8.5 + 2.7 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \left( \frac{R_{CN}}{110} \right)^3} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{1 + \left( \frac{N_{min}}{8} \right)^3} \right) \quad 3:5.1.5$$

where  $N_{min}$  is the mineral N in the layer ( $\text{mg N kg}^{-1}$  soil in this equation). The first term within brackets represents the control of the residues and the second term represents the control of mineral N on  $S_{CN}$  so that the higher the ratio of  $R_{CN}$  the higher the resulting  $S_{CN}$ , and the higher the amount of  $N_{min}$  the lower  $S_{CN}$ , with  $S_{CN}$  ranging from 8.5 to 14  $\text{kg C kg}^{-1}$  N in SOM. For manures,  $M_{CN}$  substitutes for  $R_{CN}$  and 55 substitutes for the constant 110. The ratio  $S_{CP}$  is derived from  $S_{CN}$  by assuming that the newly formed SOM will conserve the N:P ratio of the decomposing residue and manure. Thus, the C:N and C:P ratios of SOM are not constant but fluctuates according to these equations during the simulation.

Residues and manure may not supply sufficient N and P to satisfy the  $S_{CN}$  (Eq. 3:5.1.2b) and  $S_{CP}$  (Eq. 3:5.1.2c), in which case N and P will be mined from the inorganic soluble pools. If the inorganic pools cannot supply N and P for decomposition to proceed, then the decomposition rate of residue and manure is reduced. Therefore, lack of mineral N and P in solution may slow down decomposition. The net mineralization is obtained from:

$$MIN_{RN} = \frac{dR_C}{dt} \left( \frac{1}{R_{CN}} - \frac{h_R}{S_{CN}} \right), \quad 3:5.1.6a$$

$$MIN_{MN} = \frac{dM_C}{dt} \left( \frac{1}{M_{CN}} - \frac{h_M}{S_{CN}} \right), \quad 3:5.1.6b$$

where  $MIN_{RN}$  and  $MIN_{MN}$  are the net mineralization rates ( $\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) from decomposing residues (Eq. 3:5.1.6a) and manure (Eq. 3:5.1.6b), respectively, with negative values indicating immobilization and positive values net mineralization. The same equation applies for P with appropriate C:P ratios. The SOM decomposition rate ( $k_S$ ) is calculated from:

$$k_S = k_x f_{tool} f_E \left( \frac{S_C}{S_{CC}} \right)^\beta. \quad 3:5.1.7$$

The apparent  $S_C$  turnover rate ( $k_S$ ) is scaled down from an optimum of  $4.5\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$  for undisturbed soils ( $k_x = 0.000123 \text{ day}^{-1}$  so that  $k_x \times 365 = 0.045$ ) based on environmental conditions and  $S_C$ . The power  $\beta$  modulates  $k_S$  (default  $\beta = 0.5$ ) so that when  $S_C$  is low, the turnover rate slows sharply. Substituting Eq. 3:5.1.7 for  $k_S$  in Eq. 3:5.1.2a with  $\beta = 0.5$  renders a kinetics of order 3/2 for  $S_C$  decomposition, as opposed to the typical first order kinetics commonly used in SOM decomposition models (see Kemanian and Stockle, 2009). Tillage can enhance  $k_S$  through the factor  $f_{tool}$ . This factor is calculated independently for each soil layer and depends on the tillage tool mixing factor ( $f_{mix}$ , range 0 to 1) and the soil texture. The mixing factor and the tillage depth determine the fraction of the soil layer that is mixed by a tillage operation. The  $f_{tool}$  basal value is 1 and it is enhanced immediately after a tillage event based on the estimated cumulative  $f_{mix}$  (or  $f_{cm}$ ):

$$f_{tool} = 1 + (3 + 5e^{-5.5clay}) \left( \frac{f_{cm}}{f_{cm} + e^{1-2f_{cm}}} \right). \quad 3:5.1.8$$

The factor ( $f_{tool}$ ) is reduced on a daily basis based on soil moisture to simulate soil settling. If  $f_{tool} > 1$  and a tillage operation is executed, the corresponding  $f_{mix}$  has to be added to the current  $f_{cm}$ . This requires solving for  $f_{cm}$  by inverting Eq 3:5.1.6 before recalculating  $f_{tool}$ . Since Eq 3:5.1.6 is non-linear on  $f_{cm}$  the solution has to be obtained iteratively. In the SWAT code the solution for  $f_{cm}$  has been approximated by a functional equation to prevent recurrent iterations that can be computationally expensive. The SOM decomposition always causes net mineralization to be positive because humification is assumed to be zero. In actuality, the humification is not zero but since no explicit microbial pool is considered, the decomposition rate is an *apparent* decomposition rate that represents the net loss of C from the  $S_C$  and underestimates the true turnover rate of organic C, N, and P (Jenkinson and Parry, 1989).

## **3:5.2 CHANGES FROM PREVIOUS VERSION**

---

The previous versions of SWAT have separate pools for soil organic N (two pools, active and stable) and organic P (one pool) and do not include explicitly  $S_C$ ,  $R_C$ , or  $M_C$  pools. Nitrogen and P decompose separately, excepting the common effect of soil moisture and temperature on the actual decomposition rate and the indirect control of decomposition through  $R_{CN}$  and  $R_{CP}$ . The higher the ratios the lower the decomposition rate, but no immobilization of mineral N or P occurs. Of the N and P decomposed from residues, 20% is allocated to the active soil organic N and the soil organic P pools, respectively, and 80% is allocated to the nitrate ( $NO_3^-$ ) and P in the soil solution. The 20% allocated to the N and P organic pools is roughly similar to the humification of C described in the new sub-model.

In the new sub-model, mineralization of N from organic pools feeds the  $NH_4^+$  pool instead of the  $NO_3^-$  pool. This will possibly increase volatilization of ammonium because in SWAT the latter is tightly linked to nitrification. Since mineralization and immobilization are explicitly calculated, the fluctuations in mineral  $NO_3^-$  should be more realistically simulated, which has obvious

implications for  $\text{NO}_3$  transport and other processes across the watershed. Tillage accelerates SOM turnover and mixes layers according to the tillage depth. In the previous version tillage had some effects on the surface properties (residue cover) and mixing only involved two layers. No effect of tillage on the organic N or P decomposition rate was previously simulated. The new sub-model also enhances the capacity of SWAT to simulate the impact of tillage on nutrient cycling.

### 3:5.3 ANALYTICAL SOLUTIONS

---

The balanced equation for  $S_c$  in a single layer (Eq. [3:5.1.2a]) can be combined with Eq. [3:5.1.3a] and Eq. [3:5.1.7] and with a few assumptions allow for an analytical solution to the differential equation. The soil clay content and the C input rate were assumed to be constant and the powers  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  set to 1, so that the balance equation can be solved explicitly for  $S_c$ . The time step was considered to be a year and we assumed that residues and manure fully decompose in that time frame so that  $k_R = k_M = 1$ . Since the influence of residues and manure on the  $S_c$  balance is similar we assumed that C inputs are only through residues. With these substitutions Eq. [3:5.1.2a] becomes:

$$\frac{dS_c}{dt} = h_x R_C - \frac{h_x R_C}{S_x} S_c - \frac{k}{S_x} S_c^2 \quad 3:5.3.1$$

The constant  $k$  substitutes for  $k_x f_{\text{EF}} f_{\text{tool}}$ . This differential equation can be solved analytically, with integration rendering the following solution:

$$S_c(t) = \frac{h_x R_C}{2k} \left[ \left( \frac{\Phi e^{\frac{vt}{S_x}} - 1}{\Phi e^{\frac{vt}{S_x}} + 1} \right) \sqrt{1 + \frac{4kS_x}{h_x R_C}} - 1 \right] \quad 3:5.3.2$$

$$\gamma = h_x R_C \sqrt{1 + \frac{4kS_x}{h_x R_C}},$$

$$\Phi = -\frac{2kS_c(t=0) + h_x R_C + \gamma}{2kS_c(t=0) + h_x R_C - \gamma}.$$

The integration constant  $\Phi$  depends on the initial  $S_c$ . The steady state solution for Eq. 3:5.3.2 is:

$$S_c = \frac{h_x R_C}{2k} \left( \sqrt{1 + \frac{4kS_x}{h_x R_C}} - 1 \right) \quad 3:5.3.3$$

The ratio  $\frac{h_x R_C}{k}$  is the equilibrium  $S_C$  that would be obtained if neither  $h_C$  nor  $k_S$  had a dependence on  $S_C$ . As  $R_C$  increases, the value of the fraction  $\frac{4kS_x}{h_x R_C}$  will get smaller. Therefore, the squared root term in Eq. 3:5.3.3 can be approximated as  $1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{4kS_x}{h_x R_C}$  by preserving just the first two terms of the binomial expansion, from which Eq. 3:5.3.4 can be re-written as:

$$S_C = \frac{h_x R_C}{2k} \left( 1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{4kS_x}{h_x R_C} - 1 \right) = S_x \quad 3:5.3.4$$

Therefore, as  $R_C$  increases  $S_C$  approaches  $S_x$  asymptotically (Figure 1). Taking as a reference a soil layer with  $S_x = 25 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}$ ,  $h_x = 0.2$ , and  $k = 0.01 \text{ y}^{-1}$ , it can be seen in Figure 1 that doubling  $h_x$  and  $k$  have a similar effect but of opposite sign such that the equilibrium  $S_C$  increases with increasing  $h_x$  and decreases with increasing  $k$ . In both cases the increase and the decrease in  $S_C$  are less than proportional to the increase in these two parameters. The equilibrium  $S_C$ , however, is very sensitive to changes in  $S_x$ , which makes this variable critical for a correct representation of  $S_C$  dynamics. This formulation is a mathematical representation of the concept of  $S_C$  saturation (Hassink and Whitmore, 1997; Six et al., 2002), enhanced with a control of the decomposition rate by  $S_C$ .

The transient trajectory of  $S_C$  is controlled by the quotient of the two exponential terms in Eq. [3:5.3.5].

$$d = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (O_i - S_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (|S_i - \bar{O}| + |O_i - \bar{O}|)^2} \quad 3:5.3.5$$

For a given  $S_x$  and initial  $S_C$ , increasing the inputs ( $R_C$ ) changes the steady state  $S_C$  with decreasing marginal increments as  $S_C$  approaches  $S_x$ , yet the steady state condition is approached faster with higher inputs (Figure 3:5-1). For a given  $R_C$ , changing  $S_x$  has a substantial impact on the rate of change of  $S_C$  when the inputs are medium to high (Figure 3:5-1) but a minor effect if inputs are too low. This formulation strongly suggests that soils with higher carbon storage capacity (higher  $S_x$ ) that are currently depleted of  $S_C$  should be the primary targets for storing  $S_C$ , or that soils with low  $S_x$  may store carbon quickly for a few years but the rate of gains will decrease earlier than in soils with higher  $S_x$ .

The conditions for which the  $S_C$  can be modeled analytically as shown here are very restrictive. The numerical solution implemented in the model is more flexible as the constants  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are allowed to differ from 1. The model can be expanded to accommodate saturation of different SOM pools, instead of just one uniform pool, as strongly suggested by the results and analysis of Stewart et al. (2008). Yet, this will require a level of parameterization for which we consider there is simply not sufficient information for a realistic implementation in numerical models.




Figure 3:5-1: Equilibrium soil organic carbon ( $S_C$ , Mg C  $ha^{-1}$ ) for the steady state condition (Eq. [3:5.3.3]) with different values for humification ( $h_x$ , kg  $kg^{-1}$ ), SOM apparent turnover rate ( $k$ ,  $yr^{-1}$ ), and saturation soil organic carbon ( $S_{CC}$ , Mg C  $ha^{-1}$ ).

The line without a symbol in both panels was arbitrarily chosen as a reference. The linear, no asymptotic line in Panel A shows the equilibrium for the case in which  $h_x$  and  $k$  do not depend on  $S_C$  so that  $S_C$  at equilibrium =  $h_x R_C / k$ , where  $R_C$  is the residue carbon input rate (Mg C  $ha^{-1} yr^{-1}$ ). Panel A shows the equilibrium when  $S_{CC}$  is doubled and Panel B shows the equilibrium  $S_C$  when  $h_x$  or  $k$  is doubled.

## 3:5.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$f_E$	combined effect of soil temperature, moisture, and aeration on soil organic matter, residue, and manure decomposition
$f_o$	aeration factor controlling soil organic matter, residue, and manure decomposition
$f_T$	temperature factor controlling soil organic matter, residue, and manure decomposition
$f_w$	moisture factor controlling soil organic matter, residue, and manure decomposition
$f_{cm}$	cumulative $f_{mix}$
$f_{mix}$	mixing coefficient associated to different tillage tools
$f_{tool}$	tillage factor controlling soil organic matter decomposition rate
$h_R, h_M$	humification coefficient of residue and manure
$I_{RC}, I_{MC}$	input of organic C through residue and manure
$k_M$	optimum manure decomposition rate
$k_R$	optimum residue decomposition rate
$k_S$	apparent soil organic matter decomposition rate
$k_x$	maximum apparent soil organic matter decomposition rate
$M_C, M_N, M_P$	manure organic C, N, and P mass
$M_{CN}, M_{CP}$	manure C:N and C:P ratios
$MIN_{MN}$	net mineralization rates from decomposing manure
$MIN_{RN}$	net mineralization rates from decomposing residues
$N_{min}$	mineral N in the soil layer
$R_C, R_N, R_P$	residue organic C, N, and P mass
$R_{CN}, R_{CP}$	residue C:N and C:P ratios
$S_C, S_N, S_P$	soil organic carbon C, N, and P mass
$S_x$	reference or saturation soil organic C mass
$S_{CN}, S_{CP}$	soil organic C:N and C:P ratios
$Z_l$	soil layer thickness

## 3:5.5 REFERENCES

---

- Arnold, J. G., R. Srinivasan, R. S. Muttiah, and J. R. Williams. 1998. Large area hydrologic modeling and assessment: Part I. Model development. *J. American Water Resources Assoc.* 34:73-89.
- Bradbury, N.J., A.P. Whitmore, P.B.S. Hart, and D.S. Jenkinson, 1993. Modelling the fate of nitrogen in crop and soil in the years following application of  $^{15}\text{N}$ -labelled fertilizer to winter wheat. *J. Agric. Sci.* 121:363-379.
- Bruun, S. and J. Luxhoi, 2006. Letter to the Editor on –Can incubations be used to measure meaningful pools of soil organic matter? *Soil Sci Soc Am J*, 70:2164.
- Collins, H.P., E.T. Elliott, K. Paustian, L.G. Bundy, W.A. Dick, D.R. Huggins, D.R., A.J.M Smucker, and E.M. Paul, 2000. Soil carbon pools and fluxes in long-term corn belt agroecosystems. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 32:157-163.
- Galloway, J.N., A.R. Townsend, J.W. Erisman, M. Bkunda, Z. Cai, J.R. Freney, L.A. Marinelli, S.P. Seitzinger, M.A. Sutton, 2008. Transformation of the Nitrogen Cycle: Recent trends, questions, and potential solutions. *Science* 320, 889-892.
- Hassink, J. and A.P. Whitmore. 1997. A model of the physical protection of organic matter in soils. *Soil. Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 61:131-139.
- Jenkinson, D.S., 1990. The turnover of organic carbon and nitrogen in soil. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society, B.* 329:361-368.
- Jenkinson D.S. and L.C. Parry, 1989. The nitrogen cycle in the Broadbalk wheat experiment: a model for the turnover of nitrogen through the soil microbial biomass. *Soil. Biol. Biochem* 21:535-541.
- Kemanian, A.R., and C.O. Stöckle. 2010. C-Farm: A simple model to estimate the carbon balance of soil profiles. *Europ. J. Agron.* 32:22-29.
- McGill, W.B., H.W. Hunt, R.G. Woodmansee, and J.O. Reuss. 1981. PHOENIX: a model of the dynamics of carbon and nitrogen in grassland soils. In Clark F.E. and Rosswall T. (Eds.) *Terrestrial Nitrogen Cycles: Processes,*

Ecosystem, Strategy and Management Impacts, *Ecol. Bull.* (Stockholm) 33:49-115.

Parton, W.J., J.W.B. Stewart, and C.V. Cole. 1988. Dynamics of C, N, P and S in grassland soils. a model. *Biogeochem.* 5:109-131.


Paul E.A., S.J. Morris, R.T. Conant, and A.F. Plante, 2006. Does the acid hydrolysis-incubation method measure meaningful soil organic carbon pools? *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 70:1023–1035.

Six, J., R.T. Conant, E.A. Paul, and K. Paustian, 2002. Stabilization mechanisms of soil organic matter: Implications for C-saturation of soils. *Plant and Soil* 241:155-176.

Verberne, E.L.J., J. Hassink, P. de Willigen, J.J.R. Groot., and J.A. Van Veen, 1990. Modelling organic matter dynamics in different soils. *Netherlands J. Agric. Sci.* 38:221-238.



# EROSION



Transport of sediment, nutrients and pesticides from land areas to water bodies is a consequence of weathering that acts on landforms. Soil and water conservation planning requires knowledge of the relations between factors that cause loss of soil and water and those that help to reduce such losses.

The following three chapters review the methodology used by SWAT to simulate erosion processes.

---

---

## **SECTION 4 CHAPTER 1**

# **EQUATIONS: SEDIMENT**

---

Erosion is the wearing down of a landscape over time. It includes the detachment, transport, and deposition of soil particles by the erosive forces of raindrops and surface flow of water.

A land area contains rills and channels. Raindrop impact can detach soil particles on unprotected land surfaces between rills and initiate transport of these particles to the rills. From the small rills, the particles move to larger rills, then into ephemeral channels and then into continuously flowing rivers. Entrainment and deposition of particles can occur at any point along the path. When erosion occurs without human influence, it is called geologic erosion. Accelerated erosion occurs when human activity increases the rate of erosion.

Erosion is a matter of concern to watershed and natural resource managers. Two of the main reasons reservoirs are built are water supply and flood control. Erosion upstream of a reservoir deposits sediment in the bottom of the

reservoir which lowers the reservoir's water-holding capacity and consequently its usefulness for both of these purposes. The soil surface is the part of the soil profile highest in organic matter and nutrients. Organic matter forms complexes with soil particles so that erosion of the soil particles will also remove nutrients. Excessive erosion can deplete soil reserves of nitrogen and phosphorus needed by plants to grow and extreme erosion can degrade the soil to the point that it is unable to support plant life. If erosion is severe and widespread enough, the water balance of a watershed can be altered—remember that most water is lost from a watershed via evapotranspiration.

Erosion caused by rainfall and runoff is computed with the Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (MUSLE) (Williams, 1975). MUSLE is a modified version of the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) developed by Wischmeier and Smith (1965, 1978).

USLE predicts average annual gross erosion as a function of rainfall energy. In MUSLE, the rainfall energy factor is replaced with a runoff factor. This improves the sediment yield prediction, eliminates the need for delivery ratios, and allows the equation to be applied to individual storm events. Sediment yield prediction is improved because runoff is a function of antecedent moisture condition as well as rainfall energy. Delivery ratios (the sediment yield at any point along the channel divided by the source erosion above that point) are required by the USLE because the rainfall factor represents energy used in detachment only. Delivery ratios are not needed with MUSLE because the runoff factor represents energy used in detaching and transporting sediment.

## 4:1.1 MUSLE

---

The modified universal soil loss equation (Williams, 1995) is:

$$sed = 11.8 \cdot (Q_{surf} \cdot q_{peak} \cdot area_{hru})^{0.56} \cdot K_{USLE} \cdot C_{USLE} \cdot P_{USLE} \cdot LS_{USLE} \cdot CFRG \quad 4:1.1.1$$

where *sed* is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff volume (mm H<sub>2</sub>O/ha),  $q_{peak}$  is the peak runoff rate (m<sup>3</sup>/s),  $area_{hru}$  is the area of the HRU (ha),  $K_{USLE}$  is the USLE soil erodibility factor (0.013 metric ton

$\text{m}^2 \text{ hr}/(\text{m}^3\text{-metric ton cm})$ ),  $C_{USLE}$  is the USLE cover and management factor,  $P_{USLE}$  is the USLE support practice factor,  $LS_{USLE}$  is the USLE topographic factor and  $CFRG$  is the coarse fragment factor. Surface runoff and peak rate calculations are reviewed in Chapter 2:1. The USLE factors are discussed in the following sections.

#### **4:1.1.1 SOIL ERODIBILITY FACTOR**

Some soils erode more easily than others even when all other factors are the same. This difference is termed soil erodibility and is caused by the properties of the soil itself. Wischmeier and Smith (1978) define the soil erodibility factor as the soil loss rate per erosion index unit for a specified soil as measured on a unit plot. A unit plot is 22.1-m (72.6-ft) long, with a uniform length-wise slope of 9-percent, in continuous fallow, tilled up and down the slope. Continuous fallow is defined as land that has been tilled and kept free of vegetation for more than 2 years. The units for the USLE soil erodibility factor in MUSLE are numerically equivalent to the traditional English units of 0.01 (ton acre hr)/(acre ft-ton inch).

Wischmeier and Smith (1978) noted that a soil type usually becomes less erodible with decrease in silt fraction, regardless of whether the corresponding increase is in the sand fraction or clay fraction.

Direct measurement of the erodibility factor is time consuming and costly. Wischmeier et al. (1971) developed a general equation to calculate the soil erodibility factor when the silt and very fine sand content makes up less than 70% of the soil particle size distribution.

$$K_{USLE} = \frac{0.00021 \cdot M^{1.14} \cdot (12 - OM) + 3.25 \cdot (c_{soilstr} - 2) + 2.5 \cdot (c_{perm} - 3)}{100} \quad 4:1.1.2$$

where  $K_{USLE}$  is the soil erodibility factor,  $M$  is the particle-size parameter,  $OM$  is the percent organic matter (%),  $c_{soilstr}$  is the soil structure code used in soil classification, and  $c_{perm}$  is the profile permeability class.

The particle-size parameter,  $M$ , is calculated

$$M = (m_{silt} + m_{vfs}) \cdot (100 - m_c) \quad 4:1.1.3$$

where  $m_{silt}$  is the percent silt content (0.002-0.05 mm diameter particles),  $m_{vfs}$  is the percent very fine sand content (0.05-0.10 mm diameter particles), and  $m_c$  is the percent clay content (< 0.002 mm diameter particles).

The percent organic matter content,  $OM$ , of a layer can be calculated:

$$OM = 1.72 \cdot orgC \quad 4:1.1.4$$

where  $orgC$  is the percent organic carbon content of the layer (%).

Soil structure refers to the aggregation of primary soil particles into compound particles which are separated from adjoining aggregates by surfaces of weakness. An individual natural soil aggregate is called a ped. Field description of soil structure notes the shape and arrangement of peds, the size of peds, and the distinctness and durability of visible peds. USDA Soil Survey terminology for structure consists of separate sets of terms defining each of these three qualities. Shape and arrangement of peds are designated as type of soil structure; size of peds as class; and degree of distinctness as grade.

The soil-structure codes for equation 4:1.1.2 are defined by the type and class of soil structure present in the layer. There are four primary types of structure:

- Platy, with particles arranged around a plane, generally horizontal
- Prismlike, with particles arranged around a verticle line and bounded by relatively flat vertical surfaces
- Blocklike or polyhedral, with particles arranged around a point and bounded by flat or rounded surfaces which are casts of the molds formed by the faces of surrounding peds
- Spheroidal or polyhedral, with particles arranged around a point and bounded by curved or very irregular surfaces that are not accomodated to the adjoining aggregates

Each of the last three types has two subtypes:

-Prismlike

    Prismatic: without rounded upper ends

    Columnar: with rounded caps

-Blocklike

    Angular Blocky: bounded by planes intersecting at relatively sharp angles

    Subangular Blocky: having mixed rounded and plane faces with vertices mostly rounded

-Spheroidal

Granular: relatively non-porous

Crumb: very porous

The size criteria for the class will vary by type of structure and are summarized in Table 4:1-1. The codes assigned to  $c_{soilstr}$  are:

- 1 very fine granular
- 2 fine granular
- 3 medium or coarse granular
- 4 blocky, platy, prismlike or massive

Table 4:1-1: Size classes of soil structure

Size Classes	Shape of structure			
	Platy	Columnar	Blocky	Granular
Very fine	< 1 mm	< 10 mm	< 5 mm	< 1 mm
Fine	1-2 mm	10-20 mm	5-10 mm	1-2 mm
Medium	2-5 mm	20-50 mm	10-20 mm	2-5 mm
Coarse	5-10 mm	50-100 mm	20-50 mm	5-10 mm
Very coarse	> 10 mm	> 100 mm	> 50 mm	> 10 mm

Permeability is defined as the capacity of the soil to transmit water and air through the most restricted horizon (layer) when moist. The profile permeability classes are based on the lowest saturated hydraulic conductivity in the profile. The codes assigned to  $c_{perm}$  are:

- 1 rapid (> 150 mm/hr)
- 2 moderate to rapid (50-150 mm/hr)
- 3 moderate (15-50 mm hr)
- 4 slow to moderate (5-15 mm hr)
- 5 slow (1-5 mm hr)
- 6 very slow (< 1 mm hr)

Williams (1995) proposed an alternative equation:

$$K_{USLE} = f_{csand} \cdot f_{cl-si} \cdot f_{orgc} \cdot f_{hisand} \quad 4:1.1.5$$

where  $f_{csand}$  is a factor that gives low soil erodibility factors for soils with high coarse-sand contents and high values for soils with little sand,  $f_{cl-si}$  is a factor that gives low soil erodibility factors for soils with high clay to silt ratios,  $f_{orgc}$  is a factor that reduces soil erodibility for soils with high organic carbon content, and  $f_{hisand}$  is a factor that reduces soil erodibility for soils with extremely high sand contents. The factors are calculated:

$$f_{csand} = \left( 0.2 + 0.3 \cdot \exp \left[ -0.256 \cdot m_s \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{m_{silt}}{100} \right) \right] \right) \quad 4:1.1.6$$

$$f_{cl-si} = \left( \frac{m_{silt}}{m_c + m_{silt}} \right)^{0.3} \quad 4:1.1.7$$

$$f_{orgc} = \left( 1 - \frac{0.25 \cdot orgC}{orgC + \exp[3.72 - 2.95 \cdot orgC]} \right) \quad 4:1.1.8$$

$$f_{hisand} = \left( 1 - \frac{0.7 \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{m_s}{100} \right)}{\left( 1 - \frac{m_s}{100} \right) + \exp[-5.51 + 22.9 \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{m_s}{100} \right)]} \right) \quad 4:1.1.9$$

where  $m_s$  is the percent sand content (0.05-2.00 mm diameter particles),  $m_{silt}$  is the percent silt content (0.002-0.05 mm diameter particles),  $m_c$  is the percent clay content (< 0.002 mm diameter particles), and  $orgC$  is the percent organic carbon content of the layer (%).

#### **4:1.1.2 COVER AND MANAGEMENT FACTOR**

The USLE cover and management factor,  $C_{USLE}$ , is defined as the ratio of soil loss from land cropped under specified conditions to the corresponding loss from clean-tilled, continuous fallow (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978). The plant canopy affects erosion by reducing the effective rainfall energy of intercepted raindrops. Water drops falling from the canopy may regain appreciable velocity but it will be less than the terminal velocity of free-falling raindrops. The average fall height of drops from the canopy and the density of the canopy will determine the reduction in rainfall energy expended at the soil surface. A given percentage of residue on the soil surface is more effective than the same percentage of canopy cover. Residue intercepts falling raindrops so near the surface that drops regain no fall velocity. Residue also obstructs runoff flow, reducing its velocity and transport capacity.

Because plant cover varies during the growth cycle of the plant, SWAT updates  $C_{USLE}$  daily using the equation:

$$C_{USLE} = \exp(\ln(0.8) - \ln(C_{USLE,mn})) \cdot \exp[-0.00115 \cdot rsd_{surf}] + \ln[C_{USLE,mn}] \quad 4:1.1.10$$

where  $C_{USLE,mn}$  is the minimum value for the cover and management factor for the land cover, and  $rsd_{surf}$  is the amount of residue on the soil surface (kg/ha).

The minimum C factor can be estimated from a known average annual C factor using the following equation (Arnold and Williams, 1995):

$$C_{USLE,mn} = 1.463 \ln[C_{USLE,aa}] + 0.1034 \quad 4:1.1.11$$

where  $C_{USLE,mn}$  is the minimum C factor for the land cover and  $C_{USLE,aa}$  is the average annual C factor for the land cover.

### **4:1.1.3 SUPPORT PRACTICE FACTOR**

The support practice factor,  $P_{USLE}$ , is defined as the ratio of soil loss with a specific support practice to the corresponding loss with up-and-down slope culture. Support practices include contour tillage, strip cropping on the contour, and terrace systems. Stabilized waterways for the disposal of excess rainfall are a necessary part of each of these practices.

Contour tillage and planting provides almost complete protection against erosion from storms of low to moderate intensity, but little or no protection against occasional severe storms that cause extensive breakovers of contoured rows. Contouring is most effective on slopes of 3 to 8 percent. Values for  $P_{USLE}$  and slope-length limits for contour support practices are given in Table 4:1-2.

Table 4:1-2: P factor values and slope-length limits for contouring (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978).

Land slope (%)	$P_{USLE}$	Maximum length (m)
1 to 2	0.60	122
3 to 5	0.50	91
6 to 8	0.50	61
9 to 12	0.60	37
13 to 16	0.70	24
17 to 20	0.80	18
21 to 25	0.90	15

Strip cropping is a practice in which contoured strips of sod are alternated with equal-width strips of row crop or small grain. Recommended values for contour strip cropping are given in Table 4:1-3.

Table 4:1-3: P factor values, maximum strip width and slope-length limits for contour stripcropping (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978).

Land slope (%)	$P_{USLE}$ values <sup>†</sup>			Strip width (m)	Maximum length (m)
	A	B	C		
1 to 2	0.30	0.45	0.60	40	244
3 to 5	0.25	0.38	0.50	30	183
6 to 8	0.25	0.38	0.50	30	122
9 to 12	0.30	0.45	0.60	24	73
13 to 16	0.35	0.52	0.70	24	49
17 to 20	0.40	0.60	0.80	18	37
21 to 25	0.45	0.68	0.90	15	30

<sup>†</sup>P values:

A: For 4-year rotation of row crop, small grain with meadow seeding, and 2 years of meadow. A second row crop can replace the small grain if meadow is established in it.

B: For 4-year rotation of 2 years row crop, winter grain with meadow seeding, and 1-year meadow.

C: For alternate strips of row crop and winter grain

Terraces are a series of horizontal ridges made in a hillside. There are several types of terraces. Broadbase terraces are constructed on gently sloping land and the channel and ridge are cropped the same as the interterrace area. The steep backslope terrace, where the backslope is in sod, is most common on steeper land. Impoundment terraces are terraces with underground outlets.

Terraces divide the slope of the hill into segments equal to the horizontal terrace interval. With terracing, the slope length is the terrace interval. For broadbase terraces, the horizontal terrace interval is the distance from the center of the ridge to the center of the channel for the terrace below. The horizontal terrace interval for steep backslope terraces is the distance from the point where cultivation begins at the base of the ridge to the base of the frontslope of the terrace below.

Values for  $P_{USLE}$  for contour farming terraced fields are listed in Table 4:1-4. These values apply to broadbase, steep backslope and level terraces. Keep in mind that the values given in Table 4:1-4 do not account for all erosion control benefits of terraces. The shorter slope-length used in the calculation of the length-slope factor will produce additional reduction.

Table 4:1-4: P factor values for contour-farmed terraced fields<sup>1</sup> (from Wischmeier and Smith, 1978)

Land slope (%)	Farm planning		Computing sediment yield <sup>3</sup>	
	Contour P factor <sup>2</sup>	Stripcrop P factor	Graded channels sod outlets	Steep backslope underground outlets
1 to 2	0.60	0.30	0.12	0.05
3 to 8	0.50	0.25	0.10	0.05
9 to 12	0.60	0.30	0.12	0.05
13 to 16	0.70	0.35	0.14	0.05
17 to 20	0.80	0.40	0.16	0.06
21 to 25	0.90	0.45	0.18	0.06

<sup>1</sup>Slope length is the horizontal terrace interval. The listed values are for contour farming. No additional contouring factor is used in the computation.

<sup>2</sup> Use these values for control of interterrace erosion within specified soil loss tolerances.

<sup>3</sup> These values include entrapment efficiency and are used for control of offsite sediment within limits and for estimating the field's contribution to watershed sediment yield.

#### **4:1.1.4 TOPOGRAPHIC FACTOR**

The topographic factor,  $LS_{USLE}$ , is the expected ratio of soil loss per unit area from a field slope to that from a 22.1-m length of uniform 9 percent slope under otherwise identical conditions. The topographic factor is calculated:

$$LS_{USLE} = \left( \frac{L_{hill}}{22.1} \right)^m \cdot (65.41 \cdot \sin^2(\alpha_{hill}) + 4.56 \cdot \sin \alpha_{hill} + 0.065) \quad 4:1.1.12$$

where  $L_{hill}$  is the slope length (m),  $m$  is the exponential term, and  $\alpha_{hill}$  is the angle of the slope. The exponential term,  $m$ , is calculated:

$$m = 0.6 \cdot (1 - \exp[-35.835 \cdot slp]) \quad 4:1.1.13$$

where  $slp$  is the slope of the HRU expressed as rise over run (m/m). The relationship between  $\alpha_{hill}$  and  $slp$  is:

$$slp = \tan \alpha_{hill} \quad 4:1.1.14$$

#### **4:1.1.5 COARSE FRAGMENT FACTOR**

The coarse fragment factor is calculated:

$$CFRG = \exp(-0.053 \cdot rock) \quad 4:1.1.15$$

where  $rock$  is the percent rock in the first soil layer (%).

Table 4:1-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to sediment yield.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
USLE_K	$K_{USLE}$ : USLE soil erodibility factor (0.013 metric ton m <sup>2</sup> hr/(m <sup>3</sup> -metric ton cm))	.sol
USLE_C	$C_{USLE,mn}$ : Minimum value for the cover and management factor for the land cover	crop.dat
USLE_P	$P_{USLE}$ : USLE support practice factor	.mgt
SLSUBBSN	$L_{hill}$ : Slope length (m)	.hru
HRU_SLP	$slp$ : Average slope of the subbasin (% or m/m)	.hru
ROCK	$rock$ : Percent rock in the first soil layer (%)	.sol

## 4:1.2 USLE

---

For comparative purposes, SWAT prints out sediment loadings calculated with USLE. ***These values are not used by the model, they are for comparison only.*** The universal soil loss equation (Williams, 1995) is:

$$sed = 1.292 \cdot EI_{USLE} \cdot K_{USLE} \cdot C_{USLE} \cdot P_{USLE} \cdot LS_{USLE} \cdot CFRG \quad 4:1.2.1$$

where  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons/ha),  $EI_{USLE}$  is the rainfall erosion index (0.017 m-metric ton cm/(m<sup>2</sup> hr)),  $K_{USLE}$  is the USLE soil erodibility factor (0.013 metric ton m<sup>2</sup> hr/(m<sup>3</sup>-metric ton cm)),  $C_{USLE}$  is the USLE cover and management factor,  $P_{USLE}$  is the USLE support practice factor,  $LS_{USLE}$  is the USLE topographic factor and  $CFRG$  is the coarse fragment factor. The factors other than  $EI_{USLE}$  are discussed in the preceding sections.

### 4:1.2.1 RAINFALL ERODIBILITY INDEX

The value of  $EI_{USLE}$  for a given rainstorm is the product, total storm energy times the maximum 30 minute intensity. The storm energy indicates the volume of rainfall and runoff while the 30 minute intensity indicates the prolonged peak rates of detachment and runoff.

$$EI_{USLE} = E_{storm} \cdot I_{30} \quad 4:1.2.2$$

where  $EI_{USLE}$  is the rainfall erosion index (0.017 m-metric ton cm/(m<sup>2</sup> hr)),  $E_{storm}$  is the total storm energy (0.0017 m-metric ton/m<sup>2</sup>), and  $I_{30}$  is the maximum 30-minute intensity (mm/hr).

The energy of a rainstorm is a function of the amount of rain and of all the storm's component intensities. Because rainfall is provided to the model in daily

totals, an assumption must be made about variation in rainfall intensity. The rainfall intensity variation with time is assumed to be exponentially distributed:

$$i_t = i_{mx} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{t}{k_i}\right) \quad 4:1.2.3$$

where  $i_t$  is the rainfall intensity at time  $t$  (mm/hr),  $i_{mx}$  is the maximum rainfall intensity (mm/hr),  $t$  is the time (hr), and  $k_i$  is the decay constant for rainfall intensity (hr).

The USLE energy equation is

$$E_{storm} = \Delta R_{day} \cdot \left( 12.1 + 8.9 \cdot \log_{10} \left[ \frac{\Delta R_{day}}{\Delta t} \right] \right) \quad 4:1.2.4$$

where  $\Delta R_{day}$  is the amount of rainfall during the time interval (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $\Delta t$  is the time interval (hr). This equation may be expressed analytically as:

$$E_{storm} = 12.1 \int_0^{\infty} i_t dt + 8.9 \int_0^{\infty} i_t \log_{10} i_t dt \quad 4:1.2.5$$

Combining equation 4:1.2.5 and 4:1.2.3 and integrating gives the equation for estimating daily rainfall energy:

$$E_{storm} = \frac{R_{day}}{1000} \cdot (12.1 + 8.9 \cdot (\log_{10}[i_{mx}] - 0.434)) \quad 4:1.2.6$$

where  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $i_{mx}$  is the maximum rainfall intensity (mm/hr). To compute the maximum rainfall intensity,  $i_{mx}$ , equation 4:1.2.3 is integrated to give

$$R_{day} = i_{mx} \cdot k_i \quad 4:1.2.7$$

and

$$R_t = R_{day} \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ -\frac{t}{k_i} \right] \right) \quad 4:1.2.8$$

where  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $i_{mx}$  is the maximum rainfall intensity (mm/hr),  $k_i$  is the decay constant for rainfall intensity (hr),  $R_t$  is the amount of rain falling during a time interval (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $t$  is the time interval (hr). The maximum half-hour rainfall for the precipitation event is known:

$$R_{0.5} = \alpha_{0.5} \cdot R_{day} \quad 4:1.2.9$$

where  $R_{0.5}$  is the maximum half-hour rainfall (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\alpha_{0.5}$  is the maximum half-hour rainfall expressed as a fraction of daily rainfall, and  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). Calculation of  $\alpha_{0.5}$  is reviewed in Chapter 1:2 and Chapter 1:3. Substituting equation 4:1.2.9 and 4:1.2.7 into 4:1.2.8 and solving for the maximum intensity gives:

$$i_{mx} = -2 \cdot R_{day} \cdot \ln(1 - \alpha_{0.5}) \quad 4:1.2.10$$

where  $i_{mx}$  is the maximum rainfall intensity (mm/hr),  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $\alpha_{0.5}$  is the maximum half-hour rainfall expressed as a fraction of daily rainfall.

The maximum 30 minute intensity is calculated:

$$I_{30} = 2 \cdot \alpha_{0.5} \cdot R_{day} \quad 4:1.2.11$$

where  $I_{30}$  is the maximum 30-minute intensity (mm/hr),  $\alpha_{0.5}$  is the maximum half-hour rainfall expressed as a fraction of daily rainfall, and  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Table 4:1-6: SWAT input variables that pertain to USLE sediment yield.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
USLE_K	$K_{USLE}$ : USLE soil erodibility factor (0.013 metric ton m <sup>2</sup> hr/(m <sup>3</sup> -metric ton cm))	.sol
USLE_C	$C_{USLE,mn}$ : Minimum value for the cover and management factor for the land cover	crop.dat
USLE_P	$P_{USLE}$ : USLE support practice factor	.mgt
SLSUBBSN	$L_{hill}$ : Slope length (m)	.hru
SLOPE	$slp$ : Average slope of the subbasin (%) or m/m)	.hru
ROCK	$rock$ : Percent rock in the first soil layer (%)	.sol

## 4:1.3 SNOW COVER EFFECTS

---

The erosive power of rain and runoff will be less when snow cover is present than when there is no snow cover. During periods when snow is present in an HRU, SWAT modifies the sediment yield using the following relationship:

$$sed = \frac{sed'}{\exp\left[\frac{3 \cdot SNO}{25.4}\right]} \quad 4:1.3.1$$

where  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $sed'$  is the sediment yield calculated with MUSLE (metric tons), and  $SNO$  is the water content of the snow cover (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

## 4:1.4 SEDIMENT LAG IN SURFACE RUNOFF

---

In large subbasins with a time of concentration greater than 1 day, only a portion of the surface runoff will reach the main channel on the day it is generated. SWAT incorporates a surface runoff storage feature to lag a portion of the surface runoff release to the main channel. Sediment in the surface runoff is lagged as well.

Once the sediment load in surface runoff is calculated, the amount of sediment released to the main channel is calculated:

$$sed = (sed' + sed_{stor,i-1}) \cdot \left(1 - \exp\left[-\frac{surlag}{t_{conc}}\right]\right) \quad 4:1.4.1$$

where  $sed$  is the amount of sediment discharged to the main channel on a given day (metric tons),  $sed'$  is the amount of sediment load generated in the HRU on a given day (metric tons),  $sed_{stor,i-1}$  is the sediment stored or lagged from the previous day (metric tons),  $surlag$  is the surface runoff lag coefficient, and  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for the HRU (hrs).

The expression  $\left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}}\right)\right)$  in equation 4:1.4.1 represents the fraction of the total available sediment that will be allowed to enter the reach on any one day. Figure 4:1-1 plots values for this expression at different values for *surlag* and *t<sub>conc</sub>*.




Figure 4:1-1: Influence of *surlag* and *t<sub>conc</sub>* on fraction of surface runoff and sediment released.

Note that for a given time of concentration, as *surlag* decreases in value more sediment is held in storage.

Table 4:1-7: SWAT input variables that pertain to sediment lag calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SURLAG	<i>surlag</i> : surface runoff lag coefficient	.bsn

## 4:1.5 SEDIMENT IN LATERAL & GROUNDWATER FLOW

SWAT allows the lateral and groundwater flow to contribute sediment to the main channel. The amount of sediment contributed by lateral and groundwater flow is calculated:

$$sed_{lat} = \frac{(Q_{lat} + Q_{gw}) \cdot area_{hru} \cdot conc_{sed}}{1000} \quad 4:1.5.1$$

where *sed<sub>lat</sub>* is the sediment loading in lateral and groundwater flow (metric tons), *Q<sub>lat</sub>* is the lateral flow for a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), *Q<sub>gw</sub>* is the groundwater flow for

a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $area_{hru}$  is the area of the HRU (km<sup>2</sup>), and  $conc_{sed}$  is the concentration of sediment in lateral and groundwater flow (mg/L).

Table 4:1-8: SWAT input variables that pertain to sediment lag calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
LAT_SED	$conc_{sed}$ : Concentration of sediment in lateral and groundwater flow (mg/L)	.hru

## 4:1.6 NOMENCLATURE

---

$C_{USLE}$	USLE cover and management factor
$C_{USLE,aa}$	Average annual C factor for the land cover
$C_{USLE,mn}$	Minimum value for the cover and management factor for the land cover
$CFRG$	Coarse fragment factor
$E_{storm}$	Total storm energy (0.0017 m-metric ton/m <sup>2</sup> ),
$EI_{USLE}$	Rainfall erosion index (0.017 m-metric ton cm/(m <sup>2</sup> hr))
$I_{30}$	Maximum 30 minute intensity (mm/hr)
$K_{USLE}$	USLE soil erodibility factor (0.013 metric ton m <sup>2</sup> hr/(m <sup>3</sup> -metric ton cm))
$L_{hill}$	Slope length (m)
$LS_{USLE}$	USLE topographic factor
$M$	Particle-size parameter for estimation of USLE K factor
$OM$	Percent organic matter (%)
$P_{USLE}$	USLE support practice factor
$Q_{gw}$	Groundwater flow for a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$Q_{lat}$	Lateral flow (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$Q_{surf}$	Surface runoff volume (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/ha)
$R_{day}$	Amount of rainfall on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SNO$	Water content of the snow cover (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$area_{hru}$	HRU area (ha or km <sup>2</sup> )
$c_{perm}$	Profile-permeability class
$c_{soilstr}$	Soil-structure code used in soil classification
$conc_{sed}$	Concentration of sediment in lateral and groundwater flow (mg/L)
$f_{cl-si}$	Factor that gives low soil erodibility factors for soils with high clay to silt ratios
$f_{csand}$	Factor that gives low soil erodibility factors for soils with high coarse-sand contents and high values for soils with little sand
$f_{hisand}$	Factor that reduces soil erodibility for soils with extremely high sand contents
$f_{orgc}$	Factor that reduces soil erodibility for soils with high organic carbon content
$i_{mx}$	Maximum rainfall intensity (mm/hr)
$i_t$	Rainfall intensity at time $t$ (mm/hr)
$k_i$	Decay constant for rainfall intensity (hr)
$m$	Exponential term in USLE LS factor calculation
$m_c$	Percent clay content (< 0.002 mm diameter particles)
$m_s$	Percent sand content

$m_{silt}$	Percent silt content (0.002-0.05 mm diameter particles)
$m_{vfs}$	Percent very fine sand content (0.05-0.10 mm diameter particles)
$orgC_{ly}$	Amount of organic carbon in the layer (%)
$q_{peak}$	Peak runoff rate ( $m^3/s$ )
$rock$	Percent rock in soil layer (%)
$rsd_{surf}$	Amount of residue on the soil surface (kg/ha)
$sed$	Sediment yield on a given day (metric tons)
$sed_{lat}$	Sediment loading in lateral and groundwater flow (metric tons)
$sed_{stor,i-1}$	Sediment stored or lagged from the previous day (metric tons)
$slp$	Average slope of the subbasin (m/m)
$surlag$	Surface runoff lag coefficient
$t$	Time (hr)
$t_{conc}$	Time of concentration for a subbasin (hr)
$\alpha_{0.5}$	Maximum half-hour rainfall expressed as a fraction of daily rainfall
$\alpha_{hill}$	Angle of the slope

## 4:1.7 REFERENCES

---

- Arnold, J.G. and J.R. Williams. 1995. SWRRB—A watershed scale model for soil and water resources management. p. 847-908. In V.P. Singh (ed) Computer models of watershed hydrology. Water Resources Publications.
- Williams, J.R. 1975. Sediment-yield prediction with universal equation using runoff energy factor. p. 244-252. In Present and prospective technology for predicting sediment yield and sources: Proceedings of the sediment-yield workshop, USDA Sedimentation Lab., Oxford, MS, November 28-30, 1972. ARS-S-40.
- Williams, J.R. 1995. Chapter 25: The EPIC model. p. 909-1000. In V.P. Singh (ed.) Computer models of watershed hydrology. Water Resources Publications.
- Wischmeier, W.H., C.B. Johnson, and B.V. Cross. 1971. A soil erodibility nomograph for farmland and construction sites. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 26:189-193.
- Wischmeier, W.H. and D.D. Smith. 1965. Predicting rainfall-erosion losses from cropland east of the Rocky Mountains. Agriculture Handbook 282. USDA-ARS
- Wischmeier, W.H. and D.D. Smith. 1978. Predicting rainfall erosion losses: a guide to conservation planning. Agriculture Handbook 282. USDA-ARS



## **SECTION 4 CHAPTER 2**

# **EQUATIONS: NUTRIENT TRANSPORT**

---

The transport of nutrients from land areas into streams and water bodies is a normal result of soil weathering and erosion processes. However, excessive loading of nutrients into streams and water bodies will accelerate eutrophication and render the water unfit for human consumption. This chapter reviews the algorithms governing movement of mineral and organic forms of nitrogen and phosphorus from land areas to the stream network.

## 4:2.1 NITRATE MOVEMENT

---

Most soil minerals are negatively charged at normal pH and the net interaction with anions such as nitrate is a repulsion from particle surfaces. This repulsion is termed negative adsorption or anion exclusion.

Anions are excluded from the area immediately adjacent to mineral surfaces due to preferential attraction of cations to these sites. This process has a direct impact on the transport of anions through the soil for it effectively excludes anions from the slowest moving portion of the soil water volume found closest to the charged particle surfaces (Jury et al, 1991). In effect, the net pathway of the anion through the soil is shorter than it would be if all the soil water had to be used (Thomas and McMahon, 1972).

Nitrate may be transported with surface runoff, lateral flow or percolation. To calculate the amount of nitrate moved with the water, the concentration of nitrate in the mobile water is calculated. This concentration is then multiplied by the volume of water moving in each pathway to obtain the mass of nitrate lost from the soil layer.

The concentration of nitrate in the mobile water fraction is calculated:

$$conc_{NO_3, \text{mobile}} = \frac{NO_3_{ly} \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-w_{\text{mobile}}}{(1 - \theta_e) \cdot SAT_{ly}} \right] \right)}{w_{\text{mobile}}} \quad 4:2.1.2$$

where  $conc_{NO_3, \text{mobile}}$  is the concentration of nitrate in the mobile water for a given layer (kg N/mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $NO_3_{ly}$  is the amount of nitrate in the layer (kg N/ha),  $w_{\text{mobile}}$  is the amount of mobile water in the layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\theta_e$  is the fraction of porosity from which anions are excluded, and  $SAT_{ly}$  is the saturated water content of the soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The amount of mobile water in the layer is the amount of water lost by surface runoff, lateral flow or percolation:

$$w_{\text{mobile}} = Q_{\text{surf}} + Q_{\text{lat},ly} + w_{\text{perc},ly} \quad \text{for top 10 mm} \quad 4:2.1.3$$

$$w_{\text{mobile}} = Q_{\text{lat},ly} + w_{\text{perc},ly} \quad \text{for lower soil layers} \quad 4:2.1.4$$

where  $w_{\text{mobile}}$  is the amount of mobile water in the layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{\text{surf}}$  is the surface runoff generated on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{\text{lat},ly}$  is the water discharged

from the layer by lateral flow (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{perc,ly}$  is the amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). Surface runoff is allowed to interact with and transport nutrients from the top 10 mm of soil.

Nitrate removed in surface runoff is calculated:

$$NO3_{surf} = \beta_{NO3} \cdot conc_{NO3,mobile} \cdot Q_{surf} \quad 4:2.1.5$$

where  $NO3_{surf}$  is the nitrate removed in surface runoff (kg N/ha),  $\beta_{NO3}$  is the nitrate percolation coefficient,  $conc_{NO3,mobile}$  is the concentration of nitrate in the mobile water for the top 10 mm of soil (kg N/mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff generated on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The nitrate percolation coefficient allows the user to set the concentration of nitrate in surface runoff to a fraction of the concentration in percolate.

Nitrate removed in lateral flow is calculated:

$$NO3_{lat,ly} = \beta_{NO3} \cdot conc_{NO3,mobile} \cdot Q_{lat,ly} \quad \text{for top 10 mm} \quad 4:2.1.6$$

$$NO3_{lat,ly} = conc_{NO3,mobile} \cdot Q_{lat,ly} \quad \text{for lower layers} \quad 4:2.1.7$$

where  $NO3_{lat,ly}$  is the nitrate removed in lateral flow from a layer (kg N/ha),  $\beta_{NO3}$  is the nitrate percolation coefficient,  $conc_{NO3,mobile}$  is the concentration of nitrate in the mobile water for the layer (kg N/mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $Q_{lat,ly}$  is the water discharged from the layer by lateral flow (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Nitrate moved to the underlying layer by percolation is calculated:

$$NO3_{perc,ly} = conc_{NO3,mobile} \cdot w_{perc,ly} \quad 4:2.1.8$$

where  $NO3_{perc,ly}$  is the nitrate moved to the underlying layer by percolation (kg N/ha),  $conc_{NO3,mobile}$  is the concentration of nitrate in the mobile water for the layer (kg N/mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{perc,ly}$  is the amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Table 4:2-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to nitrate transport.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
ANION_EXCL	$\theta_e$ : Fraction of porosity from which anions are excluded	.sol
NPERCO	$\beta_{NO3}$ : Nitrate percolation coefficient	.bsn

## 4:2.2 ORGANIC N IN SURFACE RUNOFF

---

Organic N attached to soil particles may be transported by surface runoff to the main channel. This form of nitrogen is associated with the sediment loading from the HRU and changes in sediment loading will be reflected in the organic nitrogen loading. The amount of organic nitrogen transported with sediment to the stream is calculated with a loading function developed by McElroy et al. (1976) and modified by Williams and Hann (1978).

$$\text{org}N_{\text{surf}} = 0.001 \cdot \text{conc}_{\text{org}N} \cdot \frac{\text{sed}}{\text{area}_{\text{hru}}} \cdot \varepsilon_{N:\text{sed}} \quad 4:2.2.1$$

where  $\text{org}N_{\text{surf}}$  is the amount of organic nitrogen transported to the main channel in surface runoff (kg N/ha),  $\text{conc}_{\text{org}N}$  is the concentration of organic nitrogen in the top 10 mm (g N/ metric ton soil),  $\text{sed}$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $\text{area}_{\text{hru}}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $\varepsilon_{N:\text{sed}}$  is the nitrogen enrichment ratio.

The concentration of organic nitrogen in the soil surface layer,  $\text{conc}_{\text{org}N}$ , is calculated:

$$\text{conc}_{\text{org}N} = 100 \cdot \frac{(\text{org}N_{\text{frsh,surf}} + \text{org}N_{\text{sta,surf}} + \text{org}N_{\text{act,surf}})}{\rho_b \cdot \text{depth}_{\text{surf}}} \quad 4:2.2.2$$

where  $\text{org}N_{\text{frsh,surf}}$  is nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in the top 10mm (kg N/ha),  $\text{org}N_{\text{sta,surf}}$  is nitrogen in the stable organic pool (kg N/ha),  $\text{org}N_{\text{act,surf}}$  is nitrogen in the active organic pool in the top 10 mm (kg N/ha),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the first soil layer ( $\text{Mg/m}^3$ ), and  $\text{depth}_{\text{surf}}$  is the depth of the soil surface layer (10 mm).

### 4:2.2.1 ENRICHMENT RATIO

As surface runoff flows over the soil surface, part of the water's energy is used to pick up and transport soil particles. The smaller particles weigh less and are more easily transported than coarser particles. When the particle size distribution of the transported sediment is compared to that of the soil surface layer, the sediment load to the main channel has a greater proportion of clay sized particles. In other words, the sediment load is enriched in clay particles. Organic

nitrogen in the soil is attached primarily to colloidal (clay) particles, so the sediment load will also contain a greater proportion or concentration of organic N than that found in the soil surface layer.

The enrichment ratio is defined as the ratio of the concentration of organic nitrogen transported with the sediment to the concentration in the soil surface layer. SWAT will calculate an enrichment ratio for each storm event, or allow the user to define a particular enrichment ratio for organic nitrogen that is used for all storms during the simulation. To calculate the enrichment ratio, SWAT uses a relationship described by Menzel (1980) in which the enrichment ratio is logarithmically related to sediment concentration. The equation used to calculate the nitrogen enrichment ratio,  $\varepsilon_{N:sed}$ , for each storm event is:

$$\varepsilon_{N:sed} = 0.78 \cdot (conc_{sed,surq})^{-0.2468} \quad 4:2.2.3$$

where  $conc_{sed,surq}$  is the concentration of sediment in surface runoff ( $Mg\ sed/m^3 H_2O$ ). The concentration of sediment in surface runoff is calculated:

$$conc_{sed,surq} = \frac{sed}{10 \cdot area_{hru} \cdot Q_{surf}} \quad 4:2.2.4$$

where  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on a given day (mm  $H_2O$ ).

Table 4:2-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to organic N loading.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density ( $Mg/m^3$ )	.sol
ERORGN	$\varepsilon_{N:sed}$ : Organic nitrogen enrichment ratio	.hru

## 4:2.3 SOLUBLE PHOSPHORUS MOVEMENT

The primary mechanism of phosphorus movement in the soil is by diffusion. Diffusion is the migration of ions over small distances (1-2 mm) in the soil solution in response to a concentration gradient. Due to the low mobility of solution phosphorus, surface runoff will only partially interact with the solution P stored in the top 10 mm of soil. The amount of solution P transported in surface runoff is:

$$P_{surf} = \frac{P_{solution,surf} \cdot Q_{surf}}{\rho_b \cdot depth_{surf} \cdot k_{d,surf}} \quad 4:2.3.1$$

where  $P_{surf}$  is the amount of soluble phosphorus lost in surface runoff (kg P/ha),  $P_{solution,surf}$  is the amount of phosphorus in solution in the top 10 mm (kg P/ha),  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the top 10 mm (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>) (assumed to be equivalent to bulk density of first soil layer),  $depth_{surf}$  is the depth of the “surface” layer (10 mm), and  $k_{d,surf}$  is the phosphorus soil partitioning coefficient (m<sup>3</sup>/Mg). The phosphorus soil partitioning coefficient is the ratio of the soluble phosphorus concentration in the surface 10 mm of soil to the concentration of soluble phosphorus in surface runoff.

Table 4:2-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to soluble P runoff.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density (Mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	.sol
PHOSKD	$k_{d,surf}$ : Phosphorus soil partitioning coefficient (m <sup>3</sup> /Mg)	.bsn

## 4:2.4 ORGANIC & MINERAL P ATTACHED TO SEDIMENT IN SURFACE RUNOFF

Organic and mineral P attached to soil particles may be transported by surface runoff to the main channel. This form of phosphorus is associated with the sediment loading from the HRU and changes in sediment loading will be reflected in the loading of these forms of phosphorus. The amount of phosphorus transported with sediment to the stream is calculated with a loading function developed by McElroy et al. (1976) and modified by Williams and Hann (1978).

$$sedP_{surf} = 0.001 \cdot conc_{sedP} \cdot \frac{sed}{area_{hru}} \cdot \varepsilon_{P:sed} \quad 4:2.4.1$$

where  $sedP_{surf}$  is the amount of phosphorus transported with sediment to the main channel in surface runoff (kg P/ha),  $conc_{sedP}$  is the concentration of phosphorus attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (g P/ metric ton soil),  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $\varepsilon_{P:sed}$  is the phosphorus enrichment ratio.

The concentration of phosphorus attached to sediment in the soil surface layer,  $conc_{sedP}$ , is calculated:

$$conc_{sedP} = 100 \cdot \frac{(minP_{act,surf} + minP_{sta,surf} + orgP_{hum,surf} + orgP_{frsh,surf})}{\rho_b \cdot depth_{surf}} \quad 4:2.4.2$$

where  $minP_{act,surf}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the active mineral pool in the top 10 mm (kg P/ha),  $minP_{sta,surf}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the stable mineral pool in the top 10 mm (kg P/ha),  $orgP_{hum,surf}$  is the amount of phosphorus in humic organic pool in the top 10 mm (kg P/ha),  $orgP_{frsh,surf}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in the top 10 mm (kg P/ha),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the first soil layer ( $Mg/m^3$ ), and  $depth_{surf}$  is the depth of the soil surface layer (10 mm).

#### **4:2.4.1 ENRICHMENT RATIO**

The enrichment ratio is defined as the ratio of the concentration of phosphorus transported with the sediment to the concentration of phosphorus in the soil surface layer. SWAT will calculate an enrichment ratio for each storm event, or allow the user to define a particular enrichment ratio for phosphorus attached to sediment that is used for all storms during the simulation. To calculate the enrichment ratio, SWAT uses a relationship described by Menzel (1980) in which the enrichment ratio is logarithmically related to sediment concentration. The equation used to calculate the phosphorus enrichment ratio,  $\varepsilon_{P:sed}$ , for each storm event is:

$$\varepsilon_{P:sed} = 0.78 \cdot (conc_{sed,surq})^{-0.2468} \quad 4:2.4.3$$

where  $conc_{sed,surq}$  is the concentration of sediment in surface runoff ( $Mg sed/m^3 H_2O$ ). The concentration of sediment in surface runoff is calculated:

$$conc_{sed,surq} = \frac{sed}{10 \cdot area_{hru} \cdot Q_{surf}} \quad 4:2.4.4$$

where  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on a given day (mm  $H_2O$ ).

Table 4:2-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to loading of P attached to sediment.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density (Mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	.sol
ERORGP	$\varepsilon_{P:sed}$ : Phosphorus enrichment ratio	.hru

## 4:2.5 NUTRIENT LAG IN SURFACE RUNOFF AND LATERAL FLOW

In large subbasins with a time of concentration greater than 1 day, only a portion of the surface runoff and lateral flow will reach the main channel on the day it is generated. SWAT incorporates a storage feature to lag a portion of the surface runoff and lateral flow release to the main channel. Nutrients in the surface runoff and lateral flow are lagged as well.

Once the nutrient load in surface runoff and lateral flow is determined, the amount of nutrients released to the main channel is calculated:

$$NO3_{surf} = (NO3'_{surf} + NO3_{surstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:2.5.1$$

$$NO3_{lat} = (NO3'_{lat} + NO3_{latstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-1}{TT_{lat}} \right] \right) \quad 4:2.5.2$$

$$orgN_{surf} = (orgN'_{surf} + orgN_{stor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:2.5.3$$

$$P_{surf} = (P'_{surf} + P_{stor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:2.5.4$$

$$sedP_{surf} = (sedP'_{surf} + sedP_{stor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:2.5.5$$

where  $NO3_{surf}$  is the amount of nitrate discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (kg N/ha),  $NO3'_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff nitrate generated in the HRU on a given day (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{surstor,i-1}$  is the surface runoff nitrate stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{lat}$  is the amount of nitrate discharged to the main channel in lateral flow on a given day (kg N/ha),

$NO3'_{lat}$  is the amount of lateral flow nitrate generated in the HRU on a given day (kg N/ha),  $NO3_{latstor,i-1}$  is the lateral flow nitrate stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha),  $orgN_{surf}$  is the amount of organic N discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (kg N/ha),  $orgN'_{surf}$  is the organic N loading generated in the HRU on a given day (kg N/ha),  $orgN_{stor,i-1}$  is the organic N stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha),  $P_{surf}$  is the amount of solution P discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (kg P/ha),  $P'_{surf}$  is the amount of solution P loading generated in the HRU on a given day (kg P/ha),  $P_{stor,i-1}$  is the solution P loading stored or lagged from the previous day (kg P/ha),  $sedP_{surf}$  is the amount of sediment-attached P discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (kg P/ha),  $sedP'_{surf}$  is the amount of sediment-attached P loading generated in the HRU on a given day (kg P/ha),  $sedP_{stor,i-1}$  is the sediment-attached P stored or lagged from the previous day (kg P/ha),  $surlag$  is the surface runoff lag coefficient,  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for the HRU (hrs) and  $TT_{lag}$  is the lateral flow travel time (days).

Table 4.2-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to nutrient lag calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SURLAG	$surlag$ : surface runoff lag coefficient	.bsn
LAT_TTIME	$TT_{lag}$ : Lateral flow travel time (days)	.hru

## 4:2.6 NOMENCLATURE

$NO3_{lat,ly}$  Nitrate removed in lateral flow from a layer (kg N/ha)

$NO3'_{lat}$  Amount of lateral flow nitrate generated in HRU on a given day (kg N/ha)

$NO3_{latstor,i-1}$  Lateral flow nitrate stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha)

$NO3_{ly}$  Amount of nitrate in the layer (kg N/ha)

$NO3_{perc,ly}$  Nitrate moved to the underlying layer by percolation (kg N/ha)

$NO3_{surf}$  Nitrate removed in surface runoff (kg N/ha)

$NO3'_{surf}$  Amount of surface runoff nitrate generated in HRU on a given day (kg N/ha)

$NO3_{surstor,i-1}$  Surface runoff nitrate stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha)

$P_{solution,surf}$  Amount of phosphorus in solution in the top 10 mm (kg P/ha)

$P_{stor,i-1}$  Solution P loading stored or lagged from the previous day (kg P/ha)

$P_{surf}$  Amount of soluble phosphorus lost in surface runoff (kg P/ha)

$P'_{surf}$  Amount of solution P loading generated in HRU on a given day (kg P/ha)

- $Q_{lat}$  Lateral flow from soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $Q_{surf}$  Accumulated runoff or rainfall excess (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $SAT_{ly}$  Saturated water content of the soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $TT_{lag}$  Lateral flow travel time (days)
- $area_{hru}$  HRU area (ha)  
 $conc_{NO3,mobile}$  Concentration of nitrate in the mobile water for a given layer (kg N/mm H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $conc_{orgN}$  Concentration of organic nitrogen in the soil surface top 10 mm (g N/metric ton soil)  
 $conc_{sed,surf}$  Concentration of sediment in surface runoff (Mg sed/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $conc_{sedP}$  Concentration of phosphorus attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (g P/metric ton soil)  
 $depth_{surf}$  Depth of the “surface” layer (10 mm)  
 $k_{d,surf}$  Phosphorus soil partitioning coefficient (m<sup>3</sup>/Mg)  
 $minP_{act,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in the active mineral pool (kg P/ha)  
 $minP_{sta,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in the stable mineral pool (kg P/ha)  
 $orgN_{act,ly}$  Nitrogen in the active organic pool (mg/kg or kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{frsh,surf}$  Nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in the top 10mm (kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{sta,ly}$  Nitrogen in the stable organic pool (mg/kg or kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{stor,i-1}$  Surface runoff organic N stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{surf}$  Amount of organic nitrogen transport to the main channel in surface runoff (kg N/ha)  
 $orgN'_{surf}$  Amount of surface runoff organic N generated in HRU on a given day (kg N/ha)  
 $orgP_{frsh,ly}$  Phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in layer ly (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{hum,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in humic organic pool in the layer (kg P/ha)  
 $sed$  Sediment yield on a given day (metric tons)  
 $sedP_{stor,i-1}$  Sediment-attached P stored or lagged from the previous day (kg P/ha)  
 $sedP_{surf}$  Amount of phosphorus transported with sediment to the main channel in surface runoff (kg P/ha)  
 $sedP'_{surf}$  Amount of sediment-attached P loading generated in HRU on a given day (kg P/ha)  
 $surlag$  Surface runoff lag coefficient  
 $t_{conc}$  Time of concentration for a subbasin (hr)  
 $w_{mobile}$  Amount of mobile water in the layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $w_{perc,ly}$  Amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)
- $\beta_{NO3}$  Nitrate percolation coefficient  
 $\theta_e$  Fraction of porosity from which anions are excluded  
 $\varepsilon_{N:sed}$  Nitrogen enrichment ratio  
 $\varepsilon_{P:sed}$  Phosphorus enrichment ratio  
 $\rho_b$  Bulk density (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>)

## 4:2.7 REFERENCES

---

- Jury, W.A., W.R. Gardner, and W.H. Gardner. 1991. Soil physics, 5<sup>th</sup> edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, N.Y.
- McElroy, A.D., S.Y. Chiu, J.W. Nebgen, A. Aleti, and F.W. Bennett. 1976. Loading functions for assessment of water pollution from nonpoint sources. Environ. Prot. Tech. Serv., EPA 600/2-76-151.
- Menzel, R.G. 1980. Enrichment ratios for water quality modeling. p. 486-492. *In* W.G. Knisel (ed.) CREAMS, A field scale model for chemicals, runoff, and erosion from agricultural management systems. U.S. Dept. Agric. Conserv. Res. Rept. No. 26.
- Thomas, G.W. and M. McMahon. 1972. The relation between soil characteristics, water movement and nitrate concentration of ground water. Univ. of Kentucky Water Resources Institute Research Report No. 52, Lexington, KY.
- Williams, J.R. and R.W. Hann. 1978. Optimal operation of large agricultural watersheds with water quality constraints. Texas Water Resources Institute, Texas A&M Univ., Tech. Rept. No. 96.



## **SECTION 4 CHAPTER 3**

# **EQUATIONS: PESTICIDE TRANSPORT**

---

The transport of pesticide from land areas into streams and water bodies is a result of soil weathering and erosion processes. Excessive loading of pesticides in streams and water bodies can produce toxic conditions that harm aquatic life and render the water unfit for human consumption. This chapter reviews the algorithms governing movement of soluble and sorbed forms of pesticide from land areas to the stream network. Pesticide transport algorithms in SWAT were taken from EPIC (Williams, 1995).

## 4:3.1 PHASE DISTRIBUTION OF PESTICIDE

---

Pesticide in the soil environment can be transported in solution or attached to sediment. The partitioning of a pesticide between the solution and soil phases is defined by the soil adsorption coefficient for the pesticide. The soil adsorption coefficient is the ratio of the pesticide concentration in the soil or solid phase to the pesticide concentration in the solution or liquid phase:

$$K_p = \frac{C_{solidphase}}{C_{solution}} \quad 4:3.1.1$$

where  $K_p$  is the soil adsorption coefficient ((mg/kg)/(mg/L) or m<sup>3</sup>/ton),  $C_{solidphase}$  is the concentration of the pesticide sorbed to the solid phase (mg chemical/kg solid material or g/ton), and  $C_{solution}$  is the concentration of the pesticide in solution (mg chemical/L solution or g/ton). The definition of the soil adsorption coefficient in equation 4:3.1.1 assumes that the pesticide sorption process is linear with concentration and instantaneously reversible.

Because the partitioning of pesticide is dependent upon the amount of organic material in the soil, the soil adsorption coefficient input to the model is normalized for soil organic carbon content. The relationship between the soil adsorption coefficient and the soil adsorption coefficient normalized for soil organic carbon content is:

$$K_p = K_{oc} \cdot \frac{orgC}{100} \quad 4:3.1.2$$

where  $K_p$  is the soil adsorption coefficient ((mg/kg)/(mg/L)),  $K_{oc}$  is the soil adsorption coefficient normalized for soil organic carbon content ((mg/kg)/(mg/L) or m<sup>3</sup>/ton), and  $orgC$  is the percent organic carbon present in the soil.

Table 4:3-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to pesticide phase partitioning.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_CBN	$orgC_{ly}$ : Amount of organic carbon in the layer (%)	.sol
SKOC	$K_{oc}$ : Soil adsorption coefficient normalized for soil organic carbon content (ml/g or (mg/kg)/(mg/L) or L/kg)	pest.dat

## 4:3.2 MOVEMENT OF SOLUBLE PESTICIDE

---

Pesticide in the soluble phase may be transported with surface runoff, lateral flow or percolation. The change in the amount of pesticide contained in a soil layer due to transport in solution with flow is a function of time, concentration and amount of flow:

$$\frac{dpst_{s,ly}}{dt} = 0.01 \cdot C_{solution} \cdot w_{mobile} \quad 4:3.2.1$$

where  $pst_{s,ly}$  is the amount of pesticide in the soil layer (kg pst/ha),  $C_{solution}$  is the pesticide concentration in solution (mg/L or g/ton), and  $w_{mobile}$  is the amount of mobile water on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The amount of mobile water in the layer is the amount of water lost by surface runoff, lateral flow or percolation:

$$w_{mobile} = Q_{surf} + Q_{lat,surf} + w_{perc,surf} \quad \text{for top 10 mm} \quad 4:3.2.2$$

$$w_{mobile} = Q_{lat,ly} + w_{perc,ly} \quad \text{for lower soil layers} \quad 4:3.2.3$$

where  $w_{mobile}$  is the amount of mobile water in the layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff generated on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{lat,ly}$  is the water discharged from the layer by lateral flow (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{perc,ly}$  is the amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

The total amount of pesticide in the soil layer is the sum of the adsorbed and dissolved phases:

$$pst_{s,ly} = 0.01 \cdot (C_{solution} \cdot SAT_{ly} + C_{solidphase} \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly}) \quad 4:3.2.4$$

where  $pst_{s,ly}$  is the amount of pesticide in the soil layer (kg pst/ha),  $C_{solution}$  is the pesticide concentration in solution (mg/L or g/ton),  $SAT_{ly}$  is the amount of water in the soil layer at saturation (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $C_{solidphase}$  is the concentration of the pesticide sorbed to the solid phase (mg/kg or g/ton),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the soil layer (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>), and  $depth_{ly}$  is the depth of the soil layer (mm). Rearranging equation 4:3.1.1 to solve for  $C_{solidphase}$  and substituting into equation 4:3.2.4 yields:

$$pst_{s,ly} = 0.01 \cdot (C_{solution} \cdot SAT_{ly} + C_{solution} \cdot K_p \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly}) \quad 4:3.2.5$$

which rearranges to

$$C_{solution} = \frac{pst_{s,ly}}{0.01 \cdot (SAT_{ly} + K_p \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly})} \quad 4:3.2.6$$

Combining equation 4:3.2.6 with equation 4:3.2.1 yields

$$\frac{dpst_{s,ly}}{dt} = \frac{pst_{s,ly} \cdot w_{mobile}}{(SAT_{ly} + K_p \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly})} \quad 4:3.2.7$$

Integration of equation 4:3.2.7 gives

$$pst_{s,ly,t} = pst_{s,ly,o} \cdot \exp \left[ \frac{-w_{mobile}}{(SAT_{ly} + K_p \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly})} \right] \quad 4:3.2.8$$

where  $pst_{s,ly,t}$  is the amount of pesticide in the soil layer at time  $t$  (kg pst/ha),  $pst_{s,ly,o}$  is the initial amount of pesticide in the soil layer (kg pst/ha),  $w_{mobile}$  is the amount of mobile water in the layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $SAT_{ly}$  is the amount of water in the soil layer at saturation (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $K_p$  is the soil adsorption coefficient ((mg/kg)/(mg/L)),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the soil layer (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>), and  $depth_{ly}$  is the depth of the soil layer (mm).

To obtain the amount of pesticide removed in solution with the flow, the final amount of pesticide is subtracted from the initial amount of pesticide:

$$pst_{flow} = pst_{s,ly,o} \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-w_{mobile}}{(SAT_{ly} + K_p \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly})} \right] \right) \quad 4:3.2.9$$

where  $pst_{flow}$  is the amount of pesticide removed in the flow (kg pst/ha) and all other terms were previously defined.

For the top 10 mm that interacts with surface runoff, the pesticide concentration in the mobile water is calculated:

$$conc_{pst,flow} = \min \begin{cases} pst_{flow} / [w_{perc,surf} + \beta_{pst}(Q_{surf} + Q_{lat,surf})] \\ pst_{sol} / 100. \end{cases} \quad 4:3.2.10$$

while for lower layers

$$conc_{pst,flow} = \min \begin{cases} pst_{flow} / w_{mobile} \\ pst_{sol} / 100. \end{cases} \quad 4:3.2.11$$

where  $conc_{pst,flow}$  is the concentration of pesticide in the mobile water (kg pst/ha-mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $pst_{flow}$  is the amount of pesticide removed in the flow (kg pst/ha),  $\beta_{pst}$  is the pesticide percolation coefficient,  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff generated on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{lat,ly}$  is the water discharged from the layer by lateral flow (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{perc,ly}$  is the amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{mobile}$  is the amount of mobile water in the layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $pst_{sol}$  is the solubility of the pesticide in water (mg/L).

Pesticide moved to the underlying layer by percolation is calculated:

$$pst_{perc,ly} = conc_{pst,flow} \cdot w_{perc,ly} \quad 4:3.2.12$$

where  $pst_{perc,ly}$  is the pesticide moved to the underlying layer by percolation (kg pst/ha),  $conc_{pst,flow}$  is the concentration of pesticide in the mobile water for the layer (kg pst/mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{perc,ly}$  is the amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Pesticide removed in lateral flow is calculated:

$$pst_{lat,surf} = \beta_{pst} \cdot conc_{pst,flow} \cdot Q_{lat,surf} \quad \text{for top 10 mm} \quad 4:3.2.13$$

$$pst_{lat,ly} = conc_{pst,flow} \cdot Q_{lat,ly} \quad \text{for lower layers} \quad 4:3.2.14$$

where  $pst_{lat,ly}$  is the pesticide removed in lateral flow from a layer (kg pst/ha),  $\beta_{pst}$  is the pesticide percolation coefficient,  $conc_{pst,flow}$  is the concentration of pesticide in the mobile water for the layer (kg pst/mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $Q_{lat,ly}$  is the water discharged from the layer by lateral flow (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The pesticide percolation coefficient allows the user to set the concentration of pesticide in runoff and lateral flow from the top 10 mm to a fraction of the concentration in percolate.

Pesticide removed in surface runoff is calculated:

$$pst_{surf} = \beta_{pst} \cdot conc_{pst,flow} \cdot Q_{surf} \quad 4:3.2.15$$

where  $pst_{surf}$  is the pesticide removed in surface runoff (kg pst/ha),  $\beta_{pst}$  is the pesticide percolation coefficient,  $conc_{pst,flow}$  is the concentration of pesticide in the mobile water for the top 10 mm of soil (kg pst/mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff generated on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Table 4.3-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to pesticide transport in solution.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Soil bulk density ( $\text{Mg m}^{-3}$ )	.sol
WSOL	$pst_{sol}$ : Solubility of the pesticide in water (mg/L)	pest.dat
PERCOP	$\beta_{pst}$ : Pesticide percolation coefficient	.bsn

### 4:3.3 TRANSPORT OF SORBED PESTICIDE

Pesticide attached to soil particles may be transported by surface runoff to the main channel. This phase of pesticide is associated with the sediment loading from the HRU and changes in sediment loading will impact the loading of sorbed pesticide. The amount of pesticide transported with sediment to the stream is calculated with a loading function developed by McElroy et al. (1976) and modified by Williams and Hann (1978).

$$pst_{sed} = 0.001 \cdot C_{solidphase} \cdot \frac{sed}{area_{hru}} \cdot \varepsilon_{pst:sed} \quad 4:3.3.1$$

where  $pst_{sed}$  is the amount of sorbed pesticide transported to the main channel in surface runoff (kg pst/ha),  $C_{solidphase}$  is the concentration of pesticide on sediment in the top 10 mm (g pst/ metric ton soil),  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $\varepsilon_{pst:sed}$  is the pesticide enrichment ratio.

The total amount of pesticide in the soil layer is the sum of the adsorbed and dissolved phases:

$$pst_{s,ly} = 0.01 \cdot (C_{solution} \cdot SAT_{ly} + C_{solidphase} \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly}) \quad 4:3.3.2$$

where  $pst_{s,ly}$  is the amount of pesticide in the soil layer (kg pst/ha),  $C_{solution}$  is the pesticide concentration in solution (mg/L or g/ton),  $SAT_{ly}$  is the amount of water in the soil layer at saturation (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $C_{solidphase}$  is the concentration of the pesticide sorbed to the solid phase (mg/kg or g/ton),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the soil layer ( $\text{Mg/m}^3$ ), and  $depth_{ly}$  is the depth of the soil layer (mm). Rearranging equation 4:3.1.1 to solve for  $C_{solution}$  and substituting into equation 4:3.3.2 yields:

$$pst_{s,ly} = 0.01 \cdot \left( \frac{C_{solidphase} \cdot SAT_{ly} + C_{solidphase} \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly}}{K_p} \right) \quad 4:3.3.3$$

which rearranges to

$$C_{solidphase} = \frac{100 \cdot K_p \cdot pst_{s,ly}}{(SAT_{ly} + K_p \cdot \rho_b \cdot depth_{ly})} \quad 4:3.3.4$$

where  $C_{solidphase}$  is the concentration of the pesticide sorbed to the solid phase (mg/kg or g/ton),  $K_p$  is the soil adsorption coefficient ((mg/kg)/(mg/L) or m<sup>3</sup>/ton)  $pst_{s,ly}$  is the amount of pesticide in the soil layer (kg pst/ha),  $SAT_{ly}$  is the amount of water in the soil layer at saturation (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the soil layer (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>), and  $depth_{ly}$  is the depth of the soil layer (mm).

#### **4:3.3.1 ENRICHMENT RATIO**

As surface runoff flows over the soil surface, part of the water's energy is used to pick up and transport soil particles. The smaller particles weigh less and are more easily transported than coarser particles. When the particle size distribution of the transported sediment is compared to that of the soil surface layer, the sediment load to the main channel has a greater proportion of clay sized particles. In other words, the sediment load is enriched in clay particles. The sorbed phase of pesticide in the soil is attached primarily to colloidal (clay) particles, so the sediment load will also contain a greater proportion or concentration of pesticide than that found in the soil surface layer.

The enrichment ratio is defined as the ratio of the concentration of sorbed pesticide transported with the sediment to the concentration in the soil surface layer. SWAT will calculate an enrichment ratio for each storm event, or allow the user to define a particular enrichment ratio for sorbed pesticide that is used for all storms during the simulation. To calculate the enrichment ratio, SWAT uses a relationship described by Menzel (1980) in which the enrichment ratio is logarithmically related to sediment concentration. The equation used to calculate the pesticide enrichment ratio,  $\varepsilon_{pst:sed}$ , for each storm event is:

$$\varepsilon_{pst:sed} = 0.78 \cdot (conc_{sed,surq})^{-0.2468} \quad 4:3.3.5$$

where  $conc_{sed,surq}$  is the concentration of sediment in surface runoff (Mg sed/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O). The concentration of sediment in surface runoff is calculated:

$$conc_{sed,surq} = \frac{sed}{10 \cdot area_{hru} \cdot Q_{surf}} \quad 4:3.3.6$$

where  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Table 4:3-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to sorbed pesticide loading.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density (Mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	.sol
PSTENR	$\varepsilon_{pst:sed}$ : Pesticide enrichment ratio	.chm

## 4:3.4 PESTICIDE LAG IN SURFACE RUNOFF AND LATERAL FLOW

In large subbasins with a time of concentration greater than 1 day, only a portion of the surface runoff and lateral flow will reach the main channel on the day it is generated. SWAT incorporates a storage feature to lag a portion of the surface runoff and lateral flow release to the main channel. Pesticides in the surface runoff and lateral flow are lagged as well.

Once the pesticide load in surface runoff and lateral flow is determined, the amount of pesticide released to the main channel is calculated:

$$pst_{surf} = (pst'_{surf} + pst_{surstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:3.4.1$$

$$pst_{lat} = (pst'_{lat} + pst_{latstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-1}{TT_{lat}} \right] \right) \quad 4:3.4.2$$

$$pst_{sed} = (pst'_{sed} + pst_{sedstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:3.4.3$$

where  $pst_{surf}$  is the amount of soluble pesticide discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (kg pst/ha),  $pst'_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff soluble pesticide generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha),  $pst_{surstor,i-1}$  is the surface runoff soluble pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha),  $pst_{lat}$  is the amount of soluble pesticide discharged to the main channel in

lateral flow on a given day (kg pst/ha),  $pst'_{lat}$  is the amount of lateral flow soluble pesticide generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha),  $pst_{latstor,i-1}$  is the lateral flow pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha),  $pst_{sed}$  is the amount of sorbed pesticide discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (kg pst/ha),  $pst'_{sed}$  is the sorbed pesticide loading generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha),  $pst_{sedstor,i-1}$  is the sorbed pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha),  $surlag$  is the surface runoff lag coefficient,  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for the HRU (hrs) and  $TT_{lag}$  is the lateral flow travel time (days).

Table 4:3-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to pesticide lag calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SURLAG	$surlag$ : surface runoff lag coefficient	.bsn
LAT_TTIME	$TT_{lag}$ : Lateral flow travel time (days)	.hru

## 4:3.5 NOMENCLATURE

---

$C_{solidphase}$	Concentration of the pesticide sorbed to the solid phase (mg/kg or g/ton)
$C_{solution}$	Concentration of the pesticide in solution (mg/L or g/ton)
$K_{oc}$	Soil adsorption coefficient normalized for soil organic carbon content (ml/g or (mg/kg)/(mg/L) or L/kg)
$K_p$	Soil adsorption coefficient ((mg/kg)/(mg/L))
$Q_{lat}$	Lateral flow from soil layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$Q_{surf}$	Accumulated runoff or rainfall excess (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SAT_{ly}$	Soil water content of layer $ly$ at saturation (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$TT_{lag}$	Lateral flow travel time (days)

$area_{hru}$	HRU area (ha)
$conc_{pst,flow}$	Concentration of pesticide in the mobile water (kg pst/ha-mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$conc_{sed,surq}$	Concentration of sediment in surface runoff (Mg sed/m <sup>3</sup> H <sub>2</sub> O)
$depth_{ly}$	Depth of the soil layer (mm)
$orgC_{ly}$	Amount of organic carbon in the layer (%)
$pst_{flow}$	Amount of pesticide removed in the flow (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{lat,ly}$	Pesticide removed in lateral flow from a layer (kg pst/ha)
$pst'_{lat}$	Amount of lateral flow soluble pesticide generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{latstor,i-1}$	Lateral flow pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{perc,ly}$	Pesticide moved to the underlying layer by percolation (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{s,ly}$	Amount of pesticide in the soil (kg pst/ha)

$pst_{sed}$	Amount of sorbed pesticide transported to the main channel in surface runoff (kg pst/ha)
$pst'_{sed}$	Sorbed pesticide loading generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{sedstor,i-1}$	Sorbed pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{sol}$	Solubility of the pesticide in water (mg/L)
$pst_{surf}$	Pesticide removed in surface runoff (kg pst/ha)
$pst'_{surf}$	Amount of surface runoff soluble pesticide generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha)
$pst_{surstor,i-1}$	Surface runoff soluble pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha)
$sed$	Sediment yield on a given day (metric tons)
$surlag$	Surface runoff lag coefficient
$t_{conc}$	Time of concentration for a subbasin (hr)
$w_{mobile}$	Amount of mobile water in the layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{perc,ly}$	Amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$\beta_{pst}$	Pesticide percolation coefficient
$\varepsilon_{pst:sed}$	Pesticide enrichment ratio
$\rho_b$	Soil bulk density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )
$\rho_w$	Density of water (1 Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )

## 4:3.6 REFERENCES

---

- McElroy, A.D., S.Y. Chiu, J.W. Nebgen, A. Aleti, and F.W. Bennett. 1976. Loading functions for assessment of water pollution from nonpoint sources. Environ. Prot. Tech. Serv., EPA 600/2-76-151.
- Menzel, R.G. 1980. Enrichment ratios for water quality modeling. p. 486-492. In W.G. Knisel (ed.) CREAMS, A field scale model for chemicals, runoff, and erosion from agricultural management systems. U.S. Dept. Agric. Conserv. Res. Rept. No. 26.
- Williams, J.R. 1995. Chapter 25: The EPIC model. p. 909-1000. In V.P. Singh (ed.). Computer models of watershed hydrology. Water Resources Publications.
- Williams, J.R. and R.W. Hann. 1978. Optimal operation of large agricultural watersheds with water quality constraints. Texas Water Resources Institute, Texas A&M Univ., Tech. Rept. No. 96.



## **SECTION 4 CHAPTER 4**

# **EQUATIONS: BACTERIA TRANSPORT**

---

The transport of pathogenic bacteria from land areas into streams and water bodies is a matter of concern in some watersheds. Excessive loading of bacteria into streams and water bodies could potentially contaminate drinking water and cause outbreaks of infection among the human population using the water. This chapter reviews the algorithms governing movement of bacteria from land areas to the stream network.

## 4:4.1 BACTERIA IN SURFACE RUNOFF

---

Due to the low mobility of bacteria in soil solution, surface runoff will only partially interact with the bacteria present in the soil solution. The amount of bacteria transported in surface runoff is:

$$bact_{lp,surf} = \frac{bact_{lpsol} \cdot Q_{surf}}{\rho_b \cdot depth_{surf} \cdot k_{bact,surf}} \quad 4:4.1.1$$

$$bact_{p,surf} = \frac{bact_{psol} \cdot Q_{surf}}{\rho_b \cdot depth_{surf} \cdot k_{bact,surf}} \quad 4:4.1.2$$

where  $bact_{lp,surf}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria lost in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,surf}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria lost in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lpsol}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present in soil solution (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{psol}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present in soil solution (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the top 10 mm (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>) (assumed to be equivalent to bulk density of first soil layer),  $depth_{surf}$  is the depth of the “surface” layer (10 mm), and  $k_{bact,surf}$  is the bacteria soil partitioning coefficient (m<sup>3</sup>/Mg). The bacteria soil partitioning coefficient is the ratio of the bacteria concentration in the surface 10 mm soil solution to the concentration of bacteria in surface runoff.

Table 4:4-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to bacteria in surface runoff.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density (Mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	.sol
BACTKDQ	$k_{bact,surf}$ : Bacteria soil partitioning coefficient (m <sup>3</sup> /Mg)	.bsn

## 4:4.2 BACTERIA ATTACHED TO SEDIMENT IN SURFACE RUNOFF

---

Bacteria attached to soil particles may be transported by surface runoff to the main channel. This bacteria is associated with the sediment loading from the HRU and changes in sediment loading will be reflected in the loading of this form of bacteria. The amount of bacteria transported with sediment to the stream is

calculated with a loading function developed by McElroy et al. (1976) and modified by Williams and Hann (1978) for nutrients.

$$bact_{lp,sed} = 0.0001 \cdot conc_{sedlpbact} \cdot \frac{sed}{area_{hru}} \cdot \varepsilon_{bact:sed} \quad 4:4.2.1$$

$$bact_{p,sed} = 0.0001 \cdot conc_{sedpbact} \cdot \frac{sed}{area_{hru}} \cdot \varepsilon_{bact:sed} \quad 4:4.2.2$$

where  $bact_{lp,sed}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria transported with sediment in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,sed}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria transported with sediment in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $conc_{sedlpbact}$  is the concentration of less persistent bacteria attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (# cfu/ metric ton soil),  $conc_{sedpbact}$  is the concentration of persistent bacteria attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (# cfu/ metric ton soil),  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $\varepsilon_{bact:sed}$  is the bacteria enrichment ratio.

The concentration of bacteria attached to sediment in the soil surface layer is calculated:

$$conc_{sedlpbact} = 1000 \cdot \frac{bact_{lp,sorb}}{\rho_b \cdot depth_{surf}} \quad 4:4.2.3$$

$$conc_{sedpbact} = 1000 \cdot \frac{bact_{p,sorb}}{\rho_b \cdot depth_{surf}} \quad 4:4.2.4$$

where  $bact_{lp,sorb}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,sorb}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $\rho_b$  is the bulk density of the first soil layer (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>), and  $depth_{surf}$  is the depth of the soil surface layer (10 mm).

#### **4:4.2.1 ENRICHMENT RATIO**

The enrichment ratio is defined as the ratio of the concentration of bacteria transported with the sediment to the concentration of bacteria attached to soil particles in the soil surface layer. SWAT calculates an enrichment ratio for each storm event which is used for the bacteria loading calculations. To calculate the enrichment ratio, SWAT uses a relationship described by Menzel (1980) in which

the enrichment ratio is logarithmically related to sediment concentration. The equation used to calculate the bacteria enrichment ratio,  $\varepsilon_{bact:sed}$ , for each storm event is:

$$\varepsilon_{bact:sed} = 0.78 \cdot (conc_{sed,surq})^{-0.2468} \quad 4:4.2.5$$

where  $conc_{sed,surq}$  is the concentration of sediment in surface runoff ( $Mg\ sed/m^3 H_2O$ ). The concentration of sediment in surface runoff is calculated:

$$conc_{sed,surq} = \frac{sed}{10 \cdot area_{hru} \cdot Q_{surf}} \quad 4:4.2.6$$

where  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on a given day (mm  $H_2O$ ).

Table 4:4-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to loading of bacteria attached to sediment.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_BD	$\rho_b$ : Bulk density ( $Mg/m^3$ )	.sol

## 4:4.3 BACTERIA LAG IN SURFACE RUNOFF

In large subbasins with a time of concentration greater than 1 day, only a portion of the surface runoff will reach the main channel on the day it is generated. SWAT incorporates a storage feature to lag a portion of the surface runoff release to the main channel. Bacteria in the surface runoff are lagged as well.

Once the bacteria load in surface runoff is determined, the amount of bacteria released to the main channel is calculated:

$$bact_{lp,surf} = (bact'_{lp,surf} + bact_{lp,surstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:4.3.1$$

$$bact_{p,surf} = (bact'_{p,surf} + bact_{p,surstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:4.3.2$$

$$bact_{lp,sed} = (bact'_{lp,sed} + bact_{lp,sedstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:4.3.3$$

$$bact_{p,sed} = (bact'_{p,sed} + bact_{p,sedstor,i-1}) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-surlag}{t_{conc}} \right] \right) \quad 4:4.3.4$$

where  $bact_{lp,surf}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact'_{lp,surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff less persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lp,surstor,i-1}$  is the surface runoff less persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,surf}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact'_{p,surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,surstor,i-1}$  is the surface runoff persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lp,sed}$  is the amount of sediment-attached less persistent bacteria discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact'_{lp,sed}$  is the amount of sediment-attached less persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lp,sedstor,i-1}$  is the sediment-attached less persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,sed}$  is the amount of sediment-attached persistent bacteria discharged to the main channel in surface runoff on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact'_{p,sed}$  is the amount of sediment-attached persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,sedstor,i-1}$  is the sediment-attached persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $surlag$  is the surface runoff lag coefficient, and  $t_{conc}$  is the time of concentration for the HRU (hrs).

Table 4:4-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to bacteria lag calculations.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SURLAG	$surlag$ : surface runoff lag coefficient	.bsn

## 4:4.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$Q_{surf}$  Accumulated runoff or rainfall excess (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)

$area_{hru}$  HRU area (ha)

$bact'_{lp, sed}$  Amount of sediment-attached less persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{lp, sed}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria transported with sediment in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{lp, sedstor, i-1}$  Sediment-attached less persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{lp, sol}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria present in soil solution (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{lp, sorb}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact'_{lp, surf}$  Amount of surface runoff less persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{lp, surv}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria lost in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{lp, surstor, i-1}$  Surface runoff less persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact'_{p, sed}$  Amount of sediment-attached persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{p, sed}$  Amount of persistent bacteria transported with sediment in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{p, sedstor, i-1}$  Sediment-attached persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{psol}$  Amount of persistent bacteria present in soil solution (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{psorb}$  Amount of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact'_{p, surv}$  Amount of surface runoff persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{p, surv}$  Amount of persistent bacteria lost in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$bact_{p, surstor, i-1}$  Surface runoff persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)

$conc_{sedlpbact}$  Concentration of less persistent bacteria attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (# cfu/ metric ton soil)

$conc_{sedpbact}$  Concentration of persistent bacteria attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (# cfu/ metric ton soil)

$conc_{sed, surv}$  Concentration of sediment in surface runoff (Mg sed/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O)

$depth_{surf}$  Depth of the “surface” layer (10 mm)

$k_{bact, surv}$  Bacteria soil partitioning coefficient (m<sup>3</sup>/Mg)

$sed$  Sediment yield on a given day (metric tons)

$surlag$  Surface runoff lag coefficient

$t_{conc}$  Time of concentration for a subbasin (hr)

$\varepsilon_{bact:sed}$  Bacteria enrichment ratio

$\rho_b$  Bulk density (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>)



## **SECTION 4 CHAPTER 5**

# **EQUATIONS: WATER QUALITY PARAMETERS**

---

In addition to sediment, nutrients and pesticides, SWAT will calculate the amount of algae, dissolved oxygen and carbonaceous biological oxygen demand (CBOD) entering the main channel with surface runoff. Loadings of these three parameters impact the quality of stream water. This chapter reviews the algorithms governing movement of algae, dissolved oxygen and CBOD from land areas to the stream network. Because the algorithms were based on very limited field data, calculation of these loadings has been made optional.

## 4:5.1 ALGAE

---

Suspended algal biomass is assumed to be directly proportional to chlorophyll *a*. Therefore, the algal biomass loading to the stream can be estimated as the chlorophyll *a* loading from the land area. Cluis et al. (1988) developed a relationship between the nutrient enrichment index (total N: total P), chlorophyll *a*, and algal growth potential in the North Yamaska River, Canada.

$$(AGP + chla) \cdot v_{surf} = f \cdot \left( \frac{TN}{TP} \right)^g \quad 4:5.1.1$$

where *AGP* is the algal growth potential (mg/L), *chla* is the chlorophyll *a* concentration in the surface runoff ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ ), *v<sub>surf</sub>* is the surface runoff flow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ), *TN* is the total Kjeldahl nitrogen load (kmoles), *TP* is the total phosphorus load (kmoles), *f* is a coefficient and *g* is an exponent.

The chlorophyll *a* concentration in surface runoff is calculated in SWAT using a simplified version of Cluis et al.'s exponential function (1988):

$$chla = 0 \quad \text{if } (v_{surf} < 10^{-5} \text{ m}^3/\text{s}) \text{ or } (TP \text{ and } TN < 10^{-6}) \quad 4:5.1.2$$

$$chla = \frac{0.5 \cdot 10^{2.7}}{v_{surf}} \quad \text{if } v_{surf} > 10^{-5} \text{ m}^3/\text{s}, \text{ and } (TP \text{ and } TN > 10^{-6}) \quad 4:5.1.3$$

$$chla = \frac{0.5 \cdot 10^{0.5}}{v_{surf}} \quad \text{if } v_{surf} > 10^{-5} \text{ m}^3/\text{s}, TP < 10^{-6} \text{ and } TN > 10^{-6} \quad 4:5.1.4$$

## 4:5.2 CARBONACEOUS BIOLOGICAL OXYGEN DEMAND

---

Carbonaceous biological oxygen demand (CBOD) defines the amount of oxygen required to decompose the organic matter transported in surface runoff. The SWAT loading function for CBOD is based on a relationship given by Thomann and Mueller (1987):

$$cbod_{surq} = \frac{2.7 \cdot orgC_{surq}}{Q_{surf} \cdot area_{hru}} \quad 4:5.2.1$$

where  $cbod_{surq}$  is the CBOD concentration in surface runoff (mg CBOD/L),  $orgC_{surq}$  is the organic carbon in surface runoff (kg orgC),  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $area_{hru}$  is the area of the HRU (km<sup>2</sup>).

The amount of organic carbon in surface runoff is calculated:

$$orgC_{surq} = 1000 \cdot \frac{orgC_{surf}}{100} \cdot sed \cdot \varepsilon_{C:sed} \quad 4:5.2.2$$

where  $orgC_{surq}$  is the organic carbon in surface runoff (kg orgC),  $orgC_{surf}$  is the percent organic carbon in the top 10 mm of soil (%),  $sed$  is the sediment loading from the HRU (metric tons), and  $\varepsilon_{C:sed}$  is the carbon enrichment ratio.

#### **4:5.2.1 ENRICHMENT RATIO**

As runoff flows over the soil surface, part of the water's energy is used to pick up and transport soil particles. The smaller particles weigh less and are more easily transported than coarser particles. When the particle size distribution of the transported sediment is compared to that of the soil surface layer, the sediment load to the main channel has a greater proportion of clay sized particles. In other words, the sediment load is enriched in clay particles. Organic carbon in the soil is attached primarily to colloidal (clay) particles, so the sediment load will also contain a greater proportion or concentration of organic carbon than that found in the soil surface layer.

The enrichment ratio is defined as the ratio of the concentration of organic carbon transported with the sediment to the concentration in the soil surface layer. SWAT will calculate an enrichment ratio for each storm event. To calculate the enrichment ratio, SWAT uses a relationship described by Menzel (1980) in which the enrichment ratio is logarithmically related to sediment concentration. The equation used to calculate the carbon enrichment ratio,  $\varepsilon_{C:sed}$ , for each storm event is:

$$\varepsilon_{C:sed} = 0.78 \cdot (conc_{sed,surq})^{-0.2468} \quad 4:5.2.3$$

where  $conc_{sed,surq}$  is the concentration of sediment in surface runoff (Mg sed/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O). The concentration of sediment in surface runoff is calculated:

$$conc_{sed,surq} = \frac{sed}{10 \cdot area_{hru} \cdot Q_{surf}} \quad 4:5.2.4$$

where  $sed$  is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha), and  $Q_{surf}$  is the amount of surface runoff on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Table 4:5-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to CBOD in surface runoff.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SOL_CBN	$orgC_{ly}$ : Percent organic carbon in the top 10 mm of soil (%)	.sol

## 4:5.3 DISSOLVED OXYGEN

Rainfall is assumed to be saturated with oxygen. To determine the dissolved oxygen concentration of surface runoff, the oxygen uptake by the oxygen demanding substance in runoff is subtracted from the saturation oxygen concentration.

$$Ox_{surf} = Ox_{sat} - \kappa_1 \cdot cbod_{surq} \cdot \frac{t_{ov}}{24} \quad 4:5.3.1$$

where  $Ox_{surf}$  is the dissolved oxygen concentration in surface runoff (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L),  $Ox_{sat}$  is the saturation oxygen concentration (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L),  $\kappa_1$  is the CBOD deoxygenation rate (day<sup>-1</sup>),  $cbod_{surq}$  is the CBOD concentration in surface runoff (mg CBOD/L), and  $t_{ov}$  is the time of concentration for overland flow (hr). For loadings from HRUs, SWAT assumes  $\kappa_1 = 1.047$  day<sup>-1</sup>.

### 4:5.3.1 OXYGEN SATURATION CONCENTRATION

The amount of oxygen that can be dissolved in water is a function of temperature, concentration of dissolved solids, and atmospheric pressure. An equation developed by APHA (1985) is used to calculate the saturation concentration of dissolved oxygen:

$$Ox_{sat} = \exp \left[ -139.34410 + \frac{1.575701 \times 10^5}{T_{wat,K}} - \frac{6.642308 \times 10^7}{(T_{wat,K})^2} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1.243800 \times 10^{10}}{(T_{wat,K})^3} - \frac{8.621949 \times 10^{11}}{(T_{wat,K})^4} \right] \quad 4:5.3.2$$

where  $Ox_{sat}$  is the equilibrium saturation oxygen concentration at 1.00 atm (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L), and  $T_{wat,K}$  is the water temperature in Kelvin (273.15+°C).

## 4:5.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$AGP$	Algal growth potential (mg/L)
$Ox_{sat}$	Saturation oxygen concentration (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$Ox_{surf}$	Dissolved oxygen concentration in surface runoff (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$Q_{surf}$	Surface runoff on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$T_{wat,K}$	Water temperature in Kelvin (273.15+°C)
$TN$	Total Kjeldahl nitrogen load (moles)
$TP$	Total phosphorus load (moles)
$area_{hru}$	Area of the HRU (km <sup>2</sup> )
$cbod_{surq}$	CBOD concentration in surface runoff (mg CBOD/L)
$chl_a$	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration in the surface runoff (µg/L)
$conc_{sed,surq}$	Concentration of sediment in surface runoff (Mg sed/m <sup>3</sup> H <sub>2</sub> O)
$f$	Coefficient
$g$	Exponent
$orgC_{surf}$	Percent organic carbon in the top 10 mm of soil (%)
$orgC_{surq}$	Organic carbon in surface runoff (kg orgC),
$sed$	Sediment loading from the HRU (metric tons)
$t_{ov}$	Time of concentration for overland flow (hr)
$v_{surf}$	Surface runoff flow rate (m <sup>3</sup> /s)
$\varepsilon_{C:sed}$	Carbon enrichment ratio
$\kappa_1$	CBOD deoxygenation rate (day <sup>-1</sup> )

## 4:5.5 REFERENCES

---

- American Public Health Association. 1985. Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater, 16<sup>th</sup> edition. American Public Health Association, Inc.
- Cluis, D., P. Couture, R. Bégin, and S.A. Visser. 1988. Potential eutrophication assessment in rivers; relationship between produced and exported loads. Schweiz. Z. Hydrol. 50:166-181.
- Menzel, R.G. 1980. Enrichment ratios for water quality modeling. p. 486-492. In W.G. Knisel (ed.) CREAMS, A field scale model for chemicals, runoff, and erosion from agricultural management systems. U.S. Dept. Agric. Conserv. Res. Rept. No. 26.
- Thomann, R.V. and J.A. Mueller. 1987. Principles of surface water quality modeling and control. Harper & Row Publishers, New York.



# LAND COVER & PLANT



The plant growth component of SWAT is a simplified version of the EPIC plant growth model. As in EPIC, phenological plant development is based on daily accumulated heat units, potential biomass is based on a method developed by Monteith, a harvest index is used to calculate yield, and plant growth can be inhibited by temperature, water, nitrogen or phosphorus stress. Portions of the EPIC plant growth model that were not incorporated into SWAT include detailed root growth, micronutrient cycling and toxicity responses, and the simultaneous growth of multiple plant species in the same HRU.

---

---

## **SECTION 5 CHAPTER 1**

# **EQUATIONS: GROWTH CYCLE**

---

The growth cycle of a plant is controlled by plant attributes summarized in the plant growth database and by the timing of operations listed in the management file. This chapter reviews the heat unit theory used to regulate the growth cycle of plants. Chapter 6:1 focuses on the impact of user inputs in management operations on the growth and development of plants.

## 5:1.1 HEAT UNITS

---

Temperature is one of the most important factors governing plant growth. Each plant has its own temperature range, i.e. its minimum, optimum, and maximum for growth. For any plant, a minimum or base temperature must be reached before any growth will take place. Above the base temperature, the higher the temperature the more rapid the growth rate of the plant. Once the optimum temperature is exceeded the growth rate will begin to slow until a maximum temperature is reached at which growth ceases.

In the 1920s and 1930s, canning factories were searching for ways to time the planting of sweet peas so that there would be a steady flow of peas at the peak of perfection to the factory. Crops planted at weekly intervals in the early spring would sometimes come to maturity with only a 1- or 2-day differential while at other times there was a 6- to 8-day differential (Boswell, 1926; 1929). A heat unit theory was suggested (Boswell, 1926; Magoon and Culpepper, 1932) that was revised and successfully applied (Barnard, 1948; Phillips, 1950) by canning companies to determine when plantings should be made to ensure a steady harvest of peas with no “bunching” or “breaks”.

The heat unit theory postulates that plants have heat requirements that can be quantified and linked to time to maturity. Because a plant will not grow when the mean temperature falls below its base temperature, the only portion of the mean daily temperature that contributes towards the plant's development is the amount that exceeds the base temperature. To measure the total heat requirements of a plant, the accumulation of daily mean air temperatures above the plant's base temperature is recorded over the period of the plant's growth and expressed in terms of heat units. For example, assume sweet peas are growing with a base temperature of 5°C. If the mean temperature on a given day is 20°C, the heat units accumulated on that day are  $20 - 5 = 15$  heat units. Knowing the planting date, maturity date, base temperature and mean daily temperatures, the total number of heat units required to bring a crop to maturity can be calculated.

The heat index used by SWAT is a direct summation index. Each degree of the daily mean temperature above the base temperature is one heat unit. This method assumes that the rate of growth is directly proportional to the increase in temperature. It is important to keep in mind that the heat unit theory without a high temperature cutoff does not account for the impact of harmful high temperatures. SWAT assumes that all heat above the base temperature accelerates crop growth and development.




Figure 5:1-1: Mean daily temperature recorded for Greenfield, Indiana

The mean daily temperature during 1992 for Greenfield, Indiana is plotted in Figure 5:1-1 along with the base temperature for corn (8°C). Crop growth will only occur on those days where the mean daily temperature exceeds the base temperature. The heat unit accumulation for a given day is calculated with the equation:

$$HU = \bar{T}_{av} - T_{base} \quad \text{when } \bar{T}_{av} > T_{base} \quad 5:1.1.1$$

where  $HU$  is the number of heat units accumulated on a given day (heat units),  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean daily temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $T_{base}$  is the plant's base or minimum

temperature for growth ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The total number of heat units required for a plant to reach maturity is calculated:

$$PHU = \sum_{d=1}^m HU \quad 5:1.1.2$$

where  $PHU$  is the total heat units required for plant maturity (heat units),  $HU$  is the number of heat units accumulated on day  $d$  where  $d = 1$  on the day of planting and  $m$  is the number of days required for a plant to reach maturity.  $PHU$  is also referred to as potential heat units.

When calculating the potential heat units for a plant, the number of days to reach maturity must be known. For most crops, these numbers have been quantified and are easily accessible. For other plants, such as forest or range, the time that the plants begin to develop buds should be used as the beginning of the growing season and the time that the plant seeds reach maturation is the end of the growing season. For the Greenfield Indiana example, a 120 day corn hybrid was planted on May 15. Summing daily heat unit values, the total heat units required to bring the corn to maturity was 1456.

### **5:1.1.1 HEAT UNIT SCHEDULING**

As the heat unit theory was proven to be a reliable predictor of harvest dates for all types of crops, it was adapted by researchers for prediction of the timing of other plant development stages such as flowering (Cross and Zuber, 1972). The successful adaptation of heat units to predict the timing of plant stages has subsequently led to the use of heat units to schedule management operations.

SWAT allows management operations to be scheduled by day or by fraction of potential heat units. For each operation the model checks to see if a month and day has been specified for timing of the operation. If this information is provided, SWAT will perform the operation on that month and day. If the month and day are not specified, the model requires a fraction of potential heat units to be specified. As a general rule, if exact dates are available for scheduling operations, these dates should be used.

Scheduling by heat units allows the model to time operations as a function of temperature. This method of timing is useful for several situations. When very

large watersheds are being simulated where the climate in one portion of the watershed is different enough from the climate in another section of the watershed to affect timing of operations, heat unit scheduling may be beneficial. By using heat unit scheduling, only one generic management file has to be made for a given land use. This generic set of operations can then be used wherever the land use is found in the watershed. Also, in areas where the climate can vary greatly from year to year, heat unit scheduling will allow the model to adjust the timing of operations to the weather conditions for each year.

While scheduling by heat units is convenient, there are some negatives to using this type of scheduling that users need to take into consideration. In the real world, applications of fertilizer or pesticide are generally not scheduled on a rainy day. However when applications are scheduled by heat units, the user has no knowledge of whether or not the heat unit fraction that triggers the application will occur on a day with rainfall or not. If they do coincide, there will be a significant amount of the applied material transported with surface runoff (assuming runoff is generated on that day), much higher than if the application took place even one day prior to the rainfall event.

To schedule by heat units, the timing of the operations are expressed as fractions of the potential heat units for the plant or fraction of maturity. Let us use the following example for corn in Indiana.

Date	Operation	Heat Units Accumulated	Fraction of PHU
April 24	Tandem disk		
April 30	Tandem disk		
May 7	Field cultivator		
May 15	Plant corn (PHU = 1456)	0	.00
June 3	Row cultivator	165	.11
June 17	Row cultivator	343	.24
October 15	Harvest & Kill	1686	1.16
October 29	Tandem disk		
November 5	Chisel		

The number of heat units accumulated for the different operation timings is calculated by summing the heat units for every day starting with the planting date (May 15) and ending with the day the operation takes place. To calculate the

fraction of *PHU* at which the operation takes place, the heat units accumulated is divided by the *PHU* for the crop (1456).

Note that the fraction of *PHU* for the harvest operation is 1.16. The fraction is greater than 1.0 because corn is allowed to dry down prior to harvesting. The model will simulate plant growth until the crop reaches maturity (where maturity is defined as *PHU* = 1456). From that point on, plants will not transpire or take up nutrients and water. They will stand in the HRU until converted to residue or harvested.

While the operations after planting have been scheduled by fraction of *PHU*, operations—including planting—which occur during periods when no crop is growing must still be scheduled. To schedule these operations, SWAT keeps track of a second heat index where heat units are summed over the entire year using  $T_{base} = 0^{\circ}\text{C}$ . This heat index is solely a function of the climate and is termed the base zero heat index. For the base zero index, the heat units accumulated on a given day are:

$$HU_0 = \bar{T}_{av} \quad \text{when } \bar{T}_{av} > 0^{\circ}\text{C} \quad 5:1.1.3$$

where  $HU_0$  is the number of base zero heat units accumulated on a given day (heat units), and  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean daily temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The total number of heat units for the year is calculated:

$$PHU_0 = \sum_{d=1}^{365} HU_0 \quad 5:1.1.4$$

where  $PHU_0$  is the total base zero heat units (heat units),  $HU_0$  is the number of base zero heat units accumulated on day  $d$  where  $d = 1$  on January 1 and 365 on December 31. Unlike the plant *PHU* which must be provided by the user,  $PHU_0$  is the average calculated by SWAT using long-term weather data provided in the .wgn file.

For the example watershed in Indiana,  $PHU_0 = 4050$ . The heat unit fractions for the remaining operations are calculated using this value for potential heat units.

Date	Operation	Base Zero Heat Units Accumulated	Plant Heat Units Accumulated	Fraction of $PHU_0$ ( $PHU_0 = 4050$ )	Fraction of $PHU$ ( $PHU = 1456$ )
April 24	Tandem disk	564		.14	
April 30	Tandem disk	607		.15	
May 7	Field cultivator	696		.17	
May 15	Plant corn ( $PHU = 1456$ )	826	0	.20	
June 3	Row cultivator	1136	165		.11
June 17	Row cultivator	1217	343		.24
October 15	Harvest & Kill	3728	1686		1.16
October 29	Tandem disk	3860		.95	
November 5	Chisel	3920		.97	

As stated previously, SWAT always keeps track of base zero heat units. The base zero heat unit scheduling is used any time there are no plants growing in the HRU (before and including the plant operation and after the kill operation). Once plant growth is initiated, the model switches to plant heat unit scheduling until the plant is killed.

The following heat unit fractions have been found to provide reasonable timings for the specified operations:

0.15	planting	fraction of $PHU_0$
1.0	harvest/kill for crops with no dry-down	fraction of $PHU$
1.2	harvest/kill for crops with dry-down	fraction of $PHU$
0.6	hay cutting operation	fraction of $PHU$

Table 5:1-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to heat units.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
PHU	$PHU$ : potential heat units for plant that is growing at the beginning of the simulation in an HRU	.mgt
HEAT UNITS	$PHU$ : potential heat units for plant whose growth is initiated with a planting operation.	.mgt
HUSC	Fraction of potential heat units at which operation takes place.	.mgt
T_BASE	$T_{base}$ : Minimum temperature for plant growth ( $^{\circ}C$ )	crop.dat

## 5:1.2 DORMANCY

SWAT assumes trees, perennials and cool season annuals can go dormant as the daylength nears the shortest or minimum daylength for the year. During dormancy, plants do not grow.

The beginning and end of dormancy are defined by a threshold daylength. The threshold daylength is calculated:

$$T_{DL,thr} = T_{DL,mn} + t_{dorm}$$

5:1.2.1

where  $T_{DL,thr}$  is the threshold daylength to initiate dormancy (hrs),  $T_{DL,mn}$  is the minimum daylength for the watershed during the year (hrs), and  $t_{dorm}$  is the dormancy threshold (hrs). When the daylength becomes shorter than  $T_{DL,thr}$  in the fall, plants other than warm season annuals that are growing in the watershed will enter dormancy. The plants come out of dormancy once the daylength exceeds  $T_{DL,thr}$  in the spring.

The dormancy threshold,  $t_{dorm}$ , varies with latitude.

$$t_{dorm} = 1.0 \quad \text{if } \phi > 40^\circ \text{ N or S} \quad 5:1.2.2$$

$$t_{dorm} = \frac{\phi - 20}{20} \quad \text{if } 20^\circ \text{ N or S} \leq \phi \leq 40^\circ \text{ N or S} \quad 5:1.2.3$$

$$t_{dorm} = 0.0 \quad \text{if } \phi < 20^\circ \text{ N or S} \quad 5:1.2.4$$

where  $t_{dorm}$  is the dormancy threshold used to compare actual daylength to minimum daylength (hrs) and  $\phi$  is the latitude expressed as a positive value (degrees).

At the beginning of the dormant period for trees, a fraction of the biomass is converted to residue and the leaf area index for the tree species is set to the minimum value allowed (both the fraction of the biomass converted to residue and the minimum LAI are defined in the plant growth database). At the beginning of the dormant period for perennials, 10% of the biomass is converted to residue and the leaf area index for the species is set to the minimum value allowed. For cool season annuals, none of the biomass is converted to residue.

Table 5:1-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to dormancy.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
SUB_LAT	$\phi$ : Latitude of the subbasin (degrees).	.sub
IDC	Land cover/plant classification: 1 warm season annual legume 2 cold season annual legume 3 perennial legume 4 warm season annual 5 cold season annual 6 perennial 7 trees	crop.dat
ALAI_MIN	Minimum leaf area index for plant during dormant period ( $m^2/m^2$ )	crop.dat
BIO_LEAF	Fraction of tree biomass accumulated each year that is converted to residue during dormancy	crop.dat

## 5:1.3 PLANT TYPES

---

SWAT categorizes plants into seven different types: warm season annual legume, cold season annual legume, perennial legume, warm season annual, cold season annual, perennial and trees. The differences between the different plant types, as modeled by SWAT, are as follows:

- 1 warm season annual legume:
  - simulate nitrogen fixation
  - root depth varies during growing season due to root growth
- 2 cold season annual legume:
  - simulate nitrogen fixation
  - root depth varies during growing season due to root growth
  - fall-planted land covers will go dormant when daylength is less than the threshold daylength
- 3 perennial legume:
  - simulate nitrogen fixation
  - root depth always equal to the maximum allowed for the plant species and soil
  - plant goes dormant when daylength is less than the threshold daylength
- 4 warm season annual:
  - root depth varies during growing season due to root growth
- 5 cold season annual:
  - root depth varies during growing season due to root growth
  - fall-planted land covers will go dormant when daylength is less than the threshold daylength
- 6 perennial:
  - root depth always equal to the maximum allowed for the plant species and soil
  - plant goes dormant when daylength is less than the threshold daylength
- 7 trees:
  - root depth always equal to the maximum allowed for the plant species and soil
  - partitions new growth between leaves/needles and woody growth
  - growth in a given year will vary depending on the age of the tree relative to the number of years required for the tree to full development/maturity
  - plant goes dormant when daylength is less than the threshold daylength

Table 5:1-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to plant type.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
IDC	Land cover/plant classification:	
1	warm season annual legume	
2	cold season annual legume	
3	perennial legume	
4	warm season annual	
5	cold season annual	
6	perennial	
7	trees	

## 5:1.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

- $HU$  Number of heat units accumulated on a given day where base temperature is dependant on the plant species (heat units)  
 $HU_0$  Number of base zero heat units accumulated on a given day (heat units)  
 $PHU$  Potential heat units or total heat units required for plant maturity where base temperature is dependant on the plant species (heat units)  
 $PHU_0$  Total base zero heat units or potential base zero heat units (heat units)  
 $T_{base}$  Plant's base or minimum temperature for growth ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )  
 $T_{DL,mn}$  Minimum daylength for the watershed during the year (hrs)  
 $T_{DL,thr}$  Threshold daylength to initiate dormancy (hrs)  
 $\bar{T}_{av}$  Mean air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )  
  
 $t_{dorm}$  Dormancy threshold (hrs)  
  
 $\phi$  Latitude expressed as a positive value (degrees)

## 5:1.5 REFERENCES

---

- Barnard, J.D. 1948. Heat units as a measure of canning crop maturity. *The Canner* 106:28.
- Boswell, V.G. 1929. Factors influencing yield and quality of peas—Biophysical and biochemical studies. *Maryland Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul.* 306.
- Boswell, V.G. 1926. The influence of temperature upon the growth and yield of garden peas. *Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.* 23:162-168.
- Cross, H.Z. and M.S. Zuber. 1972. Prediction of flowering dates in maize based on different methods of estimating thermal units. *Agronomy Journal* 64:351-355.
- Magoon, C.A. and C.W. Culpepper. 1932. Response of sweet corn to varying temperatures from time of planting to canning maturity. *U.S.D.A. tech. Bull.* 312.
- Phillips, E.E. 1950. Heat summation theory as applied to canning crops. *The Canner* 27:13-15.



## SECTION 5 CHAPTER 2

# EQUATIONS: OPTIMAL GROWTH

---

For each day of simulation, potential plant growth, i.e. plant growth under ideal growing conditions, is calculated. Ideal growing conditions consist of adequate water and nutrient supply and a favorable climate. Differences in growth between plant species are defined by the parameters contained in the plant growth database.

## 5:2.1 POTENTIAL GROWTH

---

Plant growth is modeled by simulating leaf area development, light interception and conversion of intercepted light into biomass assuming a plant species-specific radiation-use efficiency.

### **5:2.1.1 BIOMASS PRODUCTION**

The amount of daily solar radiation intercepted by the leaf area of the plant is calculated using Beer's law (Monsi and Saeki, 1953):

$$H_{phosyn} = 0.5 \cdot H_{day} \cdot (1 - \exp(-k_\ell \cdot LAI)) \quad 5:2.1.1$$

where  $H_{phosyn}$  is the amount of intercepted photosynthetically active radiation on a given day ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ),  $H_{day}$  is the incident total solar ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ),  $0.5 \cdot H_{day}$  is the incident photosynthetically active radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ),  $k_\ell$  is the light extinction coefficient, and  $LAI$  is the leaf area index.

Photosynthetically active radiation is radiation with a wavelength between 400 and 700 nm (McCree, 1972). Direct solar beam radiation contains roughly 45% photosynthetically active radiation while diffuse radiation contains around 60% photosynthetically active radiation (Monteith, 1972; Ross, 1975). The fraction of photosynthetically active radiation will vary from day to day with variation in overcast conditions but studies in Europe and Israel indicate that 50% is a representative mean value (Monteith, 1972; Szeicz, 1974; Stanhill and Fuchs, 1977).

Radiation-use efficiency is the amount of dry biomass produced per unit intercepted solar radiation. The radiation-use efficiency is defined in the plant growth database and is assumed to be independent of the plant's growth stage. The maximum increase in biomass on a given day that will result from the intercepted photosynthetically active radiation is estimated (Monteith, 1977):

$$\Delta bio = RUE \cdot H_{phosyn} \quad 5:2.1.2$$

where  $\Delta bio$  is the potential increase in total plant biomass on a given day ( $\text{kg/ha}$ ),  $RUE$  is the radiation-use efficiency of the plant ( $\text{kg/ha} \cdot (\text{MJ/m}^2)^{-1}$  or  $10^{-1} \text{ g/MJ}$ ), and

$H_{phosyn}$  is the amount of intercepted photosynthetically active radiation on a given day ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ ). Equation 5:2.1.2 assumes that the photosynthetic rate of a canopy is a linear function of radiant energy.

The total biomass on a given day,  $d$ , is calculated as:

$$bio = \sum_{i=1}^d \Delta bio_i \quad 5:2.1.3$$

where  $bio$  is the total plant biomass on a given day ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), and  $\Delta bio_i$  is the increase in total plant biomass on day  $i$  ( $\text{kg/ha}$ ).

### 5:2.1.1.1 IMPACT OF CLIMATE ON RADIATION-USE EFFICIENCY

Radiation-use efficiency is sensitive to variations in atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations and equations have been incorporated into SWAT to modify the default radiation-use efficiency values in the plant database for climate change studies. The relationship used to adjust the radiation-use efficiency for effects of elevated  $\text{CO}_2$  is (Stockle et al., 1992):

$$RUE = \frac{100 \cdot CO_2}{CO_2 + \exp(r_1 - r_2 \cdot CO_2)} \quad 5:2.1.4$$

where  $RUE$  is the radiation-use efficiency of the plant ( $\text{kg/ha} \cdot (\text{MJ/m}^2)^{-1}$  or  $10^{-1} \text{ g/MJ}$ ),  $CO_2$  is the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (ppmv), and  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are shape coefficients.

The shape coefficients are calculated by solving equation 5:2.1.4 using two known points ( $RUE_{amb}$ ,  $CO_{2amb}$ ) and ( $RUE_{hi}$ ,  $CO_{2hi}$ ):

$$r_1 = \ln \left| \frac{CO_{2amb}}{(0.01 \cdot RUE_{amb})} - CO_{2amb} \right| + r_2 \cdot CO_{2amb} \quad 5:2.1.5$$

$$r_2 = \frac{\left( \ln \left| \frac{CO_{2amb}}{(0.01 \cdot RUE_{amb})} - CO_{2amb} \right| - \ln \left| \frac{CO_{2hi}}{(0.01 \cdot RUE_{hi})} - CO_{2hi} \right| \right)}{CO_{2hi} - CO_{2amb}} \quad 5:2.1.6$$

where  $r_1$  is the first shape coefficient,  $r_2$  is the second shape coefficient,  $CO_{2amb}$  is the ambient atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration (ppmv),  $RUE_{amb}$  is the radiation-use efficiency of the plant at ambient atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration ( $\text{kg/ha} \cdot (\text{MJ/m}^2)^{-1}$  or  $10^{-1} \text{ g/MJ}$ ),  $CO_{2hi}$  is an elevated

atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (ppmv),  $RUE_{hi}$  is the radiation-use efficiency of the plant at the elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration,  $CO_{2hi}$ , (kg/ha·(MJ/m<sup>2</sup>)<sup>-1</sup> or 10<sup>-1</sup> g/MJ). Equation 5:2.1.4 was developed when the ambient atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration was 330 ppmv and is valid for carbon dioxide concentrations in the range 330-660 ppmv. Even though the ambient atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide is now higher than 330 ppmv, this value is still used in the calculation. If the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration used in the simulation is less than 330 ppmv, the model defines  $RUE = RUE_{amb}$ .

Stockle and Kiniry (1990) have shown that a plant's radiation-use efficiency is affected by vapor pressure deficit. For a plant, a threshold vapor pressure deficit is defined at which the plant's radiation-use efficiency begins to drop in response to the vapor pressure deficit. The adjusted radiation-use efficiency is calculated:

$$RUE = RUE_{vpd=1} - \Delta rue_{dcl} \cdot (vpd - vpd_{thr}) \quad \text{if } vpd > vpd_{thr} \quad 5:2.1.7$$

$$RUE = RUE_{vpd=1} \quad \text{if } vpd \leq vpd_{thr} \quad 5:2.1.8$$

where  $RUE$  is the radiation-use efficiency adjusted for vapor pressure deficit (kg/ha·(MJ/m<sup>2</sup>)<sup>-1</sup> or 10<sup>-1</sup> g/MJ),  $RUE_{vpd=1}$  is the radiation-use efficiency for the plant at a vapor pressure deficit of 1 kPa (kg/ha·(MJ/m<sup>2</sup>)<sup>-1</sup> or 10<sup>-1</sup> g/MJ),  $\Delta r ue_{dcl}$  is the rate of decline in radiation-use efficiency per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit (kg/ha·(MJ/m<sup>2</sup>)<sup>-1</sup>·kPa<sup>-1</sup> or (10<sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)·kPa<sup>-1</sup>),  $vpd$  is the vapor pressure deficit (kPa), and  $vpd_{thr}$  is the threshold vapor pressure deficit above which a plant will exhibit reduced radiation-use efficiency (kPa). The radiation-use efficiency value reported for the plant in the plant growth database,  $RUE_{amb}$ , or adjusted for elevated carbon dioxide levels (equation 5:2.1.4) is the value used for  $RUE_{vpd=1}$ . The threshold vapor pressure deficit for reduced radiation-use efficiency is assumed to be 1.0 kPa for all plants ( $vpd_{thr} = 1.0$ ).

The radiation-use efficiency is never allowed to fall below 27% of  $RUE_{amb}$ . This minimum value was based on field observations (Kiniry, personal communication, 2001).

### 5:2.1.1.2 MODIFICATION OF BIOMASS CALCULATION FOR TREES

With annuals and perennials, the plants are able to reach full maturity within a single calendar year. With trees, a number of years are needed for a plant to transition from a seedling to a sapling to a fully-developed tree. The parameters in the plant growth database related to radiation-use efficiency represent the annual growth for a fully-developed tree. The heat units to maturity input in the management file is also used to simulate growth within a single year, defining for trees and perennials the period within a year bounded by the development of buds at the beginning of the annual growing season and the maturation of plant seeds at the end of the growing season.

To simulate the smaller amount of biomass accumulation seen in seedlings/saplings, tree growth within a single year is limited to a fixed amount determined by the age of the tree relative to the number of years for the tree species to reach full development. Parameters in the plant growth database define the total number of years for trees to reach full development as well as the biomass of a fully-developed tree. Until the trees in an HRU reach full development, the amount of biomass they can accumulate in a single year is limited to:

$$bio_{annual} = 1000 \cdot \left( \frac{yr_{cur}}{yr_{fulldev}} \right) \cdot bio_{fulldev} \quad 5:2.1.9$$

where  $bio_{annual}$  is the amount of biomass a tree can accumulate in a single year (kg/ha),  $yr_{cur}$  is the current age of the tree (years),  $yr_{fulldev}$  is the number of years for the tree species to reach full development (years),  $bio_{fulldev}$  is the biomass of a fully developed tree stand for the specific tree species (metric tons/ha), and 1000 is a conversion factor.

Once the total growth in biomass in a year,  $\text{bio}_i$ , reaches the annual limit,  $\text{bio}_{fulldev}$ , no more growth occurs until the next year when a new annual limit is calculated. When a tree stand has reached its biomass limit in a year, the increase in plant biomass for a day,  $\Delta\text{bio}_i$ , is set to 0.

### **5:2.1.2 CANOPY COVER AND HEIGHT**

The change in canopy height and leaf area for annuals and perennials through the growing season as modeled by SWAT is illustrated using parameters for Alamo Switchgrass in Figures 5:2-1 and 5:2-2.




Figure 5:2-1: Seasonal change in annual/perennial plant canopy height during growing season.




Figure 5:2-2: Seasonal change in annual/perennial plant leaf area index during growing season.

In the initial period of plant growth, canopy height and leaf area development are controlled by the optimal leaf area development curve:

$$fr_{LAI_{mx}} = \frac{fr_{PHU}}{fr_{PHU} + \exp(\ell_1 - \ell_2 \cdot fr_{PHU})} \quad 5:2.1.10$$

where  $fr_{LAI_{mx}}$  is the fraction of the plant's maximum leaf area index corresponding to a given fraction of potential heat units for the plant,  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season, and  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  are shape coefficients. The fraction of potential heat units accumulated by a given date is calculated:

$$fr_{PHU} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d HU_i}{PHU} \quad 5:2.1.11$$

where  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on day  $d$  in the growing season,  $HU$  is the heat units accumulated on day  $i$  (heat units), and  $PHU$  is the total potential heat units for the plant (heat units).

The shape coefficients are calculated by solving equation 5:2.1.10 using two known points ( $fr_{LAI,1}, fr_{PHU,1}$ ) and ( $fr_{LAI,2}, fr_{PHU,2}$ ):

$$\ell_1 = \ln \left[ \frac{fr_{PHU,1}}{fr_{LAI,1}} - fr_{PHU,1} \right] + \ell_2 \cdot fr_{PHU,1} \quad 5:2.1.12$$

$$\ell_2 = \frac{\left( \ln \left[ \frac{fr_{PHU,1}}{fr_{LAI,1}} - fr_{PHU,1} \right] - \ln \left[ \frac{fr_{PHU,2}}{fr_{LAI,2}} - fr_{PHU,2} \right] \right)}{fr_{PHU,2} - fr_{PHU,1}} \quad 5:2.1.13$$

where  $\ell_1$  is the first shape coefficient,  $\ell_2$  is the second shape coefficient,  $fr_{PHU,1}$  is the fraction of the growing season (i.e. fraction of total potential heat units) corresponding to the 1<sup>st</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve,  $fr_{LAI,1}$  is the fraction of the maximum plant leaf area index (i.e. fraction of  $LAI_{mx}$ ) corresponding to the 1<sup>st</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve,  $fr_{PHU,2}$  is the fraction of the growing season corresponding to the 2<sup>nd</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve, and  $fr_{LAI,2}$  is the fraction of the maximum plant leaf area index corresponding to the 2<sup>nd</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve.

The canopy height on a given day is calculated:

$$h_c = h_{c,mx} \cdot \sqrt{fr_{LAI_{mx}}} \quad 5:2.1.14$$

where  $h_c$  is the canopy height for a given day (m),  $h_{c,mx}$  is the plant's maximum canopy height (m), and  $fr_{LAI_{mx}}$  is the fraction of the plant's maximum leaf area index corresponding to a given fraction of potential heat units for the plant. As can be seen from Figure 5:2-1, once the maximum canopy height is reached,  $h_c$  will remain constant until the plant is killed.

For tree stands, the canopy height varies from year to year rather than day to day:

$$h_c = h_{c,mx} \cdot \left( \frac{yr_{cur}}{yr_{fulldev}} \right) \quad 5:2.1.15$$

where  $h_c$  is the canopy height for a given day (m),  $h_{c,mx}$  is the plant's maximum canopy height (m),  $yr_{cur}$  is the age of the tree (years), and  $yr_{fulldev}$  is the number of years for the tree species to reach full development (years).

The amount of canopy cover is expressed as the leaf area index. For annuals and perennials, the leaf area added on day  $i$  is calculated:

$$\Delta LAI_i = (fr_{LAI_{mx,i}} - fr_{LAI_{mx,i-1}}) \cdot LAI_{mx} \cdot (1 - \exp(5 \cdot (LAI_{i-1} - LAI_{mx}))) \quad 5:2.1.16$$

while for trees, the leaf area added on day  $i$  is calculated:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta LAI_i = & (fr_{LAI_{mx,i}} - fr_{LAI_{mx,i-1}}) \cdot \left( \frac{yr_{cur}}{yr_{fulldev}} \right) \cdot LAI_{mx} \cdot \\ & \left( 1 - \exp \left( 5 \cdot \left( LAI_{i-1} - \left( \frac{yr_{cur}}{yr_{fulldev}} \right) \cdot LAI_{mx} \right) \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad 5:2.1.17$$

The total leaf area index is calculated:

$$LAI_i = LAI_{i-1} + \Delta LAI_i \quad 5:2.1.18$$

where  $\Delta LAI_i$  is the leaf area added on day  $i$ ,  $LAI_i$  and  $LAI_{i-1}$  are the leaf area indices for day  $i$  and  $i-1$  respectively,  $fr_{LAI_{mx,i}}$  and  $fr_{LAI_{mx,i-1}}$  are the fraction of the plant's maximum leaf area index calculated with equation 5:2.1.10 for day  $i$  and  $i-1$ ,  $LAI_{mx}$  is the maximum leaf area index for the plant,  $yr_{cur}$  is the age of the tree

(years), and  $yr_{fulldev}$  is the number of years for the tree species to reach full development (years).

Leaf area index is defined as the area of green leaf per unit area of land (Watson, 1947). As shown in Figure 5:2-2, once the maximum leaf area index is reached,  $LAI$  will remain constant until leaf senescence begins to exceed leaf growth. Once leaf senescence becomes the dominant growth process, the leaf area index for annuals and perrenials is calculated:

$$LAI = LAI_{mx} \cdot \frac{(1 - fr_{PHU})}{(1 - fr_{PHU,sen})} \quad fr_{PHU} > fr_{PHU,sen} \quad 5:2.1.19$$

while for trees, the calculation is

$$LAI = \left( \frac{yr_{cur}}{yr_{fulldev}} \right) \cdot LAI_{mx} \cdot \frac{(1 - fr_{PHU})}{(1 - fr_{PHU,sen})} \quad fr_{PHU} > fr_{PHU,sen} \quad 5:2.1.20$$

where  $LAI$  is the leaf area index for a given day,  $LAI_{mx}$  is the maximum leaf area index,  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season,  $fr_{PHU,sen}$  is the fraction of growing season ( $PHU$ ) at which senescence becomes the dominant growth process,  $yr_{cur}$  is the number of years of development the tree has accrued (years), and  $yr_{fulldev}$  is the number of years for the tree species to reach full development (years).

### **5:2.1.3 ROOT DEVELOPMENT**

The amount of total plant biomass partitioned to the root system is 30-50% in seedlings and decreases to 5-20% in mature plants (Jones, 1985). SWAT varies the fraction of total biomass in roots from 0.40 at emergence to 0.20 at maturity. The daily root biomass fraction is calculated with the equation:

$$fr_{root} = 0.40 - 0.20 \cdot fr_{PHU} \quad 5:2.1.21$$

where  $fr_{root}$  is the fraction of total biomass partitioned to roots on a given day in the growing season, and  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season.

Calculation of root depth varies according to plant type. SWAT assumes perennials and trees have roots down to the maximum rooting depth defined for the soil throughout the growing season:

$$z_{root} = z_{root,mx}$$

5:2.1.22

where  $z_{root}$  is the depth of root development in the soil on a given day (mm), and  $z_{root,mx}$  is the maximum depth for root development in the soil (mm). The simulated root depth for annuals varies linearly from 10.0 mm at the beginning of the growing season to the maximum rooting depth at  $fr_{PHU} = 0.40$  using the equation:

$$z_{root} = 2.5 \cdot fr_{PHU} \cdot z_{root,mx} \quad \text{if } fr_{PHU} \leq 0.40 \quad 5:2.1.23$$

$$z_{root} = z_{root,mx} \quad \text{if } fr_{PHU} > 0.40 \quad 5:2.1.24$$

where  $z_{root}$  is the depth of root development in the soil on a given day (mm),  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season, and  $z_{root,mx}$  is the maximum depth for root development in the soil (mm). The maximum rooting depth is defined by comparing the maximum potential rooting depth for the plant from the plant growth database (RDMX in crop.dat), and the maximum potential rooting depth for the soil from the soil input file (SOL\_ZMX in .sol—if no value is provided for this variable the model will set it to the deepest depth specified for the soil profile). The shallower of these two depths is the value used for  $z_{root,mx}$ .

### **5:2.1.4 MATURITY**

Plant maturity is reached when the fraction of potential heat units accumulated,  $fr_{PHU}$ , is equal to 1.00. Once maturity is reached, the plant ceases to transpire and take up water and nutrients. Simulated plant biomass remains stable until the plant is harvested or killed via a management operation.

Table 5:2-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to optimal plant growth.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
EXT_COEF	$k_\ell$ : Light extinction coefficient	crop.dat
BIO_E	$RUE_{amb}$ : Radiation use efficiency in ambient CO <sub>2</sub> ((kg/ha)/(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ))	crop.dat
CO2HI	$CO_{2hi}$ : Elevated CO <sub>2</sub> atmospheric concentration (ppmv)	crop.dat
BIOEHI	$RUE_{hi}$ : Radiation use efficiency at elevated CO <sub>2</sub> atmospheric concentration value for CO2HI ((kg/ha)/(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ))	crop.dat
MAT_YRS	$yr_{fulldev}$ : The number of years for the tree species to reach full development (years)	crop.dat
BMX_TREES	$bio_{fulldev}$ : The biomass of a fully developed tree stand for the specific tree species (metric tons/ha)	crop.dat
WAVP	$\Delta rue_{dcl}$ : Rate of decline in radiation-use efficiency per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> ·kPa <sup>-1</sup> or (10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)·kPa <sup>-1</sup> )	crop.dat
PHU	$PHU$ : potential heat units for plant growing at beginning of simulation (heat units)	.mgt
HEAT UNITS	$PHU$ : potential heat units for plant whose growth is initiated in a planting operation (heat units)	.mgt
FRGRW1	$fr_{PHU,1}$ : Fraction of the growing season corresponding to the 1 <sup>st</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve	crop.dat
LAIMX1	$fr_{LAI,1}$ : Fraction of the maximum plant leaf area index corresponding to the 1 <sup>st</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve	crop.dat
FRGRW2	$fr_{PHU,2}$ : Fraction of the growing season corresponding to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve	crop.dat
LAIMX2	$fr_{LAI,2}$ : Fraction of the maximum plant leaf area index corresponding to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve	crop.dat
CHTMX	$h_{c,mx}$ : Plant's potential maximum canopy height (m)	crop.dat
BLAI	$LAI_{mx}$ : Potential maximum leaf area index for the plant	crop.dat
DLAI	$fr_{PHU,sen}$ : Fraction of growing season at which senescence becomes the dominant growth process	crop.dat
SOL_ZMX	$z_{root,mx}$ : Maximum rooting depth in soil (mm)	.sol
RDMX	$z_{root,mx}$ : Maximum rooting depth for plant (mm)	crop.dat

## 5:2.2 WATER UPTAKE BY PLANTS

The potential water uptake from the soil surface to any depth in the root zone is estimated with the function:

$$w_{up,z} = \frac{E_t}{[1 - \exp(-\beta_w)]} \cdot \left[ 1 - \exp\left(-\beta_w \cdot \frac{z}{z_{root}}\right) \right] \quad 5:2.2.1$$

where  $w_{up,z}$  is the potential water uptake from the soil surface to a specified depth,  $z$ , on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_t$  is the maximum plant transpiration on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $\beta_w$  is the water-use distribution parameter,  $z$  is the depth from the soil surface (mm), and  $z_{root}$  is the depth of root development in the soil (mm). The potential water uptake from any soil layer can be calculated by solving equation

5:2.2.1 for the depth at the top and bottom of the soil layer and taking the difference.

$$w_{up,ly} = w_{up,zl} - w_{up,zu} \quad 5:2.2.2$$

where  $w_{up,ly}$  is the potential water uptake for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{up,zl}$  is the potential water uptake for the profile to the lower boundary of the soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $w_{up,zu}$  is the potential water uptake for the profile to the upper boundary of the soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Since root density is greatest near the soil surface and decreases with depth, the water uptake from the upper layers is assumed to be much greater than that in the lower layers. The water-use distribution parameter,  $\beta_w$ , is set to 10 in SWAT. With this value, 50% of the water uptake will occur in the upper 6% of the root zone. Figure 5:2-3 graphically displays the uptake of water at different depths in the root zone.




Figure 5:2-3: Depth distribution of water uptake

The amount of water uptake that occurs on a given day is a function of the amount of water required by the plant for transpiration,  $E_t$ , and the amount of water available in the soil,  $SW$ . Equations 5:2.2.1 and 5:2.2.2 calculate potential water uptake solely as a function of water demand for transpiration and the depth distribution defined in equation 5:2.2.1. SWAT modifies the initial potential water uptake from a given soil layer to reflect soil water availability in the following ways.

### **5:2.2.1 IMPACT OF LOW SOIL WATER CONTENT**

If upper layers in the soil profile do not contain enough water to meet the potential water uptake calculated with equation 5:2.2.2, users may allow lower layers to compensate. The equation used to calculate the adjusted potential water uptake is:

$$w'_{up,ly} = w_{up,ly} + w_{demand} \cdot epco \quad 5:2.2.3$$

where  $w'_{up,ly}$  is the adjusted potential water uptake for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{up,ly}$  is the potential water uptake for layer  $ly$  calculated with equation 5:2.2.2 (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{demand}$  is the water uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $epco$  is the plant uptake compensation factor. The plant uptake compensation factor can range from 0.01 to 1.00 and is set by the user. As  $epco$  approaches 1.0, the model allows more of the water uptake demand to be met by lower layers in the soil. As  $epco$  approaches 0.0, the model allows less variation from the depth distribution described by equation 5:2.2.1 to take place.

As the water content of the soil decreases, the water in the soil is held more and more tightly by the soil particles and it becomes increasingly difficult for the plant to extract water from the soil. To reflect the decrease in the efficiency of the plant in extracting water from dryer soils, the potential water uptake is modified using the following equations:

$$w''_{up,ly} = w'_{up,ly} \cdot \exp \left[ 5 \cdot \left( \frac{SW_{ly}}{(25 \cdot AWC_{ly})} - 1 \right) \right] \quad \text{when } SW_{ly} < (25 \cdot AWC_{ly}) \quad 5:2.2.4$$

$$w''_{up,ly} = w'_{up,ly} \quad \text{when } SW_{ly} \geq (25 \cdot AWC_{ly}) \quad 5:2.2.5$$

where  $w''_{up,ly}$  is the potential water uptake adjusted for initial soil water content (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w'_{up,ly}$  is the adjusted potential water uptake for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $SW_{ly}$  is the amount of water in the soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $AWC_{ly}$  is the available water capacity for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The available water capacity is calculated:

$$AWC_{ly} = FC_{ly} - WP_{ly} \quad 5:2.2.6$$

where  $AWC_{ly}$  is the available water capacity for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $FC_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $WP_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  at wilting point (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

### **5:2.2.2 ACTUAL WATER UPTAKE**

Once the potential water uptake has been modified for soil water conditions, the actual amount of water uptake from the soil layer is calculated:

$$w_{actualup,ly} = \min\left[w''_{up,ly}, (SW_{ly} - WP_{ly})\right] \quad 5:2.2.7$$

where  $w_{actualup,ly}$  is the actual water uptake for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $SW_{ly}$  is the amount of water in the soil layer on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $WP_{ly}$  is the water content of layer  $ly$  at wilting point (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The total water uptake for the day is calculated:

$$w_{actualup} = \sum_{ly=1}^n w_{actualup,ly} \quad 5:2.2.8$$

where  $w_{actualup}$  is the total plant water uptake for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $w_{actualup,ly}$  is the actual water uptake for layer  $ly$  (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $n$  is the number of layers in the soil profile. The total plant water uptake for the day calculated with equation 5:2.2.8 is also the actual amount of transpiration that occurs on the day.

$$E_{t,act} = w_{actualup} \quad 5:2.2.9$$

where  $E_{t,act}$  is the actual amount of transpiration on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $w_{actualup}$  is the total plant water uptake for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

Table 5:2-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to plant water uptake.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
EPCO	<i>epco</i> : Plant uptake compensation factor	.bsn, .hru

## 5:2.3 NUTRIENT UPTAKE BY PLANTS

---

SWAT monitors plant uptake of nitrogen and phosphorus.

### 5:2.3.1 NITROGEN UPTAKE

Plant nitrogen uptake is controlled by the plant nitrogen equation. The plant nitrogen equation calculates the fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass as a function of growth stage given optimal growing conditions.

$$fr_N = (fr_{N,1} - fr_{N,3}) \cdot \left[ 1 - \frac{fr_{PHU}}{fr_{PHU} + \exp(n_1 - n_2 \cdot fr_{PHU})} \right] + fr_{N,3} \quad 5:2.3.1$$

where  $fr_N$  is the fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass on a given day,  $fr_{N,1}$  is the normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at emergence,  $fr_{N,3}$  is the normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at maturity,  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season, and  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are shape coefficients.

The shape coefficients are calculated by solving equation 5:2.3.1 using two known points ( $fr_{N,2}, fr_{PHU,50\%}$ ) and ( $fr_{N,3}, fr_{PHU,100\%}$ ):

$$n_1 = \ln \left[ \frac{\frac{fr_{PHU,50\%}}{\left( 1 - \frac{(fr_{N,2} - fr_{N,3})}{(fr_{N,1} - fr_{N,3})} \right)} - fr_{PHU,50\%}}{+ n_2 \cdot fr_{PHU,50\%}} \right] \quad 5:2.3.2$$

$$n_2 = \frac{\left[ \ln \left[ \frac{\frac{fr_{PHU,50\%}}{\left( 1 - \frac{(fr_{N,2} - fr_{N,3})}{(fr_{N,1} - fr_{N,3})} \right)} - fr_{PHU,50\%}}{+ n_1 \cdot fr_{PHU,50\%}} \right] - \ln \left[ \frac{\frac{fr_{PHU,100\%}}{\left( 1 - \frac{(fr_{N,~3} - fr_{N,3})}{(fr_{N,1} - fr_{N,3})} \right)} - fr_{PHU,100\%}}{+ n_1 \cdot fr_{PHU,100\%}} \right] \right]}{fr_{PHU,100\%} - fr_{PHU,50\%}} \quad 5:2.3.3$$

where  $n_1$  is the first shape coefficient,  $n_2$  is the second shape coefficient,  $fr_{N,1}$  is the normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at emergence,  $fr_{N,2}$  is the normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at 50% maturity,  $fr_{N,3}$  is the normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at maturity,  $fr_{N,~3}$  is the normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass near maturity,  $fr_{PHU,50\%}$  is the fraction of

potential heat units accumulated for the plant at 50% maturity ( $fr_{PHU,50\%}=0.5$ ), and  $fr_{PHU,100\%}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant at maturity ( $fr_{PHU,100\%}=1.0$ ). The normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass near maturity ( $fr_{N,\sim 3}$ ) is used in equation 5:2.3.3 to ensure that the denominator term  $\left(1 - \frac{(fr_{N,\sim 3} - fr_{N,3})}{(fr_{N,1} - fr_{N,3})}\right)$  does not equal 1. The model assumes  $(fr_{N,\sim 3} - fr_{N,3})=0.00001$ .

To determine the mass of nitrogen that should be stored in the plant biomass on a given day, the nitrogen fraction is multiplied by the total plant biomass:

$$bio_{N,opt} = fr_N \cdot bio \quad 5:2.3.4$$

where  $bio_{N,opt}$  is the optimal mass of nitrogen stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg N/ha),  $fr_N$  is the optimal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass for the current growth stage, and  $bio$  is the total plant biomass on a given day (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Originally, SWAT calculated the plant nitrogen demand for a given day by taking the difference between the nitrogen content of the plant biomass expected for the plant's growth stage and the actual nitrogen content  $N_{up} = bio_{N,opt} - bio_N$ . This method was found to calculate an excessive nitrogen demand immediately after a cutting (i.e. harvest operation). The equation used to calculate plant nitrogen demand is now

$$N_{up} = \text{Min} \begin{cases} bio_{N,opt} - bio_N \\ 4 \cdot fr_{N,3} \cdot \Delta bio \end{cases} \quad 5:2.3.5$$

where  $N_{up}$  is the potential nitrogen uptake (kg N/ha),  $bio_{N,opt}$  is the optimal mass of nitrogen stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg N/ha),  $bio_N$  is the actual mass of nitrogen stored in plant material (kg N/ha),  $fr_{N,3}$  is the normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at maturity, and  $\Delta bio$  is the potential increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha).

The depth distribution of nitrogen uptake is calculated with the function:

$$N_{up,z} = \frac{N_{up}}{[1 - \exp(-\beta_n)]} \cdot \left[ 1 - \exp\left(-\beta_n \cdot \frac{z}{z_{root}}\right) \right] \quad 5:2.3.6$$

where  $N_{up,z}$  is the potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to depth  $z$  (kg N/ha),  $N_{up}$  is the potential nitrogen uptake (kg N/ha),  $\beta_n$  is the nitrogen uptake distribution parameter,  $z$  is the depth from the soil surface (mm), and  $z_{root}$  is the depth of root development in the soil (mm). Note that equation 5:2.3.6 is similar in form to the depth distribution for water uptake described by equation 5:2.2.1. The potential nitrogen uptake for a soil layer is calculated by solving equation 5:2.3.6 for the depth at the upper and lower boundaries of the soil layer and taking the difference.

$$N_{up,ly} = N_{up,zl} - N_{up,zu} \quad 5:2.3.7$$

where  $N_{up,ly}$  is the potential nitrogen uptake for layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha),  $N_{up,zl}$  is the potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to the lower boundary of the soil layer (kg N/ha), and  $N_{up,zu}$  is the potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to the upper boundary of the soil layer (kg N/ha).

Root density is greatest near the surface, and nitrogen uptake in the upper portion of the soil will be greater than in the lower portion. The depth distribution of nitrogen uptake is controlled by  $\beta_n$ , the nitrogen uptake distribution parameter, a variable users are allowed to adjust. Figure 5:2-4 illustrates nitrogen uptake as a function of depth for four different uptake distribution parameter values.

Nitrogen removed from the soil by plants is taken from the nitrate pool. The importance of the nitrogen uptake distribution parameter lies in its control over the maximum amount of nitrate removed from the upper layers. Because the top 10 mm of the soil profile interacts with surface runoff, the nitrogen uptake distribution parameter will influence the amount of nitrate available for transport in surface runoff. The model allows lower layers in the root zone to fully compensate for lack of nitrate in the upper layers, so there should not be significant changes in nitrogen stress with variation in the value used for  $\beta_n$ .

The actual amount if nitrogen removed from a soil layer is calculated:

$$N_{actualuply} = \min[N_{up,ly} + N_{demand}, NO3_{ly}] \quad 5:2.3.8$$

where  $N_{actualup,ly}$  is the actual nitrogen uptake for layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha),  $N_{up,ly}$  is the potential nitrogen uptake for layer  $ly$  (kg N/ha),  $N_{demand}$  is the nitrogen uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers (kg N/ha), and  $NO3_{ly}$  is the nitrate content of soil layer  $ly$  (kg NO<sub>3</sub>-N/ha).




Figure 5:2-4: Depth distribution of nitrogen uptake

### 5:2.3.1.1 NITROGEN FIXATION

If nitrate levels in the root zone are insufficient to meet the demand of a legume, SWAT allows the plant to obtain additional nitrogen through nitrogen fixation. Nitrogen fixation is calculated as a function of soil water, soil nitrate content and growth stage of the plant.

$$N_{fix} = N_{demand} \cdot f_{gr} \cdot \min(f_{sw}, f_{no3}, 1) \quad 5:2.3.9$$

where  $N_{fix}$  is the amount of nitrogen added to the plant biomass by fixation (kg N/ha),  $N_{demand}$  is the plant nitrogen demand not met by uptake from the soil (kg N/ha),  $f_{gr}$  is the growth stage factor (0.0-1.0),  $f_{sw}$  is the soil water

factor (0.0-1.0), and  $f_{no3}$  is the soil nitrate factor (0.0-1.0). The maximum amount of nitrogen that can be fixed by the plant on a given day is  $N_{demand}$ .

Growth stage exerts the greatest impact on the ability of the plant to fix nitrogen. The growth stage factor is calculated:

$$f_{gr} = 0 \quad \text{when } fr_{PHU} \leq 0.15 \quad 5:2.3.10$$

$$f_{gr} = 6.67 \cdot fr_{PHU} - 1 \quad \text{when } 0.15 < fr_{PHU} \leq 0.30 \quad 5:2.3.11$$

$$f_{gr} = 1 \quad \text{when } 0.30 < fr_{PHU} \leq 0.55 \quad 5:2.3.12$$

$$f_{gr} = 3.75 - 5 \cdot fr_{PHU} \quad \text{when } 0.55 < fr_{PHU} \leq 0.75 \quad 5:2.3.13$$

$$f_{gr} = 0 \quad \text{when } fr_{PHU} > 0.75 \quad 5:2.3.14$$

where  $f_{gr}$  is the growth stage factor and  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season. The growth stage factor is designed to reflect the buildup and decline of nitrogen fixing bacteria in the plant roots during the growing season.

The soil nitrate factor inhibits nitrogen fixation as the presence of nitrate in the soil goes up. The soil nitrate factor is calculated:

$$f_{no3} = 1 \quad \text{when } NO3 \leq 100 \quad 5:2.3.15$$

$$f_{no3} = 1.5 - 0.0005 \cdot NO3 \quad \text{when } 100 < NO3 \leq 300 \quad 5:2.3.16$$

$$f_{no3} = 0 \quad \text{when } NO3 > 300 \quad 5:2.3.17$$

where  $f_{no3}$  is the soil nitrate factor and  $NO3$  is the nitrate content of the soil profile (kg NO<sub>3</sub>-N/ha).

The soil water factor inhibits nitrogen fixation as the soil dries out. The soil water factor is calculated:

$$f_{sw} = \frac{SW}{.85 \cdot FC} \quad 5:2.3.18$$

where  $f_{sw}$  is the soil water factor,  $SW$  is the amount of water in soil profile (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $FC$  is the water content of soil profile at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

### **5:2.3.2 PHOSPHORUS UPTAKE**

Plant phosphorus uptake is controlled by the plant phosphorus equation. The plant phosphorus equation calculates the fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass as a function of growth stage given optimal growing conditions.

$$fr_P = (fr_{P,1} - fr_{P,3}) \cdot \left[ 1 - \frac{fr_{PHU}}{fr_{PHU} + \exp(p_1 - p_2 \cdot fr_{PHU})} \right] + fr_{P,3} \quad 5:2.3.19$$

where  $fr_P$  is the fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass on a given day,  $fr_{P,1}$  is the normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at emergence,  $fr_{P,3}$  is the normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at maturity,  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season, and  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are shape coefficients.

The shape coefficients are calculated by solving equation 5:2.3.19 using two known points  $(fr_{P,2}, fr_{PHU,50\%})$  and  $(fr_{P,3}, fr_{PHU,100\%})$ :

$$p_1 = \ln \left[ \frac{fr_{PHU,50\%}}{\left( 1 - \frac{(fr_{P,2} - fr_{P,3})}{(fr_{P,1} - fr_{P,3})} \right)} - fr_{PHU,50\%} \right] + p_2 \cdot fr_{PHU,50\%} \quad 5:2.3.20$$

$$p_2 = \frac{\left( \ln \left[ \frac{fr_{PHU,50\%}}{\left( 1 - \frac{(fr_{P,2} - fr_{P,3})}{(fr_{P,1} - fr_{P,3})} \right)} - fr_{PHU,50\%} \right] - \ln \left[ \frac{fr_{PHU,100\%}}{\left( 1 - \frac{(fr_{P,~3} - fr_{P,3})}{(fr_{P,1} - fr_{P,3})} \right)} - fr_{PHU,100\%} \right] \right)}{fr_{PHU,100\%} - fr_{PHU,50\%}} \quad 5:2.3.21$$

where  $p_1$  is the first shape coefficient,  $p_2$  is the second shape coefficient,  $fr_{P,1}$  is the normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at emergence,  $fr_{P,2}$  is the normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at 50% maturity,  $fr_{P,3}$  is the normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at maturity,  $fr_{P,~3}$  is the normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass near maturity,  $fr_{PHU,50\%}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant at 50% maturity ( $fr_{PHU,50\%}=0.5$ ), and  $fr_{PHU,100\%}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant at maturity ( $fr_{PHU,100\%}=1.0$ ). The normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass

near maturity ( $fr_{N,~3}$ ) is used in equation 5:2.3.21 to ensure that the denominator term  $\left(1 - \frac{(fr_{P,~3} - fr_{P,3})}{(fr_{P,1} - fr_{P,3})}\right)$  does not equal 1. The model assumes  $(fr_{P,~3} - fr_{P,3}) = 0.00001$ .

To determine the mass of phosphorus that should be stored in the plant biomass for the growth stage, the phosphorus fraction is multiplied by the total plant biomass:

$$bio_{P,opt} = fr_P \cdot bio \quad 5:2.3.22$$

where  $bio_{P,opt}$  is the optimal mass of phosphorus stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg P/ha),  $fr_P$  is the optimal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass for the current growth stage, and  $bio$  is the total plant biomass on a given day (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Originally, SWAT calculated the plant nutrient demand for a given day by taking the difference between the nutrient content of the plant biomass expected for the plant's growth stage and the actual nutrient content. This method was found to calculate an excessive nutrient demand immediately after a cutting (i.e. harvest operation). The plant phosphorus demand for a given day is calculated:

$$P_{up} = 1.5 \cdot \text{Min} \begin{cases} bio_{P,opt} - bio_P \\ 4 \cdot fr_{P,3} \cdot \Delta bio \end{cases} \quad 5:2.3.23$$

where  $P_{up}$  is the potential phosphorus uptake (kg P/ha),  $bio_{P,opt}$  is the optimal mass of phosphorus stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg P/ha), and  $bio_P$  is the actual mass of phosphorus stored in plant material (kg P/ha),  $fr_{P,3}$  is the normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at maturity, and  $\Delta bio$  is the potential increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha). The difference between the phosphorus content of the plant biomass expected for the plant's growth stage and the actual phosphorus content is multiplied by 1.5 to simulate luxury phosphorus uptake.

The depth distribution of phosphorus uptake is calculated with the function:

$$P_{up,z} = \frac{P_{up}}{\left[1 - \exp(-\beta_p)\right]} \cdot \left[1 - \exp\left(-\beta_p \cdot \frac{z}{z_{root}}\right)\right] \quad 5:2.3.24$$

where  $P_{up,z}$  is the potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to depth  $z$  (kg P/ha),  $P_{up}$  is the potential phosphorus uptake (kg P/ha),  $\beta_p$  is the phosphorus uptake distribution parameter,  $z$  is the depth from the soil surface (mm), and  $z_{root}$  is the depth of root development in the soil (mm). The potential phosphorus uptake for a soil layer is calculated by solving equation 5:2.3.24 for the depth at the upper and lower boundaries of the soil layer and taking the difference.

$$P_{up,ly} = P_{up,zl} - P_{up,zu} \quad 5:2.3.25$$

where  $P_{up,ly}$  is the potential phosphorus uptake for layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha),  $P_{up,zl}$  is the potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to the lower boundary of the soil layer (kg P/ha), and  $P_{up,zu}$  is the potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to the upper boundary of the soil layer (kg P/ha).

Root density is greatest near the surface, and phosphorus uptake in the upper portion of the soil will be greater than in the lower portion. The depth distribution of phosphorus uptake is controlled by  $\beta_p$ , the phosphorus uptake distribution parameter, a variable users are allowed to adjust. The illustration of nitrogen uptake as a function of depth for four different uptake distribution parameter values in Figure 5:2-4 is valid for phosphorus uptake as well.

Phosphorus removed from the soil by plants is taken from the solution phosphorus pool. The importance of the phosphorus uptake distribution parameter lies in its control over the maximum amount of solution P removed from the upper layers. Because the top 10 mm of the soil profile interacts with surface runoff, the phosphorus uptake distribution parameter will influence the amount of labile phosphorus available for transport in surface runoff. The model allows lower layers in the root zone to fully compensate for lack of solution P in the upper layers, so there should not be significant changes in phosphorus stress with variation in the value used for  $\beta_p$ .

The actual amount if phosphorus removed from a soil layer is calculated:

$$P_{actualuply} = \min[P_{up,ly} + P_{demand}, P_{solutionly}] \quad 5:2.3.26$$

where  $P_{actualup,ly}$  is the actual phosphorus uptake for layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha),  $P_{up,ly}$  is the potential phosphorus uptake for layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha),  $P_{demand}$  is the phosphorus uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers (kg P/ha), and  $P_{solution,ly}$  is the phosphorus content of the soil solution in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha).

Table 5:2-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to plant nutrient uptake.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
PLTNFR(1)	$fr_{N,1}$ : Normal fraction of N in the plant biomass at emergence	crop.dat
PLTNFR(2)	$fr_{N,2}$ : Normal fraction of N in the plant biomass at 50% maturity	crop.dat
PLTNFR(3)	$fr_{N,3}$ : Normal fraction of N in the plant biomass at maturity	crop.dat
N_UPDIS	$\beta_N$ : Nitrogen uptake distribution parameter	.bsn
PLTPFR(1)	$fr_{P,1}$ : Normal fraction of P in the plant biomass at emergence	crop.dat
PLTPFR(2)	$fr_{P,2}$ : Normal fraction of P in the plant biomass at 50% maturity	crop.dat
PLTPFR(3)	$fr_{P,3}$ : Normal fraction of P in the plant biomass at maturity	crop.dat
P_UPDIS	$\beta_P$ : Phosphorus uptake distribution parameter	.bsn

## 5:2.4 CROP YIELD

When a harvest or harvest/kill operation is performed, a portion of the plant biomass is removed from the HRU as yield. The nutrients and plant material contained in the yield are assumed to be lost from the system (i.e. the watershed) and will not be added to residue and organic nutrient pools in the soil with the remainder of the plant material. In contrast, a kill operation converts all biomass to residue.

The fraction of the above-ground plant dry biomass removed as dry economic yield is called the harvest index. For the majority of crops, the harvest index will be between 0.0 and 1.0. However, plants whose roots are harvested, such as sweet potatoes, may have a harvest index greater than 1.0.

The economic yield of most commercial crops is the reproductive portion of the plant. Decades of crop breeding have lead to cultivars and hybrids having maximized harvest indices. Often, the harvest index is relatively stable across a range of environmental conditions.

SWAT calculates harvest index each day of the plant's growing season using the relationship:

$$HI = HI_{opt} \cdot \frac{100 \cdot fr_{PHU}}{(100 \cdot fr_{PHU} + \exp[11.1 - 10 \cdot fr_{PHU}])} \quad 5:2.4.1$$

where  $HI$  is the potential harvest index for a given day,  $HI_{opt}$  is the potential harvest index for the plant at maturity given ideal growing conditions, and  $fr_{PHU}$  is the fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season. The variation of the optimal harvest index during the growing season is illustrated in Figure 5:2-5.

The crop yield is calculated as:

$$yld = bio_{ag} \cdot HI \quad \text{when } HI \leq 1.00 \quad 5:2.4.2$$

$$yld = bio \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{(1+HI)}\right) \quad \text{when } HI > 1.00 \quad 5:2.4.3$$

where  $yld$  is the crop yield (kg/ha),  $bio_{ag}$  is the aboveground biomass on the day of harvest ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ),  $HI$  is the harvest index on the day of harvest, and  $bio$  is the total plant biomass on the day of harvest ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ). The aboveground biomass is calculated:

$$bio_{ag} = (1 - fr_{root}) \cdot bio \quad 5:2.4.4$$

where  $fr_{root}$  is the fraction of total biomass in the roots the day of harvest, and  $bio$  is the total plant biomass on the day of harvest ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ).




Figure 5:2-5: Variation in optimal harvest index ( $HI_i/Hi_{opt}$ ) with fraction of growing season ( $fr_{PHU}$ )

The amount of nutrients removed in the yield are calculated:

$$yld_N = fr_{N,yld} \cdot yld \quad 5:2.4.5$$

$$yld_P = fr_{P,yld} \cdot yld \quad 5:2.4.6$$

where  $yld_N$  is the amount of nitrogen removed in the yield (kg N/ha),  $yld_P$  is the amount of phosphorus removed in the yield (kg P/ha),  $fr_{N,yld}$  is the fraction of nitrogen in the yield,  $fr_{P,yld}$  is the fraction of phosphorus in the yield, and  $yld$  is the crop yield (kg/ha).

If the harvest index override is used in the harvest only operation, the model assumes that a significant portion of the plant biomass is being removed in addition to the seed. Therefore, instead of using the nitrogen and phosphorus yield fractions from the plant growth database, the model uses the total biomass nitrogen and phosphorus fractions to determine the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus removed:

$$yld_N = fr_N \cdot yld \quad 5:2.4.7$$

$$yld_P = fr_P \cdot yld \quad 5:2.4.8$$

where  $yld_N$  is the amount of nitrogen removed in the yield (kg N/ha),  $yld_P$  is the amount of phosphorus removed in the yield (kg P/ha),  $fr_N$  is the fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass calculated with equation 5:2.3.1,  $fr_P$  is the fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass calculated with equation 5:2.3.19, and  $yld$  is the crop yield (kg/ha).

Table 5:2-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to crop yield.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
HVSTI	$HI_{opt}$ : Potential harvest index for the plant at maturity given ideal growing conditions	crop.dat
CNYLD	$fr_{N,yld}$ : Fraction of nitrogen in the yield	crop.dat
CPYLD	$fr_{P,yld}$ : Fraction of phosphorus in the yield	crop.dat

## 5:2.5 NOMENCLATURE

---

$AWC_{ly}$	Available water capacity for layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$CO_2$	Concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (ppmv)
$CO_{2amb}$	Ambient atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration (330 ppmv)
$CO_{2hi}$	Elevated atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration (ppmv)
$E_t$	Maximum transpiration rate (mm d <sup>-1</sup> )
$E_{t,act}$	Actual amount of transpiration on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$FC$	Water content of soil profile at field capacity (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)

$FC_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at field capacity (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$H_{day}$	Solar radiation reaching ground on current day of simulation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_{phosyn}$	Intercepted photosynthetically active radiation on a given day (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> )
$HI$	Potential harvest index for a given day
$HI_{opt}$	Potential harvest index for the plant at maturity given ideal growing conditions
$HU$	Number of heat units accumulated on a given day (heat units)
$LAI$	Leaf area index of the canopy
$LAI_{mx}$	Maximum leaf area index for the plant
$N_{actualup,ly}$	Actual nitrogen uptake for layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{demand}$	Nitrogen uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers (kg N/ha)
$N_{fix}$	Amount of nitrogen added to the plant biomass by fixation (kg N/ha)
$N_{up}$	Potential nitrogen uptake (kg N/ha)
$N_{up,ly}$	Potential nitrogen uptake for layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{up,z}$	Potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to depth $z$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{up,zl}$	Potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to the lower boundary of the soil layer (kg N/ha)
$N_{up,zu}$	Potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to the upper boundary of the soil layer (kg N/ha)
$NO3$	Nitrate content of the soil profile (kg NO <sub>3</sub> -N/ha)
$NO3_{ly}$	Nitrate content of soil layer $ly$ (kg NO <sub>3</sub> -N/ha)
$P_{actualup,ly}$	Actual phosphorus uptake for layer $ly$ (kg P/ha)
$P_{demand}$	Phosphorus uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers (kg P/ha)
$P_{up}$	Potential phosphorus uptake (kg P/ha)
$P_{up,ly}$	Potential phosphorus uptake for layer $ly$ (kg P/ha)
$P_{up,z}$	Potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to depth $z$ (kg P/ha)
$P_{up,zl}$	Potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to the lower boundary of the soil layer (kg P/ha)
$P_{up,zu}$	Potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to the upper boundary of the soil layer (kg P/ha)
$PHU$	Potential heat units or total heat units required for plant maturity (heat units)
$P_{solution,ly}$	Phosphorus content of soil solution in layer $ly$ (kg P/ha)
$RUE$	Radiation-use efficiency of the plant (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$RUE_{amb}$	Radiation-use efficiency of the plant at ambient atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$RUE_{hi}$	Radiation-use efficiency of the plant at the elevated atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration, $CO_{2hi}$ , (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$RUE_{vpd=1}$	Radiation-use efficiency for the plant at a vapor pressure deficit of 1 kPa (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$SAT$	Amount of water in the soil profile when completely saturated (mm H <sub>2</sub> O),
$SW$	Amount of water in soil profile (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SW_{ly}$	Soil water content of layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$WP_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at wilting point (mm H <sub>2</sub> O).
$bio$	Total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)
$bio_{ag}$	Aboveground biomass on the day of harvest (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
$bio_{annual}$	The amount of biomass a tree can accumulate in a single year (kg/ha)

$bio_{fulldev}$	The biomass of a fully developed tree for the specific tree species (metric tons/ha)
$bio_N$	Actual mass of nitrogen stored in plant material (kg N/ha)
$bio_{N,opt}$	Optimal mass of nitrogen stored in plant material for the growth stage (kg N/ha)
$bio_P$	Actual mass of phosphorus stored in plant material (kg P/ha)
$bio_{P,opt}$	Optimal mass of phosphorus stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg P/ha)
$epco$	Plant uptake compensation factor
$f_{gr}$	Growth stage factor in nitrogen fixation equation
$f_{no3}$	Soil nitrate factor in nitrogen fixation equation
$f_{sw}$	Soil water factor in nitrogen fixation equation
$fr_{LAI,1}$	Fraction of the maximum plant leaf area index corresponding to the 1 <sup>st</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve
$fr_{LAI,2}$	Fraction of the maximum plant leaf area index corresponding to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve
$fr_{LAImx}$	Fraction of the plant's maximum leaf area index corresponding to a given fraction of potential heat units for the plant
$fr_N$	Optimal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass for current growth stage
$fr_{N,1}$	Normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at emergence
$fr_{N,2}$	Normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at 50% maturity
$fr_{N,3}$	Normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at maturity
$fr_{N,\sim 3}$	Normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass near maturity
$fr_{N,yld}$	Fraction of nitrogen in the yield
$fr_P$	Fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass
$fr_{P,1}$	Normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at emergence
$fr_{P,2}$	Normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at 50% maturity
$fr_{P,3}$	Normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at maturity
$fr_{P,\sim 3}$	Normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass near maturity
$fr_{P,yld}$	Fraction of phosphorus in the yield
$fr_{PHU}$	Fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season
$fr_{PHU,1}$	Fraction of the growing season corresponding to the 1 <sup>st</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve
$fr_{PHU,2}$	Fraction of the growing season corresponding to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve
$fr_{PHU,50\%}$	Fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant at 50% maturity ( $fr_{PHU,50\%}=0.5$ )
$fr_{PHU,100\%}$	Fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant at maturity ( $fr_{PHU,100\%}=1.0$ )
$fr_{PHU,sen}$	Fraction of growing season at which senescence becomes the dominant growth process
$fr_{root}$	Fraction of total biomass in the roots on a given day in the growing season
$h_c$	Canopy height (cm)
$h_{c,mx}$	Plant's maximum canopy height (m)
$k_\ell$	Light extinction coefficient
$n_1$	First shape coefficient in plant nitrogen equation

$n_2$	Second shape coefficient in plant nitrogen equation
$p_1$	First shape coefficient in plant phosphorus equation
$p_2$	Second shape coefficient in plant phosphorus equation
$r_1$	First shape coefficient for radiation-use efficiency curve
$r_2$	Second shape coefficient for radiation-use efficiency curve
$vpd$	Vapor pressure deficit (kPa)
$vpd_{thr}$	Threshold vapor pressure deficit above which a plant will exhibit reduced radiation-use efficiency (kPa)
$w_{actualup}$	Total plant water uptake for the day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{actualup,ly}$	Actual water uptake for layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{demand}$	Water uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{up,ly}$	Potential water uptake for layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w'_{up,ly}$	Adjusted potential water uptake for layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w''_{up,ly}$	Potential water uptake when the soil water content is less than 25% of plant available water (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{up,z}$	Potential water uptake from the soil surface to a specified depth, $z$ , on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{up,zl}$	is the potential water uptake for the profile to the lower boundary of the soil layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{up,zu}$	is the potential water uptake for the profile to the upper boundary of the soil layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$yld$	Crop yield (kg/ha)
$yld_N$	Amount of nitrogen removed in the yield (kg N/ha)
$yld_P$	Amount of phosphorus removed in the yield (kg P/ha)
$yr_{cur}$	The number of years of development the tree has accrued (years)
$yr_{fulldev}$	The number of years for the tree species to reach full development (years)
$z$	Depth below soil surface (mm)
$z_{root}$	Depth of root development in the soil (mm)
$z_{root,mx}$	Maximum depth for root development in the soil (mm)
$\beta_n$	Nitrogen uptake distribution parameter
$\beta_p$	Phosphorus uptake distribution parameter
$\beta_w$	Water-use distribution parameter
$\Delta LAI_i$	Leaf area added on day $i$
$\Delta bio$	Potential increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)
$\Delta rue_{del}$	Rate of decline in radiation-use efficiency per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> ·kPa <sup>-1</sup> or (10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)·kPa <sup>-1</sup> )
$\ell_1$	First shape coefficient for optimal leaf area development curve
$\ell_2$	Second shape coefficient for optimal leaf area development curve

## 5:2.6 REFERENCES

---

- Jones, C.A. 1985. C-4 grasses and cereals. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.  
419 pp.
- McCree, K.J. 1972. The action spectrum, absorption and quantum yield of photosynthesis in crop plants. *Agric. Met.* 9:191-216.
- Monsi, M. and T. Saeki. 1953. Über den Lictfaktor in den Pflanzengesellschaften und sein Bedeutung fur die Stoffproduktion. *Japan J. Bot.* 14:22-52.
- Monteith, J.L. 1972. Solar radiation and productivity in tropical ecosystems. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 9:747-766.
- Monteith, J.L. 1977. Climate and the efficiency of crop production in Britian. *Phil. Trans. Res. Soc. London Ser. B* 281:277-329.
- Ross, J. 1975. Radiative transfer in plant communities. p. 13-55 *In* J.L. Monteith (ed.) *Vegetation and the atmosphere*, Vol. 1. Academic Press, London.
- Stanhill, G. and M. Fuchs. 1977. The relative flux density of photosynthetically active radiation. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 14:317-322.
- Stockle, C.O. and J.R. Kiniry. 1990. Variability in crop radiation-use efficiency associated with vapor-pressure deficit. *Field Crops Res.* 25:171-181.
- Stockle, C.O., J.R. Williams, N.J. Rosenburg, and C.A. Jones. 1992. A method for estimating the direct and climatic effects of rising atmospheric carbon dioxide on growth and yield of crops: Part 1—Modification of the EPIC model for climate change analysis. *Agricultural Systems* 38:225-238.
- Szeicz, G. 1974. Solar radiation for plant growth. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 11:617-636.
- Watson, D.J. 1947. Comparative physiological studies on the growth of field crops. 1. Variation in net assimilation rate and leaf area index between species and varieties and within and between years. *Ann. Bot. N.S.* 11:41-76.
- Williams, J. R., C.A. Jones, and P.T. Dyke. 1984. A modeling approach to determining the relationship between erosion and soil productivity. *Trans. ASAE* 27:129-144.



## **SECTION 5 CHAPTER 3**

# **EQUATIONS: ACTUAL GROWTH**

---

Actual growth varies from potential growth due to extreme temperatures, water deficiencies and nutrient deficiencies. This chapter reviews growth constraints as well as overrides that the user may implement to ignore growth constraints.

## 5:3.1 GROWTH CONSTRAINTS

---

Plant growth may be reduced due to extreme temperatures, and insufficient water, nitrogen or phosphorus. The amount of stress for each of these four parameters is calculated on a daily basis using the equations summarized in the following sections.

### 5:3.1.1 WATER STRESS

Water stress is 0.0 under optimal water conditions and approaches 1.0 as the soil water conditions vary from the optimal. Water stress is simulated by comparing actual and potential plant transpiration:

$$wstrs = 1 - \frac{E_{t,act}}{E_t} = 1 - \frac{w_{actualup}}{E_t} \quad 5:3.1.1$$

where  $wstrs$  is the water stress for a given day,  $E_t$  is the maximum plant transpiration on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $E_{t,act}$  is the actual amount of transpiration on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $w_{actualup}$  is the total plant water uptake for the day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). The calculation of maximum transpiration is reviewed in Chapter 2:2 and the determination of actual plant water uptake/transpiration is reviewed in Chapter 5:2.

### 5:3.1.2 TEMPERATURE STRESS

Temperature stress is a function of the daily average air temperature and the optimal temperature for plant growth. Near the optimal temperature the plant will not experience temperature stress. However as the air temperature diverges from the optimal the plant will begin to experience stress. The equations used to determine temperature stress are:

$$tstrs = 1 \quad \text{when } \bar{T}_{av} \leq T_{base} \quad 5:3.1.2$$

$$tstrs = 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-0.1054 \cdot (\bar{T}_{opt} - \bar{T}_{av})^2}{(\bar{T}_{av} - T_{base})^2} \right] \quad \text{when } T_{base} < \bar{T}_{av} \leq T_{opt} \quad 5:3.1.3$$

$$tstrs = 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-0.1054 \cdot (\bar{T}_{opt} - \bar{T}_{av})^2}{(2 \cdot T_{opt} - \bar{T}_{av} - T_{base})^2} \right] \quad \text{when } T_{opt} < \bar{T}_{av} \leq 2 \cdot T_{opt} - T_{base} \quad 5:3.1.4$$

$$tstrs = 1 \quad \text{when } \bar{T}_{av} > 2 \cdot T_{opt} - T_{base} \quad 5:3.1.5$$

where  $tstrs$  is the temperature stress for a given day expressed as a fraction of optimal plant growth,  $\bar{T}_{av}$  is the mean air temperature for day ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ),  $T_{base}$  is the plant's base or minimum temperature for growth ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and  $T_{opt}$  is the plant's optimal temperature for growth ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). Figure 5:3-1 illustrates the impact of mean daily air temperature on plant growth for a plant with a base temperature of  $0^{\circ}\text{C}$  and an optimal temperature of  $15^{\circ}\text{C}$ .




Figure 5:3-1: Impact of mean air temperature on plant growth for a plant with  $T_{base}= 0^{\circ}\text{C}$  and  $T_{opt}=15^{\circ}\text{C}$

### 5:3.1.3 NITROGEN STRESS

Nitrogen stress is calculated only for non-legumes. SWAT never allows legumes to experience nitrogen stress.

Nitrogen stress is quantified by comparing actual and optimal plant nitrogen levels. Nitrogen stress varies non-linearly between 0.0 at optimal nitrogen content and 1.0 when the nitrogen content of the plant is 50% or less of the optimal value. Nitrogen stress is computed with the equation:

$$nstrs = 1 - \frac{\varphi_n}{\varphi_n + \exp[3.535 - 0.02597 \cdot \varphi_n]} \quad 5:3.1.6$$

where  $nstrs$  is the nitrogen stress for a given day, and  $\varphi_n$  is a scaling factor for nitrogen stress. The scaling factor is calculated:

$$\varphi_n = 200 \cdot \left( \frac{bio_N}{bio_{N,opt}} - 0.5 \right) \quad 5:3.1.7$$

where  $bio_{N,opt}$  is the optimal mass of nitrogen stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg N/ha) and  $bio_N$  is the actual mass of nitrogen stored in plant material (kg N/ha).

### **5:3.1.4 PHOSPHORUS STRESS**

As with nitrogen, phosphorus stress is quantified by comparing actual and optimal plant phosphorus levels. Phosphorus stress varies non-linearly between 0.0 at optimal phosphorus content and 1.0 when the phosphorus content of the plant is 50% or less of the optimal value. Phosphorus stress is computed with the equation:

$$pstres = 1 - \frac{\varphi_p}{\varphi_p + \exp[3.535 - 0.02597 \cdot \varphi_p]} \quad 5:3.1.8$$

where  $pstres$  is the phosphorus stress for a given day, and  $\varphi_p$  is a scaling factor for phosphorus stress. The scaling factor is calculated:

$$\varphi_p = 200 \cdot \left( \frac{bio_P}{bio_{P,opt}} - 0.5 \right) \quad 5:3.1.9$$

where  $bio_{P,opt}$  is the optimal mass of phosphorus stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg N/ha) and  $bio_P$  is the actual mass of phosphorus stored in plant material (kg N/ha).

Table 5:3-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to stress on plant growth.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
T_BASE	$T_{base}$ : Base temperature for plant growth (°C)	crop.dat
T_OPT	$T_{opt}$ : Optimal temperature for plant growth (°C)	crop.dat

## 5:3.2 ACTUAL GROWTH

---

The plant growth factor quantifies the fraction of potential growth achieved on a given day and is calculated:

$$\gamma_{reg} = 1 - \max(wstrs, tstrs, nstrs, pstrs) \quad 5:3.2.3$$

where  $\gamma_{reg}$  is the plant growth factor (0.0-1.0),  $wstrs$  is the water stress for a given day,  $tstrs$  is the temperature stress for a given day expressed as a fraction of optimal plant growth,  $nstrs$  is the nitrogen stress for a given day, and  $pstrs$  is the phosphorus stress for a given day.

The potential biomass predicted with equation 5:2.1.2 is adjusted daily if one of the four plant stress factors is greater than 0.0 using the equation:

$$\Delta bio_{act} = \Delta bio \cdot \gamma_{reg} \quad 5:3.2.1$$

where  $\Delta bio_{act}$  is the actual increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha),  $\Delta bio$  is the potential increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha), and  $\gamma_{reg}$  is the plant growth factor (0.0-1.0).

The potential leaf area added on a given day is also adjusted daily for plant stress:

$$\Delta LAI_{act,i} = \Delta LAI_i \cdot \sqrt{\gamma_{reg}} \quad 5:3.2.2$$

where  $\Delta LAI_{act,i}$  is the actual leaf area added on day  $i$ ,  $\Delta LAI_i$  is the potential leaf area added on day  $i$  that is calculated with equation 5:2.1.16 or 5:2.1.17, and  $\gamma_{reg}$  is the plant growth factor (0.0-1.0).

### 5:3.2.1 BIOMASS OVERRIDE

The model allows the user to specify a total biomass that the plant will produce each year. When the biomass override is set in the plant operation (.mgt), the impact of variation in growing conditions from year to year is ignored, i.e.  $\gamma_{reg}$  is always set to 1.00 when biomass override is activated in an HRU.

When a value is defined for the biomass override, the change in biomass is calculated:

$$\Delta bio_{act} = \Delta bio_i \cdot \frac{(bio_{trg} - bio_{i-1})}{bio_{trg}} \quad 5:3.2.4$$

where  $\Delta bio_{act}$  is the actual increase in total plant biomass on day  $i$  (kg/ha),  $\Delta bio_i$  is the potential increase in total plant biomass on day  $i$  calculated with equation 5:2.1.2 (kg/ha),  $bio_{trg}$  is the target biomass specified by the user (kg/ha), and  $bio_{i-1}$  is the total plant biomass accumulated on day  $i-1$  (kg/ha).

Table 5:3-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to actual plant growth.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
BIO_TARG	$bio_{trg}/1000$ : Biomass target (metric tons/ha)	.mgt

## 5:3.3 ACTUAL YIELD

The harvest index predicted with equation 5:2.4.1 is affected by water deficit using the relationship:

$$HI_{act} = (HI - HI_{min}) \cdot \frac{\gamma_{wu}}{\gamma_{wu} + \exp[6.13 - 0.883 \cdot \gamma_{wu}]} + HI_{min} \quad 5:3.3.1$$

where  $HI_{act}$  is the actual harvest index,  $HI$  is the potential harvest index on the day of harvest calculated with equation 5:2.4.1,  $HI_{min}$  is the harvest index for the plant in drought conditions and represents the minimum harvest index allowed for the plant, and  $\gamma_{wu}$  is the water deficiency factor. The water deficiency factor is calculated:

$$\gamma_{wu} = 100 \cdot \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m E_a}{\sum_{i=1}^m E_o} \quad 5:3.3.2$$

where  $E_a$  is the actual evapotranspiration on a given day,  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration on a given day,  $i$  is a day in the plant growing season, and  $m$  is the day of harvest if the plant is harvested before it reaches maturity or the last day of the growing season if the plant is harvested after it reaches maturity.

### 5:3.3.1 HARVEST INDEX OVERRIDE

In the plant and harvest only operations (.mgt), the model allows the user to specify a target harvest index. The target harvest index set in a plant operation is used when the yield is removed using a harvest/kill operation. The target

harvest index set in a harvest only operation is used only when that particular harvest only operation is executed.

When a harvest index override is defined, the override value is used in place of the harvest index calculated by the model in the yield calculations. Adjustments for growth stage and water deficiency are not made.

$$HI_{act} = HI_{trg} \quad 5:3.3.3$$

where  $HI_{act}$  is the actual harvest index and  $HI_{trg}$  is the target harvest index.

### **5:3.3.2 HARVEST EFFICIENCY**

In the harvest only operation (.mgt), the model allows the user to specify a harvest efficiency. The harvest efficiency defines the fraction of yield biomass removed by the harvesting equipment. The remainder of the yield biomass is converted to residue and added to the residue pool in the top 10 mm of soil. If the harvest efficiency is not set or a 0.00 is entered, the model assumes the user wants to ignore harvest efficiency and sets the fraction to 1.00 so that the entire yield is removed from the HRU.

$$yld_{act} = yld \cdot harv_{eff} \quad 5:3.3.4$$

where  $yld_{act}$  is the actual yield ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ),  $yld$  is the crop yield calculated with equation 5:2.4.2 or 5:2.4.3 ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), and  $harv_{eff}$  is the efficiency of the harvest operation (0.01-1.00). The remainder of the yield biomass is converted to residue:

$$\Delta rsd = yld \cdot (1 - harv_{eff}) \quad 5:3.3.5$$

$$rsd_{surf,i} = rsd_{surf,i-1} + \Delta rsd \quad 5:3.3.6$$

where  $\Delta rsd$  is the biomass added to the residue pool on a given day ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ),  $yld$  is the crop yield calculated with equation 5:2.4.2 or 5:2.4.3 ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and  $harv_{eff}$  is the efficiency of the harvest operation (0.01-1.00)  $rsd_{surf,i}$  is the material in the residue pool for the top 10 mm of soil on day  $i$  ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), and  $rsd_{surf,i-1}$  is the material in the residue pool for the top 10 mm of soil on day  $i-1$  ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ).

Table 5:3-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to actual plant yield.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
WSYF	$HI_{min}$ : Harvest index for the plant in drought conditions, the minimum harvest index allowed for the plant	crop.dat
HI_TARG	$HI_{trg}$ : Harvest index target	.mgt
HI_OVR	$HI_{trg}$ : Harvest index target	.mgt
HARVEFF	$harv_{eff}$ : Efficiency of the harvest operation	.mgt

## 5:3.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$E_a$	Actual amount of evapotranspiration on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_o$	Potential evapotranspiration (mm d <sup>-1</sup> )
$E_t$	Maximum transpiration rate (mm d <sup>-1</sup> )
$E_{t,act}$	Actual amount of transpiration on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$HI$	Potential harvest index for a given day
$HI_{act}$	Actual harvest index
$HI_{min}$	Harvest index for the plant in drought conditions and represents the minimum harvest index allowed for the plant
$HI_{trg}$	Target harvest index
$T_{base}$	Plant's base or minimum temperature for growth (°C)
$T_{opt}$	Plant's optimal temperature for growth (°C)
$\bar{T}_{av}$	Mean air temperature for day (°C)
$bio_N$	Actual mass of nitrogen stored in plant material (kg N/ha)
$bio_{N,opt}$	Optimal mass of nitrogen stored in plant material for the growth stage (kg N/ha)
$bio_P$	Actual mass of phosphorus stored in plant material (kg P/ha)
$bio_{P,opt}$	Optimal mass of phosphorus stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg P/ha)
$bio_{trg}$	Target biomass specified by the user (kg/ha)
$harv_{eff}$	Efficiency of the harvest operation
$nstrs$	Nitrogen stress for a given day
$pstrs$	Phosphorus stress for a given day
$rsd_{surf,i}$	Material in the residue pool for the top 10mm of soil on day $i$ (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
$tstrs$	Temperature stress for a given day expressed as a fraction of optimal plant growth
$w_{actualup}$	Total plant water uptake for the day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$wstrs$	Water stress for a given day
$yld_{act}$	Actual yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
$\Delta LAI_i$	Leaf area added on day $i$ (potential)
$\Delta LAI_{act,i}$	Actual leaf area added on day $i$
$\Delta bio$	Potential increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)
$\Delta bio_{act}$	Actual increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)
$\Delta rsd$	Biomass added to the residue pool on a given day (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
$\gamma_{reg}$	Plant growth factor (0.0-1.0)
$\gamma_{wu}$	Water deficiency factor
$\varphi_n$	Scaling factor for nitrogen stress equation
$\varphi_p$	Scaling factor for phosphorus stress equation



# MANAGEMENT PRACTICES



Quantifying the impact of land management and land use on water supply and quality is a primary focus of environmental modeling. SWAT allows very detailed management information to be incorporated into a simulation.

The following three chapters review the methodology used by SWAT to simulate water management, tillage and urban processes.

---

---

# SECTION 6 CHAPTER 1

## EQUATIONS: GENERAL MANAGEMENT

---

Management operations that control the plant growth cycle, the timing of fertilizer and pesticide and the removal of plant biomass are explained in this chapter. Water management and the simulation of urban areas are summarized in subsequent chapters.

A new operations input file was added that allows user to schedule management by Julian day and calendar year without considering cropping rotations and without using heat unit scheduling. Operations have been added for contouring, terracing, subsurface drains, filter strips, fire, and grass waterways.

Previous versions of SWAT only allowed the growth of one plant species at a time to be simulated. Algorithms from the ALMANAC model (Kiniry et al., 1992, Johnson et al., 2009) have been added to simulate multiple plant species growing and competing within a plant community. Plant communities that have been simulated include: crops and weeds, trees and grasses, different tree species in a boreal forest, and grasses and shrubs in rangeland communities. A data file is developed prior to simulation that describes the various plants within each community.

## **6:1.1 PLANTING/BEGINNING OF GROWING SEASON**

---

The plant operation initiates plant growth. This operation can be used to designate the time of planting for agricultural crops or the initiation of plant growth in the spring for a land cover that requires several years to reach maturity (forests, orchards, etc.).

The plant operation will be performed by SWAT only when no land cover is growing in an HRU. Before planting a new land cover, the previous land cover must be removed with a kill operation or a harvest and kill operation. If two plant operations are placed in the management file and the first land cover is not killed prior to the second plant operation, the second plant operation is ignored by the model.

Information required in the plant operation includes the timing of the operation (month and day or fraction of base zero potential heat units), the total number of heat units required for the land cover to reach maturity, and the specific land cover to be simulated in the HRU. If the land cover is being transplanted, the leaf area index and biomass for the land cover at the time of transplanting must be provided. Also, for transplanted land covers, the total number of heat units for the land cover to reach maturity should be from the period the land cover is transplanted to maturity (not from seed generation). Heat units are reviewed in Chapter 5:1.

The user has the option of varying the curve number in the HRU throughout the year. New curve number values may be entered in a plant operation, tillage operation and harvest and kill operation. The curve number entered for these operations are for moisture condition II. SWAT adjusts the entered value daily to reflect change in water content or plant evapotranspiration.

For simulations where a certain amount of crop yield and biomass is required, the user can force the model to meet this amount by setting a harvest index target and a biomass target. These targets are effective only if a harvest and kill operation is used to harvest the crop.

Table 6:1-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to planting.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<b>Variables in plant operation line:</b>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of planting operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 1 for plant operation	.mgt
HEAT UNITS	PHU : Total heat units required for plant maturity (heat units)	.mgt
PLANT_ID	Plant/land cover code from crop.dat	.mgt
<i>Optional inputs:</i>		
HI_TARG	$HI_{trg}$ : Target harvest index	.mgt
BIO_TARG	$bio_{trg}$ : Target biomass specified by the user (kg/ha)	.mgt
LAI_INIT	LAI: Leaf area index of the canopy for transplanted species	.mgt
BIO_INIT	$bio$ : Total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)	.mgt
CNOP	$CN_2$ : Moisture condition II curve number	.mgt
<b>Variables in first section of .mgt file</b>		
IGRO	Land cover status code	.mgt
<i>Inputs for plants growing at the beginning of the simulation</i>		
PLANT_ID	Plant/land cover code from crop.dat	.mgt
LAI_INIT	LAI: Leaf area index of the canopy	.mgt
BIO_MS	$bio_{trg}$ : Target biomass specified by the user (kg/ha)	.mgt
PHU	PHU : Total heat units required for plant maturity (heat units)	.mgt

## 6:1.2 HARVEST OPERATION

The harvest operation will remove plant biomass without killing the plant. This operation is most commonly used to cut hay or grass.

The only information required by the harvest operation is the date. However, a harvest index override and a harvest efficiency can be set.

When no harvest index override is specified, SWAT uses the plant harvest index from the plant growth database to set the fraction of biomass removed. The plant harvest index in the plant growth database is set to the fraction of the plant biomass partitioned into seed for agricultural crops and a typical fraction of biomass removed in a cutting for hay. If the user prefers a different fraction of biomass to be removed, the harvest index override should be set to the desired value.

A harvest efficiency may also be defined for the operation. This value specifies the fraction of harvested plant biomass removed from the HRU. The remaining fraction is converted to residue on the soil surface. If the harvest efficiency is left blank or set to zero, the model assumes this feature is not being

used and removes 100% of the harvested biomass (no biomass is converted to residue).

After biomass is removed in a harvest operation, the plant's leaf area index and accumulated heat units are set back by the fraction of biomass removed. Reducing the number of accumulated heat units shifts the plant's development to an earlier period in which growth is usually occurring at a faster rate.

Table 6.1-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to harvest.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<i>Variables in harvest operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of harvest operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 7 for harvest operation	.mgt
<i>Optional inputs:</i>		
HI_OVR	$HI_{trg}$ : Harvest index override or target harvest index	.mgt
HARVEFF	$harv_{eff}$ : Efficiency of the harvest operation	.mgt

## 6:1.3 GRAZING OPERATION

The grazing operation simulates plant biomass removal and manure deposition over a specified period of time. This operation is used to simulate pasture or range grazed by animals.

Information required in the grazing operation includes the time during the year at which grazing begins (month and day or fraction of plant potential heat units), the length of the grazing period, the amount of biomass removed daily, the amount of manure deposited daily, and the type of manure deposited. The amount of biomass trampled is an optional input.

Biomass removal in the grazing operation is similar to that in the harvest operation. However, instead of a fraction of biomass being specified, an absolute amount to be removed every day is given. In some conditions, this can result in a reduction of the plant biomass to a very low level that will result in increased erosion in the HRU. To prevent this, a minimum plant biomass for grazing may be specified (BIO\_MIN). When the plant biomass falls below the amount specified for BIO\_MIN, the model will not graze, trample, or apply manure in the HRU on that day.

If the user specifies an amount of biomass to be removed daily by trampling, this biomass is converted to residue.

Nutrient fractions and bacteria content of the manure applied during grazing must be stored in the fertilizer database. The manure nutrient and bacteria loadings are added to the topmost 10 mm of soil. This is the portion of the soil with which surface runoff interacts.

After biomass is removed by grazing and/or trampling, the plant's leaf area index and accumulated heat units are set back by the fraction of biomass removed.

Table 6:1-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to grazing.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<i>Variables in grazing operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Time grazing operation is initiated (1 <sup>st</sup> day of grazing)	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 9 for grazing operation	.mgt
GRZ_DAYS	Number of days of grazing.	.mgt
BIO_EAT	<i>bio</i> : Dry weight plant biomass consumed daily (kg/ha)	.mgt
MANURE_ID	Manure code from fert.dat	.mgt
MANURE_KG	<i>fert</i> : Amount of manure applied—dry weight (kg/ha)	.mgt
<i>Optional inputs:</i>		
BIO_TRMP	<i>bio</i> : Dry weight plant biomass trampled daily (kg/ha)	.mgt
<i>Variables in first section of .mgt file</i>		
BIO_MIN	<i>bio</i> : Minimum plant biomass for grazing to occur (kg/ha)	.mgt

## 6:1.4 HARVEST & KILL OPERATION

The harvest and kill operation stops plant growth in the HRU. The fraction of biomass specified in the land cover's harvest index (in the plant growth database) is removed from the HRU as yield. The remaining fraction of plant biomass is converted to residue on the soil surface.

The only information required by the harvest and kill operation is the timing of the operation (month and day or fraction of plant potential heat units). The user also has the option of updating the moisture condition II curve number in this operation.

Table 6:1-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to harvest & kill.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<i>Variables in harvest &amp; kill operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of harvest and kill operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 5 for harvest/kill operation	.mgt
<i>Optional inputs:</i>		
CNOP	<i>CN<sub>2</sub></i> : Moisture condition II curve number	.mgt

## 6:1.5 KILL/END OF GROWING SEASON

---

The kill operation stops plant growth in the HRU. All plant biomass is converted to residue.

The only information required by the kill operation is the timing of the operation (month and day or fraction of plant potential heat units).

Table 6:1-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to kill.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<i>Variables in kill operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of kill operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 8 for kill operation	.mgt

## 6:1.6 TILLAGE

---

The tillage operation redistributes residue, nutrients, pesticides and bacteria in the soil profile. Information required in the tillage operation includes the timing of the operation (month and day or fraction of base zero potential heat units), and the type of tillage operation.

The user has the option of varying the curve number in the HRU throughout the year. New curve number values may be entered in a plant operation, tillage operation and harvest and kill operation. The curve number entered for these operations are for moisture condition II. SWAT adjusts the entered value daily to reflect change in water content.

The mixing efficiency of the tillage implement defines the fraction of a residue/nutrient/pesticide/bacteria pool in each soil layer that is redistributed through the depth of soil that is mixed by the implement. To illustrate the redistribution of constituents in the soil, assume a soil profile has the following distribution of nitrate.

Layer #	Depth of Layer	NO <sub>3</sub> Content
surface layer	0-10 mm	50 kg/ha
1	10-100 mm	25 kg/ha
2	100-400 mm	20 kg/ha
3	400-1050 mm	10 kg/ha
4	1050-2000 mm	10 kg/ha

If this soil is tilled with a field cultivator, the soil will be mixed to a depth of 100 mm with 30% efficiency. The change in the distribution of nitrate in the soil is:

Layer #	Depth of Layer	Initial NO <sub>3</sub>	Unmixed NO <sub>3</sub> (70%)	Mixed NO <sub>3</sub> (30%)	Redistribution of Mixed NO <sub>3</sub>	Final NO <sub>3</sub>
surface layer	0-10 mm	50 kg/ha	35 kg/ha	15 kg/ha	$22.5 \times 10\text{mm}/100\text{mm} = 2.25 \text{ kg/ha}$	37.25 kg/ha
1	10-100 mm	25 kg/ha	17.5 kg/ha	7.5 kg/ha	$22.5 \times 90\text{mm}/100\text{mm} = 20.25 \text{ kg/ha}$	37.75 kg/ha
2	100-400 mm	20 kg/ha	20 kg/ha			20 kg/ha
3	400-1050 mm	10 kg/ha	10 kg/ha			10 kg/ha
4	1050-2000 mm	10 kg/ha	10 kg/ha			10 kg/ha
		Total mixed:	22.5 kg/ha			

Because the soil is mixed to a depth of 100 mm by the implement, only the nitrate in the surface layer and layer 1 is available for redistribution. To calculate redistribution, the depth of the layer is divided by the tillage mixing depth and multiplied by the total amount of nitrate mixed. To calculate the final nitrate content, the redistributed nitrate is added to the unmixed nitrate for the layer.

All nutrient/pesticide/bacteria/residue pools are treated in the same manner as the nitrate example above. Bacteria mixed into layers below the surface layer is assumed to die.

### **6:1.6.1 BIOLOGICAL MIXING**

Biological mixing is the redistribution of soil constituents as a result of the activity of biota in the soil (e.g. earthworms, etc.). Studies have shown that biological mixing can be significant in systems where the soil is only infrequently disturbed. In general, as a management system shifts from conventional tillage to conservation tillage to no-till there will be an increase in biological mixing. SWAT allows biological mixing to occur to a depth of 300 mm (or the bottom of the soil profile if it is shallower than 300 mm). The efficiency of biological mixing is defined by the user. The redistribution of nutrients by biological mixing is calculated using the same methodology as that used for a tillage operation.

Table 6:1-6: SWAT input variables that pertain to tillage.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<b>Variables in tillage operation line:</b>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of planting operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 6 for tillage operation	.mgt
TILLAGE_ID	Tillage implement code from till.dat	.mgt
<i>Optional inputs:</i>		
CNOP	CN <sub>2</sub> : Moisture condition II curve number	.mgt
<b>Variables in first section of .mgt file</b>		
BIOMIX	Biological mixing efficiency	.mgt
<b>Variable in tillage database:</b>		
EFFMIX	Mixing efficiency of tillage operation.	till.dat
DEPTHL	Depth of mixing by tillage operation.	till.dat

## 6:1.7 FERTILIZER APPLICATION

The fertilizer operation applies fertilizer or manure to the soil.

Information required in the fertilizer operation includes the timing of the operation (month and day or fraction of plant potential heat units), the type of fertilizer/manure applied, the amount of fertilizer/manure applied, and the depth distribution of fertilizer application.

SWAT assumes surface runoff interacts with the top 10 mm of soil. Nutrients contained in this surface layer are available for transport to the main channel in surface runoff. The fertilizer operation allows the user to specify the fraction of fertilizer that is applied to the top 10 mm. The remainder of the fertilizer is added to the first soil layer defined in the HRU .sol file.

In the fertilizer database, the weight fraction of different types of nutrients and bacteria are defined for the fertilizer. The amounts of nutrient added to the different pools in the soil are calculated:

$$NO_3_{fert} = fert_{minN} \cdot (1 - fert_{NH4}) \cdot fert \quad 6:1.7.1$$

$$NH_4_{fert} = fert_{minN} \cdot fert_{NH4} \cdot fert \quad 6:1.7.2$$

$$orgN_{frsh,fert} = 0.5 \cdot fert_{orgN} \cdot fert \quad 6:1.7.3$$

$$orgN_{act,fert} = 0.5 \cdot fert_{orgN} \cdot fert \quad 6:1.7.4$$

$$P_{solution,fert} = fert_{minP} \cdot fert \quad 6:1.7.5$$

$$orgP_{frsh,fert} = 0.5 \cdot fert_{orgP} \cdot fert \quad 6:1.7.6$$

$$orgP_{hum,fert} = 0.5 \cdot fert_{orgP} \cdot fert \quad 6:1.7.7$$


where  $NO3_{fert}$  is the amount of nitrate added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha),  $NH4_{fert}$  is the amount of ammonium added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha),  $orgN_{frsh,fert}$  is the amount of nitrogen in the fresh organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha),  $orgN_{act,fert}$  is the amount of nitrogen in the active organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha),  $P_{solution,fert}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the solution pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg P/ha),  $orgP_{frsh,fert}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the fresh organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg P/ha),  $orgP_{hum,fert}$  is the amount of phosphorus in the humus organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg P/ha),  $fert_{minN}$  is the fraction of mineral N in the fertilizer,  $fert_{NH4}$  is the fraction of mineral N in the fertilizer that is ammonium,  $fert_{orgN}$  is the fraction of organic N in the fertilizer,  $fert_{minP}$  is the fraction of mineral P in the fertilizer,  $fert_{orgP}$  is the fraction of organic P in the fertilizer, and  $fert$  is the amount of fertilizer applied to the soil (kg/ha).

If manure is applied, the bacteria in the manure may become attached to plant foliage or be incorporated into the soil surface layer during application. The amount of bacteria reaching the ground surface and the amount of bacteria adhering to the plant foliage is calculated as a function of ground cover. The ground cover provided by plants is:

$$gc = \frac{1.99532 - erfc[1.333 \cdot LAI - 2]}{2.1} \quad 6:1.7.8$$

where  $gc$  is the fraction of the ground surface covered by plants,  $erfc$  is the complementary error function, and  $LAI$  is the leaf area index.

The complementary error function frequently occurs in solutions to advective-dispersive equations. Values for  $erfc(\beta)$  and  $erf(\beta)$  ( $erf$  is the error function for  $\beta$ ), where  $\beta$  is the argument of the function, are graphed in Figure 6:1-1. The figure shows that  $erf(\beta)$  ranges from  $-1$  to  $+1$  while  $erfc(\beta)$  ranges from  $0$  to  $+2$ . The complementary error function takes on a value greater than  $1$  only for negative values of the argument.

Figure 6:1-1:  $\text{erf}(\beta)$  and  $\text{erfc}(\beta)$  plotted versus  $\beta$ 

Once the fraction of ground covered by plants is known, the amount of bacteria applied to the foliage is calculated:

$$bact_{lp,fol} = \frac{gc \cdot fr_{active} \cdot fert_{lpbact} \cdot fert}{10} \quad 6:1.7.9$$

$$bact_{p,fol} = \frac{gc \cdot fr_{active} \cdot fert_{pbact} \cdot fert}{10} \quad 6:1.7.10$$

and the amount of bacteria applied to the soil surface is

$$bact_{lpsol,fert} = \frac{(1-gc) \cdot fr_{active} \cdot fert_{lpbact} \cdot k_{bact} \cdot fert}{10} \quad 6:1.7.11$$

$$bact_{lpsorb,fert} = \frac{(1-gc) \cdot fr_{active} \cdot fert_{lpbact} \cdot (1-k_{bact}) \cdot fert}{10} \quad 6:1.7.12$$

$$bact_{psol,fert} = \frac{(1-gc) \cdot fr_{active} \cdot fert_{pbact} \cdot k_{bact} \cdot fert}{10} \quad 6:1.7.13$$

$$bact_{psorb,fert} = \frac{(1-gc) \cdot fr_{active} \cdot fert_{pbact} \cdot (1-k_{bact}) \cdot fert}{10} \quad 6:1.7.14$$

where  $bact_{lp,fol}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria attached to the foliage (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{p,fol}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria attached to the foliage (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lpsol,fert}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria in the solution pool added to the soil (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{lpsorb,fert}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria in the sorbed pool added to the soil (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{psol,fert}$  is the amount of persistent

bacteria in the solution pool added to the soil (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $bact_{psorb,fert}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria in the sorbed pool added to the soil (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>),  $gc$  is the fraction of the ground surface covered by plants,  $fr_{active}$  is the fraction of the manure containing active colony forming units,  $fert_{lpbact}$  is the concentration of less persistent bacteria in the fertilizer (# cfu/g manure),  $fert_{pbact}$  is the concentration of persistent bacteria in the fertilizer (# cfu/g manure),  $k_{bact}$  is the bacterial partition coefficient, and  $fert$  is the amount of fertilizer/manure applied to the soil (kg/ha).

Table 6:1-7: SWAT input variables that pertain to fertilizer application.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<i>Variables in fertilizer operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of fertilizer operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 3 for fertilizer operation	.mgt
FERT_ID	Type of fertilizer/manure applied (code from fert.dat)	.mgt
FRT_KG	$fert$ : Amount of fertilizer/manure applied (kg/ha)	.mgt
FRT_SURFACE	Fraction of fertilizer applied to top 10 mm	.mgt
<i>Variables in fertilizer database:</i>		
FMINN	$fert_{minN}$ : Fraction of mineral nitrogen in the fertilizer	fert.dat
FMINP	$fert_{minP}$ : Fraction of mineral P in the fertilizer	fert.dat
FORGN	$fert_{orgN}$ : Fraction of organic N in the fertilizer	fert.dat
FORGP	$fert_{orgP}$ : Fraction of organic P in the fertilizer	fert.dat
FNH3N	$fert_{NH4}$ : Fraction of mineral N in the fertilizer that is ammonium	fert.dat
BACTPDB	$fert_{pbact}$ : Concentration of persistent bacteria in manure (# cfu/g manure)	fert.dat
BACTLPDB	$fert_{lpbact}$ : Concentration of less-persistent bacteria in manure (# cfu/g manure)	fert.dat
BACTKDDB	$k_{bact}$ : Bacterial partition coefficient	fert.dat
<i>Other variables:</i>		
BACT_SWF	$fr_{active}$ : Fraction of manure applied to land areas that has active colony forming units	.bsn

## 6:1.8 AUTO-APPLICATION OF FERTILIZER

Fertilization in an HRU may be scheduled by the user or automatically applied by SWAT. When the user selects auto-application of fertilizer in an HRU, a nitrogen stress threshold must be specified. The nitrogen stress threshold is a fraction of potential plant growth. Anytime actual plant growth falls below this threshold fraction due to nitrogen stress, the model will automatically apply fertilizer to the HRU. The user specifies the type of fertilizer, the fraction of total

fertilizer applied to the soil surface, the maximum amount of fertilizer that can be applied during the year, the maximum amount of fertilizer that can be applied in any one application, and the application efficiency.

To determine the amount of fertilizer applied, an estimate of the amount of nitrogen that will be removed in the yield is needed. For the first year of simulation, the model has no information about the amount of nitrogen removed from the soil by the plant. The nitrogen yield estimate is initially assigned a value using the following equations:

$$yld_{est,N} = 350 \cdot fr_{N,yld} \cdot RUE \quad \text{if } HI_{opt} < 1.0 \quad 6:1.8.1$$

$$yld_{est,N} = 1000 \cdot fr_{N,yld} \cdot RUE \quad \text{if } HI_{opt} \geq 1.0 \quad 6:1.8.2$$

where  $yld_{est,N}$  is the nitrogen yield estimate (kg N/ha),  $fr_{N,yld}$  is the fraction of nitrogen in the yield,  $RUE$  is the radiation-use efficiency of the plant (kg/ha·(MJ/m<sup>2</sup>)<sup>-1</sup> or 10<sup>-1</sup> g/MJ), and  $HI_{opt}$  is the potential harvest index for the plant at maturity given ideal growing conditions. The nitrogen yield estimate is updated at the end of every simulation year using the equation:

$$yld_{est,N} = \frac{yld_{est,Nprev} \cdot yr_{sim} + yld_{yr,N}}{yr_{sim} + 1} \quad 6:1.8.3$$

where  $yld_{est,N}$  is the nitrogen yield estimate update for the current year (kg N/ha),  $yld_{est,Nprev}$  is the nitrogen yield estimate from the previous year (kg N/ha),  $yr_{sim}$  is the year of simulation,  $yld_{yr,N}$  is the nitrogen yield target for the current year (kg N/ha). The nitrogen yield target for the current year is calculated at the time of harvest using the equation:

$$yld_{yr,N} = bio_{ag} \cdot fr_N \cdot fert_{eff} \quad 6:1.8.4$$

where  $yld_{yr,N}$  is the nitrogen yield target for the current year (kg N/ha),  $bio_{ag}$  is the aboveground biomass on the day of harvest (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>),  $fr_N$  is the fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass calculated with equation 5:2.3.1, and  $fert_{eff}$  is the fertilizer application efficiency assigned by the user. The fertilizer application efficiency allows the user to modify the amount of fertilizer applied as a function of plant demand. If the user would like to apply additional fertilizer to adjust for loss in runoff,  $fert_{eff}$  will be set to a value greater than 1. If the user would like to

apply just enough fertilizer to meet the expected demand,  $fert_{eff}$  will be set to 1. If the user would like to apply only a fraction of the demand,  $fert_{eff}$  will be set to a value less than 1.

The optimal amount of mineral nitrogen to be applied is calculated:

$$minN_{app} = yld_{est,N} - (NO_3 + NH_4) - bio_N \quad 6:1.8.5$$

where  $minN_{app}$  is the amount of mineral nitrogen applied (kg N/ha),  $yld_{est,N}$  is the nitrogen yield estimate (kg N/ha),  $NO_3$  is the nitrate content of the soil profile (kg  $NO_3$ -N/ha),  $NH_4$  is the ammonium content of the soil profile (kg  $NH_4$ -N/ha), and  $bio_N$  is the actual mass of nitrogen stored in plant material (kg N/ha). If the amount of mineral nitrogen calculated with equation 6:1.8.5 exceeds the maximum amount allowed for any one application,  $minN_{app}$  is reset to the maximum value ( $minN_{app} = minN_{app,mx}$ ). The total amount of nitrogen applied during the year is also compared to the maximum amount allowed for the year. Once the amount applied reaches the maximum amount allowed for the year ( $minN_{app,mx,yr}$ ), SWAT will not apply any additional fertilizer regardless of nitrogen stress.

Once the amount of mineral nitrogen applied is determined, the total amount of fertilizer applied is calculated by dividing the mass of mineral nitrogen applied by the fraction of mineral nitrogen in the fertilizer:

$$fert = \frac{minN_{app}}{fert_{minN}} \quad 6:1.8.6$$

where  $fert$  is the amount of fertilizer applied (kg/ha),  $minN_{app}$  is the amount of mineral nitrogen applied (kg N/ha), and  $fert_{minN}$  is the fraction of mineral nitrogen in the fertilizer.

The type of fertilizer applied in the HRU is specified by the user. In addition to mineral nitrogen, organic nitrogen and phosphorus and mineral phosphorus are applied to the HRU. If a manure is applied, bacteria loadings to the HRU are also determined. The amount of each type of nutrient and bacteria is calculated from the amount of fertilizer and fraction of the various nutrient types in the fertilizer as summarized in Section 6:1.7.

While the model does not allow fertilizer to be applied as a function of phosphorus stress, the model does monitor phosphorus stress in the auto-fertilization subroutine. If phosphorus stress causes plant growth to fall below 75% of potential growth, the model ignores the fraction of mineral phosphorus in the fertilizer and applies an amount of mineral phosphorus equal to ( $\frac{1}{7} \cdot minN_{app}$ ).

Table 6:1-8: SWAT input variables that pertain to auto-fertilization.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<i>Variables in auto-fertilizer operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of fertilizer operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 11 for auto-fertilizer operation	.mgt
AFERT_ID	Type of fertilizer/manure applied (code from fert.dat).	.mgt
AFRT_SURFACE	Fraction of fertilizer applied to top 10 mm	.mgt
AUTO_NSTRS	<i>nstrs</i> : Nitrogen stress that triggers fertilizer application	.mgt
AUTO_EFF	<i>fert_eff</i> : Application efficiency	.mgt
AUTO_NAPP	<i>minN<sub>app,mx</sub></i> : Maximum amount of mineral N allowed to be applied on any one day (kg N/ha)	.mgt
AUTO_NYR	<i>minN<sub>app,mxyr</sub></i> : Maximum amount of mineral N allowed to be applied during a year (kg N/yr)	.mgt
<i>Other variables:</i>		
CNYLD	<i>fr<sub>N,yld</sub></i> : Fraction of nitrogen in the yield	crop.dat
BIO_E	<i>RUE</i> : Radiation use efficiency ((kg/ha)/(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ))	crop.dat
HVSTI	<i>HI<sub>opt</sub></i> : Potential harvest index for the plant at maturity given ideal growing conditions	crop.dat
FMINN	<i>fert<sub>minN</sub></i> : fraction of mineral N in the fertilizer	fert.dat

## 6:1.9 CONTINUOUS APPLICATION OF FERTILIZER

A primary mechanism of disposal for manure generated by intensive animal operations such as confined animal feedlots is the land application of waste. In this type of a land management system, waste is applied every few days to the fields. Using the continuous fertilization operation allows a user to specify the frequency and quantity of manure applied to an HRU without the need to insert a fertilizer operation in the management file for every single application.

The continuous fertilizer operation requires the user to specify the beginning date of the continuous fertilization period, the total length of the fertilization period, and the number of days between individual fertilizer/manure

applications. The amount of fertilizer/manure applied in each application is specified as well as the type of fertilizer/manure.

Nutrients and bacteria in the fertilizer/manure are applied to the soil surface. Unlike the fertilization operation or auto-fertilization operation, the continuous fertilization operation does not allow the nutrient and bacteria loadings to be partitioned between the surface 10 mm and the part of the 1<sup>st</sup> soil layer underlying the top 10 mm. Everything is added to the top 10 mm, making it available for transport by surface runoff.

Nutrient and bacteria loadings to the HRU are calculated using the equations reviewed in Section 6:1.7.

Table 6:1-9: SWAT input variables that pertain to continuous fertilization.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<i>Variables in auto-fertilizer operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of fertilizer operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 14 for continuous fertilizer operation	.mgt
CFERT_ID	Type of fertilizer/manure applied (code from fert.dat).	.mgt
FERT_DAYS	Duration or length of time (days) the continuous fertilizer operation takes place	.mgt
IFRT_FREQ	Application frequency. Number of days between fertilizer applications	.mgt
CFRT_KG	<i>fert</i> : Amount of fertilizer/manure applied (kg/ha)	.mgt

## 6:1.10 PESTICIDE APPLICATION

The pesticide operation applies pesticide to the HRU.

Information required in the pesticide operation includes the timing of the operation (month and day or fraction of plant potential heat units), the type of pesticide applied, and the amount of pesticide applied.

Field studies have shown that even on days with little or no wind, a portion of pesticide applied to the field is lost. The fraction of pesticide that reaches the foliage or soil surface is defined by the pesticide's application efficiency. The amount of pesticide that reaches the foliage or ground is:

$$\text{pest}' = ap_{ef} \cdot \text{pest} \quad 6:1.10.1$$

where  $pest'$  is the effective amount of pesticide applied (kg pst/ha),  $ap_{ef}$  is the pesticide application efficiency, and  $pest$  is the actual amount of pesticide applied (kg pst/ha).

The amount of pesticide reaching the ground surface and the amount of pesticide added to the plant foliage is calculated as a function of ground cover. The ground cover provided by plants is:

$$gc = \frac{1.99532 - \operatorname{erfc}[1.333 \cdot LAI - 2]}{2.1} \quad 6:1.10.2$$

where  $gc$  is the fraction of the ground surface covered by plants,  $\operatorname{erfc}$  is the complementary error function, and  $LAI$  is the leaf area index.

The complementary error function frequently occurs in solutions to advective-dispersive equations. Values for  $\operatorname{erfc}(\beta)$  and  $\operatorname{erf}(\beta)$  ( $\operatorname{erf}$  is the error function for  $\beta$ ), where  $\beta$  is the argument of the function, are graphed in Figure 6:1-1. The figure shows that  $\operatorname{erf}(\beta)$  ranges from  $-1$  to  $+1$  while  $\operatorname{erfc}(\beta)$  ranges from  $0$  to  $+2$ . The complementary error function takes on a value greater than  $1$  only for negative values of the argument.

Once the fraction of ground covered by plants is known, the amount of pesticide applied to the foliage is calculated:

$$pest_{fol} = gc \cdot pest' \quad 6:1.10.3$$

and the amount of pesticide applied to the soil surface is

$$pest_{surf} = (1 - gc) \cdot pest' \quad 6:1.10.4$$

where  $pest_{fol}$  is the amount of pesticide applied to foliage (kg pst/ha),  $pest_{surf}$  is the amount of pesticide applied to the soil surface (kg pst/ha),  $gc$  is the fraction of the ground surface covered by plants, and  $pest'$  is the effective amount of pesticide applied (kg pst/ha).

Table 6:1-10: SWAT input variables that pertain to pesticide application.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<b>Variables in pesticide operation line:</b>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of pesticide operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 4 for pesticide operation	.mgt
PEST_ID	Type of pesticide applied (code from pest.dat).	.mgt
PST_KG	$pest$ : Amount of pesticide applied (kg/ha)	.mgt
<b>Variables in pesticide database:</b>		
AP_EF	$ap_{ef}$ : Pesticide application efficiency	pest.dat

## 6:1.11 NOMENCLATURE

---

$CN_2$	Moisture condition II curve number
$HI_{opt}$	Potential harvest index for the plant at maturity given ideal growing conditions
$HI_{trg}$	Target harvest index
$LAI$	Leaf area index of the canopy
$NH_4$	Ammonium content of the soil profile (kg NH <sub>4</sub> -N/ha)
$NH_4_{fert}$	Amount of ammonium added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha)
$NO_3$	Nitrate content of the soil profile (kg NO <sub>3</sub> -N/ha)
$NO_3_{fert}$	Amount of nitrate added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha)
$P_{solution,fert}$	Amount of phosphorus in the solution pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg P/ha)
$PHU$	Potential heat units or total heat units required for plant maturity where base temperature is dependant on the plant species (heat units)
$RUE$	Radiation-use efficiency of the plant (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$ap_{ef}$	Pesticide application efficiency
$bact_{lpsol,fert}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria in the solution pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,fol}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria attached to the foliage (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> ),
$bact_{lpsorb,fert}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria in the sorbed pool added to the soil in fertilizer (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{psol,fert}$	Amount of persistent bacteria in the solution pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{p,fol}$	Amount of persistent bacteria attached to the foliage (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{psorb,fert}$	Amount of persistent bacteria in the sorbed pool added to the soil in fertilizer (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bio$	Total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)
$bio_{ag}$	Aboveground biomass on the day of harvest (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
$bio_N$	Actual mass of nitrogen stored in plant material (kg N/ha)
$bio_{trg}$	Target biomass specified by the user (kg/ha)
$fert$	Amount of fertilizer applied (kg/ha)
$fert_{eff}$	Fertilizer application efficiency assigned by the user
$fert_{lpbact}$	Concentration of less persistent bacteria in the fertilizer (# cfu/g manure)
$fert_{minN}$	Fraction of mineral nitrogen in the fertilizer
$fert_{minP}$	Fraction of mineral P in the fertilizer
$fert_{NH4}$	Fraction of mineral N in the fertilizer that is ammonium
$fert_{orgN}$	Fraction of organic N in the fertilizer
$fert_{orgP}$	Fraction of organic P in the fertilizer
$fert_{pbact}$	Concentration of persistent bacteria in the fertilizer (# cfu/g manure)
$fr_{active}$	Fraction of the manure containing active colony forming units
$fr_N$	Optimal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass for current growth stage
$fr_{N,yld}$	Fraction of nitrogen in the yield
$gc$	Fraction of the ground surface covered by plants
$harv_{eff}$	Efficiency of the harvest operation

$k_{bact}$  Bacterial partition coefficient  
 $minN_{app}$  Amount of mineral nitrogen applied (kg N/ha)  
 $minN_{app,mx}$  Maximum amount of mineral N allowed to be applied on any one day (kg N/ha)  
 $minN_{app,mxyr}$  Maximum amount of mineral N allowed to be applied during a year (kg N/ha)  
 $nstrs$  Nitrogen stress for a given day  
 $orgN_{act,fert}$  Amount of nitrogen in the active organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{frsh,fert}$  Amount of nitrogen in the fresh organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha)  
 $orgP_{frsh,fert}$  Amount of phosphorus in the fresh organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{hum,fert}$  Amount of phosphorus in the humus organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg P/ha)  
 $pest$  Actual amount of pesticide applied (kg pst/ha)  
 $pest'$  Effective amount of pesticide applied (kg pst/ha)  
 $pest_{fol}$  Amount of pesticide applied to foliage (kg pst/ha)  
 $pest_{surf}$  Amount of pesticide applied to the soil surface (kg pst/ha)  
 $trap_{ef}$  Fraction of the constituent loading trapped by the filter strip  
 $trap_{ef,bact}$  Fraction of the bacteria loading trapped by the filter strip  
 $trap_{ef,sub}$  Fraction of the subsurface flow constituent loading trapped by the filter strip  
 $width_{filtstrip}$  Width of filter strip (m)  
 $yld_{est,N}$  Nitrogen yield estimate (kg N/ha)  
 $yld_{est,Nprev}$  Nitrogen yield estimate from the previous year (kg N/ha)  
 $yld_{yr,N}$  Nitrogen yield target for the current year (kg N/ha)  
 $yr_{sim}$  Year of simulation

## 6:1.12 REFERENCES

---

Moore, J.A., J.D. Smyth, E.S. Baker, and J.R. Miner. 1988. Evaluating coliform concentrations in runoff from various animal waste management systems. Special Report 817: Agricultural Experiment Stations, Oregon State University, Corvallis.



## **SECTION 6 CHAPTER 2**

# **EQUATIONS: WATER MANAGEMENT**

---

Accurately reproducing water management practices can be one of the most complicated portions of data input for the model. Because water management affects the hydrologic balance, it is critical that the model is able to accommodate a variety of management practices. Water management options modeled by SWAT include irrigation, tile drainage, impounded/depressional areas, water transfer, consumptive water use, and loadings from point sources.

## **6:2.1 IRRIGATION**

---

Irrigation in an HRU may be scheduled by the user or automatically applied by SWAT in response to a water deficit in the soil. In addition to specifying the timing and application amount, the user must specify the source of irrigation water.

Water applied to an HRU is obtained from one of five types of water sources: a reach, a reservoir, a shallow aquifer, a deep aquifer, or a source outside the watershed. In addition to the type of water source, the model must know the location of the water source (unless the source is outside the watershed). For the reach, shallow aquifer or deep aquifer, SWAT needs to know the reach number or subbasin number, respectively, in which the source is located. If a reservoir is used to supply water, SWAT must know the reservoir number.

If the source of the irrigation water is a reach, SWAT allows additional input parameters to be set. These parameters are used to prevent flow in the reach from being reduced to zero as a result of irrigation water removal. Users may define a minimum in-stream flow, a maximum irrigation water removal amount that cannot be exceeded on any given day, and/or a fraction of total flow in the reach that is available for removal on a given day.

For a given irrigation event, SWAT determines the amount of water available in the source. The amount of water available is compared to the amount of water specified in the irrigation operation. If the amount available is less than the amount specified, SWAT will only apply the available water.

### **6:2.1.1 MANUAL APPLICATION OF IRRIGATION**

A manual irrigation application can be scheduled by date or by heat units. Irrigation amount (mm), input by the user, is the amount of water applied that reaches the soil. An irrigation efficiency factor is applied to account for losses from the source to the soil including conveyance loss and evaporative loss. The surface runoff ratio is the fraction of water applied that leaves the field as surface runoff. The remainder infiltrates into the soil and is subject to the soil water routing algorithms

described in Section 2, Chapter 3. This allows for more realistic simulation of the soil water profile and application of excess irrigation for leaching salts.

### **6.2.1.2 AUTO-APPLICATION OF IRRIGATION**

When the user selects auto-application of irrigation, the application can be triggered by a water stress threshold or a soil water deficit threshold. The water stress threshold is a fraction of potential plant growth. Any day actual plant stress falls below this threshold fraction due to water stress, the model will automatically apply water up to a maximum amount per application as input by the user. An irrigation application can also be triggered by a soil water deficit threshold. When total soil water in the profile falls below field capacity by more than the soil water deficit threshold, an irrigation application occurs. As with a manual application, a maximum irrigation amount, irrigation efficiency and surface runoff ratio are applied to each application.

Table 6:2-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to irrigation.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
<i>Variables in irrigation operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of irrigation operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 2 for irrigation operation	.mgt
IRR_AMT	Depth of irrigation water applied on HRU (mm)	.mgt
IRR_EFM	Irrigation efficiency for manual operation (0-1)	.mgt
IRR_SQ	Irrigation surface runoff ratio for manual operation (0-1)	.mgt
<i>Variables in first section of .mgt file</i>		
IRRSC	Type of water body from which irrigation water is obtained	.mgt
IRRNO	Source location	.mgt
FLOWMIN	Minimum in-stream flow ( $m^3/s$ )	.mgt
DIVMAX	Maximum daily irrigation diversion (mm or $10^4 m^3$ )	.mgt
FLOWFR	Fraction of available flow allowed to be used for irrigation	.mgt
<i>Variables in auto-irrigation operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Initialization of auto-irrigation	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 10 for auto-irrigation	.mgt
WSTRS_ID	Auto-irrigation trigger (WSTRS_ID = 0 for plant water stress trigger; WSTRS_ID = 1 for soil water deficit trigger)	.mgt
AUTO_WSTR	Water stress that triggers irrigation	.mgt
IRR_EFF	Irrigation efficiency for manual operation (0-1)	.mgt
IRR_ASQ	Irrigation surface runoff ratio for manual operation (0-1)	.mgt

## 6:2.2 TILE DRAINAGE

---

To simulate tile drainage in an HRU, the user must specify the depth from the soil surface to the drains, the amount of time required to drain the soil to field capacity, and the amount of lag between the time water enters the tile till it exits the tile and enters the main channel.

Tile drainage occurs when the perched water table rises above the depth at which the tile drains are installed. The amount of water entering the drain on a given day is calculated:

$$tile_{wtr} = \frac{h_{wtbl} - h_{drain}}{h_{wtbl}} \cdot (SW - FC) \cdot \left( 1 - \exp\left[ \frac{-24}{t_{drain}} \right] \right) \quad \text{if } h_{wtbl} > h_{drain} \quad 6:2.2.1$$

where  $tile_{wtr}$  is the amount of water removed from the layer on a given day by tile drainage (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $h_{wtbl}$  is the height of the water table above the impervious zone (mm),  $h_{drain}$  is the height of the tile drain above the impervious zone (mm),  $SW$  is the water content of the profile on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $FC$  is the field capacity water content of the profile (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $t_{drain}$  is the time required to drain the soil to field capacity (hrs).

Water entering tiles is treated like lateral flow. The flow is lagged using equations reviewed in Chapter 2:3.

Table 6:2-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to tile drainage.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
DDRAIN	Depth to subsurface drain (mm).	.mgt
TDRAIN	$t_{drain}$ : Time to drain soil to field capacity (hrs)	.mgt
GDRAIN	$tile_{lag}$ : Drain tile lag time (hrs)	.mgt

## 6:2.3 IMPOUNDED/DEPRESSIONAL AREAS

---

Impounded/depressional areas are simulated as a water body overlying a soil profile in an HRU. This type of ponded system is needed to simulate the growth of rice, cranberries or any other plant that grows in a waterlogged system. The simulation and management operations pertaining to impounded/depressional areas are reviewed in Chapter 8:1.

## 6:2.4 WATER TRANSFER

---

While water is most typically removed from a water body for irrigation purposes, SWAT also allows water to be transferred from one water body to another. This is performed with a transfer command in the watershed configuration file.

The transfer command can be used to move water from any reservoir or reach in the watershed to any other reservoir or reach in the watershed. The user must input the type of water source, the location of the source, the type of water body receiving the transfer, the location of the receiving water body, and the amount of water transferred.

Three options are provided to specify the amount of water transferred: a fraction of the volume of water in the source; a volume of water left in the source; or the volume of water transferred. The transfer is performed every day of the simulation.

The transfer of water from one water body to another can be accomplished using other methods. For example, water could be removed from one water body via consumptive water use and added to another water body using point source files.

Table 6:2-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to water transfer.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
DEP_TYPE	Water source type	.fig
DEP_NUM	Water source location	.fig
DEST_TYPE	Destination type	.fig
DEST_NUM	Destination location	.fig
TRANS_AMT	Amount of water transferred	.fig
TRANS_CODE	Rule code governing water transfer.	.fig

## 6:2.5 CONSUMPTIVE WATER USE

---

Consumptive water use is a management tool that removes water from the basin. Water removed for consumptive use is considered to be lost from the system. SWAT allows water to be removed from the shallow aquifer, the deep

aquifer, the reach or the pond within any subbasin in the watershed. Water also may be removed from reservoirs for consumptive use.

Consumptive water use is allowed to vary from month to month. For each month in the year, an average daily volume of water removed from the source is specified. For reservoirs, the user may also specify a fraction of the water removed that is lost during removal. The water lost in the removal process becomes outflow from the reservoir.

Table 6:2-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to consumptive water use.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
WUPND(1-12)	Average daily water removal from pond in subbasin ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3$ )	.wus
WURCH(1-12)	Average daily water removal from reach in subbasin ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3$ )	.wus
WUSHAL(1-12)	Average daily water removal from shallow aquifer in subbasin ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3$ )	.wus
WUDEEP(1-12)	Average daily water removal from deep aquifer in subbasin ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3$ )	.wus
WURESN(1-12)	Average daily water removal from reservoir ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3$ )	.res
WURTNF	Fraction of water removal lost in transfer and returned as reservoir outflow.	.res

## 6:2.6 POINT SOURCE LOADINGS

SWAT directly simulates the loading of water, sediment and other constituents off of land areas in the watershed. To simulate the loading of water and pollutants from sources not associated with a land area (e.g. sewage treatment plants), SWAT allows point source information to be read in at any point along the channel network. The point source loadings may be summarized on a daily, monthly, yearly, or average annual basis.

Files containing the point source loads are created by the user. The loads are read into the model and routed through the channel network using rechour, recday, recmon, recyear, or recnst commands in the watershed configuration file. SWAT will read in water, sediment, organic N, organic P, nitrate, soluble P, ammonium, nitrite, metal, and bacteria data from the point source files. Chapter 2 in the SWAT2009 User's Manual reviews the format of the command lines in the watershed configuration file while Chapter 31 in the SWAT2009 User's Manual reviews the format of the point source files.

## 6:2.7 NOMENCLATURE

---

*SW* Water content of the profile on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)

*FC* Field capacity water content of the profile (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)

*h<sub>drain</sub>* Height of the tile drain above the impervious zone (mm)

*h<sub>wtbl</sub>* Height of the water table above the impervious zone (mm)

*t<sub>drain</sub>* Time required to drain the soil to field capacity (hrs)

*tile<sub>wtr</sub>* Amount of water removed from the layer on a given day by tile drainage (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)



## SECTION 6 CHAPTER 3

# EQUATIONS: URBAN AREAS

---

Most large watersheds and river basins contain areas of urban land use. Estimates of the quantity and quality of runoff in urban areas are required for comprehensive management analysis. SWAT calculates runoff from urban areas with the SCS curve number method or the Green & Ampt equation. Loadings of sediment and nutrients are determined using one of two options. The first is a set of linear regression equations developed by the USGS (Driver and Tasker, 1988) for estimating storm runoff volumes and constituent loads. The other option is to simulate the buildup and washoff mechanisms, similar to SWMM - Storm Water Management Model (Huber and Dickinson, 1988).

## 6:3.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF URBAN AREAS

---

Urban areas differ from rural areas in the fraction of total area that is impervious. Construction of buildings, parking lots and paved roads increases the impervious cover in a watershed and reduces infiltration. With development, the spatial flow pattern of water is altered and the hydraulic efficiency of flow is increased through artificial channels, curbing, and storm drainage and collection systems. The net effect of these changes is an increase in the volume and velocity of runoff and larger peak flood discharges.

Impervious areas can be differentiated into two groups: the area that is hydraulically connected to the drainage system and the area that is not directly connected. As an example, assume there is a house surrounded by a yard where runoff from the roof flows into the yard and is able to infiltrate into the soil. The rooftop is impervious but it is not hydraulically connected to the drainage system. In contrast, a parking lot whose runoff enters a storm water drain is hydraulically connected. Table 6:3-1 lists typical values for impervious and directly connected impervious fractions in different urban land types.

Table 6:3-1: Range and average impervious fractions for different urban land types.

Urban Land Type	Average total impervious	Range total impervious	Average directly connected impervious	Range directly connected impervious
Residential-High Density (> 8 unit/acre or unit/2.5 ha)	.60	.44 - .82	.44	.32 - .60
Residential-Medium Density (1-4 unit/acre or unit/2.5 ha)	.38	.23 - .46	.30	.18 - .36
Residential-Med/Low Density (> 0.5-1 unit/acre or unit/2.5 ha)	.20	.14 - .26	.17	.12 - .22
Residential-Low Density (< 0.5 unit/acre or unit/2.5 ha)	.12	.07 - .18	.10	.06 - .14
Commercial	.67	.48 - .99	.62	.44 - .92
Industrial	.84	.63 - .99	.79	.59 - .93
Transportation	.98	.88 - 1.00	.95	.85 - 1.00
Institutional	.51	.33 - .84	.47	.30 - .77

During dry periods, dust, dirt and other pollutants build up on the impervious areas. When precipitation events occur and runoff from the impervious areas is generated, the runoff will carry the pollutants as it moves through the drainage system and enters the channel network of the watershed.

## 6:3.2 SURFACE RUNOFF FROM URBAN AREAS

---

In urban areas, surface runoff is calculated separately for the directly connected impervious area and the disconnected impervious/pervious area. For directly connected impervious areas, a curve number of 98 is always used. For disconnected impervious/pervious areas, a composite curve number is calculated and used in the surface runoff calculations. The equations used to calculate the composite curve number for disconnected impervious/pervious areas are (Soil Conservation Service Engineering Division, 1986):

$$CN_c = CN_p + imp_{tot} \cdot (CN_{imp} - CN_p) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{imp_{dcon}}{2 \cdot imp_{tot}}\right) \text{ if } imp_{tot} < 0.30 \quad 6:3.2.1$$

$$CN_c = CN_p + imp_{tot} \cdot (CN_{imp} - CN_p) \quad \text{if } imp_{tot} > 0.30 \quad 6:3.2.2$$

where  $CN_c$  is the composite moisture condition II curve number,  $CN_p$  is the pervious moisture condition II curve number,  $CN_{imp}$  is the impervious moisture condition II curve number,  $imp_{tot}$  is the fraction of the HRU area that is impervious (both directly connected and disconnected), and  $imp_{dcon}$  is the fraction of the HRU area that is impervious but not hydraulically connected to the drainage system.

The fraction of the HRU area that is impervious but not hydraulically connected to the drainage system,  $imp_{dcon}$ , is calculated

$$imp_{dcon} = imp_{tot} - imp_{con} \quad 6:3.2.3$$

where  $imp_{tot}$  is the fraction of the HRU area that is impervious (both directly connected and disconnected), and  $imp_{con}$  is the fraction of the HRU area that is impervious and hydraulically connected to the drainage system.

Table 6.3-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to surface runoff calculations in urban areas.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
CN2	$CN_p$ : SCS moisture condition II curve number for pervious areas	.mgt
CNOP	$CN_p$ : SCS moisture condition II curve number for pervious areas specified in plant, harvest/kill and tillage operation	.mgt
URBCN2	$CN_{imp}$ : SCS moisture condition II curve number for impervious areas	urban.dat
FIMP	$imp_{tot}$ : fraction of urban land type area that is impervious	urban.dat
FCIMP	$imp_{con}$ : fraction of urban land type area that is connected impervious	urban.dat

## 6:3.3 USGS REGRESSION EQUATIONS

---

The linear regression models incorporated into SWAT are those described by Driver and Tasker (1988). The regression models were developed from a national urban water quality database that related storm runoff loads to urban physical, land use, and climatic characteristics. USGS developed these equations to predict loadings in ungaged urban watersheds.

The regression models calculate loadings as a function of total storm rainfall, drainage area and impervious area. The general equation is

$$Y = \frac{\beta_0 \cdot (R_{day}/25.4)^{\beta_1} \cdot (DA \cdot imp_{tot}/2.59)^{\beta_2} \cdot (imp_{tot} \cdot 100 + 1)^{\beta_3} \cdot \beta_4}{2.205} \quad 6:3.3.1$$

where  $Y$  is the total constituent load (kg),  $R_{day}$  is precipitation on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $DA$  is the HRU drainage area (km<sup>2</sup>),  $imp_{tot}$  is the fraction of the total area that is impervious, and the  $\beta$  variables are regression coefficients. The regression equations were developed in English units, so conversion factors were incorporated to adapt the equations to metric units: 25.4 mm/inch, 2.59 km<sup>2</sup>/mi<sup>2</sup>, and 2.205 lb/kg.

USGS derived three different sets of regression coefficients that are based on annual precipitation. Category I coefficients are used in watersheds with less than 508 mm of annual precipitation. Category II coefficients are used in watersheds with annual precipitation between 508 and 1016 mm. Category III coefficients are used in watersheds with annual precipitation greater than 1016 mm. SWAT determines the annual precipitation category for each subbasin by summing the monthly precipitation totals provided in the weather generator input file.

Regression coefficients were derived to estimate suspended solid load, total nitrogen load, total phosphorus load and carbonaceous oxygen demand (COD). SWAT calculates suspended solid, total nitrogen, and total phosphorus loadings (the carbonaceous oxygen demand is not currently calculated). Regression coefficients for these constituents are listed in Table 6:3-3.

Once total nitrogen and phosphorus loads are calculated, they are partitioned into organic and mineral forms using the following relationships from Northern Virginia Planning District Commission (1979). Total nitrogen loads consist of 70 percent organic nitrogen and 30 percent mineral (nitrate). Total phosphorus loads are divided into 75 percent organic phosphorus and 25 percent orthophosphate.

Table 6:3-3: Urban regression coefficients (from Driver and Tasker, 1988).

<b>Loading</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Precipitation</b>				
		$\beta_0$	$\beta_1$	$\beta_2$	$\beta_3$	$\beta_4$
suspended solids	I	1778.0	0.867	0.728	0.157	2.367
	II	812.0	1.236	0.436	0.202	1.938
	III	97.7	1.002	1.009	0.837	2.818
total nitrogen	I	20.20	0.825	1.070	0.479	1.258
	II	4.04	0.936	0.937	0.692	1.373
	III	1.66	0.703	0.465	0.521	1.845
total phosphorus	I	1.725	0.884	0.826	0.467	2.130
	II	0.697	1.008	0.628	0.469	1.790
	III	1.618	0.954	0.789	0.289	2.247
COD	I	407.0	0.626	0.710	0.379	1.518
	II	151.0	0.823	0.726	0.564	1.451
	III	102.0	0.851	0.601	0.528	1.978

I = annual precipitation < 508 mm

II = 508 mm < annual precipitation < 1,016 mm

III = annual precipitation > 1,016 mm

Table 6:3-4: SWAT input variables that pertain to urban modeling with regression equations.

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Input File</b>
IURBAN	Urban simulation code	.mgt
URBLU	Urban land type identification number from urban database	.mgt
FIMP	Fraction of HRU that is impervious. $imp_{tot} = FIMP \cdot 100$	urban.dat
PRECIPITATION	$R_{day}$ : Precipitation on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.pcp
HRU_FR	Fraction of subbasin area in HRU	.hru
SUB_KM	Area of subbasin (km <sup>2</sup> )	.sub
PCPMM(mon)	Average amount of precipitation falling in month (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)	.wgn

## 6:3.4 BUILD UP/WASH OFF

In an impervious area, dust, dirt and other constituents are built up on street surfaces in periods of dry weather preceding a storm. Build up may be a function of time, traffic flow, dry fallout and street sweeping. During a storm runoff event, the material is then washed off into the drainage system. Although

the build up/wash off option is conceptually appealing, the reliability and credibility of the simulation may be difficult to establish without local data for calibration and validation (Huber and Dickinson, 1988).

When the build up/wash off option is used in SWAT, the urban hydrologic response unit (HRU) is divided into pervious and impervious areas. Management operations other than sweep operations are performed in the pervious portion of the HRU. Sweep operations impact build up of solids in the impervious portion of the HRU. For the pervious portion of the HRU, sediment and nutrient loadings are calculated using the methodology summarized in Chapters 4:1 and 4:2. The impervious portion of the HRU uses the build up/wash off algorithm to determine sediment and nutrient loadings.

The build up/wash off algorithm calculates the build up and wash off of solids. The solids are assumed to possess a constant concentration of organic and mineral nitrogen and phosphorus where the concentrations are a function of the urban land type.

Build up of solids is simulated on dry days with a Michaelis-Menton equation:

$$SED = \frac{SED_{mx} \cdot td}{(t_{half} + td)} \quad 6:3.4.1$$

where  $SED$  is the solid build up (kg/curb km)  $td$  days after the last occurrence of  $SED = 0$  kg/curb km,  $SED_{mx}$  is the maximum accumulation of solids possible for the urban land type (kg/curb km), and  $t_{half}$  is the length of time needed for solid build up to increase from 0 kg/curb km to  $\frac{1}{2} SED_{mx}$  (days). A dry day is defined as a day with surface runoff less than 0.1 mm. An example build-up curve is shown in Figure 6:3-1. As can be seen from the plot, the Michaelis-Menton function will initially rise steeply and then approach the asymptote slowly.




Figure 6.3-1: Build-up function for solids in urban areas.

The two parameters that determine the shape of this curve are  $SED_{mx}$  and  $t_{half}$ . These parameters are a function of the urban land type.

Wash off is the process of erosion or solution of constituents from an impervious surface during a runoff event. An exponential relationship is used to simulate the wash off process (Huber and Dickinson, 1988):

$$Y_{sed} = SED_0 \cdot (1 - e^{-kk \cdot t}) \quad 6:3.4.2$$

where  $Y_{sed}$  is the cumulative amount of solids washed off at time  $t$  (kg/curb km),  $SED_0$  is the amount of solids built up on the impervious area at the beginning of the precipitation event (kg/curb km), and  $kk$  is a coefficient.

The coefficient,  $kk$ , may be estimated by assuming it is proportional to the peak runoff rate:

$$kk = urb_{coef} \cdot q_{peak} \quad 6:3.4.3$$

where  $urb_{coef}$  is the wash off coefficient ( $\text{mm}^{-1}$ ) and  $q_{peak}$  is the peak runoff rate ( $\text{mm/hr}$ ).

The original default value for  $urb_{coef}$  was calculated as  $0.18 \text{ mm}^{-1}$  by assuming that 13 mm of total runoff in one hour would wash off 90% of the initial surface load. Later estimates of  $urb_{coef}$  gave values ranging from  $0.002\text{-}0.26 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ . Huber and Dickinson (1988) noted that values between  $0.039$  and  $0.390 \text{ mm}^{-1}$  for  $urb_{coef}$  give sediment concentrations in the range of most observed values. They also recommended using this variable to calibrate the model to observed data.

To convert the sediment loading from units of kg/curb km to kg/ha, the amount of sediment removed by wash off is multiplied by the curb length density. The curb length density is a function of the urban land type. Nitrogen and phosphorus loadings from the impervious portion of the urban land area are calculated by multiplying the concentration of nutrient by the sediment loading.

### **6:3.4.1 STREET CLEANING**

Street cleaning is performed in urban areas to control buildup of solids and trash. While it has long been thought that street cleaning has a beneficial effect on the quality of urban runoff, studies by EPA have found that street sweeping has little impact on runoff quality unless it is performed every day (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1983).

SWAT performs street sweeping operations only when the build up/wash off algorithm is specified for urban loading calculations. Street sweeping is performed only on dry days, where a dry day is defined as a day with less than 0.1 mm of surface runoff. The sweeping removal equation (Huber and Dickinson, 1988) is:

$$SED = SED_0 \cdot (1 - fr_{av} \cdot reff) \quad 6:3.4.4$$

where  $SED$  is amount of solids remaining after sweeping (kg/curb km),  $SED_0$  is the amount of solids present prior to sweeping (kg/curb km),  $fr_{av}$  is the fraction of the curb length available for sweeping (the availability factor), and  $reff$  is the removal efficiency of the sweeping equipment. The availability factor and removal efficiency are specified by the user.

Table 6:3-5: Removal efficiencies (fraction removed) from street cleaner path (from Pitt, 1979)

Street Cleaning Program and Street Surface Loading Conditions	Total Solids	BOD <sub>5</sub>	COD	KN	PO <sub>4</sub>	Pesticides
Vacuum Street Cleaner (5.5-55 kg/curb km)						
1 pass	.31	.24	.16	.26	.08	.33
2 passes	.45	.35	.22	.37	.12	.50
3 passes	.53	.41	.27	.45	.14	.59
Vacuum Street Cleaner (55-280 kg/curb km)						
1 pass	.37	.29	.21	.31	.12	.40
2 passes	.51	.42	.29	.46	.17	.59
3 passes	.58	.47	.35	.51	.20	.67
Vacuum Street Cleaner (280-2820 kg/curb km)						
1 pass	.48	.38	.33	.43	.20	.57
2 passes	.60	.50	.42	.54	.25	.72
3 passes	.63	.52	.44	.57	.26	.75
Mechanical Street Cleaner (50-500 kg/curb km)						
1 pass	.54	.40	.31	.40	.20	.40
2 passes	.75	.58	.48	.58	.35	.60
3 passes	.85	.69	.59	.69	.46	.72
Flusher	.30	a	a	a	a	a
Mechanical Street Cleaner followed by a Flusher	.80	b	b	b	b	b

a: efficiency fraction estimated .15 to .40

b: efficiency fraction estimated .35 to 1.00

The availability factor,  $fr_{av}$ , is the fraction of the curb length that is sweepable. The entire curb length is often not available for sweeping due to the presence of cars and other obstacles.

The removal efficiency of street sweeping is a function of the type of sweeper, whether flushing is a part of the street cleaning process, the quantity of total solids, the frequency of rainfall events and the constituents considered. Removal efficiency can vary depending on the constituent being considered, with efficiencies being greater for particulate constituents. The removal efficiencies for nitrogen and phosphorus are typically less than the solid removal efficiency (Pitt, 1979). Because SWAT assumes a set concentration of nutrient constituents in the solids, the same removal efficiency is in effect used for all constituents. Table 6:3-5 provides removal efficiencies for various street cleaning programs.

Table 6:3-6: SWAT input variables that pertain to build up/wash off.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
IURBAN	Urban simulation code	.mgt
URBLU	Urban land type identification number from urban database	.mgt
DIRTMX	$SED_{mx}$ : maximum amount of solids allowed to build up on impervious areas (kg/curb km)	urban.dat
THALF	$t_{half}$ : number of days for amount of solids on impervious area to build up from 0 kg/curb km to $\frac{1}{2} SED_{mx}$	urban.dat
URBCOEF	$urb_{coef}$ : wash off coefficient ( $\text{mm}^{-1}$ )	urban.dat
CURBDEN	curb length density in urban land type (km/ha)	urban.dat
TNCONC	concentration of total nitrogen in suspended solid load (mg N/kg)	urban.dat
TPCONC	concentration of total phosphorus in suspended solid load (mg N/kg)	urban.dat
TNO3CONC	concentration of nitrate in suspended solid load (mg N/kg)	urban.dat
SWEPEFF	$reff$ : removal efficiency of the sweeping equipment	.mgt
FR_CURB	$fr_{av}$ : fraction of the curb length that is sweepable.	.mgt

## 6:3.5 NOMENCLATURE

---

$CN$	Curve number
$DA$	HRU drainage area ( $\text{km}^2$ )
$R_{day}$	Amount of rainfall on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$SED$	Solid build up (kg/curb km)
$SED_{mx}$	Maximum accumulation of solids possible for the urban land type (kg/curb km)
$Y$	Total constituent load (kg)
$Y_{sed}$	Cumulative amount of solids washed off at time $t$ (kg/curb km)
$fr_{av}$	Fraction of the curb length available for sweeping (the availability factor)
$imp_{con}$	Fraction of the HRU area that is impervious and hydraulically connected to the drainage system
$imp_{dcon}$	Fraction of the HRU area that is impervious but not hydraulically connected to the drainage system
$imp_{tot}$	Fraction of the HRU area that is impervious (both connected and disconnected)
$kk$	Coefficient in urban wash off equation
$q_{peak}$	Peak runoff rate (mm/hr)
$reff$	Removal efficiency of the sweeping equipment
$t_{half}$	Length of time needed for solid build up to increase from 0 kg/curb km to $\frac{1}{2} SED_{mx}$ (days)
$urb_{coef}$	Wash off coefficient ( $\text{mm}^{-1}$ )
$\beta_0$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_1$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_2$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_3$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_4$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings

## 6:3.6 REFERENCES

---

- Driver, N.E. and G.D. Tasker. 1988. Techniques for estimation of storm-runoff loads, volumes, and selected constituent concentrations in urban watersheds in the United States. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey: Books and Open-File Reports Section 88-191.
- Huber, W.C. and R.E. Dickinson. 1988. Storm water management model, version 4: user's manual. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Athens, GA.
- Northern Virginia Planning District Commission. 1979. Guidebook for screening urban nonpoint pollution management strategies: a final report prepared for Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Northern Virginia Planning District Commission, Falls Church, VA.
- Pitt, R. 1979. Demonstration of non-point pollution abatement through improved street cleaning practices. EPA-600/2-79-161 (NTIS PB80-108988), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH.
- Soil Conservation Service Engineering Division. 1986. Urban hydrology for small watersheds. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Technical Release 55.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1983. Results of the nationwide urban runoff program; Volume 1 final report. NTIS PB84-185552, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.



## SECTION 6 CHAPTER 4

# EQUATIONS: SEPTIC SYSTEMS

---

On-site wastewater systems (OWSs) are considered the cause of significant non-point source pollution to water bodies, especially in rural areas and suburban areas. Quantifying their effects on water quality is important (McCray et al., 2005). Among the several conceptual and (or) mathematical models, a biozone algorithm proposed by Siegrist et al. (2005) was adapted to current work due to the fact that the algorithm fully describes biozone processes, validated at watershed scale, and provides coefficients specifically developed for biozone processes that were calibrated to field scale experimental data. In this algorithm, septic tank effluent directly drains into subsurface soil layer (infiltrative surfaces) affecting soil moisture content and the percolation of soil water through the vadose zone. The amount of percolation is regulated by unsaturated hydraulic conductivity as a function of soil moisture content. Total suspended solid (TSS), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and nutrients in the septic tank effluent (STE) trigger complex bio-physical processes in the biozone which, in turn, affect the hydraulics of soil water. The accumulation of TSS and

plaque (i.e., dead bodies of biomass) in the pore space causes clogging and eventually hydraulic failure of the onsite wastewater system. The concentration of nutrients, BOD, and Fecal Coliform is estimated by a first-order decay equation based on the reaction coefficients specifically developed for each constituent by Siegrist et al. (2005). The biozone is considered as a control volume either on top of soil layer 1 or wedged in between soil layer 1 and soil layer 2 depending on the soil thickness. This control volume will accept the OWS effluent as well as infiltration from above. It can output flow vertically below and can contribute to detention storage on the surface (if the biozone layer is fully saturated).

## 6:4.1 BIOZONE ALGORITHM

---

### 6:4.1.1 BUILDUP OF LIVE BACTERIAL BIOMASS

The biozone layer is formed as a biologically active layer in the soil absorption system near the infiltrative surface by the growth of microorganisms feeding on the organic matter (BOD) of the septic tank effluent (See Figure 6:4-1). The amount of live bacteria biomass in the biozone is estimated using a mass balance equation assuming the biozone as a control volume. The mass balance equation of microorganisms (live bacteria biomass) in the control volume is then estimated by:

$$\frac{d(Bio)}{dt} = \alpha \cdot [\sum Q_{STE} \cdot C_{BOD,in} - I_p \cdot C_{BOD}] - R_{resp} - R_{mort} - R_{slough} \quad (1)$$

where  $Bio$  is the amount of live bacteria biomass in biozone (kg/ha),  $C_{BOD,in}$  is the BOD concentration in the STE (mg/L),  $C_{BOD}$  is the BOD concentration in biozone (mg/L),  $\alpha$  is gram of live bacteria growth to gram of BOD in STE (conversion factor),  $Q_{STE}$  is the flow rate of STE ( $m^3/day$ ),  $I_p$  is the amount of percolation out of the biozone ( $m^3/day$ ),  $R_{resp}$  is the amount of respiration of bacteria (kg/ha),  $R_{mort}$  is the amount of mortality of bacteria (kg/ha), and  $R_{slough}$  is the amount of sloughed off bacteria (kg/ha).




Figure 6:4-1 Vertical configuration of STE distribution chamber and absorption system

### **6:4.1.2 FATE AND TRANSPORT OF BACTERIAL BIOMASS**

Fate and transport of biomass, including respiration, mortality, and slough-off, are estimated based on empirical relationships. Respiration and mortality rates are functions of the amount of the biomass. These values are normalized by the unit area (1/ha) so that these equations are applicable in different scales of simulations without unintended amplification due to a higher mass of biomass. For each time step, a portion of live biomass is removed during respiration and death. The reaction for bacterial respiration is calculated as follows.

$$R_{resp} = \gamma \cdot Bio \quad (2)$$

where  $\gamma$  is a respiration rate coefficient (unitless). The reaction for bacterial mortality is calculated by

$$R_{mort} = \phi \cdot Bio \quad (3)$$

where  $\phi$  is mortality rate coefficient (unitless). Bacterial biomass can be washed off to the subsoil layer by a high velocity of infiltrating water.

$$R_{slough} = \eta \cdot v_p^\delta \quad (4)$$

where  $v_p$  is the pore velocity in the biozone layer (mm/day),  $\eta$  is a linear coefficient (kg/ha), and  $\delta$  is an exponential coefficient (unitless). Equations (2) to (4) are highly dependent on empirical calibration coefficients and the nature of these processes makes it difficult to validate the model equations.

A portion of dead body of biomass becomes plaque. Total solids in the STE may contribute to increasing plaque accumulation in the pore space. Plaque can be sloughed off from biozone by high pore velocity of infiltrating water. As the amount of live biomass increases in the biozone, plaque also increases. The rate of change in plaque is computed by a mass balance equation.

$$\frac{d(\text{plaque})}{dt} = R_{mort} + \frac{\sigma \cdot \sum Q_{STE} \cdot TS}{1000 \cdot A_d} - R_{slough} \quad (5)$$

where  $\text{plaque}$  is the amount of dead bacteria biomass and residue (kg/ha),  $\sigma$  is a calibration parameter to convert total solids in STE to  $\text{plaque}$  (unitless),  $TS$  is the total solids contained in STE (mg/l), and  $A_d$  is the area of drain field (ha).

### **6:4.1.3 FIELD CAPACITY**

Unlike natural soil conditions, the field capacity of a biozone dynamically changes with time due to the development of filamentous material of live bacterial biomass allowing the biozone layer to retain additional water. Therefore, temporal change in the biozone field capacity is related to the amount of biomass in the layer. This is shown by the equation:

$$\theta_f^t = \theta_f^{t-1} + \Phi \cdot (\theta_s^{t-1} - \theta_f^{t-1})^{\xi} \left[ \frac{\frac{d(\text{Bio})}{dt}}{10 \cdot \rho_{bm}} \right] \quad (6)$$

where  $\theta_f^t$  is field capacity at the end of the day (mm),  $\theta_f^{t-1}$  is field capacity at the beginning of the day (mm),  $\theta_s^{t-1}$  is saturated moisture content at the beginning of the day (mm),  $\rho_{bm}$  is the density of live bacterial biomass ( $\sim 1000 \text{ kg/m}^3$ ), and  $\Phi$  is a calibration parameter.

$\phi$  is field capacity coefficient 1 (unitless), and  $\xi$  is field capacity coefficient 2 (unitless).

#### **6:4.1.4 CLOGGING EFFECT ON HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY**

Soil clogging decreases porosity in the biozone with inert and biological materials. With the reduced soil porosity, the hydraulic conductivity of soil decreases with time (USEPA, 1980). A field-scale experiment suggests the reduction in hydraulic conductivity in the biozone is primarily influenced by STE loading rate and the type of infiltrative surface (Bumgarner and McCray, 2007). Weintraub et al. (2002) proposed a relationship between the biozone hydraulic conductivity and soil moisture contents.

$$K_{bz} = K_{sat} \frac{\theta - \theta_f}{\theta_s - \theta_f} \quad (7)$$

where  $K_{bz}$  is biozone hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr),  $K_{sat}$  is saturated hydraulic conductivity of soil (mm/hr), and  $\theta$  is moisture content of biozone (mm). An advantage of this model is that,  $K_b$  is directly related to  $K_s$  and the soil moisture content. The theoretical basis on the formulation of the equation is not presented in the literature; instead, the formula is indirectly validated by comparing percolation to the subsoil layer as a function of time.

#### **6:4.1.5 SOIL MOISTURE AND PERCOLATION**

Soil porosity (or saturated moisture content) is generally constant in natural soil; however, the porosity of biozone changes with time. The actual porosity of biozone decreases as the suspended solids from STE accumulate in the pore space and the mineralized biomass (dead body) increases in the biozone.

$$\theta_s = \theta_{si} - \frac{plaque}{\rho_{bm}} \quad (8)$$

where  $\theta_{si}$  is initial soil porosity with zero plaque (mm). The moisture content at each time step is estimated using the mass balance of water within the biozone.

$$\theta^t = \theta^{t-1} + \frac{Q_{STE}}{10 \cdot A_d} - I_p - ET - Q_{lat} \quad (9)$$

where  $ET$  is evapotranspiration from biozone (mm/day) and  $Q_{lat}$  is lateral flow (mm/day). Percolation to a subsoil layer is triggered if moisture content exceeds the field capacity in the biozone layer. Potential percolation is the maximum amount of water that can percolate during the time interval.

$$I_{p,pot} = K_{bz} \cdot \Delta t \quad (10)$$

where  $I_{p,pot}$  is the potential amount of percolation (mm/day). The amount of water percolating to the sub-soil layer is calculated using storage routing methodology (Neitsch et al., 2005).

$$\begin{aligned} I_{p,excess} &= (\theta - \theta_f) \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \frac{-\Delta t}{TT_{perc}} \right] \right) && \text{if } \theta > \theta_f \\ I_{p,excess} &= 0 && \text{if } \theta \leq \theta_f \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $I_{p,excess}$  is the minimum amount of percolation (mm/day) and  $TT_{perc}$  is travel time for percolation ( $TT_{perc} = (\theta_s - \theta_f)/K_{bz}$ ) in hour. The actual percolation is the smaller of the potential and minimum percolation.

$$I_p = \min(I_{p,pot}, I_{p,excess}) \quad (12)$$

#### **6:4.1.6 NITROGEN, BOD, FECAL COLIFORM**

Transformation and removal of pollutants in the biozone is directly related with the population of live bacteria biomass and bio-physical processes in the biozone layer. The fate of pollutants including Nitrogen, BOD, and Fecal Coliform is estimated by a first order reaction equation:

$$C_{k,end} = C_{k,i} \cdot e^{-K_k \Delta t} \quad (13)$$

where  $C_{k,end}$  is concentration of  $k$  constituent in the biozone at the end of the day (mg/L),  $C_{k,i}$  is concentration of  $k$  constituent in the biozone at the beginning of the day (mg/L), and  $K_k$  is a first order reaction rate (1/day), which is a function of the total biomass of live bacteria and a reaction rate coefficient.

$$K_k = \left[ \frac{K_{1,k} \cdot A_d}{\theta_{si} \cdot V_{bz}} \right] (Bio) \quad (14)$$

where  $K_{1,k}$  is the reaction rate calibration parameter for each constituent  $k$  ( $\text{m}^3/\text{kg}$ ) and  $V_{bz}$  is the volume of the biozone ( $\text{m}^3$ ). The various constituents included are

meant for the primary reactions/processes that occur in the biozone layer such as nitrification, denitrification, BOD decay, and fecal coliform decay.

$K_{1,nitr}$	Nitrification rate coefficient
$K_{1,denitr}$	Denitrification rate coefficient
$K_{1,BOD}$	BOD decay rate coefficient
$K_{1,fecal}$	Fecal coliform bacteria decay rate coefficient

In Equation (14), the reaction rate is normalized with respect to the volume of bacterial biomass (pore volume,  $\theta_{si}V_{bz}$ ) in the biozone layer as in the case of mortality and respiration equations. This normalization is done to avoid scaling issues in applying the algorithm to watershed scale simulations with parameters calibrated to small scale results (lab column tests).

#### **6:4.1.7 PHOSPHORUS REMOVAL**

Phosphorus adsorption takes place in the soil media below the biozone. The concentration of P in the biozone is often in the linear range of reported nonlinear isotherms (McCray et al., 2005). A linear isotherm is represented by the equation:

$$S = K_D C \quad (15)$$

where  $S$  is the mass of solute sorbed per unit dry weight of solid (mg/kg),  $C$  is the concentration of the solute in solution in equilibrium with the mass of solute sorbed onto the solid (mg/L), and  $K_D$  is a linear distribution coefficient (L/kg). McCray et al. (2005) recommends  $K_D = 15.1$  L/kg, the linear sorption isotherm constant as median value, but the value may vary from the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile ( $K_D = 5$  L/kg) to 90<sup>th</sup> percentile ( $K_D = 128$  L/kg) for modeling purpose. Similarly, a median value of  $S_{max} = 237$  mg/kg is recommended for the maximum P sorption capacity. This value may underestimate the P sorption capacity of the soil in some cases. A larger value (~800mg/kg) can be used (Zanini et al., 1998) when the P sorption capacity is underestimated. The concentration of P in the biozone is often reported low; thus, only the linear portion of a nonlinear isotherm is enough for estimation.

Phosphorus sorption isotherm described in Equation (15) gives an estimate of P sorption capacity given the P concentration and the distribution coefficient. According to this equation, effluent P concentration leaching to sub-soil layer should be zero until the soil is saturated with P; however, small amount of soluble P leaches to sub-soil layer with daily inflow of P to the biozone. The effluent P concentration is estimated by a linear relationship suggested by Bond et al. (2006) in which the outflow P concentration is proportional to the total amount P in the soil layer based on soil type as depicted in Figure 6:4-2.




Figure 6:4-2 Water-soluble P as a function of Mehlich-3 P for native Autryville loamy sand, Wasda muck, Georgeville silt loam, and Pacolet sandy clay loam soils (Bond et al., 2006).

#### **6:4.1.8 MODEL ASSUMPTIONS**

After STE effluent passes through the biozone, it is discharged into the soil layers below, where the constituents are subject to additional transport/fate processes that are expected to occur in natural soils. Siegrist et al. (2005) have

made the following assumptions to represent the physical system of biozone algorithm development based on laboratory observations and available knowledge.

1. Typical biozone thickness is 2-5 cm.
2. The biozone receives a continuous daily loading of STE. Intermittent dosing over the course of one day is not considered.
3. Depending on the climatic region, bermuda grass or similar type of grass is the typical vegetation seen above drainfield.
4. No STE inflow occurs if soil temperature goes below the freezing point and the biozone processes become inactive.
5. After a hydraulic failure, the model starts counting the failure days once the STE saturates the upper soil layers completely. Therefore, the initial several days after the hydraulic failure are not counted as failing period.
6. A failing system automatically turns to a fresh new active system after a user specified failing period (typically 2-3 months).
7. Total solids and TDS concentrations of STE are the same.

## **6:4.2 INTEGRATION OF BIOZONE ALGORITHM**

The biozone algorithm was integrated into the latest version of (SWAT version 2009 and the GIS interface version ArcSWAT 2009). Each unit of onsite septic systems is represented by a septic HRU. A septic HRU represents either one OWS or a hypothetical system that aggregates several OWSs that have similar HRU properties such as soil type, landuse and slope. In the latter case, septic HRUs in a subbasin are not spatially referenced and only lumped simulation is available. Septic HRUs are generated during the GIS interface processing based on the septic land use type defined by the users. Biozone and other properties of a septic system specific to a HRU is listed in septic input files (\*.sep files). The septic water quality database developed based on literature lists STE loading rate and pollutants concentration in STE of the conventional system 25 kinds of advanced systems and an untreated effluent system (septwq.dat). Pollutant characteristics included in the water quality database are per capita

septic effluent flow rate, Bio-chemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Total Suspended Solid (TSS), Total Nitrogen (TN), ammonium, nitrite, nitrate, organic nitrogen, Total Phosphorus (TP), phosphate, organic P, and Fecal Coliform. A generic type for conventional system and advanced system are listed as the first and the second in the water quality database list, so the user can select these types with limited information. The hydrologic linkage to SWAT allows daily STE directly to be introduced to the biozone layer by increasing the soil moisture content in the subroutine *percmain*. The movement of soil water through percolation in and out of the biozne layer is then simulated by a SWAT soil water model in *percmicro*. The movement of nutrients through soil profile from the biozone layer is simulated by a combination of nutrient modules in SWAT and biozone. SWAT septic input parameters are presented in the updated SWAT Input/Output File Documentation (Neitsch et al., 2010).

### **6:4.2.1 SIMULATING ACTIVE AND FAILING SYSTEMS**

In SWAT modeling, active systems are septic systems that are in operation or functioning as per guidelines and failing systems are septic systems that are subject to hydraulic failure and the effluent discharged differ from the standards. A typical service life span of an OWS ranges from 10 to 25 years depending on maintenance, pollutant loading rate, soil conditions and other factors. A septic HRU starting as an active system becomes a failing system as the biozone gets clogged by TSS and plaque of biomass. In the SWAT biozone module, biozone clogging, or hydraulic failure, is the main cause of system failure. There are other types of failing, but they are difficult to model in the SWAT structure and thus hydraulic failure was modeled as the only type of failing.

The schematic of the SWAT biozone algorithm is described in Figure 6:4-3. The biozone processes in septic HRUs are simulated on a daily basis as a subbasin-level. The biozone subroutine is called within the HRU iteration loop whenever the current HRU is septic. Each septic HRU is simulated based on a maintenance plan in which a failing system is assumed to be fixed and reactivated in two to three months time. In an active system, saturated water content

gets lower as plaque fills in the soil pore space and field capacity increases as the amount of live bacteria biomass grows as filamentous biomass soaks up soil water. System failure occurs when the soil achieves saturated water content and field capacity. The model starts counting the number of days as the system fails and remains as a failing system. STE migrates to upper soil layers as water does not percolate through the bottom of the biozone layer. Depending on the thickness of soil above the biozone layer, it may take a few days to months until failure creates STE surface ponding. As STE migrates to upper soil layers, the nutrients in the STE are transported along with the STE. The amount of nutrients that transports to the upper soil layers is estimated based on the nutrient concentration in STE and the amount of water that migrates to the upper layer. There are no special treatment processes that apply to the nutrients in failing septic systems. If the number of days a septic system remained as failing exceeds the designed time, the failing system is updated to an active system and related properties are reinitialized as a fresh active system. An active system simulates soil water hydraulics and pollutants decay by executing the biozone equations described above.




Figure 6:4-3 Schematic of computations in the biozone algorithm. An active system becomes failing due to clogging in the biozone, then gets repaired to a new active system in several months of time period

## 6:4.3 NOMENCLATURE

---

$Bio$	amount of live bacteria biomass in biozone (kg/ha)
$C_{BOD,in}$	BOD concentration in STE (mg/L)
$C_{BOD}$	BOD concentration in biozone (mg/L)
$\alpha$	gram of live bacteria growth to gram of BOD in STE (conversion factor)
$Q_{STE}$	flow rate of STE ( $m^3/day$ )
$I_p$	amount of percolation out of the biozone ( $m^3/day$ )
$R_{resp}$	amount of respiration of bacteria (kg/ha)
$R_{mort}$	amount of mortality of bacteria (kg/ha)
$R_{slough}$	amount of sloughed off bacteria (kg/ha).
$\gamma$	respiration rate coefficient (unitless).
$\phi$	mortality rate coefficient (unitless).
$v_p$	pore velocity in the biozone layer (mm/day)
$\eta$	linear coefficient (kg/ha)
$\delta$	exponential coefficient (unitless)
$plaque$	amount of dead bacteria biomass and residue (kg/ha)
$\sigma$	is a calibration parameter to convert total solids in STE to <i>plaque</i> (unitless)
$TS$	total solids contained in STE (mg/l)
$A_d$	is the area of drain field (ha)
$\theta_f^{t-1}$	is field capacity at the end of the day (mm)
$\theta_f^{t-1}$	field capacity at the beginning of the day (mm)
$\theta_s^{t-1}$	saturated moisture content at the beginning of the day (mm)
$\rho_{bm}$	density of live bacterial biomass (~1000 kg/m <sup>3</sup> □□□)
$\Phi$	field capacity coefficient 1 (unitless),
$\xi$	field capacity coefficient 2 (unitless).
$K_{bz}$	biozone hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
$K_{sat}$	saturated hydraulic conductivity of soil (mm/hr)
$\theta$	moisture content of biozone (mm)
$\theta_{si}$	initial soil porosity with zero plaque (mm)
$ET$	evapotranspiration from biozone (mm/day)
$Q_{lat}$	lateral flow (mm/day)
$I_{p,pot}$	potential amount of percolation (mm/day)
$I_{p,excess}$	minimum amount of percolation (mm/day)
$TT_{perc}$	travel time for percolation ( $TT_{perc}=(\theta_s - \theta_f)/K_{bz}$ ) in hour
$C_{k, end}$	concentration of $k$ constituent in the biozone at the end of the day (mg/L)
$C_{k, i}$	concentration of $k$ constituent in the biozone at the beginning of the day (mg/L)
$K_k$	first order reaction rate (1/day)
$K_{1, k}$	reaction rate calibration parameter for each constituent $k$ ( $m^3/kg$ )
$V_{bz}$	volume of the biozone ( $m^3$ ).
$S$	mass of solute sorbed per unit dry weight of solid (mg/kg)
$C$	concentration of the solute in solution in equilibrium with the mass of solute sorbed onto the solid (mg/L),
$K_D$	linear distribution coefficient (L/kg).

## 6:4.4 REFERENCES

---

- Bond, C., Maguire, R., and Havlin, J. (2006). "Change in soluble phosphorus in soils following fertilization is dependent on initial Mehlich-3 phosphorus." *J. Environ. Qual.*, 35(5), 1818.
- Bumgarner, J.R., McCray, J.E., 2007. Estimating Biozone Hydraulic Conductivity in Wastewater Soil-infiltration Systems using Inverse Numerical modeling. *Water Research*, 41(11): 2349-2360.
- McCray, J.E., Kirkland, S.L., Siegrist, R.L., Thyne, G.D., 2005. Model Parameters for Simulating Fate and Transport of On-Site Wastewater Nutrients. *Ground Water*, 43(4): 628-639.
- Neitsch, S.L., Arnold, J.G., Kiniry, J.R., Williams, J.R., 2010. Soil and Water Assessment Tool Input/Output File Documentation. Grassland, Soil and Water Research Service, Temple, TX.
- Siegrist, R.L. et al., 2005. Quantifying Site-Scale Processes and Watershed-Scale Cumulative Effects of Decentralized Wastewater Systems. Project No. WU-HT-00-27. Prepared for the National Decentralized Water Resources Capacity Development Project, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, by the Colorado School of Mines.
- Weintraub, L. et al., 2002. Modifications of WARMF to Assess the Efficacy of Onsite Wastewater Systems on Public Health, WEFTEC, Chicago, IL.
- Zanini, L., Robertson, W. D., Ptacek, C. J., Schiff, S. L., and Mayer, T. (1998). "Phosphorus characterization in sediments impacted by septic effluent at four sites in central Canada." *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology*, 33(3-4), 405-429.



## **SECTION 6 CHAPTER 5**

# **EQUATIONS: FILTER STRIPS AND GRASSED WATERWAYS**

---

A widely used conservation practice to remove agricultural and urban pollutants before reaching nearby water bodies is the vegetative filter strip (VFS). A VFS is a strip of dense vegetation located to intercept runoff from upslope pollutant sources and filter it. The previous version of SWAT contained a VFS algorithm, but it had some limitations. It used the same filtering efficiency for sediment and all nutrient forms. Differing trapping efficiencies have been observed between soluble and particulate nutrients (Goel et al., 2004). In the previous version of SWAT the VFS model does not consider the effects of flow concentration apparent at the field and watershed scales. Due to widespread use of the SWAT to simulate VFSs (Chu et al., 2005; Arabi et al., 2008; Parajuli et al., 2008) improvements in these routines were needed.

A model to predict filter strip effectiveness under ideal uniform sheet flow conditions was developed from Vegetative Filter Strip MODel (VFSMOD) (Muñoz-Carpena, 1999) and measured data derived from 22 published studies.

These studies were identified from a general search of the literature and other published summaries of VFS or riparian buffer effectiveness (Wenger, 1999; Helmers, 2003; Parkyn, 2004; Krutz *et al.*, 2005; Mayer *et al.*, 2005; Dorioz *et al.*, 2006; Koelsch *et al.*, 2006).

The filter strip model was adapted to operate at the field scale by considering the effects of flow concentration generally absent from plot scale experiments. Flow distribution through ten hypothetical filter strips was evaluated using high resolution (2m) topographical data and multipath flow accumulation (Quinn *et al.*, 1991). Significant flow concentration was predicted at all sites, on average 10% of the filter strip received half of the field runoff. As implemented in SWAT, the filter strip model contains two sections, a large section receiving relatively modest flow densities and a smaller section treating more concentrated flow. The combined model was incorporated into SWAT and verified for proper function. A full description of the filter strip model is presented below.

A theoretical approach due to a lack of measured effectiveness data is used for grassed waterways. The model includes separate algorithms for the submerged and unsubmerged portions of the waterway. Particulate trapping in the submerged portion is based on the same sediment transport capacity algorithms employed in SWAT's channel reaches. The unsubmerged portion of the waterway is treated as a simplified filter strip. Runoff which enters laterally along the length of the waterway is subjected to this additional filtering effect. Larger events submerge a larger fraction of the waterway leaving less area to filter incoming runoff. Channel geometry for grassed waterways is defined as trapezoidal with 8:1 side slopes. Length, width, depth, and slope are required to simulate waterways in SWAT.

## 6:5.1 FILTER STRIPS

---

### **6:5.1.1 EMPIRICAL MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

To evaluate the effectiveness of VFSs under ideal conditions, a model was developed from a combination of measured data derived from literature and Vegetative Filter Strip MODel (VFSMOD) (Muñoz-Carpena, 1999) simulations. VFSMOD was selected for this application over other VFS-related models due to its process-based nature, abundant documentation, and ease of use. The algorithms used in VFSMOD are complex, requiring iterative solutions and significant computational resources. A watershed scale model, which may simulate many hundreds of VFS daily for decades, requires a less computationally intensive solution. VFSMOD was, therefore, not a candidate for incorporation into SWAT.

VFSMOD model and its companion program, UH, were used to generate a database of 1650 VFS simulations. The UH utility uses the curve number approach (USDA-SCS, 1972), unit hydrograph and the Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (MUSLE) (Williams, 1975) to generate synthetic sediment and runoff loads from a source area upslope of the VFS (Muñoz-Carpena and Parsons, 2005). This simulation database contained 3 h rainfall events ranging from 10 mm to 100 mm, on a cultivated field with a curve number of 85 and a C factor of 0.1. Field dimensions were fixed at 100 m by 10 m with a 10 m wide VFS at the downslope end. Width of the VFS ranged from 1 m to 20 m yielding drainage area to VFS area ratios from 5 to 100. Slopes of 2%, 5% and 10% were simulated on 11 soil textural classes. This database was generated via software, which provided input parameters to both UH and VFSMOD then executed each program in turn. This database and a variety of other VFSMOD simulations were used to evaluate the sensitivity of various parameters and correlations between model inputs and predictions.

An empirical model for runoff reduction by VFSs was developed based on VFSMOD simulations. The model was derived from runoff loading and saturated

hydraulic conductivity using the statistical package Minitab 15 (Minitab-Inc., 2006). Saturated hydraulic conductivity is available in SWAT, and runoff loading can be calculated from HRU-predicted runoff volume and drainage area to VFS area ratio (DAFS<sub>ratio</sub>). Both independent variables were transformed to improve the regression. The final form is given below:

$$R_R = 75.8 - 10.8 \ln(R_L) + 25.9 \ln(K_{SAT}) \quad 6:5.1.1$$

where  $R_R$  is the runoff reduction (%);  $R_L$  is the runoff loading (mm); and  $K_{SAT}$  is the saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr). The regression was able to explain the majority of the variability ( $R^2 = 0.76$ ;  $n = 1,650$ ) in the simulated runoff reduction. The resulting model (Figure 6:5-1) produced runoff reduction efficiencies from -30% to 160%. Reductions greater than 100% are not possible; these were an artifact of the regression model. VFSs in SWAT were not allowed to generate additional runoff or pollutants; the model was limited to a range of 0% to 100%. The comparison between the empirical model and VFSMOD simulations improved ( $R^2 = 0.84$ ) when the range was limited.




Figure 6:5-1. Empirical runoff reduction model compared to the VFSMOD dataset from which it is derived. As regressed (top) and limited from 0% to 100% (bottom). The limited form of the empirical model was implemented in SWAT. The Nash Sutcliff Efficiency (NSE), the number of sample used in the regression (n) are also given.

### **6:5.1.2 SEDIMENT REDUCTION MODEL**

The sediment reduction model developed for SWAT was based on measured VFS data. A VFS removes sediment by reducing runoff velocity due to increased resistance of the vegetative media and enhanced infiltration in the VFS area (Barfield et al., 1998). Both result in a reduction in transport capacity and the deposition of sediment. Both the filtering and infiltration aspects are represented in the model. Similar to the runoff loading approach used earlier, sediment loading per unit VFS area was found to correlate with measured sediment reduction. Dosskey et al. (2002) hypothesized that sediment trapping efficiency decreases as the load per unit of buffer area increases. Sediment loading was calculated as the mass of sediment originating from the upslope area per unit of VFS area express as  $\text{kg m}^{-2}$ . The infiltration aspect was represented in the model by incorporating the runoff reduction as a percentage. Sixty-two experiments reported in the literature were used to develop this model.

$$S_R(\%) = 79.0 - 1.04 S_L + 0.213 R_R \quad 6:5.1.2$$

where  $S_R$  is the predicted sediment reduction (%);  $S_L$  is sediment loading ( $\text{kg/m}^2$ ); and  $R_R$  is the runoff reduction (%). Sediment loading alone was correlated with sediment reduction ( $R^2 = 0.41$ ) (Figure 6:5-2). The addition of runoff reduction allowed the regression model to explain most of the variability ( $R^2 = 0.64$ ) in the measured data.




Figure 6:5-2. Sediment reduction as a function of sediment loading. Developed from measured data reported in the literature.

### **6:5.1.3 NUTRIENT REDUCTION MODELS**

In addition to the mechanisms by which sediment and runoff are captured, nutrients may be adsorbed onto vegetation, surface residues, or the soil surface (Barfield et al., 1998). For the sake of simplicity, nutrient reduction was considered to be a function of sediment or runoff reduction only. Only nitrogen and phosphorus were considered. All nutrient models were developed from measured VFS data; the current version of VFSMOD does not account for nutrients.

#### **6:5.1.3.1 TOTAL NITROGEN**

The total nitrogen model was based on sediment reduction only. Much of the nitrogen lost in runoff from agricultural fields travels with sediments. Harmel et al. (2006) found that approximately 75% of the nitrogen lost from conventional tilled fields was in particulate forms. They also found that dissolved nitrogen forms, such as nitrate, were more dominant in no-till treatments. The vast majority of VFS data derived from literature were designed to simulate higher erosion conditions where particulate forms would represent the majority of nitrogen losses.

The total nitrogen model was based on sediment reduction from 44 observations reported in the literature. Two trials were censored during the development of the model. These experiments from Magette et al. (1989) yielded significant increases in total nitrogen exiting the VFS. The authors attributed this phenomenon to flushing of fine particulates captured in the VFS from prior experimental trials. Both the slope and the intercept were significant ( $P < 0.01$ ). The model is given below and shown in Figure 6:5-3.

$$TN_R = 0.036 S_R^{1.69}$$

6:5.1.3

where  $TN_R$  is the total nitrogen reduction (%); and  $S_R$  is the sediment reduction (%). Although this model was developed from total nitrogen, which includes both soluble and particulate forms, it was applied only to particulate forms in the SWAT model.




Figure 6:5-3. Nutrient reduction models for vegetative filter strip used in the Soil and Water Assessment Tool vegetative filter strip submodel. Based on measured data reported in the literature.

### 6:5.1.3.2 NITRATE NITROGEN

The nitrate nitrogen model was developed from 42 observations. Four observations from Dillaha et al. (1989) had negative runoff reduction values due to additional runoff generated in the VFS. Because the VFS SWAT sub model is not allowed to generate additional loads, these observations were censored. All nutrient models initially included both runoff and sediment reductions as independent variables, but the nitrate nitrogen model was the only model where both were significant ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). Nitrate is soluble and should not be associated with sediments, yet they were statistically correlated in the measured data. It is likely that the relationship between nitrate and sediment is an artifact of cross-

correlation between sediment and runoff reductions (as demonstrated by Equation (2)). The nitrate model was based only on runoff reduction; both the slope and the intercept were significant ( $p<0.01$ ). The nitrate nitrogen model is given below:

$$NN_R = 39.4 + 0.584 R_R \quad 6:5.1.4$$

where  $NN_R$  is the nitrate nitrogen reduction (%); and  $R_R$  is the runoff reduction (%). Because both the slope and the intercept were significant, there is a minimum reduction of 39.4% in nitrate, even if there is no reduction in runoff due to the VFS. This outcome may be unexpected, but it is supported by the measured data. Dillaha et al. (1989) observed nitrate reductions of 52% and 32% with only 0% and 7% reductions in runoff volume. Lee et al. (2000) also found significant reductions in nitrate (61%) with low runoff reductions (7%). One possible explanation is that sufficient runoff can be generated in the VFS such that there is little net reduction in runoff, but significant infiltration may still occur. Another possibility is foliar uptake of nitrates by vegetation within the strip.

### 6:5.1.3.3 TOTAL PHOSPHORUS

The model for total phosphorus was based on sediment reduction. Although total phosphorus is composed of both soluble and particulate forms, particulate forms represent the bulk of phosphorus lost from conventionally cultivated fields. The total phosphorus model was developed from 63 observations; more data than any other nutrient model. The intercept was not significant. Sediment reduction was able to explain 43% of the variability. The model was applied to all particulate forms of phosphorus in the SWAT VFS submodel. The model is given below:

$$TP_R = 0.90 S_R \quad 6:5.1.5$$

where  $TP_R$  is the total phosphorus reduction (%); and  $S_R$  is the sediment reduction (%).

### **6:5.1.3.4 SOLUBLE PHOSPHORUS**

The soluble phosphorus model was based on runoff reduction only. The observations censored from (Dillaha et al., 1989) for the nitrates were also censored for soluble phosphorus. The soluble phosphorus model has the weakest relationship of all the nutrient models ( $R^2 = 0.27$ ), yet both the slope and intercept were significant ( $p = 0.01$ ).

$$DP_R = 29.3 + 0.51 R_R \quad 6:5.1.6$$

where  $DP_R$  is the dissolved phosphorus reduction (%); and  $R_R$  is the runoff reduction (%). Like nitrate, there is a significant reduction in soluble phosphorus (29.3%) with no corresponding runoff reduction. Experimental observations of soluble phosphorus reduction at low runoff reductions are highly variable. Dillaha et al. (1989) found reductions in soluble phosphorus ranging from 43% to -31% with near zero runoff reduction. The minimum reduction predicted by equation 6 could be the result of mechanisms similar to those cited for the removal of nitrates, or simply an artifact of experimental variability.

### **6:5.1.4 VFS SWAT MODEL STRUCTURE**

VFSs were implemented at the HRU level in SWAT. Three additional model parameters were added as SWAT inputs: the drainage area to VFS area ratio ( $DAFS_{ratio}$ ), the fraction of the field drained by the most heavily loaded 10% of the VFS ( $DF_{con}$ ), and the fraction of the flow through the most heavily loaded 10% of the VFS which is fully channelized ( $CF_{frac}$ ), all are specified in the HRU (.hru) file. A two-segment VFS was used. Section one represents the bulk of the VFS area (90%) which receives the least flow. Section two is the remaining 10% of the buffer which receives between 25% and 75% of the field runoff (Figure 6:5-4).




Figure 6.5-4. Graphical representation of HRU drainage and two section vegetative filter strip as implemented in SWAT.

The fraction of flow through section two which is channelized is not subject to the VFS model; all sediment and nutrient are conservatively delivered to the tributary channel. DA<sub>FSratio</sub> for sections one and two are calculated from DF<sub>con</sub> using the following equations:

$$\text{DAFS}_{\text{ratio}1} = \text{DAFS}_{\text{ratio}} (1 - \text{DF}_{\text{con}}) / 0.9 \quad 6.5.1.7$$

$$\text{DAFS}_{\text{ratio}2} = \text{DAFS}_{\text{ratio}} (1 - \text{CF}_{\text{frac}}) \text{DF}_{\text{con}} / 0.1 \quad 6.5.1.8$$

where DA<sub>FSratio1</sub> is the drainage area to VFS area ratio for section 1; DA<sub>FSratio2</sub> is the drainage area to the VFS area ratio for section 2; DA<sub>FSratio</sub> is the average drainage area to the VFS area ratio for the entire HRU (user input); CF<sub>frac</sub> is fraction of the flow through the most heavily loaded 10% of the VFS which is fully channelized (user input); and DF<sub>con</sub> is the fraction of the field drained by the most heavily loaded 10% of the VFS (user input). Sediment, runoff, and nutrient loadings are calculated assuming all are generated uniformly across the HRU. The DA<sub>FSratio</sub> for each VFS section is combined with SWAT HRU level runoff and sediment yield predictions to calculate the runoff and sediment loadings.

Equations 6:5.1-6 are applied to predict sediment and nutrient transport through the VFS. The fraction of runoff retained in VFS is calculated for the purposes of estimating the retention of other constituents only. It is beyond the scope of this research to predict the aspects of a VFS's hydrologic budget needed to represent that component in the SWAT model. In addition, the area occupied by VFSs within a SWAT HRU is not removed from that HRU for simplicity. For these reasons, the VFS routine in SWAT is not used to predict changes in runoff delivered to streams.

The VFS SWAT sub model also includes pesticides and bacteria. Due to a lack of measured data, these models are based on assumptions. The pesticide model assumes that pesticides sorbed to sediments are captured with the sediment, and soluble pesticides are captured with runoff. Similarly, bacteria, which are attached to sediment, are captured with sediment and unattached bacteria are captured with runoff. These assumptions are common in the structure of other SWAT model components.

## **6:5.2 GRASSED WATERWAYS**

---

Support for grass waterways was added to SWAT. Waterways are treated as trapezoidal channels; the deposition of sediment and organic nutrients is calculated in the same manner as SWAT subbasin tributary channels. The primary user inputs are waterway width and length.

The sediment transport capacity is defined as:

$$Scap = Spcon * v^{1.5} \quad 6:5.2.1$$

where  $Scap$  is the sediment transport capacity in  $(\text{mg}/\text{m}^3)$ ,  $Spcon$  is the sediment transport coefficient and  $v$  is flow velocity in the waterway ( $\text{m}/\text{s}$ ).

Unsubmerged portions of the waterway act as filter strips, and may trap both soluble and organic nutrients. These equations are simplified forms of those used by White and Arnold (2009) in the simulation of filter

strips. Removal of soluble pollutants from the unsubmerged portion is calculated as:

$$SolR = 75.8 - 10.8 \log(SD) + 25.9 \log(SoK) \quad 6:5.2.2$$

where  $SolR$  is soluble pollutant removal (%),  $SD$  is runoff depth over unsubmerged waterway area in (mm/day), and  $SoK$  is the saturated hydrologic conductivity of the soil surface (mm/hr). Removal of particulate pollutant and sediment in the unsubmerged area is calculated as:

$$SedR = 79.0 - 1.04(SedL) + 0.213 * (SolR) \quad 6:5.2.3$$

where  $SedR$  is the sediment and particulate pollutant removal (%) and  $SedL$  is the sediment load per unit area of unsubmerged waterway in (kg/ha/day).

## 6:5.3 NOMENCLATURE

---

$R_R$	runoff reduction (%)
$R_L$	runoff loading (mm)
$K_{SAT}$	saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
$S_R$	predicted sediment reduction (%)
$S_L$	sediment loading ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ )
$TN_R$	total nitrogen reduction (%)
$NN_R$	nitrate nitrogen reduction (%)
$TP_R$	total phosphorus reduction (%)
$DP_R$	dissolved phosphorus reduction (%)
$DAFS_{ratio1}$	drainage area to VFS area ratio for section 1
$DAFS_{ratio2}$	drainage area to the VFS area ratio for section 2
$DAFS_{ratio}$	average drainage area to the VFS area ratio for the entire HRU (user input)
$CF_{frac}$	fraction of the flow through the most heavily loaded 10% of the VFS which is fully channelized (user input)
$DF_{con}$	fraction of the field drained by the most heavily loaded 10% of the VFS (user input)
$Scap$	sediment transport capacity in ( $\text{mg}/\text{m}^3$ )
$Spcon$	sediment transport coefficient and v is flow velocity in the waterway (m/s)
$SolR$	soluble pollutant removal (%)
$SD$	runoff depth over unsubmerged waterway area in (mm/day)
$SolK$	saturated hydrologic conductivity of the soil surface (mm/hr)
$SedR$	sediment and particulate pollutant removal (%)
$SedL$	sediment load per unit area of unsubmerged waterway in ( $\text{kg}/\text{ha}/\text{day}$ ).

## 6:5.4 REFERENCES

---

- Arabi M, Frankenberger JR, Engel BE, Arnold JG. 2008. Representation of agricultural conservation practices with SWAT. *Hydrological Processes* 22(16): 3042-3055.
- Barfield BJ, Blevins RL, Fogle AW, Madison CE, Inamdar S, Carey DI, Evangelou VP. 1998. Water quality impacts of natural filter strips in karst areas. *Transactions of the ASAE* 41(2): 371-381.
- Chu T, Shirmohammadi A, Abbott L, Sadeghi A, Montas H. 2005. Watershed level BMP evaluation with SWAT model. In proceedings of the *American Society of Agricultural Engineers Annual International Meeting*. July 17-20, 2005, Tampa, Florida, USA. ASABE Publication number 052098.

- Dillaha TA, Reneau RB, Mostaghimi S, Lee D. 1989. Vegetative filter strips for agricultural nonpoint source pollution control. *Transactions of the ASAE* 32(2): 513-519.
- Dorioz JM, Wang D, Poulenard J, Trévisan D. 2006. The effect of grass buffer strips on phosphorus dynamics--A critical review and synthesis as a basis for application in agricultural landscapes in France. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 117(1): 4-21.
- Dosskey MG, Helmers MJ, Eisenhauer DE, Franti TG, Hoagland KD. 2002. Assessment of concentrated flow through riparian buffers. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 57(6): 336-343.
- Dosskey MG, Helmers MJ, Eisenhauer DE, Franti TG, Hoagland KD. 2002. Assessment of concentrated flow through riparian buffers. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 57(6): 336-343.
- Goel, P.K., R.P. Rudra, B. Gharabaghi, S. Das, and N. Gupta. 2004. Pollutants removal by vegetative filter strips planted with different grasses 2004 ASAE/CSAE Annual International Meeting, August 1-4, 2004, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. ASAE Publication number 042177.
- Harmel D, Potter S, Ellis P, Reckhow K, Green C. 2006. Compilation of measured nutrient load data for agricultural land uses in the United States. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(5): 1163-1178.
- Helmers MJ. 2003. *Two-dimensional overland flow and sediment trapping in a vegetative filter*. Ph.D Dissertation University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE USA.
- Koelsch RK, Lorimor JC, Mankin KR. 2006. Vegetative treatment systems for management of open lot runoff: Review of literature. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture* 22(1): 141-153.
- Krutz LJ, Senseman SA, Zablotowicz RM, Matocha MA. 2005. Reducing herbicide runoff from agricultural fields with vegetative filter strips: a review. *Weed Science* 53(3): 353-367.

- Lee KH, Isenhart TM, Schultz RC, Mickelson SK. 2000. Multispecies riparian buffers trap sediment and nutrients during rainfall simulations. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 29(4): 1200-1205.
- Magette WL, Brinsfield RB, Palmer RE, Wood JD. 1989. Nutrient and sediment removal by vegetative filter strips. *Transactions of the ASAE* 32(2): 663-667.
- Mayer PM, Steven K. Reynolds J, Canfield TJ, McCutchen MD. 2005. *Riparian buffer width, vegetative cover, and nitrogen removal effectiveness: A review of current science and regulations*. Environmental Protection Agency Document number EPA/600/R-05/118, US Government Printing Office: Washington, DC 20402-9328.
- Minitab-Inc. 2006. Minitab statistical software, release 15 for windows. State College, Pennsylvania.
- Muñoz-Carpena R, Parsons JE, Wendell GJ. 1999. Modeling hydrology and sediment transport in vegetative filter strips. *Journal of Hydrology* 214(1999): 111-129.
- Muñoz-Carpena R, Parsons JE. 2005. *VFSMOD-W Vegetative Filter Strips Hydrology and Sediment Transport Modeling System Model Documentation and Users Manual*. University of Florida. Gainesville, FL. Available online at: <http://carpena.ifas.ufl.edu/vfsmod/doc200/vfsm-draft.pdf>.
- Parajuli, P.B., K.R. Mankin, and P.L. Barnes. 2008. Applicability of targeting vegetative filter strips to abate fecal bacteria and sediment yield using SWAT. *Agricultural Water Management* 95:1189-1200.
- Parkyn S. 2004. *Review of riparian buffer zone effectiveness*. Technical Paper No: 2004/05. New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Quinn P, Beven K, Chevallier P, Planchon O. 1991. The prediction of hillslope flow paths for distributed hydrological modelling using digital terrain models. *Hydrological Processes* 5(1): 59-79.

USDA Soil Conservation Service. 1972. Section 4. Hydrology. In *National Engineering Handbook*, US. Department of Agriculture-Soil Conservation Service: Washington, DC.


Wenger S. 1999. *A review of the scientific literature on riparian buffer width, extent and vegetation*. Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia. Athens, GA.

White MJ and Arnold JG. 2009. Development of a simplistic vegetative filter strip model for sediment and nutrient retention at the field scale. *Hydrol. Process.* 23, 1602-1616.

Williams J. 1975. Sediment routing for agricultural watersheds. *Water Resources Bulletin* 11(5): 965–974.



# MAIN CHANNEL PROCESSES



Flow in a watershed is classified as overland or channelized. The primary difference between the two flow processes is that water storage and its influence on flow rates is considered in channelized flow. Main channel processes modeled by SWAT include the movement of water, sediment and other constituents (e.g. nutrients, pesticides) in the stream network, in-stream nutrient cycling, and in-stream pesticide transformations. Optional processes include the change in channel dimensions with time due to downcutting and widening.

---

## **SECTION 7 CHAPTER 1**

# **EQUATIONS: WATER ROUTING**

---

Open channel flow is defined as channel flow with a free surface, such as flow in a river or partially full pipe. SWAT uses Manning's equation to define the rate and velocity of flow. Water is routed through the channel network using the variable storage routing method or the Muskingum river routing method. Both the variable storage and Muskingum routing methods are variations of the kinematic wave model. A detailed discussion of the kinematic wave flood routing model can be found in Chow et al. (1988).

## 7:1.1 CHANNEL CHARACTERISTICS

---

SWAT assumes the main channels, or reaches, have a trapezoidal shape (Figure 7:1-1).




Figure 7:1-1: Trapezoidal channel dimensions

Users are required to define the width and depth of the channel when filled to the top of the bank as well as the channel length, slope along the channel length and Manning's "n" value. SWAT assumes the channel sides have a 2:1 run to rise ratio ( $z_{ch} = 2$ ). The slope of the channel sides is then  $\frac{1}{2}$  or 0.5. The bottom width is calculated from the bankfull width and depth with the equation:

$$W_{btm} = W_{bnkfull} - 2 \cdot z_{ch} \cdot depth_{bnkfull} \quad 7:1.1.1$$

where  $W_{btm}$  is the bottom width of the channel (m),  $W_{bnkfull}$  is the top width of the channel when filled with water (m),  $z_{ch}$  is the inverse of the channel side slope, and  $depth_{bnkfull}$  is the depth of water in the channel when filled to the top of the bank (m). Because of the assumption that  $z_{ch} = 2$ , it is possible for the bottom width calculated with equation 7:1.1.1 to be less than or equal to zero. If this occurs, the model sets  $W_{btm} = 0.5 \cdot W_{bnkfull}$  and calculates a new value for the channel side slope run by solving equation 7:1.1.1 for  $z_{ch}$ :

$$z_{ch} = \frac{(W_{bnkfull} - W_{btm})}{2 \cdot depth_{bnkfull}} \quad 7:1.1.2$$

For a given depth of water in the channel, the width of the channel at water level is:

$$W = W_{btm} + 2 \cdot z_{ch} \cdot depth \quad 7:1.1.3$$

where  $W$  is the width of the channel at water level (m),  $W_{btm}$  is the bottom width of the channel (m),  $z_{ch}$  is the inverse of the channel slope, and  $depth$  is the depth of water in the channel (m). The cross-sectional area of flow is calculated:

$$A_{ch} = (W_{btm} + z_{ch} \cdot depth) \cdot depth \quad 7:1.1.4$$

where  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^2$ ),  $W_{btm}$  is the bottom width of the channel (m),  $z_{ch}$  is the inverse of the channel slope, and  $depth$  is the depth of water in the channel (m). The wetted perimeter of the channel is defined as

$$P_{ch} = W_{btm} + 2 \cdot depth \cdot \sqrt{1 + z_{ch}^2} \quad 7:1.1.5$$

where  $P_{ch}$  is the wetted perimeter for a given depth of flow (m). The hydraulic radius of the channel is calculated

$$R_{ch} = \frac{A_{ch}}{P_{ch}} \quad 7:1.1.6$$

where  $R_{ch}$  is the hydraulic radius for a given depth of flow (m),  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^2$ ), and  $P_{ch}$  is the wetted perimeter for a given depth of flow (m). The volume of water held in the channel is

$$V_{ch} = 1000 \cdot L_{ch} \cdot A_{ch} \quad 7:1.1.7$$

where  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water stored in the channel ( $\text{m}^3$ ),  $L_{ch}$  is the channel length (km), and  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel for a given depth of water ( $\text{m}^2$ ).

When the volume of water in the reach exceeds the maximum amount that can be held by the channel, the excess water spreads across the flood plain. The flood plain dimensions used by SWAT are shown in Figure 7:1-2.




Figure 7:1-2: Illustration of flood plain dimensions.

The bottom width of the floodplain,  $W_{btm,fld}$ , is  $W_{btm,fld} = 5 \cdot W_{bnkfull}$ . SWAT assumes the flood plain side slopes have a 4:1 run to rise ratio ( $z_{fld} = 4$ ). The slope of the flood plain sides is then  $\frac{1}{4}$  or 0.25.

When flow is present in the flood plain, the calculation of the flow depth, cross-sectional flow area and wetting perimeter is a sum of the channel and floodplain components:

$$\text{depth} = \text{depth}_{bnkfull} + \text{depth}_{fld} \quad 7:1.1.8$$

$$A_{ch} = (W_{btm} + z_{ch} \cdot \text{depth}_{bnkfull}) \cdot \text{depth}_{bnkfull} + (W_{btm,fld} + z_{fld} \cdot \text{depth}_{fld}) \cdot \text{depth}_{fld} \quad 7:1.1.9$$

$$P_{ch} = W_{btm} + 2 \cdot \text{depth}_{bnkfull} \cdot \sqrt{1 + z_{ch}^2} + 4 \cdot W_{bnkfull} + 2 \cdot \text{depth}_{fld} \cdot \sqrt{1 + z_{fld}^2} \quad 7:1.1.10$$

where  $\text{depth}$  is the total depth of water (m),  $\text{depth}_{bnkfull}$  is the depth of water in the channel when filled to the top of the bank (m),  $\text{depth}_{fld}$  is the depth of water in the flood plain (m),  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow for a given depth of water ( $\text{m}^2$ ),  $W_{btm}$  is the bottom width of the channel (m),  $z_{ch}$  is the inverse of the channel side slope,  $W_{btm,fld}$  is the bottom width of the flood plain (m),  $z_{fld}$  is the inverse of the flood plain side slope,  $P_{ch}$  is the wetted perimeter for a given depth of flow (m), and  $W_{bnkfull}$  is the top width of the channel when filled with water (m).

Table 7:1-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to channel dimension calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
CH_W(2)	$W_{bnkfull}$ : Width of channel at top of bank (m)	.rte
CH_D	$\text{depth}_{bnkfull}$ : Depth of water in channel when filled to bank (m)	.rte
CH_L(2)	$L_{ch}$ : Length of main channel (km)	.rte

## 7:1.2 FLOW RATE AND VELOCITY

Manning's equation for uniform flow in a channel is used to calculate the rate and velocity of flow in a reach segment for a given time step:

$$q_{ch} = \frac{A_{ch} \cdot R_{ch}^{2/3} \cdot \text{slp}_{ch}^{1/2}}{n} \quad 7:1.2.1$$

$$v_c = \frac{R_{ch}^{2/3} \cdot \text{slp}_{ch}^{1/2}}{n} \quad 7:1.2.2$$

where  $q_{ch}$  is the rate of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ),  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^2$ ),  $R_{ch}$  is the hydraulic radius for a given depth of flow (m),

$slp_{ch}$  is the slope along the channel length (m/m),  $n$  is Manning's "n" coefficient for the channel, and  $v_c$  is the flow velocity (m/s).

SWAT routes water as a volume. The daily value for cross-sectional area of flow,  $A_{ch}$ , is calculated by rearranging equation 7:1.1.7 to solve for the area:

$$A_{ch} = \frac{V_{ch}}{1000 \cdot L_{ch}} \quad 7:1.2.3$$

where  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel for a given depth of water ( $m^2$ ),  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water stored in the channel ( $m^3$ ), and  $L_{ch}$  is the channel length (km). Equation 7:1.1.4 is rearranged to calculate the depth of flow for a given time step:

$$depth = \sqrt{\frac{A_{ch}}{z_{ch}} + \left(\frac{W_{btm}}{2 \cdot z_{ch}}\right)^2} - \frac{W_{btm}}{2 \cdot z_{ch}} \quad 7:1.2.4$$

where  $depth$  is the depth of flow (m),  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel for a given depth of water ( $m^2$ ),  $W_{btm}$  is the bottom width of the channel (m), and  $z_{ch}$  is the inverse of the channel side slope. Equation 7:1.2.4 is valid only when all water is contained in the channel. If the volume of water in the reach segment has filled the channel and is in the flood plain, the depth is calculated:

$$depth = depth_{bnkfull} + \sqrt{\frac{(A_{ch} - A_{ch,bnkfull})}{z_{fld}} + \left(\frac{W_{btm,fld}}{2 \cdot z_{fld}}\right)^2} - \frac{W_{btm,fld}}{2 \cdot z_{fld}} \quad 7:1.2.5$$

where  $depth$  is the depth of flow (m),  $depth_{bnkfull}$  is the depth of water in the channel when filled to the top of the bank (m),  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel for a given depth of water ( $m^2$ ),  $A_{ch,bnkfull}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel when filled to the top of the bank ( $m^2$ ),  $W_{btm,fld}$  is the bottom width of the flood plain (m), and  $z_{fld}$  is the inverse of the flood plain side slope.

Once the depth is known, the wetting perimeter and hydraulic radius are calculated using equations 7:1.1.5 (or 7:1.1.10) and 7:1.1.6. At this point, all values required to calculate the flow rate and velocity are known and equations 7:1.2.1 and 7:1.2.2 can be solved.

Table 7:1-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to channel flow calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
CH_S(2)	$slp_{ch}$ : Average channel slope along channel length ( $m m^{-1}$ )	.rte
CH_N(2)	$n$ : Manning's "n" value for the main channel	.rte
CH_L(2)	$L_{ch}$ : Length of main channel (km)	.rte

## 7:1.3 VARIABLE STORAGE ROUTING METHOD

The variable storage routing method was developed by Williams (1969) and used in the HYMO (Williams and Hann, 1973) and ROTO (Arnold et al., 1995) models.

For a given reach segment, storage routing is based on the continuity equation:

$$V_{in} - V_{out} = \Delta V_{stored} \quad 7:1.3.1$$

where  $V_{in}$  is the volume of inflow during the time step ( $m^3 H_2O$ ),  $V_{out}$  is the volume of outflow during the time step ( $m^3 H_2O$ ), and  $\Delta V_{stored}$  is the change in volume of storage during the time step ( $m^3 H_2O$ ). This equation can be written as

$$\Delta t \cdot \left( \frac{q_{in,1} + q_{in,2}}{2} \right) - \Delta t \cdot \left( \frac{q_{out,1} + q_{out,2}}{2} \right) = V_{stored,2} - V_{stored,1} \quad 7:1.3.2$$

where  $\Delta t$  is the length of the time step (s),  $q_{in,1}$  is the inflow rate at the beginning of the time step ( $m^3/s$ ),  $q_{in,2}$  is the inflow rate at the end of the time step ( $m^3/s$ ),  $q_{out,1}$  is the outflow rate at the beginning of the time step ( $m^3/s$ ),  $q_{out,2}$  is the outflow rate at the end of the time step ( $m^3/s$ ),  $V_{stored,1}$  is the storage volume at the beginning of the time step ( $m^3 H_2O$ ), and  $V_{stored,2}$  is the storage volume at the end of the time step ( $m^3 H_2O$ ). Rearranging equation 7:1.3.2 so that all known variables are on the left side of the equation,

$$q_{in,ave} + \frac{V_{stored,1}}{\Delta t} - \frac{q_{out,1}}{2} = \frac{V_{stored,2}}{\Delta t} + \frac{q_{out,2}}{2} \quad 7:1.3.3$$

where  $q_{in,ave}$  is the average inflow rate during the time step:  $q_{in,ave} = \frac{q_{in,1} + q_{in,2}}{2}$ .

Travel time is computed by dividing the volume of water in the channel by the flow rate.

$$TT = \frac{V_{stored}}{q_{out}} = \frac{V_{stored,1}}{q_{out,1}} = \frac{V_{stored,2}}{q_{out,2}} \quad 7:1.3.4$$

where  $TT$  is the travel time (s),  $V_{stored}$  is the storage volume ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $q_{out}$  is the discharge rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ).

To obtain a relationship between travel time and the storage coefficient, equation 7:1.3.4 is substituted into equation 7:1.3.3:

$$q_{in,ave} + \frac{V_{stored,1}}{\left(\frac{\Delta t}{TT}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{V_{stored,1}}{q_{out,1}}\right)} - \frac{q_{out,1}}{2} = \frac{V_{stored,2}}{\left(\frac{\Delta t}{TT}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{V_{stored,2}}{q_{out,2}}\right)} + \frac{q_{out,2}}{2} \quad 7:1.3.5$$

which simplifies to

$$q_{out,2} = \left( \frac{2 \cdot \Delta t}{2 \cdot TT + \Delta t} \right) \cdot q_{in,ave} + \left( 1 - \frac{2 \cdot \Delta t}{2 \cdot TT + \Delta t} \right) \cdot q_{out,1} \quad 7:1.3.6$$

This equation is similar to the coefficient method equation

$$q_{out,2} = SC \cdot q_{in,ave} + (1 - SC) \cdot q_{out,1} \quad 7:1.3.7$$

where  $SC$  is the storage coefficient. Equation 7:1.3.7 is the basis for the SCS convex routing method (SCS, 1964) and the Muskingum method (Brakensiek, 1967; Overton, 1966). From equation 7:1.3.6, the storage coefficient in equation 7:1.3.7 is defined as

$$SC = \frac{2 \cdot \Delta t}{2 \cdot TT + \Delta t} \quad 7:1.3.8$$

It can be shown that

$$(1 - SC) \cdot q_{out} = SC \cdot \frac{V_{stored}}{\Delta t} \quad 7:1.3.9$$

Substituting this into equation 7:1.3.7 gives

$$q_{out,2} = SC \cdot \left( q_{in,ave} + \frac{V_{stored,1}}{\Delta t} \right) \quad 7:1.3.10$$

To express all values in units of volume, both sides of the equation are multiplied by the time step

$$V_{out,2} = SC \cdot (V_{in} + V_{stored,1}) \quad 7:1.3.11$$

## 7:1.4 MUSKINGUM ROUTING METHOD

The Muskingum routing method models the storage volume in a channel length as a combination of wedge and prism storages (Figure 7:1-3).




Figure 7:1-3: Prism and wedge storages in a reach segment (After Chow et al., 1988)

When a flood wave advances into a reach segment, inflow exceeds outflow and a wedge of storage is produced. As the flood wave recedes, outflow exceeds inflow in the reach segment and a negative wedge is produced. In addition to the wedge storage, the reach segment contains a prism of storage formed by a volume of constant cross-section along the reach length.

As defined by Manning's equation (equation 7:1.2.1), the cross-sectional area of flow is assumed to be directly proportional to the discharge for a given reach segment. Using this assumption, the volume of prism storage can be expressed as a function of the discharge,  $K \cdot q_{out}$ , where  $K$  is the ratio of storage to discharge and has the dimension of time. In a similar manner, the volume of wedge storage can be expressed as  $K \cdot X \cdot (q_{in} - q_{out})$ , where  $X$  is a weighting factor that controls the relative importance of inflow and outflow in determining the storage in a reach. Summing these terms gives a value for total storage

$$V_{stored} = K \cdot q_{out} + K \cdot X \cdot (q_{in} - q_{out}) \quad 7:1.4.1$$

where  $V_{stored}$  is the storage volume ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $q_{in}$  is the inflow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ),  $q_{out}$  is the discharge rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ),  $K$  is the storage time constant for the reach (s), and  $X$  is the weighting factor. This equation can be rearranged to the form

$$V_{stored} = K \cdot (X \cdot q_{in} + (1 - X) \cdot q_{out}) \quad 7:1.4.2$$

This format is similar to equation 7:1.3.7.

The weighting factor,  $X$ , has a lower limit of 0.0 and an upper limit of 0.5. This factor is a function of the wedge storage. For reservoir-type storage, there is no wedge and  $X = 0.0$ . For a full-wedge,  $X = 0.5$ . For rivers,  $X$  will fall between 0.0 and 0.3 with a mean value near 0.2.

The definition for storage volume in equation 7:1.4.2 can be incorporated into the continuity equation (equation 7:1.3.2) and simplified to

$$q_{out,2} = C_1 \cdot q_{in,2} + C_2 \cdot q_{in,1} + C_3 \cdot q_{out,1} \quad 7:1.4.3$$

where  $q_{in,1}$  is the inflow rate at the beginning of the time step ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ),  $q_{in,2}$  is the inflow rate at the end of the time step ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ),  $q_{out,1}$  is the outflow rate at the beginning of the time step ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ),  $q_{out,2}$  is the outflow rate at the end of the time step ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ), and

$$C_1 = \frac{\Delta t - 2 \cdot K \cdot X}{2 \cdot K \cdot (1 - X) + \Delta t} \quad 7:1.4.4$$

$$C_2 = \frac{\Delta t + 2 \cdot K \cdot X}{2 \cdot K \cdot (1 - X) + \Delta t} \quad 7:1.4.5$$

$$C_3 = \frac{2 \cdot K \cdot (1 - X) - \Delta t}{2 \cdot K \cdot (1 - X) + \Delta t} \quad 7:1.4.6$$

where  $C_1 + C_2 + C_3 = 1$ . To express all values in units of volume, both sides of equation 7:1.4.3 are multiplied by the time step

$$V_{out,2} = C_1 \cdot V_{in,2} + C_2 \cdot V_{in,1} + C_3 \cdot V_{out,1} \quad 7:1.4.7$$

To maintain numerical stability and avoid the computation of negative outflows, the following condition must be met:

$$2 \cdot K \cdot X < \Delta t < 2 \cdot K \cdot (1 - X) \quad 7:1.4.8$$

The value for the weighting factor,  $X$ , is input by the user. The value for the storage time constant is estimated as:

$$K = \text{coef}_1 \cdot K_{\text{bnkfull}} + \text{coef}_2 \cdot K_{0.1\text{bnkfull}} \quad 7:1.4.9$$

where  $K$  is the storage time constant for the reach segment (s),  $\text{coef}_1$  and  $\text{coef}_2$  are weighting coefficients input by the user,  $K_{\text{bnkfull}}$  is the storage time constant calculated for the reach segment with bankfull flows (s), and  $K_{0.1\text{bnkfull}}$  is the storage time constant calculated for the reach segment with one-tenth of the bankfull flows (s). To calculate  $K_{\text{bnkfull}}$  and  $K_{0.1\text{bnkfull}}$ , an equation developed by Cunge (1969) is used:

$$K = \frac{1000 \cdot L_{ch}}{c_k} \quad 7:1.4.10$$

where  $K$  is the storage time constant (s),  $L_{ch}$  is the channel length (km), and  $c_k$  is the celerity corresponding to the flow for a specified depth (m/s). Celerity is the velocity with which a variation in flow rate travels along the channel. It is defined as

$$c_k = \frac{d}{dA_{ch}}(q_{ch}) \quad 7:1.4.11$$

where the flow rate,  $q_{ch}$ , is defined by Manning's equation. Differentiating equation 7:1.2.1 with respect to the cross-sectional area gives

$$c_k = \frac{5}{3} \cdot \left( \frac{R_{ch}^{2/3} \cdot \text{slp}_{ch}^{1/2}}{n} \right) = \frac{5}{3} \cdot v_c \quad 7:1.4.12$$

where  $c_k$  is the celerity (m/s),  $R_{ch}$  is the hydraulic radius for a given depth of flow (m),  $\text{slp}_{ch}$  is the slope along the channel length (m/m),  $n$  is Manning's "n" coefficient for the channel, and  $v_c$  is the flow velocity (m/s).

Table 7:1-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to Muskingum routing.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
MSK_X	X: weighting factor	.bsn
MSK_CO1	$\text{coef}_1$ : weighting factor for influence of normal flow on storage time constant value	.bsn
MSK_CO2	$\text{coef}_2$ : weighting factor for influence of low flow on storage time constant	.bsn

## 7:1.5 TRANSMISSION LOSSES

---

The classification of a stream as ephemeral, intermittent or perennial is a function of the amount of groundwater contribution received by the stream. Ephemeral streams contain water during and immediately after a storm event and are dry the rest of the year. Intermittent streams are dry part of the year, but contain flow when the groundwater is high enough as well as during and after a storm event. Perennial streams receive continuous groundwater contributions and flow throughout the year.

During periods when a stream receives no groundwater contributions, it is possible for water to be lost from the channel via transmission through the side and bottom of the channel. Transmission losses are estimated with the equation

$$tloss = K_{ch} \cdot TT \cdot P_{ch} \cdot L_{ch} \quad 7:1.5.1$$

where  $tloss$  are the channel transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $K_{ch}$  is the effective hydraulic conductivity of the channel alluvium (mm/hr),  $TT$  is the flow travel time (hr),  $P_{ch}$  is the wetted perimeter (m), and  $L_{ch}$  is the channel length (km). Transmission losses from the main channel are assumed to enter bank storage or the deep aquifer.

Typical values for  $K_{ch}$  for various alluvium materials are given in Table 7:1-4. For perennial streams with continuous groundwater contribution, the effective conductivity will be zero.

Table 7:1-4: Example hydraulic conductivity values for various bed materials (from Lane, 1983).

<b>Bed material group</b>	<b>Bed material characteristics</b>	<b>Hydraulic conductivity</b>
1 Very high loss rate	Very clean gravel and large sand	> 127 mm/hr
2 High loss rate	Clean sand and gravel, field conditions	51-127 mm/hr
3 Moderately high loss rate	Sand and gravel mixture with low silt-clay content	25-76 mm/hr
4 Moderate loss rate	Sand and gravel mixture with high silt-clay content	6-25 mm/hr
5 Insignificant to low loss rate	Consolidated bed material; high silt-clay content	0.025-2.5 mm/hr

Table 7:1-5: SWAT input variables that pertain to transmission losses.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
CH_K(2)	$K_{ch}$ : Effective hydraulic conductivity of channel (mm/hr)	.rte
CH_L(2)	$L_{ch}$ : Length of main channel (km)	.rte

## 7:1.6 EVAPORATION LOSSES

---

Evaporation losses from the reach are calculated:

$$E_{ch} = coef_{ev} \cdot E_o \cdot L_{ch} \cdot W \cdot fr_{\Delta t} \quad 7:1.6.1$$

where  $E_{ch}$  is the evaporation from the reach for the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $coef_{ev}$  is an evaporation coefficient,  $E_o$  is potential evaporation (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $L_{ch}$  is the channel length (km),  $W$  is the channel width at water level (m), and  $fr_{\Delta t}$  is the fraction of the time step in which water is flowing in the channel.

The evaporation coefficient is a calibration parameter for the user and is allowed to vary between 0.0 and 1.0.

The fraction of the time step in which water is flowing in the channel is calculated by dividing the travel time by the length of the time step.

Table 7:1-6: SWAT input variables that pertain to evaporation losses.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
EVRCH	$coef_{ev}$ : Reach evaporation adjustment factor	.bsn
CH_L(2)	$L_{ch}$ : Length of main channel (km)	.rte

## 7:1.7 BANK STORAGE

---

The amount of water entering bank storage on a given day is calculated:

$$bnk_{in} = tloss \cdot (1 - fr_{trms}) \quad 7:1.7.1$$

where  $bnk_{in}$  is the amount of water entering bank storage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $tloss$  are the channel transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $fr_{trms}$  is the fraction of transmission losses partitioned to the deep aquifer.

Bank storage contributes flow to the main channel or reach within the subbasin. Bank flow is simulated with a recession curve similar to that used for groundwater. The volume of water entering the reach from bank storage is calculated:

$$V_{bnk} = bnk \cdot (1 - \exp[-\alpha_{bnk}]) \quad 7:1.7.2$$

where  $V_{bnk}$  is the volume of water added to the reach via return flow from bank storage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $bnk$  is the total amount of water in bank storage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $\alpha_{bnk}$  is the bank flow recession constant or constant of proportionality.

Water may move from bank storage into an adjacent unsaturated zone. SWAT models the movement of water into adjacent unsaturated areas as a function of water demand for evapotranspiration. To avoid confusion with soil evaporation and transpiration, this process has been termed revap. This process is significant in watersheds where the saturated zone is not very far below the surface or where deep-rooted plants are growing. Revap from bank storage is governed by the groundwater revap coefficient defined for the last HRU in the subbasin.

The maximum amount of water than will be removed from bank storage via revap on a given day is:

$$bnk_{revap,mx} = \beta_{rev} \cdot E_o \cdot L_{ch} \cdot W \quad 7:1.7.3$$

where  $bnk_{revap,mx}$  is the maximum amount of water moving into the unsaturated zone in response to water deficiencies ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $\beta_{rev}$  is the revap coefficient,  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration for the day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $L_{ch}$  is the channel length (km), and  $W$  is the width of the channel at water level (m). The actual amount of revap that will occur on a given day is calculated:

$$bnk_{revap} = bnk \quad \text{if } bnk < bnk_{revap,mx} \quad 7:1.7.4$$

$$bnk_{revap} = bnk_{revap,mx} \quad \text{if } bnk \geq bnk_{revap,mx} \quad 7:1.7.5$$

where  $bnk_{revap}$  is the actual amount of water moving into the unsaturated zone in response to water deficiencies ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $bnk_{revap,mx}$  is the maximum amount of water moving into the unsaturated zone in response to water deficiencies ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $bnk$  is the amount of water in bank storage at the beginning of day  $i$  ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

Table 7:1-7: SWAT input variables that pertain to bank storage.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
TRNSRCH	$fr_{trns}$ : Fraction of transmission losses partitioned to the deep aquifer	.bsn
ALPHA_BNK	$\alpha_{bnk}$ : Bank flow recession constant or constant of proportionality	.rte
GW_REVAP	$\beta_{rev}$ : Revap coefficient	.gw

## 7:1.8 CHANNEL WATER BALANCE

Water storage in the reach at the end of the time step is calculated:

$$V_{stored,2} = V_{stored,1} + V_{in} - V_{out} - tloss - E_{ch} + div + V_{bnk} \quad 7:1.8.1$$

where  $V_{stored,2}$  is the volume of water in the reach at the end of the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{stored,1}$  is the volume of water in the reach at the beginning of the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{in}$  is the volume of water flowing into the reach during the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{out}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the reach during the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $tloss$  is the volume of water lost from the reach via transmission through the bed ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $E_{ch}$  is the evaporation from the reach for the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $div$  is the volume of water added or removed from the reach for the day through diversions ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{bnk}$  is the volume of water added to the reach via return flow from bank storage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

SWAT treats the volume of outflow calculated with equation 7:1.3.11 or 7:1.4.7 as the net amount of water removed from the reach. As transmission losses, evaporation and other water losses for the reach segment are calculated, the amount of outflow to the next reach segment is reduced by the amount of the loss. When outflow and all losses are summed, the total amount will equal the value obtained from 7:1.3.11 or 7:1.4.7.

## 7:1.9 NOMENCLATURE

---

$A_{ch}$	Cross-sectional area of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$A_{ch,bnkfull}$	Cross-sectional area of flow in the channel when filled to the top of the bank ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$C_1$	Coefficient in Muskingum flood routing equation
$C_2$	Coefficient in Muskingum flood routing equation
$C_3$	Coefficient in Muskingum flood routing equation
$E_{ch}$	Evaporation from the reach for the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$E_o$	Potential evapotranspiration ( $\text{mm d}^{-1}$ )
$K$	Storage time constant for the reach (s)
$K_{0.1bnkfull}$	Storage time constant calculated for the reach segment with one-tenth of the bankfull flows (s)
$K_{bnkfull}$	Storage time constant calculated for the reach segment with bankfull flows (s)
$K_{ch}$	Effective hydraulic conductivity of the channel alluvium ( $\text{mm/hr}$ )
$L_{ch}$	Length of main channel (km)
$P_{ch}$	Wetted perimeter for a given depth of flow (m)
$R_{ch}$	Hydraulic radius for a given depth of flow (m)
$SC$	Storage coefficient for variable storage flow routing
$TT$	Travel time (s)
$V_{bnk}$	Volume of water added to the reach via return flow from bank storage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{ch}$	Volume of water stored in the channel ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{in}$	Volume of inflow during the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{out}$	Volume of outflow during the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{stored}$	Volume of water stored in water body or channel ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$W$	Width of channel at water level (m)
$W_{bnkfull}$	Top width of the channel when filled with water (m)
$W_{btm}$	Bottom width of the channel (m)
$W_{btm,fld}$	Bottom width of the flood plain (m)
$X$	Weighting factor in Muskingum routing
$bnk$	Total amount of water in bank storage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$bnk_{in}$	Amount of water entering bank storage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$bnk_{revap,mx}$	Maximum amount of water moving into the unsaturated zone in response to water deficiencies ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$c_k$	Celerity corresponding to the flow for a specified depth (m/s)
$coef_1$	Weighting coefficient for storage time constant calculation
$coef_2$	Weighting coefficient for storage time constant calculation
$coef_{ev}$	Evaporation coefficient
$depth$	Depth of water in the channel (m)
$depth_{bnkfull}$	Depth of water in the channel when filled to the top of the bank (m)
$depth_{fld}$	Depth of water in the flood plain (m)
$div$	Volume of water added or removed from the reach for the day through diversions ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$fr_{trns}$	Fraction of transmission losses partitioned to the deep aquifer

$fr_{\Delta t}$	Fraction of the time step in which water is flowing in the channel
$n$	Manning's roughness coefficient for the subbasin or channel
$q_{ch}$	Average channel flow rate ( $m^3 s^{-1}$ )
$q_{in}$	Inflow rate ( $m^3/s$ )
$q_{out}$	Outflow rate ( $m^3/s$ )
$slp_{ch}$	Average channel slope along channel length ( $m m^{-1}$ )
$tloss$	Channel transmission losses ( $m^3 H_2O$ )
$v_c$	Average channel velocity ( $m s^{-1}$ )
$Z_{ch}$	Inverse of the channel side slope
$Z_{fld}$	Inverse of the flood plain side slope
$\alpha_{bnk}$	Bank flow recession constant or constant of proportionality
$\beta_{rev}$	Revap coefficient
$\Delta t$	Length of the time step (s)

## 7:1.10 REFERENCES

---

- Arnold, J.G., J.R. Williams, and D.R. Maidment. 1995. Continuous-time water and sediment routing model for large basins. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 121(2): 171-183.
- Brakensiek, D.L. 1967. Kinematic flood routing. *Transactions of the ASAE* 10(3):340-343.
- Chow, V.T., D.R. Maidment, and L.W. Mays. 1988. *Applied hydrology*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, NY.
- Cunge, J.A. 1969. On the subject of a flood propagation method (Muskingum method). *J. Hydraulics Research* 7(2):205-230.
- Lane, L.J. 1983. Chapter 19: Transmission Losses. p.19-1–19-21. In Soil Conservation Service. National engineering handbook, section 4: hydrology. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Overton, D.E. 1966. Muskingum flood routing of upland streamflow. *Journal of Hydrology* 4:185-200.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1964. Chapter 17: Flood routing, Section 4, Hydrology, National engineering handbook. U.S. Department of Agriculture. U.S. Gov't Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Williams, J.R. 1969. Flood routing with variable travel time or variable storage coefficients. *Transactions of the ASAE* 12(1):100-103.
- Williams, J.R. and R.W. Hann. 1973. HYMO: Problem-oriented language for hydrologic modeling—User's manual. USDA, ARS-S-9.



## **SECTION 7 CHAPTER 2**

# **EQUATIONS: SEDIMENT ROUTING**

---

Sediment transport in the channel network is a function of two processes, deposition and degradation, operating simultaneously in the reach. SWAT will compute deposition and degradation using the same channel dimensions for the entire simulation. Alternatively, SWAT can also simulate downcutting and widening of the stream channel and update channel dimensions throughout the simulation. Sediment transport consists of two components 1) Landscape component and 2) Channel component. From the landscape component, SWAT keep tracks of the particle size distribution of eroded sediments and routes them through ponds, channels, and surface water bodies. In the channel, degradation or deposition of sediment can occur depending on the stream power, the exposure of channel sides and bottom to the erosive force of the stream and the composition of channel bank and bed sediment.

## 7:2.1 LANDSCAPE CONTRIBUTION TO SUBBASIN ROUTING REACH

---

The sediment size distribution of the detached sediment is estimated from the primary particle size distribution (Foster et al., 1980). The values are typical of many Midwestern soils.

$$PSA = (SAN)(1 - CLA)^{2.4} \quad 7:2.1.1$$

$$PSI = 0.13SIL \quad 7:2.1.2$$

$$PCL = 0.20CLA \quad 7:2.1.3$$

$$SAG = \begin{cases} 2.0CLA & \text{for } CLA < 0.25 \\ 0.28(CLA - 0.25) + 0.5 & \text{for } CLA \geq 0.25 \text{ and } CLA \leq 0.5 \\ 0.57 & \text{for } CLA > 0.5 \end{cases} \quad 7:2.1.4$$

$$LAG = 1.0 - PSA - PSI - PCL - SAG \quad 7:2.1.5$$

where SAN, SIL and CLA are the fractions of primary sand, silt, and clay in the original soil mass, and PSA, PSI, PCL, SAG and LAG are the fractions of sand, silt, clay, small aggregates, and large aggregates for the detached sediment before deposition. Total sediment yield from landscape calculated by MUSLE is multiplied by these fractions to get the corresponding yield distributions of sand, silt, clay, small aggregate and large aggregate. The particle diameters assumed are:

$$Sand = 0.20mm$$

$$Silt = 0.01mm$$

$$Clay = 0.002mm$$

$$SmallAggregate = 0.03mm$$

$$LargeAggregate = 0.50mm$$

Sediment yield from landscape is lagged (see the chapter on Erosion) and routed through grassed waterway, vegetative filter strips, and ponds, if available, before reaching the stream channel. Thus, the sediment yield reaching the stream channel is the sum of total sediment yield calculated by MUSLE minus the lag, and the sediment trapped in grassed waterway, vegetative filter strips and/or ponds. Please refer to the individual chapters for sediment routing through these elements. Based on the total sediment trapping calculated in these elements, coarser sediments such as sand and large aggregate are assumed to settle/trap first followed by fine sediments such as clay. This gives the final particle size distribution of sediment reaching the stream from landscape portion.

## **7.2.2 SEDIMENT ROUTING IN STREAM CHANNELS**

---

Each subbasin has a main routing reach where sediment from upland subbasins is routed and then added to downstream reaches. In SWAT 2005, a simplified version of Bagnold (1977) stream power equation was used to calculate the maximum amount of sediment that can be transported in a stream segment. It does not keep track of sediment pools in various particle sizes.

In the current version, four additional stream power equations with more physically based approach have been incorporated for modeling sediment transport, bank and bed erosions in channel containing various bed materials and sediment deposition. If one among these four physically based approach is selected, then the sediment pool in six particle sizes are tracked by the model.

### **7.2.2.1 SIMPLIFIED BAGNOLD EQUATION (DEFAULT METHOD)**

Williams (1980) used Bagnold's (1977) definition of stream power to develop a method for determining degradation as a function of channel slope and velocity. In this version, the equations have been simplified and the maximum amount of sediment that can be transported from a reach segment is a function of the peak channel velocity. The peak channel velocity,  $v_{ch,pk}$ , is calculated:

$$v_{ch,pk} = \frac{q_{ch,pk}}{A_{ch}} \quad 7:2.2.1$$

where  $q_{ch,pk}$  is the peak flow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ) and  $A_{ch}$  is the cross-sectional area of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^2$ ). The peak flow rate is defined as:

$$q_{ch,pk} = prf \cdot q_{ch} \quad 7:2.2.2$$

where  $prf$  is the peak rate adjustment factor, and  $q_{ch}$  is the average rate of flow ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ). Calculation of the average rate of flow,  $q_{ch}$ , and the cross-sectional area of flow,  $A_{ch}$ , is reviewed in Section 7, Chapter 1.

The maximum amount of sediment that can be transported from a reach segment is calculated:

$$conc_{sed,ch,mx} = c_{sp} \cdot v_{ch,pk}^{spexp} \quad 7:2.2.3$$

where  $conc_{sed,ch,mx}$  is the maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (ton/ $\text{m}^3$  or kg/L),  $c_{sp}$  is a coefficient defined by the user,  $v_{ch,pk}$  is the peak channel velocity ( $\text{m}/\text{s}$ ), and  $spexp$  is an exponent defined by the user. The exponent,  $spexp$ , normally varies between 1.0 and 2.0 and was set at 1.5 in the original Bagnold stream power equation (Arnold et al., 1995).

The maximum concentration of sediment calculated with equation 24.1.3 is compared to the concentration of sediment in the reach at the beginning of the time step,  $conc_{sed,ch,i}$ . If  $conc_{sed,ch,i} > conc_{sed,ch,mx}$ , deposition is the dominant process in the reach segment and the net amount of sediment deposited is calculated:

$$sed_{dep} = (conc_{sed,ch,i} - conc_{sed,ch,mx}) \cdot V_{ch} \quad 7:2.2.4$$

where  $sed_{dep}$  is the amount of sediment deposited in the reach segment (metric tons),  $conc_{sed,ch,i}$  is the initial sediment concentration in the reach (kg/L or ton/ $\text{m}^3$ ),  $conc_{sed,ch,mx}$  is the maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (kg/L or ton/ $\text{m}^3$ ), and  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water in the reach segment ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

If  $conc_{sed,ch,i} < conc_{sed,ch,mx}$ , degradation is the dominant process in the reach segment and the net amount of sediment reentrained is calculated:

$$sed_{deg} = (conc_{sed, ch, mx} - conc_{sed, ch, i}) \cdot V_{ch} \cdot K_{CH} \cdot C_{CH} \quad 7.2.2.5$$

where  $sed_{deg}$  is the amount of sediment reentrained in the reach segment (metric tons),  $conc_{sed, ch, mx}$  is the maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (kg/L or ton/m<sup>3</sup>),  $conc_{sed, ch, i}$  is the initial sediment concentration in the reach (kg/L or ton/m<sup>3</sup>),  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water in the reach segment (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O),  $K_{CH}$  is the channel erodibility factor, and  $C_{CH}$  is the channel cover factor.

Once the amount of deposition and degradation has been calculated, the final amount of sediment in the reach is determined:

$$sed_{ch} = sed_{ch, i} - sed_{dep} + sed_{deg} \quad 7.2.2.6$$

where  $sed_{ch}$  is the amount of suspended sediment in the reach (metric tons),  $sed_{ch, i}$  is the amount of suspended sediment in the reach at the beginning of the time period (metric tons),  $sed_{dep}$  is the amount of sediment deposited in the reach segment (metric tons), and  $sed_{deg}$  is the amount of sediment reentrained in the reach segment (metric tons).

The amount of sediment transported out of the reach is calculated:

$$sed_{out} = sed_{ch} \cdot \frac{V_{out}}{V_{ch}} \quad 7.2.2.7$$

where  $sed_{out}$  is the amount of sediment transported out of the reach (metric tons),  $sed_{ch}$  is the amount of suspended sediment in the reach (metric tons),  $V_{out}$  is the volume of outflow during the time step (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water in the reach segment (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O).

In this method, the erosion is assumed to be limited only by the transport capacity, i.e., the sediment supply from channel erosion is unlimited. If the bedload entering the channel is less than the transport capacity, then channel erosion is assumed to meet this deficit. On the other hand if the bedload entering the channel is more than the transport capacity, the difference in the load will get deposited within the channel. Hence, in the default method, the bed load carried by the channel is almost always near the maximum transport capacity given by the simplified Bagnold equation and only limited by the channel cover and

erodibility factors (eq. 7:2.2.11). During subsequent floods, the deposited sediments will be resuspended and transported before channel degradation.

If this method is chosen for sediment transport modeling, it does not keep track of particle size distribution through the channel reaches and all are assumed to be of silt size particles. Further, the channel erosion is not partitioned between stream bank and stream bed and deposition is assumed to occur only in the main channel; flood plain deposition of sediments is also not modeled separately.

### **7:2.2.2 PHYSICS BASED APPROACH FOR CHANNEL EROSION**

For the channel erosion to occur, both transport and supply should not be limiting, i.e., 1) the stream power (transport capacity) of the water should be high and the sediment load from the upstream regions should be less than this capacity and 2) The shear stress exerted by the water on the bed and bank should be more than the critical shear stress to dislodge the sediment particle. The potential erosion rates of bank and bed is predicted based on the excess shear stress equation (Hanson and Simon, 2001):

$$\xi_{bank} = k_{d,bank} \cdot (\tau_{e,bank} - \tau_{c,bank}) \cdot 10^{-6} \quad 7:2.2.8$$

$$\xi_{bed} = k_{d,bed} \cdot (\tau_{e,bed} - \tau_{c,bed}) \cdot 10^{-6} \quad 7:2.2.9$$

where  $\xi$  – erosion rates of the bank and bed (m/s),  $k_d$  – erodibility coefficient of bank and bed ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{N}\cdot\text{s}$ ) and  $\tau_c$  – Critical shear stress acting on bank and bed ( $\text{N}/\text{m}^2$ ). This equation indicates that effective stress on the channel bank and bed should be more than the respective critical stress for the erosion to occur.

The effective shear stress acting on the bank and bed are calculated using the following equations (Eaton and Millar, 2004):

$$\frac{\tau_{e,bank}}{\gamma \cdot depth \cdot slp_{ch}} = \frac{SF_{bank}}{100} \left( \frac{(W + P_{bed}) \cdot \sin \theta}{4 \cdot depth} \right) \quad 7:2.2.10$$

$$\frac{\tau_{e,bed}}{\gamma_w \cdot depth \cdot slp_{ch}} = \left( 1 - \frac{SF_{bank}}{100} \right) \left( \frac{W}{2 \cdot P_{bed}} + 0.5 \right) \quad 7:2.2.11$$

$$\log SF_{bank} = -1.4026 \cdot \log \left( \frac{P_{bed}}{P_{bank}} + 1.5 \right) + 2.247 \quad 7:2.2.12$$

where  $SF_{bank}$  – proportion of shear stress acting on the bank,  $\tau_e$  – effective shear stress on bed and bank ( $N/m^2$ ),  $\gamma_w$  – specific weight of water ( $9800 N/m^3$ ), depth – Depth of water in the channel (m),  $W$  – Top width of channel (m),  $P_{bed}$  – Wetted perimeter of bed (bottom width of channel) (m),  $P_{bank}$  – Wetted perimeter of channel banks (m),  $\theta$  – angle of the channel bank from horizontal,  $slp_{ch}$  – Channel bed slope (m/m).

The effective shear stress calculated by the above equations should be more than the critical shear stress or the tractive force needed to dislodge the sediment. Critical shear stress for channel bank can be measured using submerged jet test (described later in this chapter). However, if field data is not available, critical shear stress is estimated using the third-order polynomial fitted to the results of Dunn (1959) and Vanoni (1977) by Julian and Torres (2006) :

$$\tau_c = (0.1 + 0.1779 \cdot SC + 0.0028 \cdot SC^2 - 2.34 \times 10^{-5} \cdot SC^3) \cdot C_{CH} \quad 7:2.2.19$$

where  $SC$  – percent silt and clay content and  $C_{CH}$  – channel vegetation coefficient (range from 1.0 for bare soil to 19.20 for heavy vegetation; see table 7:2-1):

Table 7:2-1. Channel vegetation coefficient for critical shear stress (Julian and Torres, 2006)

Bank Vegetation	$C_{CH}$
None	1.00
Grassy	1.97
Sparse trees	5.40
Dense trees	19.20

Channel erodibility coefficient ( $k_d$ ) can also be measured from insitu submerged jet tests. However, if field data is not available, the model estimates  $k_d$  using the empirical relation developed by Hanson and Simon (2001). Hanson and Simon (2001) conducted 83 jet tests on the stream beds of Midwestern USA

and established the following relationship between critical shear stress and erodibility coefficient:

$$k_d = 0.2 \cdot \tau_c^{-0.5} \quad 7:2.2.13$$

where  $k_d$  – erodibility coefficient ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{N}\cdot\text{s}$ ) and  $\tau_c$  – Critical shear stress ( $\text{N}/\text{m}^2$ ).

Using the above relationships, the bank/bed erosion rate ( $\text{m}/\text{s}$ ) can be calculated using eqns. 7:2.2.14 and 7:2.2.15. This has to be multiplied by the sediment bulk density and area exposed to erosion to get the total mass of sediment that could be eroded. Due to the meandering nature of the channel, the outside bank in a meander is more prone to erosion than the inside bank. Hence, the potential bank erosion is calculated by assuming erosion of effectively one channel bank:

$$Bnkrte = \xi_{bnk} \cdot (L_{ch} \cdot 1000 \cdot depth \cdot \sqrt{1+Z_{ch}^2}) \cdot \rho_{b,bank} \cdot 86400 \quad 7:2.2.14$$

Similarly, the amount of bed erosion is calculated as:

$$Bedrte = \xi_{bed} \cdot (L_{ch} \cdot 1000 \cdot W_{btm}) \cdot \rho_{b,bed} \cdot 86400 \quad 7:2.2.15$$

where Bnkrte, Bedrte – potential bank and bed erosion rates (Metric tons per day),  $L_{ch}$  – length of the channel (m), depth – depth of water flowing in the channel (m),  $W_{btm}$  – Channel bottom width (m),  $\rho_{b,bank}$ ,  $\rho_{b,bed}$  – bulk density of channel bank and bed sediment ( $\text{g}/\text{cm}^3$  or Metric tons/ $\text{m}^3$  or  $\text{Mg}/\text{m}^3$ ). The relative erosion potential is used to partition the erosion in channel among stream bed and stream bank if the transport capacity of the channel is high. The relative erosion potential of stream bank and bed is calculated as:

$$Bnk_{rp} = \frac{Bnkrte}{Bnkrte + Bedrte} \quad 7:2.2.16$$

$$Bed_{rp} = 1 - Bnk_{rp} \quad 7:2.2.17$$

SWAT currently has four stream power models to predict the transport capacity of channel. The stream power models predict the maximum concentration of bed load it can carry as a non-linear function of peak velocity:

$$conc_{sed,ch.mx} = f(\text{peak velocity}) \quad 7:2.2.18$$

where  $\text{conc}_{\text{sed},\text{ch},\text{mx}}$  – maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (Metric ton/m<sup>3</sup>). The stream power models currently used in SWAT are 1) Simplified Bagnold model 2) Kodatie model (for streams with bed material size ranging from silt to gravel) 3) Molinas and Wu model (for primarily sand size particles) and 4) Yang sand and gravel model (for primarily sand and gravel size particles).

### 1. Simplified Bagnold model: (same as eqn. 7.2.2.9)

$$\text{conc}_{\text{sed},\text{ch},\text{mx}} = c_{sp} \cdot v_{ch,pk}^{spexp} \quad 7.2.2.19$$

where  $\text{conc}_{\text{sed},\text{ch},\text{mx}}$  is the maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (ton/m<sup>3</sup> or kg/L),  $c_{sp}$  is a coefficient defined by the user,  $v_{ch,pk}$  is the peak channel velocity (m/s), and  $spexp$  is an exponent defined by the user. The exponent,  $spexp$ , normally varies between 1.0 and 2.0 and was set at 1.5 in the original Bagnold stream power equation (Arnold et al., 1995).

### 2. Kodatie model

Kodatie (2000) modified the equations developed by Posada (1995) using nonlinear optimization and field data for different sizes of riverbed sediment. This method can be used for streams with bed material in size ranging from silt to gravel:

$$\text{conc}_{\text{sed},\text{ch},\text{mx}} = \left( \frac{a \cdot v_{ch}^b \cdot y^c \cdot S^d}{Q_{in}} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{W + W_{btm}}{2} \right) \quad 7.2.2.20$$

where  $v_{ch}$  – mean flow velocity (m/s),  $y$  – mean flow depth (m),  $S$  – Energy slope, assumed to be the same as bed slope (m/m), (a,b,c and d) – regression coefficients for different bed materials (Table 7.2-1),  $Q_{in}$  – Volume of water entering the reach in the day (m<sup>3</sup>),  $W$  – width of the channel at the water level (m),  $W_{btm}$  – bottom width of the channel (m).

Table 7:2-2. Regression coefficients for Kodatie equation

	a	b	c	d
Silt-bed rivers ( $D_{50}^*$ $\leq$ 0.05 mm)	281.4	2.622	0.182	0
Very fine to fine-bed river (0.05 mm $<$ $D_{50}$ $\leq$ 0.25 mm)	2,829.6	3.646	0.406	0.412
Medium to very coarse sand-bed rivers (0.25 mm $<$ $D_{50}$ $\leq$ 2 mm)	2,123.4	3.300	0.468	0.613
Gravel-bed rivers ( $D_{50} > 2$ mm)	431,884.8	1.000	1.000	2.000

\* $D_{50}$  – median bank/bed-sediment size

### 3. Molinas and Wu model:

Molinas and Wu (2001) developed a sediment transport equation for large sand-bed rivers based on universal stream power. The transport equation is of the form:

$$C_w = M\psi^N \quad 7:2.2.21$$

where  $C_w$  – is the concentration of sediments by weight,  $\psi$  – universal stream power, M and N are coefficients. This equation was fitted to 414 sets of large river bed load data including rivers such as Amazon, Mississippi. The resulting expression is:

$$C_w = \frac{1430 \cdot (0.86 + \sqrt{\psi}) \cdot \psi^{1.5}}{0.016 + \psi} \cdot 10^{-6} \quad 7:2.2.22$$

where  $\psi$  – universal stream power is given by:

$$\psi = \frac{\psi^3}{(S_g - 1) \cdot g \cdot depth \cdot \omega_{50} \cdot \left[ \log_{10} \left( \frac{depth}{D_{50}} \right) \right]^2} \quad 7:2.2.23$$

where  $S_g$  – relative density of the solid (2.65),  $g$  – acceleration due to gravity ( $9.81 \text{ m/s}^2$ ), depth – flow depth (m),  $\omega_{50}$  – fall velocity of median size particles

(m/s),  $D_{50}$  – median sediment size. The fall velocity is calculated using Stokes' Law by assuming a temperature of 22°C and a sediment density of 1.2 t/m<sup>3</sup>:

$$\omega_{50} = \frac{411 \cdot D_{50}^2}{3600} \quad 7.2.2.24$$

The concentration by weight is converted to concentration by volume and the maximum bed load concentration in metric tons/m<sup>3</sup> is calculated as:

$$conc_{sed, ch.mx} = \frac{C_w}{C_w + (1 - C_w) \cdot S_g} \cdot S_g \quad 7.2.2.25$$

#### 4. Yang sand and gravel model

Yang (1996) related total load to excess unit stream power expressed as the product of velocity and slope. Separate equations were developed for sand and gravel bed material and solved for sediment concentration in ppm by weight. The regression equations were developed based on dimensionless combinations of unit stream power, critical unit stream power, shear velocity, fall velocity, kinematic viscosity and sediment size. The sand equation, which should be used for median sizes ( $D_{50}$ ) less than 2mm is:

$$\log C_w = 5.435 - 0.286 \log \frac{\omega_{50} D_{50}}{v} - 0.457 \log \frac{V_*}{\omega_{50}} + \left( 1.799 - 0.409 \log \frac{\omega_{50} D_{50}}{v} - 0.314 \log \frac{V_*}{\omega_{50}} \right) \log \left( \frac{v_{ch} S}{\omega_{50}} - \frac{V_{cr} S}{\omega_{50}} \right) \quad 7.2.2.26$$

and the gravel equation for D50 between 2mm and 10mm:

$$\log C_w = 6.681 - 0.633 \log \frac{\omega_{50} D_{50}}{v} - 4.816 \log \frac{V_*}{\omega_{50}} + \left( 2.784 - 0.305 \log \frac{\omega_{50} D_{50}}{v} - 0.282 \log \frac{V_*}{\omega_{50}} \right) \log \left( \frac{v_{ch} S}{\omega_{50}} - \frac{V_{cr} S}{\omega_{50}} \right) \quad 7.2.2.27$$

where  $C_w$  – Sediment concentration in parts per million by weight,  $\omega_{50}$  – fall velocity of the median size sediment (m/s),  $v$  – Kinematic viscosity (m<sup>2</sup>/s),  $V_*$  - Shear velocity ( $\sqrt{gRS}$ ) (m/s),  $v_{ch}$  – mean channel velocity (m/s),  $V_{cr}$  – Critical velocity (m/s), and  $S$  – Energy slope, assumed to be the same as bed slope (m/m).

From the above equations,  $C_w$  in ppm is divided by  $10^6$  to convert in to concentration by weight. Using eq. 7:2.2.32,  $C_w$  is converted in to maximum bed load concentration ( $conc_{sed, ch, mx}$ ) in metric tons/m<sup>3</sup>.

By using one of the four models discussed above, the maximum sediment transport capacity of the channel can be calculated. The excess transport capacity available in the channel is calculated as:

$$SedEx = V_{ch} \cdot (conc_{sed, ch, mx} - conc_{sed, ch, i}) \quad 7:2.2.28$$

If SedEX is  $< 0$  then the channel does not have the capacity to transport eroded sediments and hence there will be no bank and bed erosion. If SedEx is  $> 0$  then the channel has the transport capacity to support eroded bank and bed sediments. Before channel degradation bank erosion, the deposited sediment during the previous time steps will be resuspended and removed. The excess transport capacity available after resuspending the deposited sediments is removed from channel bank and channel bed.

$$\begin{aligned} Bnk_{deg} &= SedEX \times Bnk_{rp} & SedEX \times Bnk_{rp} &\leq Bnkrte \\ Bnk_{deg} &= Bnkrte & SedEX \times Bnk_{rp} &> Bnkrte \end{aligned} \quad 7:2.2.29$$

$$\begin{aligned} Bed_{deg} &= SedEX \times Bed_{rp} & SedEX \times Bed_{rp} &\leq Bedrte \\ Bed_{deg} &= Bedrte & SedEX \times Bed_{rp} &> Bedrte \end{aligned} \quad 7:2.2.30$$

$$sed_{deg} = Bank_{deg} + Bed_{deg} \quad 7:2.2.31$$

where  $Bnk_{deg}$  – is the amount of bank erosion in metric tons,  $Bed_{deg}$  – is the amount of bed erosion in metric tons,  $sed_{deg}$  – is the total channel erosion from channel bank and bed in metric tons. Particle size contribution from bank erosion is calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} Bnksan &= Bnk_{deg} \times Bnksanfr_i \\ Bnksil &= Bnk_{deg} \times Bnksilfr_i \\ Bnkcla &= Bnk_{deg} \times Bnkclafri \\ Bnkgra &= Bnk_{deg} \times Bnkgrafr_i \end{aligned} \quad 7:2.2.32$$

where  $Bnksan$  – is the amount of sand eroded from bank in metric tons,  $Bnksil$  – is the amount of silt eroded from bank,  $Bnkcla$  – is the amount of clay eroded from bank,  $Bnkgra$  – is the amount of gravel eroded from bank;  $Bnksanfr_i$ ,  $Bnksilfr_i$ ,  $Bnkclafri$ , and  $Bnkgrafr_i$  – fraction of sand, silt, clay and gravel content of bank in channel i. Similarly the particle size contribution from bed erosion is also calculated separately.

The particle size distribution indicated in Table 7.2-3 for bank and bed sediments is assumed by the model based on the median sediment size ( $BnkD_{50}$ ,  $BedD_{50}$ ) input by the user. If the median sediment size is not specified by the user, then the model assumed  $BnkD_{50}$  and  $BedD_{50}$  to be 50 micrometer (0.05 mm) equivalent to the silt size particles.

Table 7.2-3. Particle size distribution assumed by SWAT based on the median size of bank and bed sediments

Sediment Fraction	D <sub>50</sub> (in micrometers)			
	≤ 5	5 to 50	50 to 2000	> 2000
Sand	0.15	0.15	0.65	0.15
Silt	0.15	0.65	0.15	0.15
Clay	0.65	0.15	0.15	0.05
Gravel	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.65

Deposition of bedload sediments in channel is modeled using the following equations (Einstein 1965; Pemberton and Lara 1971):

$$P_{dep_z} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{e^x}\right) \times 100 \quad \text{where} \\ x = \frac{1.055 \cdot L_{ch} \cdot 1000 \cdot \omega}{v_{ch} \cdot \text{depth}} \quad 7.2.2.33$$

where  $P_{dep_z}$  – is the percentage of sediments (z - sand, silt, clay, and gravel) that get deposited,  $L_{ch}$  – length of the reach (km),  $\omega$  – fall velocity of the sediment particles in m/s (eq. 7.2.2.31),  $v_{ch}$  – mean flow velocity in the reach (m/s), and depth – is the depth of water in the channel (m). The particle size diameters

assumed to calculate the fall velocity are 0.2mm, 0.01mm, 0.002mm, 2 mm, 0.0300, 0.500 respectively for sand, silt, clay, gravel, small aggregate and large aggregate.

It should be kept in mind that small aggregate and large aggregates in the bedload are contributed only from overland erosion and routed through the channel. Gravel is contributed only from channel erosion. Only sand, silt and clay in the bedload is contributed both from overland and channel erosion.

If the water in the channel enters the floodplain during large storm events, then silt and clay particles are deposited in the floodplains and the main channel in proportion to their flow cross-sectional areas. Silt and clay deposited in the flooplain are assumed to be lost from the system and is not resuspended during subsequent time steps as in the main channel. The complete mass balance equations for sediment routing are as follows:

$$sed_{ch} = sed_{ch,i} - sed_{dep} + sed_{deg} \quad \text{where}$$

$$sed_{ch,i} = san_{ch,i} + sil_{ch,i} + cla_{ch,i} + gra_{ch,i} + sagg_{ch,i} + lagg_{ch,i}$$

$$sed_{dep} = san_{ch,i} \cdot Pdep_{san} + sil_{ch,i} \cdot Pdep_{sil} + cla_{ch,i} \cdot Pdep_{cla}$$

$$+ gra_{ch,i} \cdot Pdep_{gra} + sagg_{ch,i} \cdot Pdep_{sagg} + lagg_{ch,i} \cdot Pdep_{lagg} \quad 7:2.2.34$$

$$sed_{deg} = Bnk_{deg} + Bed_{deg} \quad \text{where}$$

$$Bnk_{deg} = Bnksan + Bnksil + Bnkcla + Bnkgra$$

$$Bed_{deg} = Bedsan + Bedsil + Bedcla + Bedgra$$

where  $sed_{ch}$  is the amount of suspended sediment in the reach (metric tons),  $sed_{ch,i}$  is the amount of suspended sediment entering the reach at the beginning of the time period (metric tons),  $sed_{dep}$  is the amount of sediment deposited in the reach segment (metric tons), and  $sed_{deg}$  is the amount of sediment contribution from bank and bed erosion in the reach segment (metric tons).

The amount of sediment transported out of the reach is calculated:

$$sed_{out} = sed_{ch} \cdot \frac{V_{out}}{V_{ch}} \quad 7:2.2.35$$

where  $sed_{out}$  is the amount of sediment transported out of the reach (metric tons),  $sed_{ch}$  is the amount of suspended sediment in the reach (metric tons),  $V_{out}$  is the

volume of outflow during the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water in the reach segment ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

## 7:2.3 CHANNEL ERODIBILITY FACTOR

---

The channel erodibility factor is conceptually similar to the soil erodibility factor used in the USLE equation. Channel erodibility is a function of properties of the bed or bank materials.

Channel erodibility can be measured with a submerged vertical jet device. The basic premise of the test is that erosion of a vegetated or bare channel and local scour beneath an impinging jet are the result of hydraulic stresses, boundary geometry, and the properties of the material being eroded. Hanson (1990) developed a method for determining the erodibility coefficient of channels *in situ* with the submerged vertical jet. Allen et al. (1999) utilized this method to determine channel erodibility factors for thirty sites in Texas.

A submerged, vertical jet of water directed perpendicularly at the channel bed causes erosion of the bed material in the vicinity of the jet impact area (Figure 7:2-1). Important variables in the erosion process are: the volume of material removed during a jetting event, elevation of the jet above the ground surface, diameter of the jet nozzle, jet velocity, time, mass density of the fluid and coefficient of erodibility.

Hanson (1991) defined a jet index,  $J_i$ , to relate erodibility to scour created by the submerged jet. The jet index is a function of the depth of scour beneath the jet per unit time and the jet velocity. The jet index is determined by a least squares fit following the procedures outlined in ASTM standard D 5852-95.




Figure 7.2.3-1: Simplified cross-section of submerged jet test (After Allen et al, 1999).

Once the jet index is determined, the channel erodibility coefficient is calculated:

$$K_{d,bankbed} = 0.003 \cdot \exp[385 \cdot J_i] \quad 7.2.3.1$$

where  $K_{d,bankbed}$  is the channel bank/bed erodibility coefficient ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{N}\cdot\text{s}$ ) and  $J_i$  is the jet index. In general, values for channel erodibility are an order of magnitude smaller than values for soil erodibility.

## 7:2.4 CHANNEL COVER FACTOR

---

The channel cover factor,  $C_{CH}$ , is defined as the ratio of degradation from a channel with a specified vegetative cover to the corresponding degradation from a channel with no vegetative cover. The vegetation affects degradation by reducing the stream velocity, and consequently its erosive power, near the bed surface.

Table 7.2-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to sediment routing.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
CH_EQN	Model used for Channel Erosion 0 – Simplified Bagnold Equation (Default) <u>Physics based approach for channel erosion</u> 1 – Simplified Bagnold Equation 2 – Kodatic model 3 – Molinas and Wu model: 4 – Yang sand and gravel model	.rte
PRF	<i>prf</i> : Peak rate adjustment factor (Used only if you choose the simplified Bagnold equation)	.bsn
SPCON	$c_{sp}$ : Coefficient in sediment transport equation (Used only if you choose the simplified Bagnold equation)	.bsn
SPEXP	$spexp$ : Exponent in sediment transport equation (Used only if you choose the simplified Bagnold equation)	.bsn
CH_COV1	If CH_EQN = 1: $K_{ch}$ : Channel erodibility factor (0.0 to 1.0) If CH_EQN ≠ 1: $C_{CH}$ : Channel bank vegetation coefficient as given by table 7.2-1	.rte
CH_COV2	If CH_EQN = 1: $C_{CH}$ : Channel cover factor (0.0 to 1.0) If CH_EQN ≠ 1: $C_{CH}$ : Channel bed vegetation coefficient as given by table 7.2-1	.rte
CH_BNK_BD	$\rho_{b,bank}$ : Channel bank bulk density ( $\text{g}/\text{cm}^3$ )	.rte
CH_BED_BD	$\rho_{b,bed}$ : Channel bed bulk density ( $\text{g}/\text{cm}^3$ )	.rte
CH_BNK_KD	$K_{d,bank}$ : Channel bank erodibility coefficient ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{N}\cdot\text{s}$ )	.rte
CH_BED_KD	$K_{d,bed}$ : Channel bed erodibility coefficient ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{N}\cdot\text{s}$ )	.rte
CH_BNK_D50	$BnkD_{50}$ : Median particle size diameter of channel bank sediment ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	.rte
CH_BED_D50	$BedD_{50}$ : Median particle size diameter of channel bed sediment ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	.rte
CH_BNK_TC	$T_{c,bank}$ : Critical shear stress of channel bank ( $\text{N}/\text{m}^2$ )	.rte
CH_BED_TC	$T_{c,bed}$ : Critical shear stress of channel bed ( $\text{N}/\text{m}^2$ )	.rte

## 7.2.5 CHANNEL DOWNCUTTING AND WIDENING

While sediment transport calculations have traditionally been made with the same channel dimensions throughout a simulation, SWAT will model channel downcutting and widening. When channel downcutting and widening is simulated, channel dimensions are allowed to change during the simulation period.

Three channel dimensions are allowed to vary in channel downcutting and widening simulations: bankfull depth,  $depth_{bnkfull}$ , channel width,  $W_{bnkfull}$ , and channel slope,  $slp_{ch}$ . Channel dimensions are updated using the following equations when the volume of water in the reach exceeds  $1.4 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ .

The amount of downcutting is calculated (Allen et al., 1999):

$$depth_{dcut} = 358.6 \cdot depth \cdot slp_{ch} \cdot K_{CH} \quad 7:2.5.1$$

where  $depth_{dcut}$  is the amount of downcutting (m),  $depth$  is the depth of water in channel (m),  $slp_{ch}$  is the channel slope (m/m), and  $K_{CH}$  is the channel erodibility coefficient (cm/h/Pa).

The new bankfull depth is calculated:

$$depth_{bnkfull} = depth_{bnkfull,i} + depth_{dcut} \quad 7:2.5.2$$

where  $depth_{bnkfull}$  is the new bankfull depth (m),  $depth_{bnkfull,i}$  is the previous bankfull depth, and  $depth_{dcut}$  is the amount of downcutting (m).

The new bank width is calculated:

$$W_{bnkfull} = ratio_{WD} \cdot depth_{bnkfull} \quad 7:2.5.3$$

where  $W_{bnkfull}$  is the new width of the channel at the top of the bank (m),  $ratio_{WD}$  is the channel width to depth ratio, and  $depth_{bnkfull}$  is the new bankfull depth (m).

The new channel slope is calculated:

$$slp_{ch} = slp_{ch,i} - \frac{depth_{dcut}}{1000 \cdot L_{ch}} \quad 7:2.5.4$$

where  $slp_{ch}$  is the new channel slope (m/m),  $slp_{ch,i}$  is the previous channel slope (m/m),  $depth_{bnkfull}$  is the new bankfull depth (m), and  $L_{ch}$  is the channel length (km).

Table 7:2-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to channel downcutting and widening.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
IDEG	Channel degradation code	.bsn
CH_WDR	$ratio_{WD}$ : Channel width to depth ratio	.rte

## 7:4.6 NOMENCLATURE

---

$A_{ch}$	Cross-sectional area of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$C_{CH}$	Channel cover factor
$J_i$	Jet index used to calculate channel erodibility
$K_{CH}$	Channel erodibility factor ( $\text{cm}/\text{hr}/\text{Pa}$ )
$L_{ch}$	Channel length (km)
$V_{ch}$	Volume of water in the reach segment ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{out}$	Volume of outflow during the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$W_{bnkfull}$	Top width of the channel when filled with water (m)
$c_{sp}$	Coefficient in sediment transport equation
$conc_{sed,ch,i}$	Initial sediment concentration in the reach (kg/L or ton/ $\text{m}^3$ )
$conc_{sed,ch,mx}$	Maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (kg/L or ton/ $\text{m}^3$ )
$depth$	Depth of water in channel (m)
$depth_{bnkfull}$	Depth of water in the channel when filled to the top of the bank (m)
$depth_{dcut}$	Amount of downcutting (m)
$prf$	Peak rate adjustment factor
$q_{ch}$	Average rate of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
$q_{ch,pk}$	Peak flow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
$ratio_{WD}$	Channel width to depth ratio
$sed_{ch}$	Amount of suspended sediment in the reach (metric tons)
$sed_{deg}$	Amount of sediment reentrained in the reach segment (metric tons)
$sed_{dep}$	Amount of sediment deposited in the reach segment (metric tons)
$sed_{out}$	Amount of sediment transported out of the reach (metric tons)
$slp_{ch}$	Average channel slope along channel length ( $\text{m m}^{-1}$ )
$spexp$	Exponent in sediment transport equation
$v_{ch,pk}$	Peak channel velocity (m/s)

## 7:2.7 REFERENCES

---

- Allen, P.M., J. Arnold, E. Jakubowski. 1999. Prediction of stream channel erosion potential. *Environmental and Engineering Geoscience* 5:339-351.
- American Society for Testing and Materials. 1995. Annual book of ASTM standards, Vol. 04.08, Designation: D 5852-5. American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, PA. p. 653-657.
- Arnold, J.G., J.R. Williams, and D.R. Maidment. 1995. Continuous-time water and sediment-routing model for large basins. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*. 121:171-183.
- Bagnold, R.A. 1977. Bedload transport in natural rivers. *Water Resour. Res.* 13:303-312.
- Dunn, I.S. 1959. Tractive resistance of cohesive channels. *Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Division, ASCE* 85 (SM 3), 1-24.
- Eaton, B. C. and R. G. Millar. 2004. Optimal alluvial channel width under a bank stability constraint. *Geomorphology*, 62:35-45.
- Einstein, H.A. 1965. Final Report Spawning Grounds. U. of California, Hydr. Eng. Lab., 16p.
- Foster, G.R., L.J. Lane, J.D. Nowlin, J.M. Laflen, and R.A. Young. 1980. A model to estimate the sediment yield from file-sized areas: Development of model. CP-80-10. Intl. Inst. For Applied Systems Analysis. A-2361. Lexenburg, Austria.
- Hanson, G.J. 1990. Surface erodibility of earthen channels at high stresses. Part II-Developing an *in situ* testing device. *Trans. ASAE* 33:132-137.
- Hanson, G.J. 1991. Development of a jet index method to characterize erosion resistance of soils in earthen spillways. *Trans. ASAE* 34:2015-2020.
- Hanson, G. J. and A. Simon. 2001. Erodibility of cohesive streambeds in the loess area of the Midwestern USA. *Hydrological Processes*, 15:23-38.
- Julian, J. P. and R. Torres. 2006. Hydraulic Erosion of Cohesive river banks. *Geomorphology*, 76:193-206.

- Kodoatie, Robert J. 2000. Sediment transport relations in alluvial channels. Thesis (Ph. D.)--Colorado State University, 285pp.
- Molinias, A. and B. Wu. 2001. Transport of Sediment in large sand-bed rivers. Journal of Hydraulic research, 39: 135-146.
- Pemberton, E. L. and J. M. Lara. 1971. A procedure to determine sediment deposition in a settling basin. Section E: Intake Works and Desilting Basins. Sedimentation Section, Division of Planning Coordination, Bureau of Reclamation, U. S. Department of the Interior.
- Posada. 1995. Transport of Sands in Deep Rivers. Thesis (Ph. D.)--Colorado State University, 158pp.
- Vanoni, V.A. (Ed.). 1977. Sedimentation Engineering. ASCE, New York. 745pp.
- Williams, J.R. 1980. SPNM, a model for predicting sediment, phosphorus, and nitrogen yields from agricultural basins. Water Resour. Bull. 16:843-848.
- Williams, J.R. and H.D. Berndt. 1977. Sediment yield prediction based on watershed hydrology. Trans. ASAE 20(6): 1100-1104.
- Yang, C. T. 1996. Sediment Transport Theory and practice. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., New York.



## SECTION 7 CHAPTER 3

# EQUATIONS: IN-STREAM NUTRIENT PROCESSES

---

Parameters which affect water quality and can be considered pollution indicators include nutrients, total solids, biological oxygen demand, nitrates, and microorganisms (Loehr, 1970; Paine, 1973). Parameters of secondary importance include odor, taste, and turbidity (Azevedo and Stout, 1974).

The SWAT in-stream water quality algorithms incorporate constituent interactions and relationships used in the QUAL2E model (Brown and Barnwell, 1987). The documentation provided in this chapter has been taken from Brown and Barnwell (1987). The modeling of in-stream nutrient transformations has been made an optional feature of SWAT. To route nutrient loadings downstream without simulating transformations, the variable IWQ in the basin input (.bsn) file should be set to 0. To activate the simulation of in-stream nutrient transformations, this variable should be set to 1.

## 7:3.1 ALGAE

---

During the day, algae increase the stream's dissolved oxygen concentration via photosynthesis. At night, algae reduce the concentration via respiration. As algae grow and die, they form part of the in-stream nutrient cycle. This section summarizes the equations used to simulate algal growth in the stream.

### 7:3.1.1 CHLOROPHYLL *a*

Chlorophyll *a* is assumed to be directly proportional to the concentration of phytoplanktonic algal biomass.

$$chl_a = \alpha_0 \cdot algae \quad 7:3.1.1$$

where *chl<sub>a</sub>* is the chlorophyll *a* concentration ( $\mu\text{g chl/L}$ ),  $\alpha_0$  is the ratio of chlorophyll *a* to algal biomass ( $\mu\text{g chl/mg alg}$ ), and *algae* is the algal biomass concentration ( $\text{mg alg/L}$ ).

### 7:3.1.2 ALGAL GROWTH

Growth and decay of algae/chlorophyll *a* is calculated as a function of the growth rate, the respiration rate, the settling rate and the amount of algae present in the stream. The change in algal biomass for a given day is:

$$\Delta algae = \left( (\mu_a \cdot algae) - (\rho_a \cdot algae) - \left( \frac{\sigma_1}{depth} \cdot algae \right) \right) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.1.2$$

where  $\Delta algae$  is the change in algal biomass concentration ( $\text{mg alg/L}$ ),  $\mu_a$  is the local specific growth rate of algae ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $\rho_a$  is the local respiration or death rate of algae ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $\sigma_1$  is the local settling rate for algae ( $\text{m/day}$  or  $\text{m/hr}$ ), *depth* is the depth of water in the channel ( $\text{m}$ ), *algae* is the algal biomass concentration at the beginning of the day ( $\text{mg alg/L}$ ), and *TT* is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The calculation of depth and travel time are reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

#### **7:3.1.2.1 LOCAL SPECIFIC GROWTH RATE OF ALGAE**

The local specific growth rate of algae is a function of the availability of required nutrients, light and temperature. SWAT first calculates the growth rate at 20°C and then adjusts the growth rate for

water temperature. The user has three options for calculating the impact of nutrients and light on growth: multiplicative, limiting nutrient, and harmonic mean.

The multiplicative option multiplies the growth factors for light, nitrogen and phosphorus together to determine their net effect on the local algal growth rate. This option has its biological basis in the multiplicative effects of enzymatic processes involved in photosynthesis:

$$\mu_{a,20} = \mu_{max} \cdot FL \cdot FN \cdot FP \quad 7:3.1.3$$

where  $\mu_{a,20}$  is the local specific algal growth rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\mu_{max}$  is the maximum specific algal growth rate (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $FL$  is the algal growth attenuation factor for light,  $FN$  is the algal growth limitation factor for nitrogen, and  $FP$  is the algal growth limitation factor for phosphorus. The maximum specific algal growth rate is specified by the user.

The limiting nutrient option calculates the local algal growth rate as limited by light and either nitrogen or phosphorus. The nutrient/light effects are multiplicative, but the nutrient/nutrient effects are alternate. The algal growth rate is controlled by the nutrient with the smaller growth limitation factor. This approach mimics Liebig's law of the minimum:

$$\mu_{a,20} = \mu_{max} \cdot FL \cdot \min(FN, FP) \quad 7:3.1.4$$

where  $\mu_{a,20}$  is the local specific algal growth rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\mu_{max}$  is the maximum specific algal growth rate (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $FL$  is the algal growth attenuation factor for light,  $FN$  is the algal growth limitation factor for nitrogen, and  $FP$  is the algal growth limitation factor for phosphorus. The maximum specific algal growth rate is specified by the user.

The harmonic mean is mathematically analogous to the total resistance of two resistors in parallel and can be considered a compromise between equations 7:3.1.3 and 7:3.1.4. The algal growth rate is controlled by a multiplicative relation between light and nutrients, while the nutrient/nutrient interactions are represented by a harmonic mean.

$$\mu_{a,20} = \mu_{max} \cdot FL \cdot \frac{2}{\left( \frac{1}{FN} + \frac{1}{FP} \right)} \quad 7:3.1.5$$

where  $\mu_{a,20}$  is the local specific algal growth rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\mu_{max}$  is the maximum specific algal growth rate (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $FL$  is the algal growth attenuation factor for light,  $FN$  is the algal growth limitation factor for nitrogen, and  $FP$  is the algal growth limitation factor for phosphorus. The maximum specific algal growth rate is specified by the user.

Calculation of the growth limiting factors for light, nitrogen and phosphorus are reviewed in the following sections.

#### **ALGAL GROWTH LIMITING FACTOR FOR LIGHT.**

A number of mathematical relationships between photosynthesis and light have been developed. All relationships show an increase in photosynthetic rate with increasing light intensity up to a maximum or saturation value. The algal growth limiting factor for light is calculated using a Monod half-saturation method. In this option, the algal growth limitation factor for light is defined by a Monod expression:

$$FL_z = \frac{I_{phosyn,z}}{K_L + I_{phosyn,z}} \quad 7:3.1.6$$

where  $FL_z$  is the algal growth attenuation factor for light at depth  $z$ ,  $I_{phosyn,z}$  is the photosynthetically-active light intensity at a depth  $z$  below the water surface (MJ/m<sup>2</sup>-hr), and  $K_L$  is the half-saturation coefficient for light (MJ/m<sup>2</sup>-hr). Photosynthetically-active light is radiation with a wavelength between 400 and 700 nm. The half-saturation coefficient for light is defined as the light intensity at which the algal growth rate is 50% of the maximum growth rate. The half-saturation coefficient for light is defined by the user.

Photosynthesis is assumed to occur throughout the depth of the water column. The variation in light intensity with depth is defined by Beer's law:

$$I_{phosyn,z} = I_{phosyn,hr} \exp(-k_\ell \cdot z) \quad 7:3.1.7$$

where  $I_{phosyn,z}$  is the photosynthetically-active light intensity at a depth  $z$  below the water surface ( $\text{MJ/m}^2\text{-hr}$ ),  $I_{phosyn,hr}$  is the photosynthetically-active solar radiation reaching the ground/water surface during a specific hour on a given day ( $\text{MJ/m}^2\text{-hr}$ ),  $k_\ell$  is the light extinction coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1}$ ), and  $z$  is the depth from the water surface (m). Substituting equation 7:3.1.7 into equation 7:3.1.6 and integrating over the depth of flow gives:

$$FL = \left( \frac{1}{k_\ell \cdot depth} \right) \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{K_L + I_{phosyn,hr}}{K_L + I_{phosyn,hr} \exp(-k_\ell \cdot depth)} \right] \quad 7:3.1.8$$

where  $FL$  is the algal growth attenuation factor for light for the water column,  $K_L$  is the half-saturation coefficient for light ( $\text{MJ/m}^2\text{-hr}$ ),  $I_{phosyn,hr}$  is the photosynthetically-active solar radiation reaching the ground/water surface during a specific hour on a given day ( $\text{MJ/m}^2\text{-hr}$ ),  $k_\ell$  is the light extinction coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1}$ ), and  $depth$  is the depth of water in the channel (m). Equation 7:3.1.8 is used to calculate  $FL$  for hourly routing. The photosynthetically-active solar radiation is calculated:

$$I_{phosyn,hr} = I_{hr} \cdot fr_{phosyn} \quad 7:3.1.9$$

where  $I_{hr}$  is the solar radiation reaching the ground during a specific hour on current day of simulation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ), and  $fr_{phosyn}$  is the fraction of solar radiation that is photosynthetically active. The calculation of  $I_{hr}$  is reviewed in Chapter 1:1. The fraction of solar radiation that is photosynthetically active is user defined.

For daily simulations, an average value of the algal growth attenuation factor for light calculated over the diurnal cycle must be used. This is calculated using a modified form of equation 7:3.1.8:

$$FL = 0.92 \cdot fr_{DL} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{k_\ell \cdot depth} \right) \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{K_L + \bar{I}_{phosyn,hr}}{K_L + \bar{I}_{phosyn,hr} \exp(-k_\ell \cdot depth)} \right] \quad 7:3.1.10$$

where  $fr_{DL}$  is the fraction of daylight hours,  $\bar{I}_{phosyn,hr}$  is the daylight average photosynthetically-active light intensity ( $\text{MJ/m}^2\text{-hr}$ ) and all

other variables are defined previously. The fraction of daylight hours is calculated:

$$fr_{DL} = \frac{T_{DL}}{24} \quad 7:3.1.11$$

where  $T_{DL}$  is the daylength (hr).  $\bar{I}_{phosynhr}$  is calculated:

$$\bar{I}_{phosynhr} = \frac{fr_{phosyn} \cdot H_{day}}{T_{DL}} \quad 7:3.1.12$$

where  $fr_{phosyn}$  is the fraction of solar radiation that is photosynthetically active,  $H_{day}$  is the solar radiation reaching the water surface in a given day ( $MJ/m^2$ ), and  $T_{DL}$  is the daylength (hr). Calculation of  $H_{day}$  and  $T_{DL}$  are reviewed in Chapter 1:1.

The light extinction coefficient,  $k_\ell$ , is calculated as a function of the algal density using the nonlinear equation:

$$k_\ell = k_{\ell,0} + k_{\ell,1} \cdot \alpha_0 \cdot algae + k_{\ell,2} \cdot (\alpha_0 \cdot algae)^{2/3} \quad 7:3.1.13$$

where  $k_{\ell,0}$  is the non-algal portion of the light extinction coefficient ( $m^{-1}$ ),  $k_{\ell,1}$  is the linear algal self shading coefficient ( $m^{-1} (\mu g\text{-chla/L})^{-1}$ ),  $k_{\ell,2}$  is the nonlinear algal self shading coefficient ( $m^{-1} (\mu g\text{-chla/L})^{-2/3}$ ),  $\alpha_0$  is the ratio of chlorophyll *a* to algal biomass ( $\mu g\text{ chla/mg alg}$ ), and  $algae$  is the algal biomass concentration ( $mg\text{ alg/L}$ ).

Equation 7:3.1.13 allows a variety of algal, self-shading, light extinction relationships to be modeled. When  $k_{\ell,1} = k_{\ell,2} = 0$ , no algal self-shading is simulated. When  $k_{\ell,1} \neq 0$  and  $k_{\ell,2} = 0$ , linear algal self-shading is modeled. When  $k_{\ell,1}$  and  $k_{\ell,2}$  are set to a value other than 0, non-linear algal self-shading is modeled. The Riley equation (Bowie et al., 1985) defines  $k_{\ell,1} = 0.0088 m^{-1} (\mu g\text{-chla/L})^{-1}$  and  $k_{\ell,2} = 0.054 m^{-1} (\mu g\text{-chla/L})^{-2/3}$ .

### ALGAL GROWTH LIMITING FACTOR FOR NUTRIENTS.

The algal growth limiting factor for nitrogen is defined by a Monod expression. Algae are assumed to use both ammonia and nitrate as a source of inorganic nitrogen.

$$FN = \frac{(C_{NO_3} + C_{NH_4})}{(C_{NO_3} + C_{NH_4}) + K_N} \quad 7:3.1.14$$

where  $FN$  is the algal growth limitation factor for nitrogen,  $C_{NO_3}$  is the concentration of nitrate in the reach (mg N/L),  $C_{NH_4}$  is the concentration of ammonium in the reach (mg N/L), and  $K_N$  is the Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for nitrogen (mg N/L).

The algal growth limiting factor for phosphorus is also defined by a Monod expression.

$$FP = \frac{C_{solP}}{C_{solP} + K_P} \quad 7:3.1.15$$

where  $FP$  is the algal growth limitation factor for phosphorus,  $C_{solP}$  is the concentration of phosphorus in solution in the reach (mg P/L), and  $K_P$  is the Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for phosphorus (mg P/L).

The Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for nitrogen and phosphorus define the concentration of N or P at which algal growth is limited to 50% of the maximum growth rate. Users are allowed to set these values. Typical values for  $K_N$  range from 0.01 to 0.30 mg N/L while  $K_P$  will range from 0.001 to 0.05 mg P/L.

Once the algal growth rate at 20°C is calculated, the rate coefficient is adjusted for temperature effects using a Streeter-Phelps type formulation:

$$\mu_a = \mu_{a,20} \cdot 1.047^{(T_{water} - 20)} \quad 7:3.1.16$$

where  $\mu_a$  is the local specific growth rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\mu_{a,20}$  is the local specific algal growth rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

### 7:3.1.2.2 LOCAL RESPIRATION RATE OF ALGAE

The local respiration or death rate of algae represents the net effect of three processes: the endogenous respiration of algae, the conversion of algal phosphorus to organic phosphorus, and the conversion of algal nitrogen to organic nitrogen. The user defines the local respiration rate of algae at 20°C. The respiration rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\rho_a = \rho_{a,20} \cdot 1.047^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:3.1.17$$

where  $\rho_a$  is the local respiration rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\rho_{a,20}$  is the local algal respiration rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

### 7:3.1.2.3 LOCAL SETTLING RATE OF ALGAE

The local settling rate of algae represents the net removal of algae due to settling. The user defines the local settling rate of algae at 20°C. The settling rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\sigma_1 = \sigma_{1,20} \cdot 1.024^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:3.1.18$$

where  $\sigma_1$  is the local settling rate of algae (m/day or m/hr),  $\sigma_{1,20}$  is the local algal settling rate at 20°C (m/day or m hr), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

Table 7:3-1: SWAT input variables used in algae calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
AI0	$\alpha_0$ : Ratio of chlorophyll <i>a</i> to algal biomass (µg chla/mg alg)	.wwq
IGROPT	Algal specific growth rate option	.wwq
MUMAX	$\mu_{max}$ : Maximum specific algal growth rate (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.wwq
K_L	$K_L$ : Half-saturation coefficient for light (MJ/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)	.wwq
TFACT	$fr_{phosyn}$ : Fraction of solar radiation that is photosynthetically active	.wwq
LAMBDA0	$k_{\ell,0}$ : Non-algal portion of the light extinction coefficient (m <sup>-1</sup> )	.wwq
LAMBDA1	$k_{\ell,1}$ : Linear algal self shading coefficient (m <sup>-1</sup> (µg-chla/L) <sup>-1</sup> )	.wwq
LAMBDA2	$k_{\ell,2}$ : Nonlinear algal self shading coefficient (m <sup>-1</sup> (µg-chla/L) <sup>-2/3</sup> )	.wwq
K_N	$K_N$ : Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for nitrogen (mg N/L)	.wwq
K_P	$K_P$ : Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for phosphorus (mg P/L)	.wwq
RHOQ	$\rho_{a,20}$ : Local algal respiration rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.wwq
RS1	$\sigma_{1,20}$ : Local algal settling rate at 20°C (m/day)	.swq

## 7:3.2 NITROGEN CYCLE

---

In aerobic water, there is a stepwise transformation from organic nitrogen to ammonia, to nitrite, and finally to nitrate. Organic nitrogen may also be removed from the stream by settling. This section summarizes the equations used to simulate the nitrogen cycle in the stream.

### 7:3.2.1 ORGANIC NITROGEN

The amount of organic nitrogen in the stream may be increased by the conversion of algal biomass nitrogen to organic nitrogen. Organic nitrogen concentration in the stream may be decreased by the conversion of organic nitrogen to  $\text{NH}_4^+$  or the settling of organic nitrogen with sediment. The change in organic nitrogen for a given day is:

$$\Delta\text{org}N_{str} = (\alpha_1 \cdot \rho_a \cdot \text{algae} - \beta_{N,3} \cdot \text{org}N_{str} - \sigma_4 \cdot \text{org}N_{str}) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.2.1$$

where  $\Delta\text{org}N_{str}$  is the change in organic nitrogen concentration (mg N/L),  $\alpha_1$  is the fraction of algal biomass that is nitrogen (mg N/mg alg biomass),  $\rho_a$  is the local respiration or death rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\text{algae}$  is the algal biomass concentration at the beginning of the day (mg alg/L),  $\beta_{N,3}$  is the rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to ammonia nitrogen (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\text{org}N_{str}$  is the organic nitrogen concentration at the beginning of the day (mg N/L),  $\sigma_4$  is the rate coefficient for organic nitrogen settling (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The fraction of algal biomass that is nitrogen is user-defined. Equation 7:3.1.17 describes the calculation of the local respiration rate of algae. The calculation of travel time is reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

The user defines the local rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to  $\text{NH}_4^+$  at 20°C. The organic nitrogen hydrolysis rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\beta_{N,3} = \beta_{N,3,20} \cdot 1.047^{(T_{water} - 20)} \quad 7:3.2.2$$

where  $\beta_{N,3}$  is the local rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to  $\text{NH}_4^+$  (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\beta_{N,3,20}$  is the local rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to  $\text{NH}_4^+$  at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

The user defines the rate coefficient for organic nitrogen settling at 20°C. The organic nitrogen settling rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\sigma_4 = \sigma_{4,20} \cdot 1.024^{(T_{water} - 20)} \quad 7:3.2.3$$

where  $\sigma_4$  is the local settling rate for organic nitrogen (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\sigma_{4,20}$  is the local settling rate for organic nitrogen at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

### **7:3.2.2 AMMONIUM**

The amount of ammonium ( $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) in the stream may be increased by the mineralization of organic nitrogen and diffusion of ammonium from the streambed sediments. The ammonium concentration in the stream may be decreased by the conversion of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  to  $\text{NO}_2^-$  or the uptake of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  by algae. The change in ammonium for a given day is:

$$\Delta\text{NH4}_{str} = \left( \beta_{N,3} \cdot \text{orgN}_{str} - \beta_{N,1} \cdot \text{NH4}_{str} + \frac{\sigma_3}{(1000 \cdot depth)} - fr_{NH4} \cdot \alpha_1 \cdot \mu_a \cdot algae \right) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.2.4$$

where  $\Delta\text{NH4}_{str}$  is the change in ammonium concentration (mg N/L),  $\beta_{N,3}$  is the rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to ammonia nitrogen (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\text{orgN}_{str}$  is the organic nitrogen concentration at the beginning of the day (mg N/L),  $\beta_{N,1}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\text{NH4}_{str}$  is the ammonium concentration at the beginning of the day (mg N/L),  $\sigma_3$  is the benthos (sediment) source rate for ammonium (mg N/m<sup>2</sup>-day or mg N/m<sup>2</sup>-hr),  $depth$  is the depth of water in the channel (m),  $fr_{NH4}$  is the fraction of algal nitrogen uptake from ammonium pool,  $\alpha_1$  is the fraction of algal biomass that is nitrogen (mg N/mg alg biomass),  $\mu_a$  is the local growth rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $algae$  is the algal biomass concentration at the beginning of the day (mg alg/L), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The local rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to  $\text{NH}_4^+$  is calculated with equation 7:3.2.2. Section 7:3.1.2.1 describes the calculation of the local growth rate of algae. The calculation of depth and travel time is reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

The rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen will vary as a function of in-stream oxygen concentration and temperature. The rate constant is calculated:

$$\beta_{N,1} = \beta_{N,1,20} \cdot (1 - \exp[-0.6 \cdot Ox_{str}]) \cdot 1.083^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:3.2.5$$

where  $\beta_{N,1}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $\beta_{N,1,20}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $Ox_{str}$  is the dissolved oxygen concentration in the stream ( $\text{mg O}_2/\text{L}$ ), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour ( $^\circ\text{C}$ ). The second term on the right side of equation 7:3.2.5,  $(1 - \exp[-0.6 \cdot Ox_{str}])$ , is a nitrification inhibition correction factor. This factor inhibits nitrification at low dissolved oxygen concentrations.

The user defines the benthos source rate for ammonium at  $20^\circ\text{C}$ . The benthos source rate for ammonium nitrogen is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\sigma_3 = \sigma_{3,20} \cdot 1.074^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:3.2.6$$

where  $\sigma_3$  is the benthos (sediment) source rate for ammonium ( $\text{mg N/m}^2\text{-day}$  or  $\text{mg N/m}^2\text{-hr}$ ),  $\sigma_{3,20}$  is the benthos (sediment) source rate for ammonium nitrogen at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  ( $\text{mg N/m}^2\text{-day}$  or  $\text{mg N/m}^2\text{-hr}$ ), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour ( $^\circ\text{C}$ ).

The fraction of algal nitrogen uptake from ammonium pool is calculated:

$$fr_{NH4} = \frac{f_{NH4} \cdot NH4_{str}}{(f_{NH4} \cdot NH4_{str} + (1 - f_{NH4}) \cdot NO3_{str})} \quad 7:3.2.7$$

where  $fr_{NH4}$  is the fraction of algal nitrogen uptake from ammonium pool,  $f_{NH4}$  is the preference factor for ammonia nitrogen,  $NH4_{str}$  is the ammonium concentration in the stream ( $\text{mg N/L}$ ), and  $NO3_{str}$  is the nitrate concentration in the stream ( $\text{mg N/L}$ ).

### **7:3.2.3 NITRITE**

The amount of nitrite ( $\text{NO}_2^-$ ) in the stream will be increased by the conversion of  $\text{NH}_4^+$  to  $\text{NO}_2^-$  and decreased by the conversion of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  to  $\text{NO}_3^-$ . The conversion of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  to  $\text{NO}_3^-$  occurs more rapidly than the conversion of  $\text{NH}_4^+$

to  $\text{NO}_2^-$ , so the amount of nitrite present in the stream is usually very small. The change in nitrite for a given day is:

$$\Delta NO2_{str} = (\beta_{N,1} \cdot NH4_{str} - \beta_{N,2} \cdot NO2_{str}) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.2.8$$

where  $\Delta NO2_{str}$  is the change in nitrite concentration (mg N/L),  $\beta_{N,1}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $NH4_{str}$  is the ammonium concentration at the beginning of the day (mg N/L),  $\beta_{N,2}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $NO2_{str}$  is the nitrite concentration at the beginning of the day (mg N/L), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The local rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen is calculated with equation 7:3.2.5. The calculation of travel time is reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

The rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate will vary as a function of in-stream oxygen concentration and temperature. The rate constant is calculated:

$$\beta_{N,2} = \beta_{N,2,20} \cdot (1 - \exp[-0.6 \cdot Ox_{str}]) \cdot 1.047^{(T_{water} - 20)} \quad 7:3.2.9$$

where  $\beta_{N,2}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $\beta_{N,2,20}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate at  $20^\circ\text{C}$  ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $Ox_{str}$  is the dissolved oxygen concentration in the stream (mg  $\text{O}_2/\text{L}$ ), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour ( $^\circ\text{C}$ ). The second term on the right side of equation 7:3.2.9,  $(1 - \exp[-0.6 \cdot Ox_{str}])$ , is a nitrification inhibition correction factor. This factor inhibits nitrification at low dissolved oxygen concentrations.

### **7:3.2.4 NITRATE**

The amount of nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) in the stream may be increased by the oxidation of  $\text{NO}_2^-$ . The nitrate concentration in the stream may be decreased by the uptake of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  by algae. The change in nitrate for a given day is:

$$\Delta NO3_{str} = (\beta_{N,2} \cdot NO2_{str} - (1 - fr_{NH4}) \cdot \alpha_1 \cdot \mu_a \cdot algae) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.2.10$$

where  $\Delta NO3_{str}$  is the change in nitrate concentration (mg N/L),  $\beta_{N,2}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $NO2_{str}$  is the nitrite concentration at the beginning of the day (mg N/L),  $fr_{NH4}$  is the fraction of

algal nitrogen uptake from ammonium pool,  $\alpha_1$  is the fraction of algal biomass that is nitrogen (mg N/mg alg biomass),  $\mu_a$  is the local growth rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $algae$  is the algal biomass concentration at the beginning of the day (mg alg/L), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The local rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate is calculated with equation 7:3.2.9 while the fraction of algal nitrogen uptake from ammonium pool is calculated with equation 7:3.2.7. Section 7:3.1.2.1 describes the calculation of the local growth rate of algae. The calculation of travel time is reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

Table 7:3-2: SWAT input variables used in in-stream nitrogen calculations.

<b>Variable name</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>File Name</b>
AI1	$\alpha_1$ : Fraction of algal biomass that is nitrogen (mg N/mg alg biomass)	.wwq
RHOQ	$\rho_{a,20}$ : Local algal respiration rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.wwq
BC3	$\beta_{N,3,20}$ : Local rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq
RS4	$\sigma_{4,20}$ : Local settling rate for organic nitrogen at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq
BC1	$\beta_{N,1,20}$ : Rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq
RS3	$\sigma_{3,20}$ : Benthos (sediment) source rate for ammonium nitrogen at 20°C (mg N/m <sup>2</sup> -day or mg N/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)	.swq
P_N	$f_{NH4}$ : Preference factor for ammonia nitrogen	.wwq
BC2	$\beta_{N,2,20}$ : Rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq

## 7:3.3 PHOSPHORUS CYCLE

The phosphorus cycle is similar to the nitrogen cycle. The death of algae transforms algal phosphorus into organic phosphorus. Organic phosphorus is mineralized to soluble phosphorus which is available for uptake by algae. Organic phosphorus may also be removed from the stream by settling. This section summarizes the equations used to simulate the phosphorus cycle in the stream.

### 7:3.3.1 ORGANIC PHOSPHORUS

The amount of organic phosphorus in the stream may be increased by the conversion of algal biomass phosphorus to organic phosphorus. Organic phosphorus concentration in the stream may be decreased by the conversion of organic phosphorus to soluble inorganic phosphorus or the settling of organic phosphorus with sediment. The change in organic phosphorus for a given day is:

$$\Delta orgP_{str} = (\alpha_2 \cdot \rho_a \cdot algae - \beta_{P,4} \cdot orgP_{str} - \sigma_5 \cdot orgP_{str}) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.3.1$$

where  $\Delta orgP_{str}$  is the change in organic phosphorus concentration (mg P/L),  $\alpha_2$  is the fraction of algal biomass that is phosphorus (mg P/mg alg biomass),  $\rho_a$  is the local respiration or death rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $algae$  is the algal biomass concentration at the beginning of the day (mg alg/L),  $\beta_{P,4}$  is the rate constant for mineralization of organic phosphorus (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $orgP_{str}$  is the organic phosphorus concentration at the beginning of the day (mg P/L),  $\sigma_5$  is the rate coefficient for organic phosphorus settling (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The fraction of algal biomass that is phosphorus is user-defined. Equation 7:3.1.17 describes the calculation of the local respiration rate of algae. The calculation of travel time is reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

The user defines the local rate constant for mineralization of organic phosphorus at 20°C. The organic phosphorus mineralization rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\beta_{P,4} = \beta_{P,4,20} \cdot 1.047^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:3.3.2$$

where  $\beta_{P,4}$  is the local rate constant for organic phosphorus mineralization (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\beta_{P,4,20}$  is the local rate constant for organic phosphorus mineralization at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

The user defines the rate coefficient for organic phosphorus settling at 20°C. The organic phosphorus settling rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\sigma_5 = \sigma_{5,20} \cdot 1.024^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:3.3.3$$

where  $\sigma_5$  is the local settling rate for organic phosphorus (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\sigma_{5,20}$  is the local settling rate for organic phosphorus at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

### **7:3.3.2 INORGANIC/SOLUBLE PHOSPHORUS**

The amount of soluble, inorganic phosphorus in the stream may be increased by the mineralization of organic phosphorus and diffusion of inorganic phosphorus from the streambed sediments. The soluble phosphorus concentration

in the stream may be decreased by the uptake of inorganic P by algae. The change in soluble phosphorus for a given day is:

$$\Delta solP_{str} = \left( \beta_{P,4} \cdot orgP_{str} + \frac{\sigma_2}{(1000 \cdot depth)} - \alpha_2 \cdot \mu_a \cdot algae \right) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.3.4$$

where  $\Delta solP_{str}$  is the change in solution phosphorus concentration (mg P/L),  $\beta_{P,4}$  is the rate constant for mineralization of organic phosphorus (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $orgP_{str}$  is the organic phosphorus concentration at the beginning of the day (mg P/L),  $\sigma_2$  is the benthos (sediment) source rate for soluble P (mg P/m<sup>2</sup>-day or mg P/m<sup>2</sup>-hr),  $depth$  is the depth of water in the channel (m),  $\alpha_2$  is the fraction of algal biomass that is phosphorus (mg P/mg alg biomass),  $\mu_a$  is the local growth rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $algae$  is the algal biomass concentration at the beginning of the day (mg alg/L), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The local rate constant for mineralization of organic phosphorus is calculated with equation 7:3.3.2. Section 7:3.1.2.1 describes the calculation of the local growth rate of algae. The calculation of depth and travel time is reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

The user defines the benthos source rate for soluble P at 20°C. The benthos source rate for soluble phosphorus is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\sigma_2 = \sigma_{2,20} \cdot 1.074^{(T_{water} - 20)} \quad 7:3.3.5$$

where  $\sigma_2$  is the benthos (sediment) source rate for soluble P (mg P/m<sup>2</sup>-day or mg P/m<sup>2</sup>-hr),  $\sigma_{2,20}$  is the benthos (sediment) source rate for soluble phosphorus at 20°C (mg P/m<sup>2</sup>-day or mg P/m<sup>2</sup>-hr), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

Table 7:3-3: SWAT input variables used in in-stream phosphorus calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
AI2	$\alpha_2$ : Fraction of algal biomass that is phosphorus (mg P/mg alg biomass)	.wwq
RHOQ	$\rho_{a,20}$ : Local algal respiration rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.wwq
BC4	$\beta_{P,4,20}$ : Local rate constant for organic phosphorus mineralization at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq
RS5	$\sigma_{5,20}$ : Local settling rate for organic phosphorus at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq
RS2	$\sigma_{2,20}$ : Benthos (sediment) source rate for soluble phosphorus at 20°C (mg P/m <sup>2</sup> -day)	.swq

## 7:3.4 CARBONACEOUS BIOLOGICAL OXYGEN DEMAND

---

The carbonaceous oxygen demand (CBOD) of the water is the amount of oxygen required to decompose the organic material in the water. CBOD is added to the stream with loadings from surface runoff or point sources. Within the stream, two processes are modeled that impact CBOD levels, both of which serve to reduce the carbonaceous biological oxygen demand as the water moves downstream. The change in CBOD within the stream on a given day is calculated:

$$\Delta cbod = -(\kappa_1 \cdot cbod + \kappa_3 \cdot cbod) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.4.1$$

where  $\Delta cbod$  is the change in carbonaceous biological oxygen demand concentration (mg CBOD/L),  $\kappa_1$  is the CBOD deoxygenation rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $cbod$  is the carbonaceous biological oxygen demand concentration (mg CBOD/L),  $\kappa_3$  is the settling loss rate of CBOD ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The calculation of travel time is reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

The user defines the carbonaceous deoxygenation rate at 20°C. The CBOD deoxygenation rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\kappa_1 = \kappa_{1,20} \cdot 1.047^{(T_{\text{water}} - 20)} \quad 7:3.4.2$$

where  $\kappa_1$  is the CBOD deoxygenation rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $\kappa_{1,20}$  is the CBOD deoxygenation rate at 20°C ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ), and  $T_{\text{water}}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

The user defines the settling loss rate of CBOD at 20°C. The settling loss rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\kappa_3 = \kappa_{3,20} \cdot 1.024^{(T_{\text{water}} - 20)} \quad 7:3.4.3$$

where  $\kappa_3$  is the settling loss rate of CBOD ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ),  $\kappa_{3,20}$  is the settling loss rate of CBOD at 20°C ( $\text{day}^{-1}$  or  $\text{hr}^{-1}$ ), and  $T_{\text{water}}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

Table 7:3-4: SWAT input variables used in in-stream CBOD calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
RK1	$\kappa_{1,20}$ : CBOD deoxygenation rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq
RK3	$\kappa_{3,20}$ : Settling loss rate of CBOD at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq

## 7:3.5 OXYGEN

An adequate dissolved oxygen concentration is a basic requirement for a healthy aquatic ecosystem. Dissolved oxygen concentrations in streams are a function of atmospheric reaeration, photosynthesis, plant and animal respiration, benthic (sediment) demand, biochemical oxygen demand, nitrification, salinity, and temperature. The change in dissolved oxygen concentration on a given day is calculated:

$$\Delta Ox_{str} = (\kappa_2 \cdot (Ox_{sat} - Ox_{str}) + (\alpha_3 \cdot \mu_a - \alpha_4 \cdot \rho_a) \cdot algae - \kappa_1 \cdot cbod - \frac{\kappa_4}{1000 \cdot depth} \\ - \alpha_5 \cdot \beta_{N,1} \cdot NH4_{str} - \alpha_6 \cdot \beta_{N,2} \cdot NO2_{str}) \cdot TT \quad 7:3.5.1$$

where  $\Delta Ox_{str}$  is the change in dissolved oxygen concentration (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L),  $\kappa_2$  is the reaeration rate for Fickian diffusion (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $Ox_{sat}$  is the saturation oxygen concentration (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L),  $Ox_{str}$  is the dissolved oxygen concentration in the stream (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L),  $\alpha_3$  is the rate of oxygen production per unit of algal photosynthesis (mg O<sub>2</sub>/mg alg),  $\mu_a$  is the local specific growth rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\alpha_4$  is the rate of oxygen uptake per unit of algae respiration (mg O<sub>2</sub>/mg alg),  $\rho_a$  is the local respiration or death rate of algae (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $algae$  is the algal biomass concentration at the beginning of the day (mg alg/L),  $\kappa_1$  is the CBOD deoxygenation rate (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $cbod$  is the carbonaceous biological oxygen demand concentration (mg CBOD/L),  $\kappa_4$  is the sediment oxygen demand rate (mg O<sub>2</sub>/(m<sup>2</sup>·day) or mg O<sub>2</sub>/(m<sup>2</sup>·hr)),  $depth$  is the depth of water in the channel (m),  $\alpha_5$  is the rate of oxygen uptake per unit NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> oxidation (mg O<sub>2</sub>/mg N),  $\beta_{N,1}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $NH4_{str}$  is the ammonium concentration at the beginning of the day (mg N/L),  $\alpha_6$  is the

rate of oxygen uptake per unit  $\text{NO}_2^-$  oxidation (mg O<sub>2</sub>/mg N),  $\beta_{N,2}$  is the rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\text{NO}_2\text{str}$  is the nitrite concentration at the beginning of the day (mg N/L) and  $TT$  is the flow travel time in the reach segment (day or hr). The user defines the rate of oxygen production per unit algal photosynthesis, the rate of oxygen uptake per unit algal respiration, the rate of oxygen uptake per unit NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> oxidation and rate of oxygen uptake per unit NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> oxidation. Section 7:3.1.2.1 describes the calculation of the local growth rate of algae while equation 7:3.1.17 describes the calculation of the local respiration rate of algae. The rate constant for biological oxidation of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> is calculated with equation 7:3.2.5 while the rate constant for NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> oxidation is determined with equation 7:3.2.9. The CBOD deoxygenation rate is calculated using equation 7:3.4.2. The calculation of depth and travel time are reviewed in Chapter 7:1.

The user defines the sediment oxygen demand rate at 20°C. The sediment oxygen demand rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\kappa_4 = \kappa_{4,20} \cdot 1.060^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:3.5.2$$

where  $\kappa_4$  is the sediment oxygen demand rate (mg O<sub>2</sub>/(m<sup>2</sup>·day) or mg O<sub>2</sub>/(m<sup>2</sup>·hr)),  $\kappa_{4,20}$  is the sediment oxygen demand rate at 20°C (mg O<sub>2</sub>/(m<sup>2</sup>·day) or mg O<sub>2</sub>/(m<sup>2</sup>·hr)), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

### **7:3.5.1 OXYGEN SATURATION CONCENTRATION**

The amount of oxygen that can be dissolved in water is a function of temperature, concentration of dissolved solids, and atmospheric pressure. An equation developed by APHA (1985) is used to calculate the saturation concentration of dissolved oxygen:

$$Ox_{sat} = \exp \left[ -139.34410 + \frac{1.575701 \times 10^5}{T_{wat,K}} - \frac{6.642308 \times 10^7}{T_{wat,K}^2} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1.243800 \times 10^{10}}{T_{wat,K}^3} - \frac{8.621949 \times 10^{11}}{T_{wat,K}^4} \right] \quad 7:3.5.3$$

where  $Ox_{sat}$  is the equilibrium saturation oxygen concentration at 1.00 atm (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L), and  $T_{wat,K}$  is the water temperature in Kelvin (273.15+°C).

### **7:3.5.2 REAERATION**

Reaeration occurs by diffusion of oxygen from the atmosphere into the stream and by the mixing of water and air that occurs during turbulent flow.

#### **7:3.5.2.1 REAERATION BY FICKIAN DIFFUSION**

The user defines the reaeration rate at 20°C. The reaeration rate is adjusted to the local water temperature using the relationship:

$$\kappa_2 = \kappa_{2,20} \cdot 1.024^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:3.5.4$$

where  $\kappa_2$  is the reaeration rate (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>),  $\kappa_{2,20}$  is the reaeration rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup> or hr<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_{water}$  is the average water temperature for the day or hour (°C).

Numerous methods have been developed to calculate the reaeration rate at 20°C,  $\kappa_{2,20}$ . A few of the methods are listed below. Brown and Barnwell (1987) provide additional methods.

Using field measurements, Churchill, Elmore and Buckingham (1962) derived the relationship:

$$\kappa_{2,20} = 5.03 \cdot v_c^{0.969} \cdot depth^{-1.673} \quad 7:3.5.5$$

where  $\kappa_{2,20}$  is the reaeration rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup>),  $v_c$  is the average stream velocity (m/s), and  $depth$  is the average stream depth (m).

O'Connor and Dobbins (1958) incorporated stream turbulence characteristics into the equations they developed. For streams with low velocities and isotropic conditions,

$$\kappa_{2,20} = 294 \cdot \frac{(D_m \cdot v_c)^{0.5}}{depth^{1.5}} \quad 7:3.5.6$$

where  $\kappa_{2,20}$  is the reaeration rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup>),  $D_m$  is the molecular diffusion coefficient (m<sup>2</sup>/day),  $v_c$  is the average stream velocity (m/s), and  $depth$  is the average stream depth (m). For streams with high velocities and nonisotropic conditions,

$$\kappa_{2,20} = 2703 \cdot \frac{D_m^{0.5} \cdot slp^{0.25}}{depth^{1.25}} \quad 7:3.5.7$$

where  $\kappa_{2,20}$  is the reaeration rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup>),  $D_m$  is the molecular diffusion coefficient (m<sup>2</sup>/day),  $slp$  is the slope of the streambed (m/m), and  $depth$  is the average stream depth (m). The molecular diffusion coefficient is calculated

$$D_m = 177 \cdot 1.037^{\bar{T}_{water}-20} \quad 7:3.5.8$$

where  $D_m$  is the molecular diffusion coefficient (m<sup>2</sup>/day), and  $\bar{T}_{water}$  is the average water temperature (°C).

Owens et al. (1964) developed an equation to determine the reaeration rate for shallow, fast moving streams where the stream depth is 0.1 to 3.4 m and the velocity is 0.03 to 1.5 m/s.

$$\kappa_{2,20} = 5.34 \cdot \frac{v_c^{0.67}}{depth^{1.85}} \quad 7:3.5.9$$

where  $\kappa_{2,20}$  is the reaeration rate at 20°C (day<sup>-1</sup>),  $v_c$  is the average stream velocity (m/s), and  $depth$  is the average stream depth (m).

### 7:3.5.2.2 REAERATION BY TURBULENT FLOW OVER A DAM

Reaeration will occur when water falls over a dam, weir, or other structure in the stream. To simulate this form of reaeration, a “structure” command line is added in the watershed configuration file (.fig) at every point along the stream where flow over a structure occurs.

The amount of reaeration that occurs is a function of the oxygen deficit above the structure and a reaeration coefficient:

$$\Delta Ox_{str} = D_a - D_b = D_a \left( 1 - \frac{1}{rea} \right) \quad 7:3.5.10$$

where  $\Delta Ox_{str}$  is the change in dissolved oxygen concentration (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L),  $D_a$  is the oxygen deficit above the structure (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L),  $D_b$  is the oxygen deficit below the structure (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L), and  $rea$  is the reaeration coefficient.

The oxygen deficit above the structure,  $D_a$ , is calculated:

$$D_a = Ox_{sat} - Ox_{str} \quad 7:3.5.11$$

where  $Ox_{sat}$  is the equilibrium saturation oxygen concentration (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L), and  $Ox_{str}$  is the dissolved oxygen concentration in the stream (mg O<sub>2</sub>/L).

Butts and Evans (1983) documents the following relationship that can be used to estimate the reaeration coefficient:

$$rea = 1 + 0.38 \cdot coef_a \cdot coef_b \cdot h_{fall} \cdot (1 - 0.11 \cdot h_{fall}) \cdot (1 + 0.046 \cdot \bar{T}_{water}) \quad 7:3.5.12$$

where  $rea$  is the reaeration coefficient,  $coef_a$  is an empirical water quality factor,  $coef_b$  is an empirical dam aeration coefficient,  $h_{fall}$  is the height through which water falls (m), and  $\bar{T}_{water}$  is the average water temperature (°C).

The empirical water quality factor is assigned a value based on the condition of the stream:

$coef_a = 1.80$  in clean water

$coef_a = 1.60$  in slightly polluted water

$coef_a = 1.00$  in moderately polluted water

$coef_a = 0.65$  in grossly polluted water

The empirical dam aeration coefficient is assigned a value based on the type of structure:

$coef_b = 0.70$  to  $0.90$  for flat broad crested weir

$coef_b = 1.05$  for sharp crested weir with straight slope face

$coef_b = 0.80$  for sharp crested weir with vertical face

$coef_b = 0.05$  for sluice gates with submerged discharge

Table 7:3-5: SWAT input variables used in in-stream oxygen calculations.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
RK2	$\kappa_{2,20}$ : Reaeration rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq
AI3	$\alpha_3$ : Rate of oxygen production per unit algal photosynthesis (mg O <sub>2</sub> /mg alg)	.wwq
AI4	$\alpha_4$ : Rate of oxygen uptake per unit algal respiration (mg O <sub>2</sub> /mg alg)	.wwq
RHOQ	$\rho_{a,20}$ : Local algal respiration rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.wwq
RK1	$\kappa_{1,20}$ : CBOD deoxygenation rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> )	.swq
RK4	$\kappa_{4,20}$ : Sediment oxygen demand rate at 20°C (mg O <sub>2</sub> /(m <sup>2</sup> ·day))	.swq
AI5	$\alpha_5$ : Rate of oxygen uptake per unit NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> oxidation (mg O <sub>2</sub> /mg N)	.wwq
AI6	$\alpha_6$ : Rate of oxygen uptake per unit NO <sub>2</sub> oxidation (mg O <sub>2</sub> /mg N)	.wwq
AERATION_COEF	$rea$ : Reaeration coefficient	.fig

## 7:3.6 NOMENCLATURE

---

$C_{NH4}$	Concentration of ammonium in the reach (mg N/L)
$C_{NO3}$	Concentration of nitrate in the reach (mg N/L)
$C_{solP}$	Concentration of phosphorus in solution in the reach (mg P/L)
$D_a$	Oxygen deficit above the structure (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$D_b$	Oxygen deficit below the structure (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$D_m$	Molecular diffusion coefficient for oxygen (m <sup>2</sup> /day)
$FL$	Algal growth attenuation factor for light for the water column
$FL_z$	Algal growth attenuation factor for light at depth $z$
$FN$	Algal growth limitation factor for nitrogen
$FP$	Algal growth limitation factor for phosphorus
$H_{day}$	Solar radiation reaching ground on current day of simulation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$I_{hr}$	Solar radiation reaching ground during specific hour on current day of simulation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )
$I_{phosyn,hr}$	Photosynthetically-active solar radiation reaching ground during specific hour on current day of simulation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )
$I_{phosyn,z}$	Photosynthetically-active light intensity at a depth $z$ below the water surface (MJ/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$\bar{I}_{phosyn,hr}$	Daylight average photosynthetically-active light intensity (MJ/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$K_L$	Half-saturation coefficient for light (MJ/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$K_N$	Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for nitrogen (mg N/L)
$K_P$	Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for phosphorus (mg P/L)
$NH4_{str}$	Ammonium concentration in the stream (mg N/L)
$NO2_{str}$	Nitrite concentration in the stream (mg N/L)
$NO3_{str}$	Nitrate concentration in the stream (mg N/L)
$Ox_{sat}$	Saturation oxygen concentration (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$Ox_{str}$	Dissolved oxygen concentration in the stream (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$T_{DL}$	Daylength (h)
$T_{water}$	Average daily or hourly water temperature (°C)
$T_{wat,K}$	Water temperature in Kelvin (273.15+°C)
$\bar{T}_{water}$	Average water temperature (°C)
$TT$	Travel time (day)
<i>algae</i>	Algal biomass concentration (mg alg/L)
<i>cbod</i>	Carbonaceous biological oxygen demand concentration (mg CBOD/L)
<i>chl<sub>a</sub></i>	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration (µg chl <sub>a</sub> /L)
<i>coef<sub>a</sub></i>	Empirical water quality factor
<i>coef<sub>b</sub></i>	Empirical dam aeration coefficient
<i>depth</i>	Depth of water in the channel (m)
<i>f<sub>NH4</sub></i>	Preference factor for ammonia nitrogen
<i>fr<sub>DL</sub></i>	Fraction of daylight hours
<i>fr<sub>NH4</sub></i>	Fraction of algal nitrogen uptake from ammonium pool,
<i>fr<sub>phosyn</sub></i>	Fraction of solar radiation that is photosynthetically active
<i>h<sub>fall</sub></i>	Height through which water falls (m)

$k_\ell$	Light extinction coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1}$ )
$k_{\ell,0}$	Non-algal portion of the light extinction coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1}$ )
$k_{\ell,1}$	Linear algal self shading coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1} (\mu\text{g-chla/L})^{-1}$ )
$k_{\ell,2}$	Nonlinear algal self shading coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1} (\mu\text{g-chla/L})^{-2/3}$ )
$\text{orgN}_{\text{str}}$	Organic nitrogen concentration in the stream (mg N/L)
$\text{orgP}_{\text{str}}$	Organic phosphorus concentration in the stream (mg P/L)
$\text{rea}$	Reaeration coefficient
$\text{slp}$	Slope of the streambed (m/m)
$v_c$	Average stream velocity (m/s)
$z$	Depth from the water surface (m)
$\alpha_0$	Ratio of chlorophyll <i>a</i> to algal biomass ( $\mu\text{g chla/mg alg}$ )
$\alpha_1$	Fraction of algal biomass that is nitrogen (mg N/mg alg biomass),
$\alpha_2$	Fraction of algal biomass that is phosphorus (mg P/mg alg biomass)
$\alpha_3$	Rate of oxygen production per unit algal photosynthesis (mg O <sub>2</sub> /mg alg)
$\alpha_4$	Rate of oxygen uptake per unit algal respiration (mg O <sub>2</sub> /mg alg)
$\alpha_5$	Rate of oxygen uptake per unit NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> oxidation (mg O <sub>2</sub> /mg N)
$\alpha_6$	Rate of oxygen uptake per unit NO <sub>2</sub> oxidation (mg O <sub>2</sub> /mg N)
$\beta_{N,1}$	Rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{N,1,20}$	Rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{N,2}$	Rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{N,2,20}$	Rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{N,3}$	Rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to ammonia nitrogen (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{N,3,20}$	Local rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{P,4}$	Rate constant for mineralization of organic phosphorus (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{P,4,20}$	Local rate constant for organic phosphorus mineralization at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\Delta_{\text{algae}}$	Change in algal biomass concentration (mg alg/L)
$\Delta\text{NH4}_{\text{str}}$	Change in ammonium concentration (mg N/L)
$\Delta\text{NO2}_{\text{str}}$	Change in nitrite concentration (mg N/L)
$\Delta\text{orgN}_{\text{str}}$	Change in organic nitrogen concentration (mg N/L)
$\Delta\text{orgP}_{\text{str}}$	Change in organic phosphorus concentration (mg P/L)
$\Delta\text{Ox}_{\text{str}}$	Change in dissolved oxygen concentration (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$\Delta\text{solP}_{\text{str}}$	Change in solution phosphorus concentration (mg P/L)
$\kappa_1$	CBOD deoxygenation rate (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_{1,20}$	CBOD deoxygenation rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_2$	Reaeration rate for Fickian diffusion (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_{2,20}$	Reaeration rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_3$	Settling loss rate of CBOD (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_{3,20}$	Settling loss rate of CBOD at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_4$	Sediment oxygen demand rate (mg O <sub>2</sub> /(m <sup>2</sup> ·day))
$\kappa_{4,20}$	Sediment oxygen demand rate at 20°C (mg O <sub>2</sub> /(m <sup>2</sup> ·day) or mg O <sub>2</sub> /(m <sup>2</sup> ·hr))
$\rho_a$	Local respiration rate of algae (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )

$\rho_{a,20}$	Local algal respiration rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\sigma_1$	Local settling rate for algae (m/day or m/hr)
$\sigma_{1,20}$	Local algal settling rate at 20°C (m/day or m/hr)
$\sigma_2$	Benthos (sediment) source rate for soluble P (mg P/m <sup>2</sup> -day or mg P/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$\sigma_{2,20}$	Benthos (sediment) source rate for soluble phosphorus at 20°C (mg P/m <sup>2</sup> -day or mg P/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$\sigma_3$	Benthos (sediment) source rate for ammonium (mg N/m <sup>2</sup> -day or mg N/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$\sigma_{3,20}$	Benthos (sediment) source rate for ammonium nitrogen at 20°C (mg N/m <sup>2</sup> -day or mg N/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$\sigma_4$	Rate coefficient of organic nitrogen settling (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\sigma_{4,20}$	Local settling rate for organic nitrogen at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\sigma_5$	Rate coefficient for organic phosphorus settling (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\sigma_{5,20}$	Local settling rate for organic phosphorus at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\mu_a$	Local specific growth rate of algae (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\mu_{a,20}$	Local specific algal growth rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\mu_{max}$	Maximum specific algal growth rate (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )

## 7:3.7 REFERENCES

---

- American Public Health Association. 1985. Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater, 16<sup>th</sup> edition. American Public Health Association, Inc.
- Azevedo, J., and P.R. Stout. 1974. Farm animal manures: An overview of their role in the agricultural environment (Service Manual no. 44). University of California, Agricultural Experiment Station Extension.
- Bowie, G.L. W.B. Mills, D.B. Porcella, C.L. Campbell, J.R. Pagenkopf, G.L. Rupp, K.M. Johnson, P.W.H. Chan, and S.A. Gherini. 1985. Rates, constants, and kinetic formulations in surface water quality modeling, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. EPA/600/3-85/040, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Athens, GA.
- Brown, L.C. and T.O. Barnwell, Jr. 1987. The enhanced water quality models QUAL2E and QUAL2E-UNCAS documentation and user manual. EPA document EPA/600/3-87/007. USEPA, Athens, GA.
- Butts, T.A. and R.L. Evans. 1983. Small stream channel dam aeration characteristics. Journal, Environmental Engineering Division, ASAE 109:555-573.

- Churchill, M.A., H.L. Elmore, and R.A. Buckingham. 1962. The prediction of stream reaeration rates. International Journal of Air and Water Pollution. 6: 467-504.
- Loehr, R.C. 1970. Drainage and pollution from beef cattle feedlots (Proceedings paper No. 7726). Journal of the Sanitary Engineers Division, American Society of Civil Engineers, 96 (SA6): 1295-1309.
- O'Connor, D.J. and W.E. Dobbins. 1958. Mechanism of reaeration in natural streams. Trans. ASCE. 123:641-684.
- Owens, M. R.W. Edwards, and J.W. Gibbs. 1964. Some reaeration studies in streams. International Journal of Air and Water Pollution 8:469-486.
- Paine, M.D. 1973. Confined animals and public environment (Great Plains Beef Cattle Feeding Handbook, GPE-7000/EC-72-246). Lincoln: University of Nebraska, College of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service.



## **SECTION 7 CHAPTER 4**

# **EQUATIONS: IN-STREAM PESTICIDE TRANSFORMATIONS**

---

SWAT incorporates a simple mass balance developed by Chapra (1997) to model the transformation and transport of pesticides in streams. The model assumes a well-mixed layer of water overlying a sediment layer. Only one pesticide can be routed through the stream network. The pesticide to be routed is defined by the variable IRTPEST in the .bsn file.

## **7:4.1 PESTICIDE IN THE WATER**

---

Pesticide in a reach segment is increased through addition of mass in inflow as well as resuspension and diffusion of pesticide from the sediment layer. The amount of pesticide in a reach segment is reduced through removal in outflow as well as degradation, volatilization, settling and diffusion into the underlying sediment.

### **7:4.1.1 SOLID-LIQUID PARTITIONING**

Pesticides will partition into particulate and dissolved forms. The fraction of pesticide in each phase is a function of the pesticide's partition coefficient and the reach segment's suspended solid concentration:

$$F_d = \frac{1}{1 + K_d \cdot conc_{sed}} \quad 7:4.1.1$$

$$F_p = \frac{K_d \cdot conc_{sed}}{1 + K_d \cdot conc_{sed}} = 1 - F_d \quad 7:4.1.2$$

where  $F_d$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $F_p$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase,  $K_d$  is the pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ ), and  $conc_{sed}$  is the concentration of suspended solids in the water ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ).

The pesticide partition coefficient can be estimated from the octanol-water partition coefficient (Chapra, 1997):

$$K_d = 3.085 \times 10^{-8} \cdot K_{ow} \quad 7:4.1.3$$

where  $K_d$  is the pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ ) and  $K_{ow}$  is the pesticide's octanol-water partition coefficient ( $\text{mg m}_{\text{octanol}}^{-3} (\text{mg m}_{\text{water}}^{-3})^{-1}$ ). Values for the octanol-water partition coefficient have been published for many chemicals. If a published value cannot be found, it can be estimated from solubility (Chapra, 1997):

$$\log(K_{ow}) = 5.00 - 0.670 \cdot \log(pst'_{sol}) \quad 7:4.1.4$$

where  $pst'_{sol}$  is the pesticide solubility ( $\mu\text{moles/L}$ ). The solubility in these units is calculated:

$$pst'_{sol} = \frac{pst_{sol}}{MW} \cdot 10^3 \quad 7:4.1.5$$

where  $pst'_{sol}$  is the pesticide solubility ( $\mu\text{moles/L}$ ),  $pst_{sol}$  is the pesticide solubility ( $\text{mg/L}$ ) and  $MW$  is the molecular weight ( $\text{g/mole}$ ).

### **7:4.1.2 DEGRADATION**

Pesticides in both the particulate and dissolved forms are subject to degradation. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the water via degradation is:

$$pst_{deg,wtr} = k_{p,aq} \cdot pst_{rchwtr} \cdot TT \quad 7:4.1.6$$

where  $pst_{deg,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the water via degradation ( $\text{mg pst}$ ),  $k_{p,aq}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day),  $pst_{rchwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water at the beginning of the day ( $\text{mg pst}$ ), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time (days). The rate constant is related to the aqueous half-life:

$$k_{p,aq} = \frac{0.693}{t_{1/2,aq}} \quad 7:4.1.7$$

where  $k_{p,aq}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day), and  $t_{1/2,aq}$  is the aqueous half-life for the pesticide (days).

### **7:4.1.3 VOLATILIZATION**

Pesticide in the dissolved phase is available for volatilization. The amount of pesticide removed from the water via volatilization is:

$$pst_{vol,wtr} = \frac{v_v}{depth} \cdot F_d \cdot pst_{rchwtr} \cdot TT \quad 7:4.1.8$$

where  $pst_{vol,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via volatilization ( $\text{mg pst}$ ),  $v_v$  is the volatilization mass-transfer coefficient ( $\text{m/day}$ ),  $depth$  is the flow depth ( $\text{m}$ ),  $F_d$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $pst_{rchwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water ( $\text{mg pst}$ ), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time (days).

The volatilization mass-transfer coefficient can be calculated based on Whitman's two-film or two-resistance theory (Whitman, 1923; Lewis and Whitman, 1924 as described in Chapra, 1997). While the main body of the gas and liquid phases are assumed to be well-mixed and homogenous, the two-film

theory assumes that a substance moving between the two phases encounters maximum resistance in two laminar boundary layers where transfer is a function of molecular diffusion. In this type of system the transfer coefficient or velocity is:

$$v_v = K_l \cdot \frac{H_e}{H_e + R \cdot T_K \cdot (K_l/K_g)} \quad 7:4.1.9$$

where  $v_v$  is the volatilization mass-transfer coefficient (m/day),  $K_l$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the liquid laminar layer (m/day),  $K_g$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the gaseous laminar layer (m/day),  $H_e$  is Henry's constant ( $\text{atm m}^3 \text{ mole}^{-1}$ ),  $R$  is the universal gas constant ( $8.206 \times 10^{-5} \text{ atm m}^3 (\text{K mole})^{-1}$ ), and  $T_K$  is the temperature (K).

For rivers where liquid flow is turbulent, the transfer coefficients are estimated using the surface renewal theory (Higbie, 1935; Danckwerts, 1951; as described by Chapra, 1997). The surface renewal model visualizes the system as consisting of parcels of water that are brought to the surface for a period of time. The fluid elements are assumed to reach and leave the air/water interface randomly, i.e. the exposure of the fluid elements to air is described by a statistical distribution. The transfer velocities for the liquid and gaseous phases are calculated:

$$K_l = \sqrt{r_l \cdot D_l} \quad K_g = \sqrt{r_g \cdot D_g} \quad 7:4.1.10$$

where  $K_l$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the liquid laminar layer (m/day),  $K_g$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the gaseous laminar layer (m/day),  $D_l$  is the liquid molecular diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ ),  $D_g$  is the gas molecular diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ ),  $r_l$  is the liquid surface renewal rate (1/day), and  $r_g$  is the gaseous surface renewal rate (1/day).

O'Connor and Dobbins (1958) defined the surface renewal rate as the ratio of the average stream velocity to depth.

$$r_l = \frac{86400 \cdot v_c}{\text{depth}} \quad 7:4.1.11$$

where  $r_l$  is the liquid surface renewal rate (1/day),  $v_c$  is the average stream velocity (m/s) and *depth* is the depth of flow (m).

### **7:4.1.4 SETTLING**

Pesticide in the particulate phase may be removed from the water layer by settling. Settling transfers pesticide from the water to the sediment layer. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the water via settling is:

$$pst_{stl,wtr} = \frac{v_s}{depth} \cdot F_p \cdot pst_{rchwtr} \cdot TT \quad 7:4.1.12$$

where  $pst_{stl,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the water due to settling (mg pst),  $v_s$  is the settling velocity (m/day),  $depth$  is the flow depth (m),  $F_p$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase,  $pst_{rchwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time (days).

### **7:4.1.5 OUTFLOW**

Pesticide is removed from the reach segment in outflow. The amount of dissolved and particulate pesticide removed from the reach segment in outflow is:

$$pst_{sol,o} = Q \cdot \frac{F_d \cdot pst_{rchwtr}}{V} \quad 7:4.1.13$$

$$pst_{sorb,o} = Q \cdot \frac{F_p \cdot pst_{rchwtr}}{V} \quad 7:4.1.14$$

where  $pst_{sol,o}$  is the amount of dissolved pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst),  $pst_{sorb,o}$  is the amount of particulate pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst),  $Q$  is the rate of outflow from the reach segment ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/\text{day}$ ),  $F_d$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $F_p$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase,  $pst_{rchwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst), and  $V$  is the volume of water in the reach segment ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

Table 7:4-1: SWAT input variables that pesticide partitioning.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
CHPST_KOC	$K_d$ : Pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ )	.swq
CHPST_REA	$k_{p,aq}$ : Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day)	.swq
CHPST_VOL	$v_v$ : Volatilization mass-transfer coefficient (m/day)	.swq
CHPST_STL	$v_s$ : Pesticide settling velocity (m/day)	.swq

## 7:4.2 PESTICIDE IN THE SEDIMENT

---

Pesticide in the sediment layer underlying a reach segment is increased through addition of mass by settling and diffusion from the water. The amount of pesticide in the sediment layer is reduced through removal by degradation, resuspension, diffusion into the overlying water, and burial.

### 7:4.2.1 SOLID-LIQUID PARTITIONING

As in the water layer, pesticides in the sediment layer will partition into particulate and dissolved forms. Calculation of the solid-liquid partitioning in the sediment layer requires a suspended solid concentration. The “concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer is defined as:

$$conc_{sed}^* = \frac{M_{sed}}{V_{tot}} \quad 7:4.2.1$$

where  $conc_{sed}^*$  is the “concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ),  $M_{sed}$  is the mass of solid particles in the sediment layer ( $\text{g}$ ) and  $V_{tot}$  is the total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ).

Mass and volume are also used to define the porosity and density of the sediment layer. In the sediment layer, porosity is the fraction of the total volume in the liquid phase:

$$\phi = \frac{V_{wtr}}{V_{tot}} \quad 7:4.2.2$$

where  $\phi$  is the porosity,  $V_{wtr}$  is the volume of water in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ) and  $V_{tot}$  is the total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ). The fraction of the volume in the solid phase can then be defined as:

$$1 - \phi = \frac{V_{sed}}{V_{tot}} \quad 7:4.2.3$$

where  $\phi$  is the porosity,  $V_{sed}$  is the volume of solids in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ) and  $V_{tot}$  is the total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ).

The density of sediment particles is defined as:

$$\rho_s = \frac{M_{sed}}{V_{sed}} \quad 7:4.2.4$$

where  $\rho_s$  is the particle density ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ),  $M_{\text{sed}}$  is the mass of solid particles in the sediment layer (g), and  $V_{\text{sed}}$  is the volume of solids in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ).

Solving equation 7:4.2.3 for  $V_{\text{tot}}$  and equation 7:4.2.4 for  $M_{\text{sed}}$  and substituting into equation 7:4.2.1 yields:

$$\text{conc}_{\text{sed}}^* = (1 - \phi) \cdot \rho_s \quad 7:4.2.5$$

where  $\text{conc}_{\text{sed}}^*$  is the “concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ),  $\phi$  is the porosity, and  $\rho_s$  is the particle density ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ).

Assuming  $\phi = 0.5$  and  $\rho_s = 2.6 \times 10^6 \text{ g}/\text{m}^3$ , the “concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer is  $1.3 \times 10^6 \text{ g}/\text{m}^3$ .

The fraction of pesticide in each phase is then calculated:

$$F_{d,\text{sed}} = \frac{1}{\phi + (1 - \phi) \cdot \rho_s \cdot K_d} \quad 7:4.2.6$$

$$F_{p,\text{sed}} = 1 - F_{d,\text{sed}} \quad 7:4.2.7$$

where  $F_{d,\text{sed}}$  is the fraction of total sediment pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $F_{p,\text{sed}}$  is the fraction of total sediment pesticide in the particulate phase,  $\phi$  is the porosity,  $\rho_s$  is the particle density ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ), and  $K_d$  is the pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ ).

The pesticide partition coefficient used for the water layer is also used for the sediment layer.

### **7:4.2.2 DEGRADATION**

Pesticides in both the particulate and dissolved forms are subject to degradation. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the sediment via degradation is:

$$pst_{\text{deg,sed}} = k_{p,\text{sed}} \cdot pst_{\text{rchsed}} \quad 7:4.2.8$$

where  $pst_{\text{deg,sed}}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the sediment via degradation (mg  $\text{pst}$ ),  $k_{p,\text{sed}}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment (1/day), and  $pst_{\text{rchsed}}$  is the amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg  $\text{pst}$ ). The rate constant is related to the sediment half-life:

$$k_{p,\text{sed}} = \frac{0.693}{t_{1/2,\text{sed}}} \quad 7:4.2.9$$

where  $k_{p, \text{sed}}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment (1/day), and  $t_{1/2, \text{sed}}$  is the sediment half-life for the pesticide (days).

### **7:4.2.3 RESUSPENSION**

Pesticide in the sediment layer is available for resuspension. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the sediment via resuspension is:

$$pst_{rsp,wtr} = \frac{v_r}{depth} \cdot pst_{rchsed} \cdot TT \quad 7:4.2.10$$

where  $pst_{rsp,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via resuspension (mg pst),  $v_r$  is the resuspension velocity (m/day),  $depth$  is the flow depth (m),  $pst_{rchsed}$  is the amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst), and  $TT$  is the flow travel time (days). Pesticide removed from the sediment layer by resuspension is added to the water layer.

### **7:4.2.4 DIFFUSION**

Pesticide in the dissolved phase is available for diffusion. Diffusion transfers pesticide between the water and sediment layers. The direction of movement is controlled by the pesticide concentration. Pesticide will move from areas of high concentration to areas of low concentration. The amount of pesticide that is transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion is:

$$pst_{dif} = \left| \frac{v_d}{depth} \cdot (F_{d,sed} \cdot pst_{rchsed} - F_d \cdot pst_{rchwtr}) \cdot TT \right| \quad 7:4.2.11$$

where  $pst_{dif}$  is the amount of pesticide transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion (mg pst),  $v_d$  is the rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day),  $depth$  is the flow depth (m),  $F_{d,sed}$  is the fraction of total sediment pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $pst_{rchsed}$  is the amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst),  $F_d$  is the fraction of total water layer pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $pst_{rchwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst), and  $TT$  is the flow duration (days). If  $F_{d,sed} \cdot pst_{rchsed} > F_d \cdot pst_{rchwtr}$ ,  $pst_{dif}$  is transferred from the sediment to the water layer. If,  $F_{d,sed} \cdot pst_{rchsed} < F_d \cdot pst_{rchwtr}$ ,  $pst_{dif}$  is transferred from the water to the sediment layer.

The diffusive mixing velocity,  $v_d$ , can be estimated from the empirically derived formula (Chapra, 1997):

$$v_d = \frac{69.35}{365} \cdot \phi \cdot MW^{-2/3} \quad 7:4.2.12$$

where  $v_d$  is the rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day),  $\phi$  is the sediment porosity, and  $MW$  is the molecular weight of the pesticide compound.

### **7:4.2.5 BURIAL**

Pesticide in the sediment layer may be lost by burial. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the sediment via burial is:

$$pst_{bur} = \frac{v_b}{D_{sed}} \cdot pst_{rchsed} \quad 7:4.2.13$$

where  $pst_{bur}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via burial (mg pst),  $v_b$  is the burial velocity (m/day),  $D_{sed}$  is the depth of the active sediment layer (m), and  $pst_{rchsed}$  is the amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst).

Table 7:4-2: SWAT input variables related to pesticide in the sediment.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
CHPST_KOC	$K_d$ : Pesticide partition coefficient ( $m^3/g$ )	.swq
SEDPST_REA	$k_{p, sed}$ : Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment (1/day)	.swq
CHPST_RSP	$v_r$ : Resuspension velocity (m/day)	.swq
SEDPST_ACT	$D_{sed}$ : Depth of the active sediment layer (m)	.swq
CHPST_MIX	$v_d$ : Rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day)	.swq
SEDPST_BRY	$v_b$ : Pesticide burial velocity (m/day)	.swq

## **7:4.3 MASS BALANCE**

The processes described above can be combined into mass balance equations for the well-mixed reach segment and the well-mixed sediment layer:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta pst_{rchwtr} &= pst_{in} - (pst_{sol,o} + pst_{sorb,o}) - pst_{deg,wtr} - pst_{vol,wtr} \\ &\quad - pst_{stl,wtr} + pst_{rsp,wtr} \pm pst_{dif} \end{aligned} \quad 7:4.3.1$$

$$\Delta pst_{rchsed} = -pst_{deg,sed} + pst_{stl,wtr} - pst_{rsp,wtr} - pst_{bur} \pm pst_{dif} \quad 7:4.3.2$$

where  $\Delta pst_{rchwtr}$  is the change in pesticide mass in the water layer (mg pst),  $\Delta pst_{rchsed}$  is the change in pesticide mass in the sediment layer (mg pst),  $pst_{in}$  is the

pesticide added to the reach segment via inflow (mg pst),  $pst_{sol,o}$  is the amount of dissolved pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst),  $pst_{sorb,o}$  is the amount of particulate pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst),  $pst_{deg,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the water via degradation (mg pst),  $pst_{vol,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via volatilization (mg pst),  $pst_{stl,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the water due to settling (mg pst),  $pst_{rsp,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via resuspension (mg pst),  $pst_{dif}$  is the amount of pesticide transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion (mg pst),  $pst_{deg,sed}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the sediment via degradation (mg pst),  $pst_{bur}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via burial (mg pst).

## 7:3.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$D_g$	Gas molecular diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ )
$D_l$	Liquid molecular diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ )
$D_{sed}$	Depth of the active sediment layer (m)
$F_d$	Fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase
$F_{d,sed}$	Fraction of total sediment pesticide in the dissolved phase
$F_p$	Fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase
$F_{p,sed}$	Fraction of total sediment pesticide in the particulate phase
$H_e$	Henry's constant ( $\text{atm m}^3 \text{ mole}^{-1}$ )
$K_d$	Pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ )
$K_g$	Mass-transfer velocity in the gaseous laminar layer (m/day)
$K_l$	Mass-transfer velocity in the liquid laminar layer (m/day)
$M_{sed}$	Mass of solid phase in the sediment layer (g)
$MW$	Molecular weight of the pesticide compound
$Q$	Rate of outflow from the reach segment ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/\text{day}$ )
$R$	Universal gas constant ( $8.206 \times 10^{-5} \text{ atm m}^3 (\text{K mole})^{-1}$ )
$V_{sed}$	Volume of solids in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{tot}$	Total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{wtr}$	Volume of water in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )

$conc_{sed}$  Concentration of suspended solids in the water ( $\text{g/m}^3$ )

$conc_{sed}^*$  "Concentration" of solid particles in the sediment layer ( $\text{g/m}^3$ )

$depth$  Depth of flow (m)

$k_{p,aq}$  Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day)

$k_{p,sed}$  Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment (1/day)

$pst_{bur}$  Amount of pesticide removed via burial (mg pst)

$pst_{deg,sed}$  Amount of pesticide removed from the sediment via degradation (mg pst)

$pst_{deg,wtr}$	Amount of pesticide removed from the water via degradation (mg pst)
$pst_{dif}$	Amount of pesticide transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion (mg pst)
$pst_{rchsed}$	Amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst)
$pst_{rchwtr}$	Amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst)
$pst_{rsp,wtr}$	Amount of pesticide removed from sediment via resuspension (mg pst)
$pst_{sol,o}$	Amount of dissolved pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst)
$pst_{sorb,o}$	Amount of particulate pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst)
$pst_{stl,wtr}$	Amount of pesticide removed from the water due to settling (mg pst)
$pst_{vol,wtr}$	Amount of pesticide removed via volatilization (mg pst)
$r_g$	Gaseous surface renewal rate (1/day)
$r_l$	Liquid surface renewal rate (1/day)
$t_{1/2,aq}$	Aqueous half-life for the pesticide (days)
$t_{1/2,sed}$	Sediment half-life for the pesticide (days)
$v_b$	Pesticide burial velocity (m/day)
$v_c$	Average stream velocity (m/s)
$v_d$	Rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day)
$v_r$	Resuspension velocity (m/day)
$v_s$	Settling velocity (m/day)
$v_v$	Volatile mass-transfer coefficient (m/day)
$\Delta pst_{rchwtr}$	Change in pesticide mass in the water layer (mg pst)
$\Delta pst_{rchsed}$	Change in pesticide mass in the sediment layer (mg pst)
$\phi$	Porosity
$\rho_s$	Particle density ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )

## 7:4.5 REFERENCES

---

- Chapra, S.C. 1997. Surface water-quality modeling. WCB/McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA.
- Danckwerts, P.V. 1951. Significance of liquid-film coefficients in gas absorption. Ind. Eng. Chem. 43:1460-1467.
- Higbie, R. 1935. The rate of adsorption of a pure gas into a still liquid during short periods of exposure. Trans. Amer. Inst. Chem. Engin. 31:365-389.
- Lewis, W.K. and W.G. Whitman. 1924. Principles of gas absorption. Ind. Eng. Chem. 16:1215-1220.
- O'Connor, D.J. and Dobbins, W.E. 1958. Mechanisms of reaeration in natural streams. Trans ASAE 123: 641-666.
- Whitman, W.G. 1923. The two-film theory of gas adsorption. Chem. Metallurg. Eng. 29:146-148.



## **SECTION 7 CHAPTER 5**

# **EQUATIONS: BACTERIA ROUTING**

---

SWAT calculates loading of pathogens and indicator bacteria for pathogens from land areas in the watershed. In the stream, bacteria die-off is the only process modeled.

## 7:5.1 BACTERIA DECAY

A first order decay function is used to calculate changes in bacteria concentrations (Bowie et al., 1985).

$$bact_{lprch,i} = bact_{lprch,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{lprch,die}) \quad 7:5.1.1$$

$$bact_{prch,i} = bact_{prch,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{prch,die}) \quad 7:5.1.2$$

where  $bact_{lprch,i}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present in the reach on day  $i$  (#cfu/100mL),  $bact_{lprch,i-1}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present in the reach on day  $i - 1$  (#cfu/100mL),  $\mu_{lprch,die}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in streams (1/day),  $bact_{prch,i}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present in the reach on day  $i$  (#cfu/100mL),  $bact_{prch,i-1}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present in the reach on day  $i - 1$  (#cfu/100mL), and  $\mu_{prch,die}$ , is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in streams (1/day).

The die-off rate constants are adjusted for temperature using the equations:

$$\mu_{lprch,die} = \mu_{lprch,die,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:5.1.3$$

$$\mu_{prch,die} = \mu_{prch,die,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(T_{water}-20)} \quad 7:5.1.4$$

where  $\mu_{lprch,die}$ , is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in streams (1/day),  $\mu_{prch,die}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in streams (1/day),  $\mu_{lprch,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in streams at 20°C (1/day),  $\mu_{prch,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in streams at 20°C (1/day),  $\theta_{bact}$  is the temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/re-growth, and  $T_{water}$  is the water temperature (°C).

Table 7:5-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to bacteria die-off in the stream.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
WDPRCH	$\mu_{prch,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for persistent bacteria in streams at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WDLPRCH	$\mu_{lprch,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for less persistent bacteria in streams at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
THBACT	$\theta_{bact}$ : Temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/growth	.bsn

## 7:5.2 BACTERIA SEDIMENT

---

In sediment channel routing, the maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water,  $conc_{sed,ch,mx}$ , (ton/m<sup>3</sup> or kg/L) is compared to the concentration of sediment in the reach at the beginning of the time step,  $conc_{sed,ch,i}$  (Neitsch et al., 2005).

If  $conc_{sed,ch,i} < conc_{sed,ch,mx}$ , resuspension is the dominant process in the reach segment and the net amount of sediment reentrained is calculated:

$$sed_{deg} = (conc_{sed,ch,mx} - conc_{sed,ch,i}) \cdot V_{ch} \cdot K_{ch} \cdot C_{ch} \quad 7:5.2.1$$

where  $sed_{deg}$  is the amount of sediment reentrained in the reach segment (metric tons),  $conc_{sed,ch,mx}$  is the maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (ton sediment/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O or kg sediment/L H<sub>2</sub>O),  $conc_{sed,ch,i}$  is the initial sediment concentration in the reach (ton sediment/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O or kg sediment/L H<sub>2</sub>O),  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water in the reach segment (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O),  $K_{ch}$  is the channel erodibility factor (cm/hr/Pa), and  $C_{ch}$  is the channel cover factor. When sediment resuspends, both bacteria in sediment solution and on sediment particles are released, and the net amount of bacteria released from streambed is calculated:

$$bact_{deg} = sed_{deg} \cdot conc_{bact,sed} \quad 7:5.2.2$$

where  $bact_{deg}$  is the amount of bacteria released from streambed in the reach segment (# cfu),  $sed_{deg}$  is the amount of sediment reentrained in the reach segment (metric tons), and  $conc_{bact,sed}$  is the concentration of bacteria in streambed in the reach segment (# cfu/ton sediment). Bacteria concentration in streambed is calculated by the empirical regression equation, logarithmic sine function of the days of year:

$$\log(conc_{bac,sed}) = bsc_1 \cdot \sin\left(bsc_2 \cdot \frac{day - bsc_3}{366} \cdot \pi\right) + bsc_4 \quad 7:5.2.3$$

where  $conc_{bac,sed}$  is the concentration of bacteria in streambed (# cfu/ton sediment),  $day$  is the days of year, and  $bsc_1$  through  $bsc_4$  are the regression coefficients in streambed bacteria concentration equation.

If  $conc_{sed,ch,i} > conc_{sed,ch,mx}$ , deposition is the dominant process in the reach segment and the net amount of sediment deposited is calculated:

$$sed_{dep} = (conc_{sed,ch,i} - conc_{sed,ch,mx}) \cdot V_{ch} \quad 7:5.2.4$$

where  $sed_{dep}$  is the amount of sediment deposited in the reach segment (metric tons),  $conc_{sed,ch,i}$  is the initial sediment concentration in the reach (ton sediment/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O or kg sediment/L H<sub>2</sub>O),  $conc_{sed,ch,mx}$  is the maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (ton sediment/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O or kg sediment/L H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water in the reach segment (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O). When suspended sediment deposits, bacteria on settling sediment particles are deposited, and the net amount of bacteria settled from stream water is calculated (Bai and Lung, 2005):

$$bact_{dep} = bact_{ch,i} \cdot \frac{K_p \cdot sed_{dep}}{V_{ch} + K_p \cdot (conc_{sed,ch,i} \cdot V_{ch})} \quad 7:5.2.5$$

where  $bact_{dep}$  is the amount of bacteria settled from stream water in the reach segment (# cfu),  $bact_{ch,i}$  is the amount of bacteria in the stream water in the reach segment at the beginning of the time period (# cfu),  $K_p$  is the linear partitioning coefficient of bacteria between the suspended sediment and water (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O/ton sediment or L H<sub>2</sub>O/kg sediment),  $sed_{dep}$  is the amount of sediment deposited in the reach segment (metric tons),  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water in the reach segment (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $conc_{sed,ch,i}$  is the initial sediment concentration in the reach (ton sediment/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O or kg sediment/L H<sub>2</sub>O). The linear partitioning coefficient is calculated from the empirical regression equation (Pachepsky et al., 2006):

$$K_p = 10^{-1.6} \cdot clay^{1.98} \quad 7:5.2.6$$

where  $K_p$  is the linear partitioning coefficient of bacteria onto the suspended sediment (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O/ton sediment or L H<sub>2</sub>O/kg sediment) and  $clay$  is the percentage of clay in suspended sediment in stream water in the reach segment (%).  $clay$  normally varies between 2 and 50%.

Once the amount of bacteria released and settled has been calculated, the final amount of sediment in the reach is determined:

$$bact_{ch} = bact_{ch,i} + bact_{deg} - bact_{dep} \quad 7:5.2.7$$

where  $bact_{ch}$  is the amount of bacteria in the stream water in the reach segment (# cfu),  $bact_{ch,i}$  is the amount of bacteria in the stream water in the reach segment at the beginning of the time period (# cfu),  $bact_{deg}$  is the amount of bacteria released from streambed in the reach segment (# cfu), and  $bact_{dep}$  is the amount of bacteria settled from stream water in the reach segment (# cfu).

The final bacteria concentration in the reach is calculated:

$$conc_{bact,ch} = \frac{bact_{ch}}{V_{ch}} \cdot 10^{-4} \quad 7:5.2.8$$

where  $conc_{bact,ch}$  is the concentration of bacteria in the stream water in the reach segment (# cfu/100 mL),  $bact_{ch}$  is the amount of bacteria in the stream water in the reach segment (# cfu), and  $V_{ch}$  is the volume of water in the reach segment ( $m^3 H_2O$ ).

## 7:5.3 NOMENCLATURE

---

$T_{water}$  Average daily water temperature (°C)

$bact_{lprch}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria present in the reach (#cfu/100mL)  
 $bact_{prch}$  Amount of persistent bacteria present in the reach (#cfu/100mL)

$\theta_{bact}$  Temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/re-growth  
 $\mu_{lprch,die}$  Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in streams (1/day)  
 $\mu_{lprch,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in streams at 20°C (1/day)  
 $\mu_{prch,die}$  Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in streams (1/day)  
 $\mu_{prch,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in streams at 20°C (1/day)

## 7:5.4 REFERENCES

---

- Bai, S.; Lung, W.S., 2005. Modeling sediment impact on the transport of fecal bacteria. Water Research, 39(20): 5232-5240.
- Bowie, G.W., W. Mills, D. Porcella, C. Campbell, J. Pagenkopf, G. Rupp, K. Johnson, P. Chan, S. Gherini, and C. Chamberlin. 1985. Rates, constants and kinetics formulations in surface water quality modeling. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. USEPA/600/3-85-040.
- Byappanahalli, M.; Fowler, M.; Shively, D.; Whitman, R., 2003. Ubiquity and persistence of *Escherichia coli* in a midwestern coastal stream. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 69(8): 4549-4555.

- Cinotto, P.J., 2005. Occurrence of fecal-indicator bacteria and protocols for identification of fecal-contamination sources in selected reaches of the West Branch Brandywine Creek, Chester County, Pennsylvania: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2005-5039, pp 91.
- Davies, C.M.; Long, J.A.H.; Donald, M.; Ashbolt, N.J., 1995. Survival of fecal microorganisms in marine and fresh-water sediments. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 61(5): 1888-1896.
- Gannon, J.J.; Busse, M.K.; Schillinger, J.E., 1983. Fecal coliform disappearance in a river impoundment. *Water Research*, 17(11): 1595-1601.
- Giddings, E.M.; Oblinger, C.J., 2004. Fecal-indicator bacteria in the Newfound Creek watershed, western North Carolina, during a high and low streamflow condition, 2003: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2004-5257, accessed January 18, 2005, at <http://pubs.water.usgs.gov/sir2004-5257>.
- Muirhead, R.W.; Davies-Colley, R.J.; Donnison, A.M.; Nagels, J.W., 2004. Faecal bacteria yields in artificial flood events: quantifying in-stream stores. *Water Research*, 38: 1215-1224.
- Neitsch, S.L.; Arnold, J.G.; Kiniry, J.R.; Williams, J.R., 2005. Soil and Water Assessment Tool Theoretical Documentation (Version 2005).
- Pachepsky, Y.A.; Sadeghi, A.M.; Bradford, S.A.; Shelton, D.R.; Guber, A.K.; Dao, T., 2006. Transport and fate of manure-borne pathogens: Modeling perspective. *Agricultural Water Management*, 86: 81-92.



## SECTION 7 CHAPTER 6

# EQUATIONS: HEAVY METAL ROUTING

---

Heavy metals are pollutants that are increasingly under scrutiny. Most heavy metals can exist in a number of different valence states and the solubility of a heavy metal is often dependent on the valence state it is in. The complexity of the processes affecting heavy metal solubility make modeling these processes directly unrealistic. At this time, SWAT allows heavy metal loadings to be added to the stream network in point source loading inputs. SWAT currently routes the heavy metals through the channel network, but includes no algorithms to model in-stream processes. Simple mass balance equations are used to determine the movement of heavy metals through the river network.



# WATER BODIES



Impoundment structures modify the movement of water in the channel network by lowering the peak flow and volume of flood discharges. Because impoundments slow down the flow of water, sediment will fall from suspension, removing nutrient and chemicals adsorbed to the soil particles.

---

---

## **SECTION 8 CHAPTER 1**

# **EQUATIONS: IMPOUNDMENT WATER ROUTING**

---

Impoundments play an important role in water supply and flood control. SWAT models four types of water bodies: ponds, wetlands, depressions/potholes, and reservoirs. Ponds, wetlands, and depressions/potholes are located within a subbasin off the main channel. Water flowing into these water bodies must originate from the subbasin in which the water body is located. Reservoirs are located on the main channel network. They receive water from all subbasins upstream of the water body.

## 8:1.1 RESERVOIRS

A reservoir is an impoundment located on the main channel network of a watershed. No distinction is made between naturally-occurring and man-made structures. The features of an impoundment are shown in Figure 8:1.1.




Figure 8:1.1: Components of a reservoir with flood water detention features (After Ward and Elliot, 1995).

The water balance for a reservoir is:

$$V = V_{stored} + V_{flowin} - V_{flowout} + V_{pcp} - V_{evap} - V_{seep} \quad 8:1.1.1$$

where  $V$  is the volume of water in the impoundment at the end of the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{stored}$  is the volume of water stored in the water body at the beginning of the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{flowin}$  is the volume of water entering the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{pcp}$  is the volume of precipitation falling on the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{evap}$  is the volume of water removed from the water body by evaporation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{seep}$  is the volume of water lost from the water body by seepage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

### **8:1.1.1 SURFACE AREA**

The surface area of the reservoir is needed to calculate the amount of precipitation falling on the water body as well as the amount of evaporation and seepage. Surface area varies with change in the volume of water stored in the reservoir. The surface area is updated daily using the equation:

$$SA = \beta_{sa} \cdot V^{expsa} \quad 8:1.1.2$$

where  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha),  $\beta_{sa}$  is a coefficient,  $V$  is the volume of water in the impoundment ( $m^3 H_2O$ ), and  $expsa$  is an exponent.

The coefficient,  $\beta_{sa}$ , and exponent,  $expsa$ , are calculated by solving equation 8:1.1.2 using two known points. The two known points are surface area and volume information provided for the principal and emergency spillways.

$$expsa = \frac{\log_{10}(SA_{em}) - \log_{10}(SA_{pr})}{\log_{10}(V_{em}) - \log_{10}(V_{pr})} \quad 8:1.1.3$$

$$\beta_{sa} = \left( \frac{SA_{em}}{V_{em}} \right)^{expsa} \quad 8:1.1.4$$

where  $SA_{em}$  is the surface area of the reservoir when filled to the emergency spillway (ha),  $SA_{pr}$  is the surface area of the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway (ha),  $V_{em}$  is the volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the emergency spillway ( $m^3 H_2O$ ), and  $V_{pr}$  is the volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway ( $m^3 H_2O$ ).

### **8:1.1.2 PRECIPITATION**

The volume of precipitation falling on the reservoir during a given day is calculated:

$$V_{pcp} = 10 \cdot R_{day} \cdot SA \quad 8:1.1.5$$

where  $V_{pcp}$  is the volume of water added to the water body by precipitation during the day ( $m^3 H_2O$ ),  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm  $H_2O$ ), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha).

### **8:1.1.3 EVAPORATION**

The volume of water lost to evaporation on a given day is calculated:

$$V_{evap} = 10 \cdot \eta \cdot E_o \cdot SA \quad 8:1.1.6$$

where  $V_{evap}$  is the volume of water removed from the water body by evaporation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $\eta$  is an evaporation coefficient (0.6),  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration for a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha).

### **8:1.1.4 SEEPAGE**

The volume of water lost by seepage through the bottom of the reservoir on a given day is calculated:

$$V_{seep} = 240 \cdot K_{sat} \cdot SA \quad 8:1.1.7$$

where  $V_{seep}$  is the volume of water lost from the water body by seepage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $K_{sat}$  is the effective saturated hydraulic conductivity of the reservoir bottom ( $\text{mm/hr}$ ), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha).

### **8:1.1.5 OUTFLOW**

The volume of outflow may be calculated using one of four different methods: measured daily outflow, measured monthly outflow, average annual release rate for uncontrolled reservoir, controlled outflow with target release.

#### **8:1.1.5.1 MEASURED DAILY OUTFLOW**

When measured daily outflow (IRESCO = 3) is chosen as the method to calculate reservoir outflow, the user must provide a file with the outflow rate for every day the reservoir is simulated in the watershed. The volume of outflow from the reservoir is then calculated:

$$V_{flowout} = 86400 \cdot q_{out} \quad 8:1.1.8$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $q_{out}$  is the outflow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ).

### 8:1.1.5.2 MEASURED MONTHLY OUTFLOW

When measured monthly outflow (*IRESKO* = 1) is chosen as the method to calculate reservoir outflow, the user must provide a file with the average daily outflow rate for every month the reservoir is simulated in the watershed. The volume of outflow from the reservoir is then calculated using equation 8:1.1.8.

### 8:1.1.5.3 AVERAGE ANNUAL RELEASE RATE

#### FOR UNCONTROLLED RESERVOIR

When the average annual release rate (*IRESKO* = 0) is chosen as the method to calculate reservoir outflow, the reservoir releases water whenever the reservoir volume exceeds the principal spillway volume,  $V_{pr}$ . If the reservoir volume is greater than the principal spillway volume but less than the emergency spillway volume, the amount of reservoir outflow is calculated:

$$V_{flowout} = V - V_{pr} \quad \text{if } V - V_{pr} < q_{rel} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.1.9$$

$$V_{flowout} = q_{rel} \cdot 86400 \quad \text{if } V - V_{pr} > q_{rel} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.1.10$$

If the reservoir volume exceeds the emergency spillway volume, the amount of outflow is calculated:

$$V_{flowout} = (V - V_{em}) + (V_{em} - V_{pr}) \quad \text{if } V_{em} - V_{pr} < q_{rel} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.1.11$$

$$V_{flowout} = (V - V_{em}) + q_{rel} \cdot 86400 \quad \text{if } V_{em} - V_{pr} > q_{rel} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.1.12$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V$  is the volume of water stored in the reservoir ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{pr}$  is the volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{em}$  is the volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the emergency spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $q_{rel}$  is the average daily principal spillway release rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ).

#### 8:1.1.5.4 TARGET RELEASE FOR CONTROLLED RESERVOIR

When target release (*IRESKO* = 2) is chosen as the method to calculate reservoir outflow, the reservoir releases water as a function of the desired target storage.

The target release approach tries to mimic general release rules that may be used by reservoir operators. Although the method is simplistic and cannot account for all decision criteria, it can realistically simulate major outflow and low flow periods.

For the target release approach, the principal spillway volume corresponds to maximum flood control reservation while the emergency spillway volume corresponds to no flood control reservation. The model requires the beginning and ending month of the flood season. In the non-flood season, no flood control reservation is required, and the target storage is set at the emergency spillway volume. During the flood season, the flood control reservation is a function of soil water content. The flood control reservation for wet ground conditions is set at the maximum. For dry ground conditions, the flood control reservation is set at 50% of the maximum.

The target storage may be specified by the user on a monthly basis or it can be calculated as a function of flood season and soil water content. If the target storage is specified:

$$V_{targ} = starg \quad 8:1.1.13$$

where  $V_{targ}$  is the target reservoir volume for a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $starg$  is the target reservoir volume specified for a given month ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

If the target storage is not specified, the target reservoir volume is calculated:

$$V_{targ} = V_{em} \quad \text{if } mon_{fld,beg} < mon < mon_{fld,end} \quad 8:1.1.14$$

$$V_{targ} = V_{pr} + \frac{\left(1 - \min\left[\frac{SW}{FC}, 1\right]\right)}{2} \cdot (V_{em} - V_{pr})$$

if  $mon \leq mon_{fld,beg}$  or  $mon \geq mon_{fld,end}$       8:1.1.15

where  $V_{targ}$  is the target reservoir volume for a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{em}$  is the volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the emergency spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{pr}$  is the volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $SW$  is the average soil water content in the subbasin ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $FC$  is the water content of the subbasin soil at field capacity ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $mon$  is the month of the year,  $mon_{fld,beg}$  is the beginning month of the flood season, and  $mon_{fld,end}$  is the ending month of the flood season.

Once the target storage is defined, the outflow is calculated:

$$V_{flowout} = \frac{V - V_{targ}}{ND_{targ}} \quad 8:1.1.16$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V$  is the volume of water stored in the reservoir ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{targ}$  is the target reservoir volume for a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $ND_{targ}$  is the number of days required for the reservoir to reach target storage.

Once outflow is determined using one of the preceding four methods, the user may specify maximum and minimum amounts of discharge that the initial outflow estimate is checked against. If the outflow doesn't meet the minimum discharge or exceeds the maximum specified discharge, the amount of outflow is altered to meet the defined criteria.

$$V_{flowout} = V'_{flowout} \quad \text{if } q_{rel,mn} \cdot 86400 \leq V'_{flowout} \leq q_{rel,mx} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.1.17$$

$$V_{flowout} = q_{rel,mn} \cdot 86400 \quad \text{if } V'_{flowout} < q_{rel,mn} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.1.18$$

$$V_{flowout} = q_{rel,mx} \cdot 86400 \quad \text{if } V'_{flowout} > q_{rel,mx} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.1.19$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V'_{flowout}$  is the initial estimate of the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $q_{rel,mn}$  is the minimum average daily outflow for the month ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ), and  $q_{rel,mx}$  is the maximum average daily outflow for the month ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ).

Table 8:1-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to reservoirs.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
RES_ESA	$SA_{em}$ : Surface area of the reservoir when filled to the emergency spillway (ha)	.res
RES_PSA	$SA_{pr}$ : Surface area of the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway (ha)	.res
RES_EVOL	$V_{em}$ : Volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the emergency spillway ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )	.res
RES_PVOL	$V_{pr}$ : Volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )	.res
RES_K	$K_{sat}$ : Effective saturated hydraulic conductivity of the reservoir bottom (mm/hr)	.res
IRESKO	Outflow method	.res
RES_OUTFLOW	$q_{out}$ : Outflow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )	resdayo.dat
RESOUT	$q_{out}$ : Outflow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )	resmono.dat
RES_RR	$q_{rel}$ : Average daily principal spillway release rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )	.res
STARG(mon)	$starg$ : Target reservoir volume specified for a given month ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )	.res
IFLOD1R	$mon_{fld,beg}$ : Beginning month of the flood season	.res
IFLOD2R	$mon_{fld,end}$ : Ending month of the flood season	.res
NDTARGR	$ND_{targ}$ : Number of days required for the reservoir to reach target storage	.res
OFLOWMN(mon)	$q_{rel,mn}$ : Minimum average daily outflow for the month ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )	.res
OFLOWMX(mon)	$q_{rel,mx}$ : Maximum average daily outflow for the month ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )	.res

## 8:1.2 PONDS/WETLANDS

Ponds and wetlands are water bodies located within subbasins that received inflow from a fraction of the subbasin area. The algorithms used to model these two types of water bodies differ only in the options allowed for outflow calculation.

The water balance for a pond or wetland is:

$$V = V_{stored} + V_{flowin} - V_{flowout} + V_{pcp} - V_{evap} - V_{seep} \quad 8:1.2.1$$

where  $V$  is the volume of water in the impoundment at the end of the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{stored}$  is the volume of water stored in the water body at the beginning of the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{flowin}$  is the volume of water entering the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{pcp}$  is the volume of precipitation falling on the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{evap}$  is the volume of water removed from the water body by evaporation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{seep}$  is the volume of water lost from the water body by seepage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

### **8:1.2.1 SURFACE AREA**

The surface area of the pond or wetland is needed to calculate the amount of precipitation falling on the water body as well as the amount of evaporation and seepage. Surface area varies with change in the volume of water stored in the impoundment. The surface area is updated daily using the equation:

$$SA = \beta_{sa} \cdot V^{expsa} \quad 8:1.2.2$$

where  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha),  $\beta_{sa}$  is a coefficient,  $V$  is the volume of water in the impoundment ( $m^3 H_2O$ ), and  $expsa$  is an exponent.

The coefficient,  $\beta_{sa}$ , and exponent,  $expsa$ , are calculated by solving equation 8:1.1.2 using two known points. For ponds, the two known points are surface area and volume information provided for the principal and emergency spillways.

$$expsa = \frac{\log_{10}(SA_{em}) - \log_{10}(SA_{pr})}{\log_{10}(V_{em}) - \log_{10}(V_{pr})} \quad 8:1.2.3$$

$$\beta_{sa} = \left( \frac{SA_{em}}{V_{em}} \right)^{expsa} \quad 8:1.2.4$$

where  $SA_{em}$  is the surface area of the pond when filled to the emergency spillway (ha),  $SA_{pr}$  is the surface area of the pond when filled to the principal spillway (ha),  $V_{em}$  is the volume of water held in the pond when filled to the emergency spillway ( $m^3 H_2O$ ), and  $V_{pr}$  is the volume of water held in the pond when filled to the principal spillway ( $m^3 H_2O$ ). For wetlands, the two known points are surface area and volume information provided for the maximum and normal water levels.

$$expsa = \frac{\log_{10}(SA_{mx}) - \log_{10}(SA_{nor})}{\log_{10}(V_{mx}) - \log_{10}(V_{nor})} \quad 8:1.2.5$$

$$\beta_{sa} = \left( \frac{SA_{mx}}{V_{mx}} \right)^{expsa} \quad 8:1.2.6$$

where  $SA_{mx}$  is the surface area of the wetland when filled to the maximum water level (ha),  $SA_{nor}$  is the surface area of the wetland when filled to the normal water level (ha),  $V_{mx}$  is the volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the

maximum water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{nor}$  is the volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the normal water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

### **8:1.2.2 PRECIPITATION**

The volume of precipitation falling on the pond or wetland during a given day is calculated:

$$V_{pcp} = 10 \cdot R_{day} \cdot SA \quad 8:1.2.7$$

where  $V_{pcp}$  is the volume of water added to the water body by precipitation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha).

### **8:1.2.3 INFLOW**

The volume of water entering the pond or wetland on a given day is calculated:

$$V_{flowin} = fr_{imp} \cdot 10 \cdot (Q_{surf} + Q_{gw} + Q_{lat}) \cdot (Area - SA) \quad 8:1.2.8$$

where  $V_{flowin}$  is the volume of water flowing into the water body on a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $fr_{imp}$  is the fraction of the subbasin area draining into the impoundment,  $Q_{surf}$  is the surface runoff from the subbasin on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $Q_{gw}$  is the groundwater flow generated in a subbasin on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $Q_{lat}$  is the lateral flow generated in a subbasin on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $Area$  is the subbasin area (ha), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha). The volume of water entering the pond or wetland is subtracted from the surface runoff, lateral flow and groundwater loadings to the main channel.

### **8:1.2.4 EVAPORATION**

The volume of water lost to evaporation on a given day is calculated:

$$V_{evap} = 10 \cdot \eta \cdot E_o \cdot SA \quad 8:1.2.9$$

where  $V_{evap}$  is the volume of water removed from the water body by evaporation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $\eta$  is an evaporation coefficient (0.6),  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration for a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha).

### **8:1.2.5 SEEPAGE**

The volume of water lost by seepage through the bottom of the pond or wetland on a given day is calculated:

$$V_{seep} = 240 \cdot K_{sat} \cdot SA \quad 8:1.2.10$$

where  $V_{seep}$  is the volume of water lost from the water body by seepage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $K_{sat}$  is the effective saturated hydraulic conductivity of the pond or wetland bottom (mm/hr), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha).

### **8:1.2.6 OUTFLOW**

The primary difference between ponds and wetlands is the method in which the outflow is calculated.

#### **8:1.2.6.1 POND OUTFLOW**

Pond outflow is calculated as a function of target storage. The target storage varies based on flood season and soil water content. The target pond volume is calculated:

$$V_{targ} = V_{em} \quad \text{if } mon_{fld,beg} < mon < mon_{fld,end} \quad 8:1.2.11$$

$$V_{targ} = V_{pr} + \frac{\left(1 - \min\left[\frac{SW}{FC}, 1\right]\right)}{2} \cdot (V_{em} - V_{pr}) \quad \text{if } mon \leq mon_{fld,beg} \text{ or } mon \geq mon_{fld,end} \quad 8:1.2.12$$

where  $V_{targ}$  is the target pond volume for a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{em}$  is the volume of water held in the pond when filled to the emergency spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{pr}$  is the volume of water held in the pond when filled to the principal spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $SW$  is the average soil water content in the subbasin (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $FC$  is the water content of the subbasin soil at field capacity (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $mon$  is the month of the year,  $mon_{fld,beg}$  is the beginning month of the flood season, and  $mon_{fld,end}$  is the ending month of the flood season.

Once the target storage is defined, the outflow is calculated:

$$V_{flowout} = \frac{V - V_{targ}}{ND_{targ}} \quad 8:1.2.13$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V$  is the volume of water stored in the pond ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{targ}$  is the target pond volume for a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $ND_{targ}$  is the number of days required for the pond to reach target storage.

### 8:1.2.6.2 WETLAND OUTFLOW

The wetland releases water whenever the water volume exceeds the normal storage volume,  $V_{nor}$ . Wetland outflow is calculated:

$$V_{flowout} = 0 \quad \text{if } V < V_{nor} \quad 8:1.2.14$$

$$V_{flowout} = \frac{V - V_{nor}}{10} \quad \text{if } V_{nor} \leq V \leq V_{mx} \quad 8:1.2.15$$

$$V_{flowout} = V - V_{mx} \quad \text{if } V > V_{mx} \quad 8:1.2.16$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V$  is the volume of water stored in the wetland ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{mx}$  is the volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the maximum water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{nor}$  is the volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the normal water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

Table 8:1-2: SWAT input variables that pertain to ponds and wetlands.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
PND_ESA	$SA_{em}$ : Surface area of the pond when filled to the emergency spillway (ha)	.pnd
PND_PSA	$SA_{pr}$ : Surface area of the pond when filled to the principal spillway (ha)	.pnd
PND_EVOL	$V_{em}$ : Volume of water held in the pond when filled to the emergency spillway ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )	.pnd
PND_PVOL	$V_{pr}$ : Volume of water held in the pond when filled to the principal spillway ( $10^4 \text{ m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )	.pnd
WET_MXSA	$SA_{mx}$ : Surface area of the wetland when filled to the maximum water level (ha)	.pnd
WET_NSA	$SA_{nor}$ : Surface area of the wetland when filled to the normal water level (ha)	.pnd
WET_MXVOL	$V_{mx}$ : Volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the maximum water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )	.pnd
WET_NVOL	$V_{nor}$ : Volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the normal water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )	.pnd
PND_FR	$fr_{imp}$ : Fraction of the subbasin area draining into the pond	.pnd
WET_FR	$fr_{imp}$ : Fraction of the subbasin area draining into the wetland	.pnd

Table 8:1-2, cont.: SWAT input variables that pertain to ponds and wetlands

Variable name	Definition	File Name
PND_K	$K_{sat}$ : Effective saturated hydraulic conductivity of the pond bottom (mm/hr)	.pnd
WET_K	$K_{sat}$ : Effective saturated hydraulic conductivity of the wetland bottom (mm/hr)	.pnd
IFLOD1	$mon_{fld,beg}$ : Beginning month of the flood season	.pnd
IFLOD2	$mon_{fld,end}$ : Ending month of the flood season	.pnd
NDTARG	$ND_{targ}$ : Number of days required for the reservoir to reach target storage	.pnd

## 8:1.3 DEPRESSIONS/POTHOLES

In areas of low relief and/or young geologic development, the drainage network may be poorly developed. Watersheds in these areas may have many closed depressional areas, referred to as potholes. Runoff generated within these areas flows to the lowest portion of the pothole rather than contributing to flow in the main channel. Other systems that are hydrologically similar to potholes include playa lakes and fields that are artificially impounded for rice production. The algorithms reviewed in this section are used to model these types of systems.

To define an HRU as a pothole, the user must set IPOT (.hru) to the HRU number. To initiate water impoundment, a release/impound operation must be placed in the .mgt file. The water balance for a pothole is:

$$V = V_{stored} + V_{flowin} - V_{flowout} + V_{pcp} - V_{evap} - V_{seep} \quad 8:1.3.1$$

where  $V$  is the volume of water in the impoundment at the end of the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{stored}$  is the volume of water stored in the water body at the beginning of the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{flowin}$  is the volume of water entering the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{pcp}$  is the volume of precipitation falling on the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{evap}$  is the volume of water removed from the water body by evaporation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{seep}$  is the volume of water lost from the water body by seepage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

### 8:1.3.1 SURFACE AREA

The surface area of the pothole is needed to calculate the amount of precipitation falling on the water body as well as the amount of evaporation and

seepage. Surface area varies with change in the volume of water stored in the impoundment. For surface area calculations, the pothole is assumed to be cone-shaped. The surface area is updated daily using the equation:

$$SA = \frac{\pi}{10^4} \cdot \left( \frac{3 \cdot V}{\pi \cdot slp} \right)^{2/3} \quad 8:1.3.2$$

where  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha),  $V$  is the volume of water in the impoundment ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $slp$  is the slope of the HRU (m/m).

### **8:1.3.2 PRECIPITATION**

The volume of precipitation falling on the pothole during a given day is calculated:

$$V_{pcp} = 10 \cdot R_{day} \cdot SA \quad 8:1.3.3$$

where  $V_{pcp}$  is the volume of water added to the water body by precipitation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $R_{day}$  is the amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha).

### **8:1.3.3 INFLOW**

Water entering the pothole on a given day may be contributed from any HRU in the subbasin. To route a portion of the flow from an HRU into a pothole, the variable IPOT (.hru) is set to the number of the HRU containing the pothole and POT\_FR (.hru) is set to the fraction of the HRU area that drains into the pothole. This must be done for each HRU contributing flow to the pothole. Water routing from other HRUs is performed only during the period that water impoundment has been activated (release/impound operation in .mgt). Water may also be added to the pothole with an irrigation operation in the management file (.mgt). Chapter 6:2 reviews the irrigation operation.

The inflow to the pothole is calculated:

$$V_{flowin} = irr + \sum_{hru=1}^n [fr_{pot,hru} \cdot 10 \cdot (Q_{surf,hru} + Q_{gw,hru} + Q_{lat,hru}) \cdot area_{hru}] \quad 8:1.3.4$$

where  $V_{flowin}$  is the volume of water flowing into the pothole on a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $irr$  is the amount of water added through an irrigation operation on a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $n$  is the number of HRUs contributing water to the pothole,  $fr_{pot,hru}$

is the fraction of the HRU area draining into the pothole,  $Q_{surf,hru}$  is the surface runoff from the HRU on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{gw,hru}$  is the groundwater flow generated in the HRU on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $Q_{lat,hru}$  is the lateral flow generated in the HRU on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $area_{hru}$  is the HRU area (ha).

### **8:1.3.4 EVAPORATION**

The volume of water lost to evaporation on a given day is calculated:

$$V_{evap} = 5 \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{LAI}{LAI_{evap}} \right) \cdot E_o \cdot SA \quad \text{if } LAI < LAI_{evap} \quad 8:1.3.5$$

$$V_{evap} = 0 \quad \text{if } LAI \geq LAI_{evap} \quad 8:1.3.6$$

where  $V_{evap}$  is the volume of water removed from the water body by evaporation during the day (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O),  $LAI$  is the leaf area index of the plants growing in the pothole,  $LAI_{evap}$  is the leaf area index at which no evaporation occurs from the water surface,  $E_o$  is the potential evapotranspiration for a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha).

### **8:1.3.5 SEEPAGE**

The volume of water lost by seepage through the bottom of the pothole on a given day is calculated as a function of the water content of the soil profile beneath the pothole.

$$V_{seep} = 240 \cdot K_{sat} \cdot SA \quad \text{if } SW < 0.5 \cdot FC \quad 8:1.3.7$$

$$V_{seep} = 240 \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{SW}{FC} \right) \cdot K_{sat} \cdot SA \quad \text{if } 0.5 \cdot FC \leq SW < FC \quad 8:1.3.8$$

$$V_{seep} = 0 \quad \text{if } SW \geq FC \quad 8:1.3.9$$

where  $V_{seep}$  is the volume of water lost from the water body by seepage (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O),  $K_{sat}$  is the effective saturated hydraulic conductivity of the 1<sup>st</sup> soil layer in the profile (mm/hr),  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body (ha),  $SW$  is the soil water content of the profile on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), and  $FC$  is the field capacity soil water content (mm H<sub>2</sub>O). Water lost from the pothole by seepage is added to the soil profile.

### **8:1.3.6 OUTFLOW**

Water may be removed from the pothole in three different types of outflow. When the volume of water in the pothole exceeds the maximum storage, the excess water is assumed to overflow and enter the main channel in the subbasin. When the retaining wall or berm is removed (this is done with a release/impound operation in the management file), all water stored in the pothole enters the main channel. The third type of flow from the pothole is via drainage tiles installed in the pothole.

#### **8:1.3.6.1 OVERFLOW**

Pothole outflow caused by overflow is calculated:

$$V_{flowout} = V - V_{pot,mx} \quad \text{if } V > V_{pot.mx} \quad 8:1.3.10$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V$  is the volume of water stored in the pothole ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{pot.mx}$  is the maximum amount of water that can be stored in the pothole ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

#### **8:1.3.6.2 RELEASE OPERATION**

When a release operation is scheduled, all water in the pothole becomes outflow:

$$V_{flowout} = V \quad 8:1.3.11$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V$  is the volume of water stored in the pothole ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

#### **8:1.3.6.3 TILE FLOW**

When drainage tiles are installed in a pothole, the pothole will contribute water to the main channel through tile flow. The pothole outflow originating from tile drainage is:

$$V_{flowout} = q_{tile} \cdot 86400 \quad \text{if } V > q_{tile} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.3.12$$

$$V_{flowout} = V \quad \text{if } V \leq q_{tile} \cdot 86400 \quad 8:1.3.13$$

where  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $q_{tile}$  is the average daily tile flow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ), and  $V$  is the volume of water stored in the pothole ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

Table 8:1-3: SWAT input variables that pertain to potholes.

Variable name	Definition	File Name
IPOT	Number of HRU that is impounding water (that contains the pothole)	.hru
<i>Variables in release/impound operation line:</i>		
MONTH/DAY or HUSC	Timing of release/impound operation.	.mgt
MGT_OP	Operation code. MGT_OP = 13 for release/impound operation	.mgt
IMP_TRIG	Release/impound action code: 0: impound, 1: release	.mgt
SLOPE	$slp$ : Slope of the HRU (m/m)	.hru
POT_FR	$fr_{pot}$ : Fraction of the HRU area draining into the pothole	.hru
EVLAI	$LAI_{evap}$ : Leaf area index at which no evaporation occurs from the water surface	.bsn
POT_VOLX	$V_{pot,mx}$ : Maximum amount of water that can be stored in the pothole (mm)	.hru
POT_TILE	$q_{tile}$ : Average daily tile flow rate (mm)	.hru

## 8:1.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

<i>Area</i>	Subbasin area (ha)
$E_o$	Potential evapotranspiration for a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$FC$	Water content of the soil at field capacity (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$K_{sat}$	Effective saturated hydraulic conductivity of the reservoir bottom (mm/hr)
$LAI$	Leaf area index of the plants growing in the pothole
$LAI_{evap}$	Leaf area index at which no evaporation occurs from the water surface
$ND_{targ}$	Number of days required for the reservoir to reach target storage
$Q_{gw}$	Groundwater flow generated in a subbasin on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$Q_{lat}$	Lateral flow generated in a subbasin on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$Q_{surf}$	Surface runoff from the subbasin on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_{day}$	Amount of precipitation falling on a given day (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$SA$	Surface area of the water body (ha)
$SA_{em}$	Surface area of the reservoir or pond when filled to the emergency spillway (ha)
$SA_{mx}$	Surface area of the wetland when filled to the maximum water level (ha)
$SA_{nor}$	Surface area of the wetland when filled to the normal water level (ha)
$SA_{pr}$	Surface area of the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway (ha)
$SW$	Average soil water content (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V$	Volume of water in the impoundment at the end of the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{em}$	Volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the emergency spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{evap}$	Volume of water removed from the water body by evaporation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{flowin}$	Volume of water entering the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )

$V_{flowout}$	Volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V'_{flowout}$	Initial estimate of the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{mx}$	Volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the maximum water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{nor}$	Volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the normal water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{pcp}$	Volume of precipitation falling on the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{pot,mx}$	Maximum amount of water that can be stored in the pothole ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{pr}$	Volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{seep}$	Volume of water lost from the water body by seepage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{stored}$	Volume of water stored in the water body at the beginning of the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{targ}$	Target reservoir volume for a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>area<sub>hru</sub></i>	HRU area (ha)
<i>expsa</i>	Exponent for impoundment surface area calculation
<i>fr<sub>imp</sub></i>	Fraction of the subbasin area draining into the impoundment
<i>fr<sub>pot</sub></i>	Fraction of the HRU area draining into the pothole
<i>irr</i>	Amount of irrigation water added on a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
<i>mon</i>	Month of the year
<i>mon<sub>fld,beg</sub></i>	Beginning month of the flood season
<i>mon<sub>fld,end</sub></i>	Ending month of the flood season
<i>q<sub>out</sub></i>	Outflow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
<i>q<sub>rel</sub></i>	Average daily principal spillway release rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
<i>q<sub>rel,mn</sub></i>	Minimum average daily outflow for the month ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
<i>q<sub>rel,mx</sub></i>	Maximum average daily outflow for the month ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
<i>q<sub>tile</sub></i>	Average daily tile flow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
<i>slp</i>	Slope of the HRU (m/m)
<i>starg</i>	Target reservoir volume specified for a given month ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$\beta_{sa}$	Coefficient for impoundment surface area equation
$\eta$	Evaporation coefficient (0.6)

## 8:1.5 REFERENCES

---

Ward, A.D. and W.J. Elliot. 1995. Environmental hydrology. Lewis Publishers, CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, FL.



## **SECTION 8 CHAPTER 2**

# **EQUATIONS: SEDIMENT IN WATER BODIES**

---

SWAT incorporates a simple mass balance model to simulate the transport of sediment into and out of water bodies. SWAT defines four different types of water bodies: ponds, wetlands, reservoirs and potholes. Sediment processes modeled in ponds, wetlands, reservoirs, and potholes are identical.

When calculating sediment movement through a water body, SWAT assumes the system is completely mixed. In a completely mixed system, as sediment enters the water body it is instantaneously distributed throughout the volume.

## 8:2.1 MASS BALANCE

---

The mass balance equation for sediment in a water body is:

$$sed_{wb} = sed_{wb,i} + sed_{flowin} - sed_{stl} - sed_{flowout} \quad 8:2.1.1$$

where  $sed_{wb}$  is the amount of sediment in the water body at the end of the day (metric tons),  $sed_{wb,i}$  is the amount of sediment in the water body at the beginning of the day (metric tons),  $sed_{flowin}$  is the amount of sediment added to the water body with inflow (metric tons),  $sed_{stl}$  is the amount of sediment removed from the water by settling (metric tons),  $sed_{flowout}$  is the amount of sediment transported out of the water body with outflow (metric tons).

## 8:2.2 SETTLING

---

Incoming sediment is deposited using a modified overflow rate model (EPA 1986, cited in Haan et al., 1994). For each day, the deposition routine begins with the computation of the detention times. The actual detention time is based upon the ratio of the impoundment volume to the outflow rate.

$$t_D = \frac{(C_t(1-DS)Vol)}{(Q_o)} \quad 8:2.2.1$$

Where  $t_D$  is detention time (s),  $C_t$  is an empirical parameter to account for impoundment geometry, hydraulic response, and stratification of the suspended sediment,  $DS$  is the dead storage (the portion of the pond area that does not contribute to settling) (Griffin et al., 1985),  $Vol$  is the average impoundment volume over the time step ( $ft^3$ ), and  $Q_o$  is the average outflow rate over the time step ( $ft^3 s^{-1}$ ). The detention time required for 100% of the suspended sediment to settle out of suspension is computed from the average impoundment depth (volume / area) and the settling velocity.

The trapping efficiency is calculated as

$$trappeff = V_{set} / V_{ovfl} \quad 8:2.2.2$$

Where  $trapeff$  is trapping efficiency (fraction),  $V_{setl}$  is the settling velocity ( $m/d$ ),  $V_{ovfl}$  is overflow velocity ( $m/d$ ).  $V_{ovfl}$  is defined as

$$V_{ovfl} = \frac{(Q_o / SA_{res})}{(10,000)} \quad 8:2.2.3$$

Where  $Q_o$  is reservoir outflow in  $m^3$  and  $SA_{res}$  is reservoir surface area in  $ha$ .

During days of no sediment inflow the amount of suspended solid settling that occurs in the water body on a given day is calculated as a function of concentration. The initial suspended solid concentration is:

$$conc_{sed,i} = \frac{(sed_{wb,i} + sed_{flowin})}{(V_{stored} + V_{flowin})} \quad 8:2.2.4$$

where  $conc_{sed,i}$  is the initial concentration of suspended solids in the water ( $Mg/m^3$ ),  $sed_{wb,i}$  is the amount of sediment in the water body at the beginning of the day (metric tons),  $sed_{flowin}$  is the amount of sediment added to the water body with inflow (metric tons),  $V_{stored}$  is the volume of water stored in water body or channel at the beginning of the day ( $m^3 H_2O$ ), and  $V_{flowin}$  is the volume of water entering water body on given day ( $m^3 H_2O$ ).

Settling occurs only when the sediment concentration in the water body exceeds the equilibrium sediment concentration specified by the user,  $conc_{sed,eq}$ . The concentration of sediment in the water body at the end of the day is calculated:

$$conc_{sed,f} = (conc_{sed,i} - conc_{sed,eq}) \cdot \exp[-k_s \cdot t \cdot d_{50}] + conc_{sed,eq} \quad \text{if } conc_{sed,i} > conc_{sed,eq} \quad 8:2.2.5$$

$$conc_{sed,f} = conc_{sed,i} \quad \text{if } conc_{sed,i} \leq conc_{sed,eq} \quad 8:2.2.6$$

where  $conc_{sed,f}$  is the final sediment concentration in the water body ( $Mg/m^3$ ),  $conc_{sed,i}$  is the initial concentration of suspended solids in the water body ( $Mg/m^3$ ),  $conc_{sed,eq}$  is the equilibrium concentration of suspended solids in the water body ( $Mg/m^3$ ),  $k_s$  is the decay constant (1/day),  $t$  is the length of the time step (1 day), and  $d_{50}$  is the median particle size of the inflow sediment ( $\mu m$ ). Assuming 99% of the  $1 \mu m$  size particles settle out of solution within 25 days,  $k_s$  is equal to 0.184.

For ponds, wetlands, and potholes, the median particle size of the inflow sediment is calculated:

$$d_{50} = \exp\left(0.41 \cdot \frac{m_c}{100} + 2.71 \cdot \frac{m_{silt}}{100} + 5.7 \cdot \frac{m_s}{100}\right) \quad 8:2.2.7$$

where  $d_{50}$  is the median particle size of the inflow sediment ( $\mu\text{m}$ ),  $m_c$  is percent clay in the surface soil layer in the subbasin,  $m_{silt}$  is the percent silt in the surface soil layer in the subbasin,  $m_s$  is the percent sand in the surface soil layer in the subbasin. Because reservoirs are located on the main channel network and receive sediment from the entire area upstream, defaulting the sand, silt, and clay fractions to those of a single subbasin or HRU in the upstream area is not appropriate. Instead the user is allowed to set the median particle size diameter to a representative value for reservoirs.

The amount of sediment settling out of solution on a given day is then calculated:

$$sed_{stl} = (conc_{sed,i} - conc_{sed,f}) \cdot V \quad 8:2.2.8$$

where  $sed_{stl}$  is the amount of sediment removed from the water by settling (metric tons),  $conc_{sed,i}$  is the initial concentration of suspended solids in the water body ( $\text{Mg/m}^3$ ),  $conc_{sed,f}$  is the final sediment concentration in the water body ( $\text{Mg/m}^3$ ), and  $V$  is the volume of water in the impoundment ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

Table 8:2-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to sediment settling.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
RES_NSED	$conc_{sed,eq}$ : Equilibrium sediment concentration in water body (mg/L)	.res
PND_NSED	$conc_{sed,eq}$ : Equilibrium sediment concentration in water body (mg/L)	.pnd
WET_NSED	$conc_{sed,eq}$ : Equilibrium sediment concentration in water body (mg/L)	.pnd
POT_NSED	$conc_{sed,eq}$ : Equilibrium sediment concentration in water body (mg/L)	.hru
CLAY	$m_c$ : Percent clay in the surface soil layer in the subbasin	.sol
SILT	$m_{silt}$ : Percent silt in the surface soil layer in the subbasin	.sol
SAND	$m_s$ : Percent sand in the surface soil layer in the subbasin	.sol
RES_D50	$d_{50}$ : Median particle size of sediment in a reservoir	.res

## 8:2.3 SEDIMENT OUTFLOW

---

The amount of sediment transported out of the water body on a given day is calculated as a function of the final concentration. The initial suspended solid concentration is:

$$sed_{flowout} = conc_{sed,f} \cdot V_{flowout} \quad 8:2.3.1$$

where  $sed_{flowout}$  is the amount of sediment transported out of the water body with outflow (metric tons),  $conc_{sed,f}$  is the final sediment concentration in the water body ( $Mg/m^3$ ), and  $V_{flowout}$  is the volume of outflow from the impoundment ( $m^3 H_2O$ ).

## 8:2.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$V$  Volume of water in the impoundment ( $m^3 H_2O$ )

$V_{flowin}$  Volume of water entering water body on given day ( $m^3 H_2O$ )

$V_{flowout}$  Volume of outflow from the impoundment ( $m^3 H_2O$ )

$V_{stored}$  Volume of water stored in water body or channel ( $m^3 H_2O$ )

$conc_{sed}$  Concentration of suspended solids in the water ( $Mg/m^3$ )

$conc_{sed,eq}$  Equilibrium concentration of suspended solids in the water body ( $Mg/m^3$ )

$d_{50}$  Median particle size of the inflow sediment ( $\mu m$ )

$k_s$  Decay constant (1/day)

$t$  Length of the time step (1 day)

$m_c$  Percent clay in the surface soil layer in the subbasin

$m_s$  Percent sand in the surface soil layer in the subbasin

$m_{silt}$  Percent silt in the surface soil layer in the subbasin

$sed_{flowin}$  Amount of sediment added to the water body with inflow (metric tons)

$sed_{flowout}$  Amount of sediment transported out of the water body (metric tons)

$sed_{stl}$  Amount of sediment removed from the water by settling (metric tons)

$sed_{wb}$  Sediment in the water body (metric tons)

## 8:2.5 REFERENCES

---

Haan, C.T., B.J. Barfield, and J.C. Hayes. 1994. Design Hydrology and Sedimentology for Small Catchments. Academic Press, New York.

Griffin, M.L., B.J. Barfield, and R.C. Warner. 1985. Laboratory studies of dead storage in sediment ponds. Transactions of the ASAE 28(3):799-804.



## SECTION 8 CHAPTER 3

# EQUATIONS: NUTRIENTS IN WATER BODIES

---

SWAT incorporates a simple empirical model to predict the trophic status of water bodies. For studies that require detailed modeling of lake water quality, SWAT has been linked to distributed lake water quality models such as WASP.

SWAT defines four different types of water bodies: ponds, wetlands, reservoirs and depressional/impounded areas (potholes). Nutrient processes modeled in ponds, wetlands and reservoirs are identical. Nutrient processes are not yet modeled in potholes.

## 8:3.1 NUTRIENT TRANSFORMATIONS

---

When calculating nutrient transformations in a water body, SWAT assumes the system is completely mixed. In a completely mixed system, as nutrients enter the water body they are instantaneously distributed throughout the volume. The assumption of a completely mixed system ignores lake stratification and intensification of phytoplankton in the epilimnion.

The initial amount of nitrogen and phosphorus in the water body on the given day is calculated by summing the mass of nutrient entering the water body on that day with the mass of nutrient already present in the water body.

$$M_{initial} = M_{stored} + M_{flowin} \quad 8:3.1.1$$

where  $M_{initial}$  is the initial mass of nutrient in the water body for the given day (kg),  $M_{stored}$  is the mass of nutrient in the water body at the end of the previous day (kg), and  $M_{flowin}$  is the mass of nutrient added to the water body on the given day (kg).

In a similar manner, the initial volume of water in the water body is calculated by summing the volume of water entering the water body on that day with the volume already present in the water body.

$$V_{initial} = V_{stored} + V_{flowin} \quad 8:3.1.2$$

where  $V_{initial}$  is the initial volume of water in the water body for a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $V_{stored}$  is the volume of water in the water body at the end of the previous day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $V_{flowin}$  is the volume of water entering the water body on the given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

The initial concentration of nutrients in the water body is calculated by dividing the initial mass of nutrient by the initial volume of water.

Nutrient transformations simulated in ponds, wetlands and reservoirs are limited to the removal of nutrients by settling. Transformations between nutrient pools (e.g.  $\text{NO}_3 \Leftrightarrow \text{NO}_2 \Leftrightarrow \text{NH}_4$ ) are ignored.

Settling losses in the water body can be expressed as a flux of mass across the surface area of the sediment-water interface (Figure 8:3-1) (Chapra, 1997).




Figure 8:3-1: Settling losses calculated as flux of mass across the sediment-water interface.

The mass of nutrient lost via settling is calculated by multiplying the flux by the area of the sediment-water interface.

$$M_{\text{settling}} = v \cdot c \cdot A_s \cdot dt \quad 8:3.1.3$$

where  $M_{\text{settling}}$  is the mass of nutrient lost via settling on a day (kg),  $v$  is the apparent settling velocity (m/day),  $A_s$  is the area of the sediment-water interface ( $\text{m}^2$ ),  $c$  is the initial concentration of nutrient in the water ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ), and  $dt$  is the length of the time step (1 day). The settling velocity is labeled as “apparent” because it represents the net effect of the different processes that deliver nutrients to the water body’s sediments. The water body is assumed to have a uniform depth of water and the area of the sediment-water interface is equivalent to the surface area of the water body.

The apparent settling velocity is most commonly reported in units of m/year and this is how the values are input to the model. For natural lakes, measured phosphorus settling velocities most frequently fall in the range of 5 to 20 m/year although values less than 1 m/year to over 200 m/year have been reported (Chapra, 1997). Panuska and Robertson (1999) noted that the range in apparent settling velocity values for man-made reservoirs tends to be significantly greater than for natural lakes. Higgins and Kim (1981) reported phosphorus

apparent settling velocity values from -90 to 269 m/year for 18 reservoirs in Tennessee with a median value of 42.2 m/year. For 27 Midwestern reservoirs, Walker and Kihner (1978) reported phosphorus apparent settling velocities ranging from -1 to 125 m/year with an average value of 12.7 m/year. *A negative settling rate indicates that the reservoir sediments are a source of N or P; a positive settling rate indicates that the reservoir sediments are a sink for N or P.*

A number of inflow and impoundment properties affect the apparent settling velocity for a water body. Factors of particular importance include the form of phosphorus in the inflow (dissolved or particulate) and the settling velocity of the particulate fraction. Within the impoundment, the mean depth, potential for sediment resuspension and phosphorus release from the sediment will affect the apparent settling velocity (Panuska and Robertson, 1999). Water bodies with high internal phosphorus release tend to possess lower phosphorus retention and lower phosphorus apparent settling velocities than water bodies with low internal phosphorus release (Nürnberg, 1984). Table 8:3-1 summarizes typical ranges in phosphorus settling velocity for different systems.

Table 8:3-1: Recommended apparent settling velocity values for phosphorus (Panuska and Robertson, 1999)

Nutrient Dynamics	Range in settling velocity values (m/year)
Shallow water bodies with high net internal phosphorus flux	$v \leq 0$
Water bodies with moderate net internal phosphorus flux	$1 < v < 5$
Water bodies with minimal net internal phosphorus flux	$5 < v < 16$
Water bodies with high net internal phosphorus removal	$v > 16$

SWAT input variables that pertain to nutrient settling in ponds, wetlands and reservoirs are listed in Table 8:3-2. The model allows the user to define two settling rates for each nutrient and the time of the year during which each settling rate is used. A variation in settling rates is allowed so that impact of temperature and other seasonal factors may be accounted for in the modeling of nutrient settling. To use only one settling rate for the entire year, both variables for the nutrient may be set to the same value. Setting all variables to zero will cause the model to ignore settling of nutrients in the water body.

After nutrient losses in the water body are determined, the final concentration of nutrients in the water body is calculated by dividing the final mass of nutrient by the initial volume of water. The concentration of nutrients in outflow from the water body is equivalent to the final concentration of the nutrients in the water body for the day. The mass of nutrient in the outflow is calculated by multiplying the concentration of nutrient in the outflow by the volume of water leaving the water body on that day.

Table 8:3-2: SWAT input variables that control settling in ponds, wetlands and reservoirs.

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Input File</b>
IPND1	Beginning month of mid-year nutrient settling period for pond and wetland modeled in subbasin	.pnd
IPND2	Ending month of mid-year nutrient settling period for pond and wetland modeled in subbasin	.pnd
PSETL1	Phosphorus settling rate in pond during mid-year nutrient settling period ( $IPND1 \leq month \leq IPND2$ ) (m/year)	.pnd
PSETL2	Phosphorus settling rate in pond during time outside mid-year nutrient settling period (month < IPND1 or month > IPND2) (m/year)	.pnd
NSETL1	Nitrogen settling rate in pond during mid-year nutrient settling period ( $IPND1 \leq month \leq IPND2$ ) (m/year)	.pnd
NSETL2	Nitrogen settling rate in pond during time outside mid-year nutrient settling period (month < IPND1 or month > IPND2) (m/year)	.pnd
PSETLW1	Phosphorus settling rate in wetland during mid-year nutrient settling period ( $IPND1 \leq month \leq IPND2$ ) (m/year)	.pnd
PSETLW2	Phosphorus settling rate in wetland during time outside mid-year nutrient settling period (month < IPND1 or month > IPND2) (m/year)	.pnd
NSETLW1	Nitrogen settling rate in wetland during mid-year nutrient settling period ( $IPND1 \leq month \leq IPND2$ ) (m/year)	.pnd
NSETLW2	Nitrogen settling rate in wetland during time outside mid-year nutrient settling period (month < IPND1 or month > IPND2) (m/year)	.pnd
IRES1	Beginning month of mid-year nutrient settling period for reservoir	.lwq
IRES2	Ending month of mid-year nutrient settling period for reservoir	.lwq
PSETLR1	Phosphorus settling rate in reservoir during mid-year nutrient settling period ( $IRES1 \leq month \leq IRES2$ ) (m/year)	.lwq
PSETLR2	Phosphorus settling rate in reservoir during time outside mid-year nutrient settling period (month < IRES1 or month > IRES2) (m/year)	.lwq
NSETLR1	Nitrogen settling rate in reservoir during mid-year nutrient settling period ( $IRES1 \leq month \leq IRES2$ ) (m/year)	.lwq
NSETLR2	Nitrogen settling rate in reservoir during time outside mid-year nutrient settling period (month < IRES1 or month > IRES2) (m/year)	.lwq

## 8:3.2 TOTAL BALANCE

---

Assuming that the volume of the water body remains constant over time, the processes described above (inflow, settling, outflow) can be combined into the following mass balance equation for a well-mixed water body:

$$V \cdot \frac{dc}{dt} = W(t) - Q \cdot c - v \cdot c \cdot A_s \quad 8:3.2.1$$

where  $V$  is the volume of the system ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $c$  is the concentration of nutrient in the system ( $\text{kg/m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $dt$  is the length of the time step (1 day),  $W(t)$  is the amount of nutrient entering the water body during the day (kg/day),  $Q$  is the rate of water flow exiting the water body ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/\text{day}$ ),  $v$  is the apparent settling velocity (m/day), and  $A_s$  is the area of the sediment-water interface ( $\text{m}^2$ ).

## 8:3.3 EUTROPHICATION

---

Under favorable conditions of light and temperature, excess amounts of nutrients in water can increase the growth of algae and other plants. The result of this growth is an increase in the rate of eutrophication, which is a natural ecological process of change from a nutrient-poor to a nutrient-rich environment. Eutrophication is defined as the process by which a body of water becomes enriched in dissolved nutrients (as phosphates) that stimulate the growth of aquatic plant life, usually resulting in the depletion of dissolved oxygen (Merriam-Webster, Inc., 1996).

Nutrient enrichment of moving waters and lakes is a normal result of soil weathering and erosion processes. The gradual evolution of Ice Age lakes into marshes and, eventually, organic soils is a result of eutrophication. However, this process can be accelerated by the discharge of wastes containing high levels of nutrients into lakes or rivers. One example of this is Lake Erie, which is estimated to have aged the equivalent of 150 natural years in a 15-year span of accelerated eutrophication.

Excessive plant growth caused by accelerated eutrophication can lead to stagnation of the water. The stagnation is caused by an increased biological

oxygen demand created by decaying plant remains. The result of this increased oxygen demand is a tendency toward anaerobic conditions and the inability of the water body to support fish and other aerobic organisms.

Nitrogen, carbon and phosphorus are essential to the growth of aquatic biota. Due to the difficulty of controlling the exchange of nitrogen and carbon between the atmosphere and water and fixation of atmospheric nitrogen by some blue-green algae, attempts to mitigate eutrophication have focused on phosphorus inputs. In fresh-water systems, phosphorus is often the limiting element. By controlling phosphorus loading, accelerated eutrophication of lake waters can be reduced.

In systems where phosphorus is the primary, controllable limiting nutrient of water body eutrophication, the amount of phosphorus present in the water body can be used to estimate the amount of eutrophication present in the water body.

### **8:3.3.1 PHOSPHORUS/CHLOROPHYLL *a* CORRELATIONS**

A number of empirically derived equations have been developed to calculate chlorophyll *a* level as a function of total phosphorus concentration. SWAT uses an equation developed by Rast and Lee (1978) to calculate the chlorophyll *a* concentration in the water body.

$$Chla = 0.551 \cdot p^{0.76} \quad 8:3.3.1$$

where *Chla* is the chlorophyll *a* concentration ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) and *p* is the total phosphorus concentration ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ).

The equation has been modified to include a user-defined coefficient:

$$Chla = Chla_{co} \cdot 0.551 \cdot p^{0.76} \quad 8:3.3.2$$

The user-defined coefficient, *Chla<sub>co</sub>*, is included to allow the user to adjust the predicted chlorophyll *a* concentration for limitations of nutrients other than phosphorus. When *Chla<sub>co</sub>* is set to 1.00, equation 8:3.3.2 is equivalent to equation 8:3.3.1. For most water bodies, the original equation will be adequate.

### **8:3.3.2 CHLOROPHYLL *a*/SECCHI-DISK DEPTH CORRELATION**

The secchi-disk depth is another measure of the trophic status of a water body. The secchi-disk depth quantifies the clarity of the water, an attribute easily perceived by the general public. The secchi-disk depth can be calculated from chlorophyll levels using the equation (Chapra, 1997):

$$SD = 6.35 \cdot Chla^{-0.473} \quad 8:3.3.3$$

where  $SD$  is the secchi-disk depth (m) and  $Chla$  is the chlorophyll *a* concentration ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ).

For incorporation into SWAT, equation 8:3.3.3 was modified to include a user-defined coefficient:

$$SD = SD_{co} \cdot 6.35 \cdot Chla^{-0.473} \quad 8:3.3.4$$

The user-defined coefficient,  $SD_{co}$ , is included to allow the user to adjust the predicted secchi-disk depth for impacts of suspended sediment and other particulate matter on water clarity that are ignored by the original equation. When  $SD_{co}$  is set to 1.00, equation 8:3.3.4 is equivalent to equation 8:3.3.3. For most water bodies, the original equation will be adequate.

While evaluation of water quality by secchi-disk depth measurements is subjective, some general correlations between secchi-disk depth and public perception of water quality have been made. One such correlation made for Annebessacook Lake in Maine (EPA, 1980) is given in Table 8:3-3.

Table 8:3-3: Relationship between secchi-disk depth and public perception of water quality.

<b>Secchi-disk depth (m)</b>	<b>Public perception of water quality</b>
0.0 – 0.9	gross pollution; water body totally unsuitable for recreation
1.0 – 1.9	algae blooms still evident; quality unacceptable for most uses
2.0 – 2.9	some complaints of declining water quality; some impairment of water use
3.0 – 3.9	satisfactory quality; no impairment of water use
4.0 – 4.9	excellent water quality; a positive factor encouraging use of lake
5.0 +	exceptional quality

Table 8:3-4: SWAT input variables that impact eutrophication calculations in ponds, wetlands and reservoirs.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
CHLA	$Chla_{co}$ variable for calculation of chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration in a pond	.pnd
CHLAW	$Chla_{co}$ variable for calculation of chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration in a wetland	.pnd
CHLAR	$Chla_{co}$ variable for calculation of chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration in a reservoir	.lwq
SECCI	$SD_{co}$ variable for calculation of secchi-disk depth in a pond	.pnd
SECCIW	$SD_{co}$ variable for calculation of secchi-disk depth in a wetland	.pnd
SECCIR	$SD_{co}$ variable for calculation of secchi-disk depth in a reservoir	.lwq

## 8:3.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$A_s$	Area of sediment-water interface ( $m^2$ )
$Chla$	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )
$Chla_{co}$	User-defined coefficient to adjust predicted chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration
$M_{flowin}$	Mass of nutrient entering water body on the given day (kg)
$M_{initial}$	Initial mass of nutrient in water body for the given day (kg)
$M_{settling}$	Mass of nutrient lost via settling on a given day (kg)
$M_{stored}$	Mass of nutrient in water body at end of previous day (kg)
$Q$	Volumetric flow rate for water exiting water body ( $m^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/\text{day}$ )
$SD$	Secchi-disk depth (m)
$SD_{co}$	User-defined coefficient to adjust predicted secchi-disk depth
$V$	Volume of water in water body (assumed constant) ( $m^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{flowin}$	Volume of water entering water body on given day ( $m^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{initial}$	Initial volume of water in water body on given day ( $m^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{stored}$	Volume of water in water body at end of previous day ( $m^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$W(t)$	Rate of nutrient loading (kg/day)
$c$	Concentration of nutrient in the water ( $\text{kg/m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$dt$	Length of time step (1 day)
$p$	Total phosphorus concentration ( $\mu\text{g P/L}$ )
$v$	Apparent settling velocity (m/day)

## 8:3.5 REFERENCES

---

- Chapra, S.C. 1997. Surface water-quality modeling. WCB/McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA.
- Higgins, J.M. and B.R. Kim. 1981. Phosphorus retention models for the Tennessee Valley Authority reservoirs. *Wat. Resour. Res.* 17:571-576.

- Merriam-Webster, Inc. 1996. Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary, 10<sup>th</sup> edition. Merriam-Webster, Inc. Springfield, MA.
- Nürnberg, G.K. 1984. The prediction of internal phosphorus load in lakes with anoxic hypolimnia. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 29:111-124.
- Panuska, J.C. and D.M. Robertson. 1999. Estimating phosphorus concentration following alum treatment using apparent settling velocity. *Lake and Reserv. Manage.* 15:28-38.
- Rast, W. and Lee, G.F. 1978. Summary analysis of the North American project (US portion) OECD eutrophication project: nutrient loading-lake response relationships and trophic state indices. USEPA Corvallis Environmental Research Laboratory, Corvallis, OR. EPA-600/3-78-008.
- USEPA. 1980. Lake restoration in Cobossee watershed. Capsule Rept. Office of Water Planning and Standards Div., ORD, Cincinnati, OH. EPA-624/2-80-027.
- Walker, W.W. and J. Kihner. 1978. An empirical analysis of factors controlling eutrophication in midwestern impoundments. Paper presented at the International Symposium on the Environmental Effects of Hydraulic Engineering Works, Univ. of Tenn., Knoxville.



## **SECTION 8 CHAPTER 4**

# **EQUATIONS: PESTICIDES IN WATER BODIES**

---

SWAT incorporates a simple mass balance developed by Chapra (1997) to model the transformation and transport of pesticides in water bodies. The model assumes a well-mixed layer of water overlying a sediment layer. Figure 8:4-1 illustrates the mechanisms affecting the pesticide mass balance in water bodies.

SWAT defines four different types of water bodies: ponds, wetlands, reservoirs and depressional/impounded areas (potholes). Pesticide processes are modeled only in reservoirs.




Figure 8:4-1: Pesticide mass balance for well-mixed water body with sediment layer (after Chapra, 1997).

## 8:4.1 PESTICIDE IN THE WATER

Pesticide in a well-mixed water body is increased through addition of mass in inflow, resuspension and diffusion from the sediment layer. The amount of pesticide in a well-mixed water body is reduced through removal in outflow, degradation, volatilization, settling and diffusion into the underlying sediment.

### 8:4.1.1 SOLID-LIQUID PARTITIONING

Pesticides will partition into particulate and dissolved forms. The fraction of pesticide in each phase is a function of the pesticide's partition coefficient and the water body's suspended solid concentration:

$$F_d = \frac{1}{1 + K_d \cdot conc_{sed}} \quad 8:4.1.1$$

$$F_p = \frac{K_d \cdot conc_{sed}}{1 + K_d \cdot conc_{sed}} = 1 - F_d \quad 8:4.1.2$$

where  $F_d$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $F_p$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase,  $K_d$  is the pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ ), and  $conc_{sed}$  is the concentration of suspended solids in the water ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ).

The pesticide partition coefficient can be estimated from the octanol-water partition coefficient (Chapra, 1997):

$$K_d = 3.085 \times 10^{-8} \cdot K_{ow} \quad 8:4.1.3$$

where  $K_d$  is the pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ ) and  $K_{ow}$  is the pesticide's octanol-water partition coefficient ( $\text{mg m}_{\text{octanol}}^{-3} (\text{mg m}_{\text{water}}^{-3})^{-1}$ ). Values for the octanol-water partition coefficient have been published for many chemicals. If a published value cannot be found, it can be estimated from solubility (Chapra, 1997):

$$\log(K_{ow}) = 5.00 - 0.670 \cdot \log(pst'_{sol}) \quad 8:4.1.4$$

where  $pst'_{sol}$  is the pesticide solubility ( $\mu\text{moles/L}$ ). The solubility in these units is calculated:

$$pst'_{sol} = \frac{pst_{sol}}{MW} \cdot 10^3 \quad 8:4.1.5$$

where  $pst'_{sol}$  is the pesticide solubility ( $\mu\text{moles/L}$ ),  $pst_{sol}$  is the pesticide solubility ( $\text{mg/L}$ ) and  $MW$  is the molecular weight ( $\text{g/mole}$ ).

### **8:4.1.2 DEGRADATION**

Pesticides in both the particulate and dissolved forms are subject to degradation. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the water via degradation is:

$$pst_{deg,wtr} = k_{p,aq} \cdot pst_{lkwtr} \quad 8:4.1.6$$

where  $pst_{deg,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the water via degradation ( $\text{mg pst}$ ),  $k_{p,aq}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day), and  $pst_{lkwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water at the beginning of the day ( $\text{mg pst}$ ). The rate constant is related to the aqueous half-life:

$$k_{p,aq} = \frac{0.693}{t_{1/2,aq}} \quad 8:4.1.7$$

where  $k_{p,aq}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day), and  $t_{1/2,aq}$  is the aqueous half-life for the pesticide (days).

### **8:4.1.3 VOLATILIZATION**

Pesticide in the dissolved phase is available for volatilization. The amount of pesticide removed from the water via volatilization is:

$$pst_{vol,wtr} = v_v \cdot SA \cdot \frac{F_d \cdot pst_{lkwtr}}{V} \quad 8:4.1.8$$

where  $pst_{vol,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via volatilization (mg pst),  $v_v$  is the volatilization mass-transfer coefficient (m/day),  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body ( $m^2$ ),  $F_d$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $pst_{lkwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst), and  $V$  is the volume of water in the water body ( $m^3 H_2O$ ).

The volatilization mass-transfer coefficient can be calculated based on Whitman's two-film or two-resistance theory (Whitman, 1923; Lewis and Whitman, 1924 as described in Chapra, 1997). While the main body of the gas and liquid phases are assumed to be well-mixed and homogenous, the two-film theory assumes that a substance moving between the two phases encounters maximum resistance in two laminar boundary layers where transfer is a function of molecular diffusion. In this type of system the transfer coefficient or velocity is:

$$v_v = K_l \cdot \frac{H_e}{H_e + R \cdot T_K \cdot (K_l/K_g)} \quad 8:4.1.9$$

where  $v_v$  is the volatilization mass-transfer coefficient (m/day),  $K_l$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the liquid laminar layer (m/day),  $K_g$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the gaseous laminar layer (m/day),  $H_e$  is Henry's constant ( $atm\ m^3\ mole^{-1}$ ),  $R$  is the universal gas constant ( $8.206 \times 10^{-5}\ atm\ m^3\ (K\ mole)^{-1}$ ), and  $T_K$  is the temperature (K).

For lakes, the transfer coefficients are estimated using a stagnant film approach:

$$K_l = \frac{D_l}{z_l} \quad K_g = \frac{D_g}{z_g} \quad 8:4.1.10$$

where  $K_l$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the liquid laminar layer (m/day),  $K_g$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the gaseous laminar layer (m/day),  $D_l$  is the liquid molecular diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ ),  $D_g$  is the gas molecular diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ ),  $z_l$  is the thickness of the liquid film (m), and  $z_g$  is the thickness of the gas film (m).

Alternatively, the transfer coefficients can be estimated with the equations:

$$K_l = K_{l,O_2} \cdot \left( \frac{32}{MW} \right)^{0.25} \quad 8:4.1.11$$

$$K_g = 168 \cdot \mu_w \cdot \left( \frac{18}{MW} \right)^{0.25} \quad 8:4.1.12$$

where  $K_l$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the liquid laminar layer (m/day),  $K_g$  is the mass-transfer velocity in the gaseous laminar layer (m/day),  $K_{l,O_2}$  is the oxygen transfer coefficient (m/day),  $MW$  is the molecular weight of the compound, and  $\mu_w$  is the wind speed (m/s). Chapra (1997) lists several different equations that can be used to calculate  $K_{l,O_2}$ .

#### **8:4.1.4 SETTLING**

Pesticide in the particulate phase may be removed from the water layer by settling. Settling transfers pesticide from the water to the sediment layer. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the water via settling is:

$$pst_{stl,wtr} = v_s \cdot SA \cdot \frac{F_p \cdot pst_{lkwtr}}{V} \quad 8:4.1.13$$

where  $pst_{stl,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the water due to settling (mg pst),  $v_s$  is the settling velocity (m/day),  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body ( $\text{m}^2$ ),  $F_p$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase,  $pst_{lkwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst), and  $V$  is the volume of water in the water body ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

### **8:4.1.5 OUTFLOW**

Pesticide is removed from the water body in outflow. The amount of dissolved and particulate pesticide removed from the water body in outflow is:

$$pst_{sol,o} = Q \cdot \frac{F_d \cdot pst_{lkwtr}}{V} \quad 8:4.1.14$$

$$pst_{sorb,o} = Q \cdot \frac{F_p \cdot pst_{lkwtr}}{V} \quad 8:4.1.15$$

where  $pst_{sol,o}$  is the amount of dissolved pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst),  $pst_{sorb,o}$  is the amount of particulate pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst),  $Q$  is the rate of outflow from the water body ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/\text{day}$ ),  $F_d$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $F_p$  is the fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase,  $pst_{lkwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst), and  $V$  is the volume of water in the water body ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ ).

Table 8:4-1: SWAT input variables that pesticide partitioning.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
LKPST_KOC	$K_d$ : Pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ )	.lwq
LKPST_REA	$k_{p,aq}$ : Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day)	.lwq
LKPST_VOL	$v_v$ : Volatilization mass-transfer coefficient (m/day)	.lwq
LKPST_STL	$v_s$ : Pesticide settling velocity (m/day)	.lwq

### **8:4.2 PESTICIDE IN THE SEDIMENT**

Pesticide in the sediment layer underlying a water body is increased through addition of mass by settling and diffusion from the water. The amount of pesticide in the sediment layer is reduced through removal by degradation, resuspension, diffusion into the overlying water, and burial.

#### **8:4.2.1 SOLID-LIQUID PARTITIONING**

As in the water layer, pesticides in the sediment layer will partition into particulate and dissolved forms. Calculation of the solid-liquid partitioning in the sediment layer requires a suspended solid concentration. The “concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer is defined as:

$$conc_{sed}^* = \frac{M_{sed}}{V_{tot}} \quad 8:4.2.1$$

where  $conc_{sed}^*$  is the “concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ),  $M_{sed}$  is the mass of solid particles in the sediment layer (g) and  $V_{tot}$  is the total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ).

Mass and volume are also used to define the porosity and density of the sediment layer. In the sediment layer, porosity is the fraction of the total volume in the liquid phase:

$$\phi = \frac{V_{wtr}}{V_{tot}} \quad 8:4.2.2$$

where  $\phi$  is the porosity,  $V_{wtr}$  is the volume of water in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ) and  $V_{tot}$  is the total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ). The fraction of the volume in the solid phase can then be defined as:

$$1 - \phi = \frac{V_{sed}}{V_{tot}} \quad 8:4.2.3$$

where  $\phi$  is the porosity,  $V_{sed}$  is the volume of solids in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ) and  $V_{tot}$  is the total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ).

The density of sediment particles is defined as:

$$\rho_s = \frac{M_{sed}}{V_{sed}} \quad 8:4.2.4$$

where  $\rho_s$  is the particle density ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ),  $M_{sed}$  is the mass of solid particles in the sediment layer (g), and  $V_{sed}$  is the volume of solids in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ ).

Solving equation 8:4.2.3 for  $V_{tot}$  and equation 8:4.2.4 for  $M_{sed}$  and substituting into equation 8:4.2.1 yields:

$$conc_{sed}^* = (1 - \phi) \cdot \rho_s \quad 8:4.2.5$$

where  $conc_{sed}^*$  is the “concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ),  $\phi$  is the porosity, and  $\rho_s$  is the particle density ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ).

Typical values of porosity and particle density for fine-grained sediments are  $\phi = 0.8\text{-}0.95$  and  $\rho_s = 2.4\text{-}2.7 \times 10^6 \text{ g}/\text{m}^3$  (Chapra, 1997). Assuming  $\phi = 0.8$

and  $\rho_s = 2.6 \times 10^6 \text{ g/m}^3$ , the “concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer is  $5.2 \times 10^5 \text{ g/m}^3$ .

The fraction of pesticide in each phase is then calculated:

$$F_{d,sed} = \frac{1}{\phi + (1-\phi) \cdot \rho_s \cdot K_d} \quad 8:4.2.6$$

$$F_{p,sed} = 1 - F_{d,sed} \quad 8:4.2.7$$

where  $F_{d,sed}$  is the fraction of total sediment pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $F_{p,sed}$  is the fraction of total sediment pesticide in the particulate phase,  $\phi$  is the porosity,  $\rho_s$  is the particle density ( $\text{g/m}^3$ ), and  $K_d$  is the pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ ). The pesticide partition coefficient used for the water layer is also used for the sediment layer.

### **8:4.2.2 DEGRADATION**

Pesticides in both the particulate and dissolved forms are subject to degradation. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the sediment via degradation is:

$$pst_{deg,sed} = k_{p,sed} \cdot pst_{lk sed} \quad 8:4.2.8$$

where  $pst_{deg,sed}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the sediment via degradation ( $\text{mg pst}$ ),  $k_{p,sed}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment ( $1/\text{day}$ ), and  $pst_{lk sed}$  is the amount of pesticide in the sediment ( $\text{mg pst}$ ). The rate constant is related to the sediment half-life:

$$k_{p,sed} = \frac{0.693}{t_{1/2,sed}} \quad 8:4.2.9$$

where  $k_{p,sed}$  is the rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment ( $1/\text{day}$ ), and  $t_{1/2,sed}$  is the sediment half-life for the pesticide (days).

### **8:4.2.3 RESUSPENSION**

Pesticide in the sediment layer is available for resuspension. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the sediment via resuspension is:

$$pst_{rsp,wtr} = v_r \cdot SA \cdot \frac{pst_{lk sed}}{V_{tot}} \quad 8:4.2.10$$

where  $pst_{rsp,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via resuspension (mg pst),  $v_r$  is the resuspension velocity (m/day),  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body ( $m^2$ ),  $pst_{lksed}$  is the amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst), and  $V_{tot}$  is the volume of the sediment layer ( $m^3$ ). The volume of the sediment layer is calculated:

$$V_{tot} = SA \cdot D_{sed} \quad 8:4.2.11$$

where  $V_{tot}$  is the volume of the sediment layer ( $m^3$ ),  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body ( $m^2$ ),  $D_{sed}$  is the depth of the active sediment layer (m). Pesticide removed from the sediment layer by resuspension is added to the water layer.

#### **8:4.2.4 DIFFUSION**

Pesticide in the dissolved phase is available for diffusion. Diffusion transfers pesticide between the water and sediment layers. The direction of movement is controlled by the pesticide concentration. Pesticide will move from areas of high concentration to areas of low concentration. The amount of pesticide that is transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion is:

$$pst_{dif} = \left| v_d \cdot SA \cdot \left( \frac{F_{d,sed} \cdot pst_{lksed}}{V_{tot}} - \frac{F_d \cdot pst_{lkwtr}}{V} \right) \right| \quad 8:4.2.12$$

where  $pst_{dif}$  is the amount of pesticide transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion (mg pst),  $v_d$  is the rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day),  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body ( $m^2$ ),  $F_{d,sed}$  is the fraction of total sediment pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $pst_{lksed}$  is the amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst),  $V_{tot}$  is the volume of the sediment layer ( $m^3$ ),  $F_d$  is the fraction of total water layer pesticide in the dissolved phase,  $pst_{lkwtr}$  is the amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst), and  $V$  is the volume of water in the water body ( $m^3 H_2O$ ). If

$\frac{F_{d,sed} \cdot pst_{lksed}}{V_{tot}} > \frac{F_d \cdot pst_{lkwtr}}{V}$ ,  $pst_{dif}$  is transferred from the sediment to the water

layer. If  $\frac{F_{d,sed} \cdot pst_{lksed}}{V_{tot}} < \frac{F_d \cdot pst_{lkwtr}}{V}$ ,  $pst_{dif}$  is transferred from the water to the sediment layer.

The diffusive mixing velocity,  $v_d$ , can be estimated from the empirically derived formula (Chapra, 1997):

$$v_d = \frac{69.35}{365} \cdot \phi \cdot MW^{-2/3} \quad 8:4.2.13$$

where  $v_d$  is the rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day),  $\phi$  is the sediment porosity, and  $MW$  is the molecular weight of the pesticide compound.

### **8:4.2.5 BURIAL**

Pesticide in the sediment layer may be lost by burial. The amount of pesticide that is removed from the sediment via burial is:

$$pst_{bur} = v_b \cdot SA \cdot \frac{pst_{lksed}}{V_{tot}} \quad 8:4.2.14$$

where  $pst_{bur}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via burial (mg pst),  $v_b$  is the burial velocity (m/day),  $SA$  is the surface area of the water body ( $m^2$ ),  $pst_{lksed}$  is the amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst), and  $V_{tot}$  is the volume of the sediment layer ( $m^3$ ).

Table 8:4-2: SWAT input variables related to pesticide in the sediment.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
LKPST_KOC	$K_d$ : Pesticide partition coefficient ( $m^3/g$ )	.lwq
LKSPST_REA	$k_{p, sed}$ : Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment (1/day)	.lwq
LKPST_RSP	$v_r$ : Resuspension velocity (m/day)	.lwq
LKSPST_ACT	$D_{sed}$ : Depth of the active sediment layer (m)	.lwq
LKPST_MIX	$v_d$ : Rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day)	.lwq
LKSPST_BRY	$v_b$ : Pesticide burial velocity (m/day)	.lwq

## **8:4.3 MASS BALANCE**

The processes described above can be combined into mass balance equations for the well-mixed water body and the well-mixed sediment layer:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta pst_{lkwtr} &= pst_{in} - (pst_{sol,o} + pst_{sorbo}) - pst_{deg,wtr} - pst_{vol,wtr} \\ &\quad - pst_{stl,wtr} + pst_{rsp,wtr} \pm pst_{dif} \end{aligned} \quad 8:4.3.1$$

$$\Delta pst_{lksed} = pst_{deg,sed} + pst_{stl,wtr} - pst_{rsp,wtr} - pst_{bur} \pm pst_{dif} \quad 8:4.3.2$$

where  $\Delta pst_{lkwtr}$  is the change in pesticide mass in the water layer (mg pst),  $\Delta pst_{lksed}$  is the change in pesticide mass in the sediment layer (mg pst),  $pst_{in}$  is the pesticide added to the water body via inflow (mg pst),  $pst_{sol,o}$  is the amount of

dissolved pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst),  $pst_{sorb,o}$  is the amount of particulate pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst),  $pst_{deg,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the water via degradation (mg pst),  $pst_{vol,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via volatilization (mg pst),  $pst_{stl,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the water due to settling (mg pst),  $pst_{rsp,wtr}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via resuspension (mg pst),  $pst_{dif}$  is the amount of pesticide transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion (mg pst),  $pst_{deg,sed}$  is the amount of pesticide removed from the sediment via degradation (mg pst),  $pst_{bur}$  is the amount of pesticide removed via burial (mg pst)

## 8:4.4 NOMENCLATURE

---

$D_g$	Gas molecular diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ )
$D_l$	Liquid molecular diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2/\text{day}$ )
$D_{sed}$	Depth of the active sediment layer (m)
$F_d$	Fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase
$F_{d,sed}$	Fraction of total sediment pesticide in the dissolved phase
$F_p$	Fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase
$F_{p,sed}$	Fraction of total sediment pesticide in the particulate phase
$H_e$	Henry's constant ( $\text{atm m}^3 \text{ mole}^{-1}$ )
$K_d$	Pesticide partition coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{g}$ )
$K_g$	Mass-transfer velocity in the gaseous laminar layer (m/day)
$K_l$	Mass-transfer velocity in the liquid laminar layer (m/day)
$K_{l,O_2}$	Oxygen transfer coefficient (m/day)
$M_{sed}$	Mass of solid phase in the sediment layer (g)
$MW$	Molecular weight of the pesticide compound
$Q$	Rate of outflow from the water body ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/\text{day}$ )
$R$	Universal gas constant ( $8.206 \times 10^{-5} \text{ atm m}^3 (\text{K mole})^{-1}$ )
$SA$	Surface area of the water body ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$V$	Volume of water in the water body ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{sed}$	Volume of solids in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{tot}$	Total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{wtr}$	Volume of water in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )

$conc_{sed}$  Concentration of suspended solids in the water ( $\text{g/m}^3$ )

$conc_{sed}^*$  "Concentration" of solid particles in the sediment layer ( $\text{g/m}^3$ )

$k_{p,aq}$  Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day)

$k_{p,sed}$  Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment (1/day)

$pst_{bur}$  Amount of pesticide removed via burial (mg pst)

$pst_{deg,sed}$  Amount of pesticide removed from the sediment via degradation (mg pst)

$pst_{deg,wtr}$	Amount of pesticide removed from the water via degradation (mg pst)
$pst_{dif}$	Amount of pesticide transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion (mg pst)
$pst_{in}$	Pesticide added to the water body via inflow (mg pst)
$pst_{lksed}$	Amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst)
$pst_{lkwtr}$	Amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst)
$pst_{rsp,wtr}$	Amount of pesticide removed from sediment via resuspension (mg pst)
$pst_{sol,o}$	Amount of dissolved pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst)
$pst_{sorb,o}$	Amount of particulate pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst)
$pst_{stl,wtr}$	Amount of pesticide removed from the water due to settling (mg pst)
$pst_{vol,wtr}$	Amount of pesticide removed via volatilization (mg pst)
$t_{1/2,aq}$	Aqueous half-life for the pesticide (days)
$t_{1/2,sed}$	Sediment half-life for the pesticide (days)
$v_b$	Pesticide burial velocity (m/day)
$v_d$	Rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day)
$v_r$	Resuspension velocity (m/day)
$v_s$	Settling velocity (m/day)
$v_v$	Volatile mass-transfer coefficient (m/day)
$z_g$	Thickness of the gas film (m)
$z_l$	Thickness of the liquid film (m)
$\phi$	Porosity
$\Delta pst_{lkwtr}$	Change in pesticide mass in the water layer (mg pst)
$\Delta pst_{lksed}$	Change in pesticide mass in the sediment layer (mg pst)
$\rho_s$	Particle density ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )
$\mu_w$	Wind speed (m/s)

## 8:4.5 REFERENCES

---

- Chapra, S.C. 1997. Surface water-quality modeling. WCB/McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA.
- Lewis, W.K. and W.G. Whitman. 1924. Principles of gas absorption. Ind. Eng. Chem. 16:1215-1220.
- Whitman, W.G. 1923. The two-film theory of gas adsorption. Chem. Metallurg. Eng. 29:146-148.



## **SECTION 8 CHAPTER 5**

# **EQUATIONS: BACTERIA IN WATER BODIES**

---

SWAT calculates loading of pathogens and indicator bacteria for pathogens from land areas in the watershed. In reservoirs, bacteria die-off is the only process modeled.

## 8:5.1 BACTERIA DECAY

A first order decay function is used to calculate changes in bacteria concentrations (Bowie et al., 1985).

$$bact_{lpres,i} = bact_{lpres,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{lpres,die}) \quad 8:5.1.1$$

$$bact_{pres,i} = bact_{pres,i-1} \cdot \exp(-\mu_{pres,die}) \quad 8:5.1.2$$

where  $bact_{lpres,i}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present in the reservoir on day  $i$  (#cfu/100mL),  $bact_{lpres,i-1}$  is the amount of less persistent bacteria present in the reservoir on day  $i - 1$  (#cfu/100mL),  $\mu_{lpres,die}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in water bodies (1/day),  $bact_{pres,i}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present in the reservoir on day  $i$  (#cfu/100mL),  $bact_{pres,i-1}$  is the amount of persistent bacteria present in the reservoir on day  $i - 1$  (#cfu/100mL), and  $\mu_{pres,die}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in water bodies (1/day).

The die-off rate constants are adjusted for temperature using the equations:

$$\mu_{lpres,die} = \mu_{lpres,die,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(T_{water} - 20)} \quad 8:5.1.3$$

$$\mu_{pres,die} = \mu_{pres,die,20} \cdot \theta_{bact}^{(T_{water} - 20)} \quad 8:5.1.4$$

where  $\mu_{lpres,die}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in water bodies (1/day),  $\mu_{pres,die}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in water bodies (1/day),  $\mu_{lpres,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in water bodies at 20°C (1/day),  $\mu_{pres,die,20}$  is the rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in water bodies at 20°C (1/day),  $\theta_{bact}$  is the temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/re-growth, and  $T_{water}$  is the water temperature (°C).

Table 8:5-1: SWAT input variables that pertain to bacteria die-off in the water bodies.

Variable Name	Definition	Input File
WDPRES	$\mu_{pres,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for persistent bacteria in water bodies at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
WDLPRES	$\mu_{lpres,die,20}$ : Die-off factor for less persistent bacteria in water bodies at 20°C (1/day)	.bsn
THBACT	$\theta_{bact}$ : Temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/growth	.bsn

## 8:5.2 NOMENCLATURE

---

$T_{water}$  Average daily water temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )

$bact_{lpres}$  Amount of less persistent bacteria present in the reservoir (#cfu/100mL)

$bact_{pres}$  Amount of persistent bacteria present in the reservoir (#cfu/100mL)

$\theta_{bact}$  Temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/re-growth

$\mu_{lpres,die}$  Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in water bodies (1/day)

$\mu_{lpres,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in water bodies at  $20^{\circ}\text{C}$  (1/day)

$\mu_{pres,die}$  Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in water bodies (1/day)

$\mu_{pres,die,20}$  Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in water bodies at  $20^{\circ}\text{C}$  (1/day)

## 8:5.3 REFERENCES

---

Bowie, G.W., W. Mills, D. Porcella, C. Campbell, J. Pagenkopf, G. Rupp, K. Johnson, P. Chan, S. Gherini, and C. Chamberlin. 1985. Rates, constants and kinetics formulations in surface water quality modeling. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. USEPA/600/3-85-040.



## APPENDIX A

### LIST OF VARIABLES

---

$A$	$3 \times 3$ matrix of elements defined to ensure serial and cross correlation of generated temperature and radiation values $A = M_1 \cdot M_0^{-1}$
$A_{ch}$	Cross-sectional area of flow in the channel ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$A_{ch,bnkfull}$	Cross-sectional area of flow in the channel when filled to the top of the bank ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$A_d$	Area of drain field (ha)
$A_s$	Area of sediment-water interface ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$A_{surf}$	Amplitude of the surface fluctuations in soil temperature ( $^\circ\text{C}$ )
$AGP$	Algal growth potential (mg/L)
$Area$	Subbasin area ( $\text{km}^2$ or ha)
$AU$	Astronomical unit (1 AU = $1.496 \times 10^8$ km)
$AWC$	Available water capacity ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$AWC_{ly}$	Available water capacity for layer $ly$ ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$B$	$3 \times 3$ matrix of elements defined to ensure serial and cross correlation of generated temperature and radiation values $B \cdot B^T = M_0 - M_1 \cdot M_0^{-1} \cdot M_1^T$
$BFD$	Number of baseflow days for the watershed
$Bio$	Amount of live bacteria biomass in biozone (kg/ha)
$C$	Runoff coefficient in peak runoff rate calculation
$C$	Concentration of the solute in solution in equilibrium with the mass of solute sorbed onto the solid (mg/L),
$C_1$	Coefficient in Muskingum flood routing equation
$C_2$	Coefficient in Muskingum flood routing equation
$C_3$	Coefficient in Muskingum flood routing equation
$C_{BOD,in}$	BOD concentration in STE (mg/L)
$C_{BOD}$	BOD concentration in biozone (mg/L)
$C_{CH}$	Channel cover factor
$C_{k,end}$	Concentration of $k$ constituent in the biozone at the end of the day (mg/L)
$C_{k,i}$	Concentration of $k$ constituent in the biozone at the beginning of the day (mg/L)
$C_{NH4}$	Concentration of ammonium in the reach (mg N/L)
$C_{NO3}$	Concentration of nitrate in the reach (mg N/L)
$C_{solidphase}$	Concentration of the pesticide sorbed to the solid phase (mg chemical/kg solid material)
$C_{solP}$	Concentration of phosphorus in solution in the reach (mg P/L)
$C_{solution}$	Concentration of the pesticide in solution (mg chemical/L solution)
$C_{USLE}$	USLE cover and management factor
$C_{USLE,aa}$	Average annual C factor for the land cover
$C_{USLE,mn}$	Minimum value for the cover and management factor for the land cover
$CFRG$	Coarse fragment factor
$Chla$	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )
$Chla_{co}$	User-defined coefficient to adjust predicted chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration
$CF_{frac}$	Fraction of the flow through the most heavily loaded 10% of the VFS which is fully channelized (user input)
$CN$	Curve number
$CN_1$	Moisture condition I curve number
$CN_2$	Moisture condition II curve number

$CN_{2s}$	Moisture condition II curve number adjusted for slope
$CN_3$	Moisture condition III curve number
$CO_2$	Concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (ppmv)
$CO_{2amb}$	Ambient atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration (330 ppmv)
$CO_{2hi}$	Elevated atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration (ppmv)
$CV$	Total aboveground biomass and residue present on current day (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
$D_a$	Oxygen deficit above the structure (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$D_b$	Oxygen deficit below the structure (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$D_g$	Gas molecular diffusion coefficient (m <sup>2</sup> /day)
$D_l$	Liquid molecular diffusion coefficient (m <sup>2</sup> /day)
$D_m$	Molecular diffusion coefficient for oxygen (m <sup>2</sup> /day)
$D_{sed}$	Depth of the active sediment layer (m)
$DA$	HRU drainage area (km <sup>2</sup> )
$DAFS_{ratio1}$	Drainage area to VFS area ratio for section 1
$DAFS_{ratio2}$	Drainage area to the VFS area ratio for section 2
$DAFS_{ratio}$	Average drainage area to the VFS area ratio for the entire HRU (user input)
$DF_{con}$	Fraction of the field drained by the most heavily loaded 10% of the VFS $DP_R$ dissolved phosphorus reduction (%)
$E$	Depth rate evaporation (mm d <sup>-1</sup> )
$E_0$	Eccentricity correction factor of earth ( $r_0/r$ ) <sup>2</sup>
$E_a$	Actual amount of evapotranspiration on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_{can}$	Amount of evaporation from free water in the canopy on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_{ch}$	Evaporation from the reach for the day (m <sup>3</sup> H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_o$	Potential evapotranspiration (mm d <sup>-1</sup> )
$E'_o$	Potential evapotranspiration adjusted for evaporation of free water in the canopy (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_s$	Maximum sublimation/soil evaporation on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E'_s$	Maximum sublimation/soil evaporation adjusted for plant water use on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E''_s$	Maximum soil water evaporation on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_{soil,ly}$	Evaporative demand for layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E'_{soil,ly}$	Evaporative demand for layer $ly$ adjusted for water content (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E''_{soil,ly}$	Amount of water removed from layer $ly$ by evaporation (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_{soil,z}$	Evaporative demand at depth $z$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_{storm}$	Total storm energy (0.0017 m-metric ton/m <sup>2</sup> ),
$E_{sub}$	Amount of sublimation on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$E_t$	Transpiration rate (maximum) (mm d <sup>-1</sup> )
$E_{t,act}$	Actual amount of transpiration on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$EI_{USLE}$	Rainfall erosion index (0.017 m-metric ton cm/(m <sup>2</sup> hr))
$EL$	Elevation (m)
$EL_{band}$	Mean elevation in the elevation band (m)
$EL_{gage}$	Elevation at the precipitation, temperature, or weather generator data recording gage (m)
$ET$	Evapotranspiration from biozone (mm/day)

$F_d$	Fraction of total pesticide in the dissolved phase
$F_{d,sed}$	Fraction of total sediment pesticide in the dissolved phase
$F_{inf}$	Cumulative infiltration at time $t$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$F_p$	Fraction of total pesticide in the particulate phase
$F_{p,sed}$	Fraction of total sediment pesticide in the particulate phase
$FC$	Water content of soil profile at field capacity (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$FC_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at field capacity (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$FL$	Algal growth attenuation factor for light for the water column
$FL_z$	Algal growth attenuation factor for light at depth $z$
$FN$	Algal growth limitation factor for nitrogen
$FP$	Algal growth limitation factor for phosphorus
$G$	Heat flux density to the ground (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_0$	Extraterrestrial daily irradiation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_b$	Net outgoing long-wave radiation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_{day}$	Solar radiation reaching ground on current day of simulation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_e$	Henry's constant (atm m <sup>3</sup> mole <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_L$	Long-wave radiation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_{MX}$	Maximum possible solar radiation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_{net}$	Net radiation on day (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$H_o$	Saturated thickness normal to the hillslope at the outlet expressed as a fraction of the total thickness (mm/mm)
$H_{phosyn}$	Intercepted photosynthetically active radiation on a given day (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> )
$H_R$	Radiant energy (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> )
$HI$	Potential harvest index for a given day
$HI_{act}$	Actual harvest index
$HI_{min}$	Harvest index for the plant in drought conditions and represents the minimum harvest index allowed for the plant
$HI_{opt}$	Potential harvest index for the plant at maturity given ideal growing conditions
$HI_{trg}$	Target harvest index
$HU$	Number of heat units accumulated on a given day where base temperature is dependant on the plant species (heat units)
$HU_0$	Number of base zero heat units accumulated on a given day (heat units)
$I_0$	Extraterrestrial daily irradiance incident on a horizontal surface (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )
$I_{0n}$	Extraterrestrial daily irradiance incident on a normal surface (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )
$I_{30}$	Maximum 30 minute intensity (mm/hr)
$I_a$	Initial abstractions which includes surface storage, interception and infiltration prior to runoff (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$I_{frac}$	Fraction of daily solar radiation falling during specific hour on current day of simulation
$I_{hr}$	Solar radiation reaching ground during specific hour on current day of simulation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )
$I_p$	Amount of percolation out of the biozone (m <sup>3</sup> /day)
$I_{p,pot}$	Potential amount of percolation (mm/day)
$I_{p,excess}$	Minimum amount of percolation (mm/day)
$I_{phosyn,hr}$	Photosynthetically-active solar radiation reaching ground during specific hour on current day of simulation (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )

$I_{phosyn,z}$	Photosynthetically-active light intensity at a depth $z$ below the water surface (MJ/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$I_{SC}$	Solar constant (4.921 MJ m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )
$\bar{I}_{phosyn,hr}$	Daylight average photosynthetically-active light intensity (MJ/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$J_i$	Jet index used to calculate channel erodibility
$K$	Storage time constant for the reach (s)
$K_{0.1bnkfull}$	Storage time constant calculated for the reach segment with one-tenth of the bankfull flows (s)
$K_1$	Dimension coefficient in Penman-Monteith equation
$K_{bnkfull}$	Storage time constant calculated for the reach segment with bankfull flows (s)
$K_{bz}$	Biozone hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
$K_{ch}$	Effective hydraulic conductivity of the channel alluvium (mm/hr)
$K_{CH}$	Channel erodibility factor
$K_d$	Pesticide partition coefficient (m <sup>3</sup> /g)
$K_D$	Linear distribution coefficient (L/kg).
$K_e$	Effective hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
$K_g$	Mass-transfer velocity in the gaseous laminar layer (m/day)
$K_l$	Mass-transfer velocity in the liquid laminar layer (m/day)
$K_k$	First order reaction rate (1/day)
$K_{1,k}$	Reaction rate calibration parameter for each constituent $k$ (m <sup>3</sup> /kg)
$K_L$	Half-saturation coefficient for light (MJ/m <sup>2</sup> -hr)
$K_{l,O_2}$	Oxygen transfer coefficient (m/day)
$K_N$	Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for nitrogen (mg N/L)
$K_{oc}$	Soil adsorption coefficient normalized for soil organic carbon content (ml/g or (mg/kg)/(mg/L) or L/kg)
$K_p$	Soil adsorption coefficient ((mg/kg)/(mg/L))
$K_P$	Michaelis-Menton half-saturation constant for phosphorus (mg P/L)
$K_{sat}$	Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
$K_{USLE}$	USLE soil erodibility factor (0.013 metric ton m <sup>2</sup> hr/(m <sup>3</sup> -metric ton cm))
$L$	Channel length from the most distant point to the subbasin outlet (km)
$L_c$	Average flow channel length for the subbasin (km)
$L_{cen}$	Distance along the channel to the subbasin centroid (km)
$L_{ch}$	Length of main channel (km)
$L_{gw}$	Distance from the ridge or subbasin divide for the groundwater system to the main channel (m)
$L_{hill}$	Hillslope length (m)
$L_{slp}$	Subbasin slope length (m)
$LAI$	Leaf area index of the canopy
$LAI_{evap}$	Leaf area index at which no evaporation occurs from the water surface
$LAI_{mx}$	Maximum leaf area index for the plant
$LS_{USLE}$	USLE topographic factor
$M$	Particle-size parameter for estimation of USLE K factor
$M_0$	3 × 3 matrix of correlation coefficients between maximum temperature, minimum temperature and solar radiation on same day
$M_1$	3 × 3 matrix of correlation coefficients between maximum temperature, minimum temperature and solar radiation on consecutive days

$M_C, M_N, M_P$	manure organic C, N, and P mass
$M_{CN}, M_{CP}$	manure C:N and C:P ratios
$M_{flowin}$	Mass of nutrient entering water body on the given day (kg)
$M_{initial}$	Initial mass of nutrient in water body for the given day (kg)
$MIN_{MN}$	net mineralization rates from decomposing manure
$MIN_{RN}$	net mineralization rates from decomposing residues
$M_S$	Mass of the solids (Mg)
$M_{sed}$	Mass of solid phase in the sediment layer (g)
$M_{settling}$	Mass of nutrient lost via settling on a given day (kg)
$M_{stored}$	Mass of nutrient in water body at end of previous day (kg)
$MW$	Molecular weight of the pesticide compound
$N$	Time lapsed since the start of the recession (days)
$N_{actualup,ly}$	Actual nitrogen uptake for layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{dec,ly}$	Nitrogen decomposed from the fresh organic N pool (kg N/ha)
$N_{demand}$	Nitrogen uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers (kg N/ha)
$N_{denit,ly}$	Amount of nitrogen lost to denitrification (kg N/ha)
$N_{evap}$	Amount of nitrate moving from the first soil layer to the soil surface zone (kg N/ha)
$N_{fix}$	Amount of nitrogen added to the plant biomass by fixation (kg N/ha)
$N_{min}$	mineral N in the soil layer
$N_{mina,ly}$	Nitrogen mineralized from the humus active organic N pool (kg N/ha)
$N_{minf,ly}$	Nitrogen mineralized from the fresh organic N pool (kg N/ha)
$N_{nitr,ly}$	Amount of nitrogen converted from $\text{NH}_4^+$ to $\text{NO}_3^-$ in layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{nit vol,ly}$	Amount of ammonium converted via nitrification and volatilization in layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{rain}$	Nitrate added by rainfall (kg N/ha)
$N_{trns,ly}$	Amount of nitrogen transferred between the active and stable organic pools (kg N/ha)
$N_{up}$	Potential nitrogen uptake (kg N/ha)
$N_{up,ly}$	Potential nitrogen uptake for layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{up,z}$	Potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to depth $z$ (kg N/ha)
$N_{up,zl}$	Potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to the lower boundary of the soil layer (kg N/ha)
$N_{up,zu}$	Potential nitrogen uptake from the soil surface to the upper boundary of the soil layer (kg N/ha)
$N_{vol,ly}$	Amount of nitrogen converted from $\text{NH}_4^+$ to $\text{NH}_3$ in layer $ly$ (kg N/ha)
$ND_{targ}$	Number of days required for the reservoir to reach target storage
$NH4$	Ammonium content of the soil profile (kg $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}/\text{ha}$ )
$NH4_{drydep}$	Daily ammonium dry deposition rate (kg/ha)
$NH4_{rain}$	Ammonium added by rainfall (kg N/ha)
$NH4_{fert}$	Amount of ammonium added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha)
$NH4_{ly}$	Ammonium content of layer $ly$ (kg $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}/\text{ha}$ )
$NH4_{str}$	Ammonium concentration in the stream (mg N/L)
$NO2_{str}$	Nitrite concentration in the stream (mg N/L)
$NO3$	Nitrate content of the soil profile (kg $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}/\text{ha}$ )
$NO3_{drydep}$	Daily nitrate dry deposition rate (kg/ha)

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| $NO3_{conc,z}$      | Concentration of nitrate in the soil at depth $z$ (mg/kg or ppm)                           |
| $NO3_{dp}$          | Amount of nitrate in recharge entering the deep aquifer (kg N/ha)                          |
| $NO3_{fert}$        | Amount of nitrate added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha)                            |
| $NO3_{gw}$          | Amount of nitrate in groundwater flow from the shallow aquifer (kg N/ha)                   |
| $NO3'_{lat}$        | Amount of lateral flow nitrate generated in HRU on a given day (kg N/ha)                   |
| $NO3_{lat,ly}$      | Nitrate removed in lateral flow from a layer (kg N/ha)                                     |
| $NO3_{latstor,i-1}$ | Lateral flow nitrate stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha)                      |
| $NO3_{ly}$          | Nitrate content of soil layer $ly$ (kg $NO_3$ -N/ha)                                       |
| $NO3_{perc}$        | Total amount of nitrate exiting the bottom of the soil profile (kg N/ha)                   |
| $NO3_{perc,ly}$     | Nitrate moved to the underlying layer by percolation (kg N/ha)                             |
| $NO3_{rain}$        | Nitrate added by rainfall (kg N/ha)  |
| $NO3_{rchrg}$       | Amount of nitrate in recharge entering the aquifers (kg N/ha)                              |
| $NO3_{revap}$       | Amount of nitrate in revap to the soil profile from the shallow aquifer (kg N/ha)          |
| $NO3_{sh}$          | Amount of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (kg N/ha)   |
| $NO3_{str}$         | Nitrate concentration in the stream (mg N/L)   |
| $NO3_{surf}$        | Nitrate removed in surface runoff (kg N/ha)  |
| $NO3'_{surf}$       | Amount of surface runoff nitrate generated in HRU on a given day (kg N/ha)                 |
| $NO3_{surstor,i-1}$ | Surface runoff nitrate stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha)                    |
| $NN_R$              | Nitrate nitrogen reduction (%)   |
| $OM$                | Percent organic matter (%)   |
| $Ox_{sat}$          | Saturation oxygen concentration (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)                                     |
| $Ox_{str}$          | Dissolved oxygen concentration in the stream (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)                        |
| $Ox_{surf}$         | Dissolved oxygen concentration in surface runoff (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)                    |
| $P$                 | Atmospheric pressure (kPa)   |
| $P_{actualup,ly}$   | Actual phosphorus uptake for layer $ly$ (kg P/ha)  |
| $P_{act sta,ly}$    | Amount of phosphorus transferred between the active and stable mineral pools<br>(kg P/ha)  |
| $P_{ch}$            | Wetted perimeter for a given depth of flow (m)   |
| $P_{dec,ly}$        | Phosphorus decomposed from the fresh organic P pool (kg P/ha)                              |
| $P_{demand}$        | Phosphorus uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers (kg P/ha)                        |
| $P_i(D/D)$          | Probability of a dry day on day $i$ given a dry day on day $i - 1$                         |
| $P_i(D/W)$          | Probability of a dry day on day $i$ given a wet day on day $i - 1$                         |
| $P_i(W/D)$          | Probability of a wet day on day $i$ given a dry day on day $i - 1$                         |
| $P_i(W/W)$          | Probability of a wet day on day $i$ given a wet day on day $i - 1$                         |
| $P_{mina,ly}$       | Phosphorus mineralized from the humus active organic P pool (kg P/ha)                      |
| $P_{minf,ly}$       | Phosphorus mineralized from the fresh organic P pool (kg P/ha),                            |
| $P_{perc}$          | Amount of phosphorus moving from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer (kg P/ha)         |
| $P_{solution,fert}$ | Amount of phosphorus in the solution pool added to the soil in the fertilizer<br>(kg P/ha) |
| $P_{solution,ly}$   | Phosphorus content of soil solution in layer $ly$ (kg P/ha)                                |
| $P_{sol act,ly}$    | Amount of phosphorus transferred between the soluble and active mineral pool<br>(kg P/ha)  |
| $P_{stor,i-1}$      | Solution P loading stored or lagged from the previous day (kg P/ha)                        |
| $P_{surf}$          | Amount of soluble phosphorus lost in surface runoff (kg P/ha)                              |

$P'_{surf}$	Amount of solution P loading generated in HRU on a given day (kg P/ha)
$P_{up}$	Potential phosphorus uptake (kg P/ha)
$P_{up,ly}$	Potential phosphorus uptake for layer $ly$ (kg P/ha)
$P_{up,z}$	Potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to depth $z$ (kg P/ha)
$P_{up,zl}$	Potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to the lower boundary of the soil layer (kg P/ha)
$P_{up,zu}$	Potential phosphorus uptake from the soil surface to the upper boundary of the soil layer (kg P/ha)
$P_{USLE}$	USLE support practice factor
$POR$	Porosity of the soil profile (mm)
$PHU$	Potential heat units or total heat units required for plant maturity where base temperature is dependant on the plant species (heat units)
$PHU_0$	Total base zero heat units or potential base zero heat units (heat units)
$Q$	Volumetric flow rate for water exiting water body ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/\text{day}$ )
$Q_{gw}$	Groundwater flow, or base flow, into the main channel ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$Q_{gw,0}$	Groundwater flow at the start of the recession ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$Q_{gw,N}$	Groundwater flow on day $N$ ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$Q_{lat}$	Lateral flow; water discharged from the hillslope outlet ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}/\text{day}$ )
$Q_{latstor,i-1}$	Lateral flow stored or lagged from the previous day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$Q_{stor}$	Surface runoff stored or lagged ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$Q_{surf}$	Surface runoff on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$Q_{STE}$	flow rate of STE ( $\text{m}^3/\text{day}$ )
$R$	Universal gas constant ( $8.206 \times 10^{-5} \text{ atm m}^3 (\text{K mole})^{-1}$ )
$R_{0.5sm}$	Smoothed maximum half-hour rainfall for a given month ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_{0.5x}$	Extreme maximum half-hour rainfall for the specified month ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_{At}$	Amount of rain falling during the time step ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_{band}$	Precipitation falling in the elevation band ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_C, R_N, R_P$	residue organic C, N, and P mass
$R_{CN}, R_{CP}$	residue C:N and C:P ratios
$R_{ch}$	Hydraulic radius for a given depth of flow (m)
$R_{day}$	Amount of rainfall on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R'_{day}$	Amount of precipitation on a given day before canopy interception is removed ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_h$	Average relative humidity for the day
$R_{hDmon}$	Average relative humidity of the month on dry days
$R_{hLmon}$	Smallest relative humidity value that can be generated on a given day in the month
$R_{hmon}$	Average relative humidity for the month
$R_{hmon,mean}$	Mean of $R_{hLmon}$ , $R_{hmon}$ , and $R_{hUmon}$
$R_{hUmon}$	Largest relative humidity value that can be generated on a given day in the month
$R_{hwmon}$	Average relative humidity for the month on wet days
$R_{INT}$	Amount of free water held in the canopy on a given day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$R_L$	Runoff loading (mm)
$R_{mort}$	Amount of mortality of bacteria (kg/ha)
$R_{NO3}$	Concentration of nitrogen in the rain (mg N/L)
$R_R$	Runoff reduction (%)

$R_{resp}$	Amount of respiration of bacteria (kg/ha)
$R_{slough}$	Amount of sloughed off bacteria (kg/ha).
$R_{tc}$	Amount of rain falling during the time of concentration (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$RUE$	Radiation-use efficiency of the plant (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$RUE_{amb}$	Radiation-use efficiency of the plant at ambient atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$RUE_{hi}$	Radiation-use efficiency of the plant at the elevated atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration, CO <sub>2hi</sub> , (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$RUE_{vpd=1}$	Radiation-use efficiency for the plant at a vapor pressure deficit of 1 kPa (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> or 10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)
$S$	Retention parameter in SCS curve number equation (mm)
$S_3$	Retention parameter for the moisture condition III curve number
$S$	Mass of solute sorbed per unit dry weight of solid (mg/kg)
$S_C, S_N, S_P$	Soil organic carbon C, N, and P mass
$S_{CN}, S_{CP}$	Soil organic C:N and C:P ratios
$Scap$	Sediment transport capacity in (mg/m <sup>3</sup> )
$Spcon$	Sediment transport coefficient and v is flow velocity in the waterway (m/s)
$SolR$	Soluble pollutant removal (%)
$SD$	Runoff depth over unsubmerged waterway area in (mm/day)
$SolK$	Saturated hydrologic conductivity of the soil surface (mm/hr)
$SedR$	Sediment and particulate pollutant removal (%)
$SedL$	Sediment load per unit area of unsubmerged waterway in (kg/ha/day).
$S_{frz}$	Retention parameter adjusted for frozen conditions (mm)
$S_L$	Sediment loading (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )
$S_{max}$	Maximum value the retention parameter can achieve on any given day (mm)
$S_{prev}$	Retention parameter in SCS curve number equation from previous day (mm)
$S_R$	Sediment reduction (%)
$S_x$	Reference or saturation soil organic C mass
$SA$	Surface area of the water body (m <sup>2</sup> )
$SA_{em}$	Surface area of the reservoir/pond when filled to the emergency spillway (ha)
$SA_{mx}$	Surface area of the wetland when filled to the maximum water level (ha)
$SA_{nor}$	Surface area of the wetland when filled to the normal water level (ha)
$SA_{pr}$	Surface area of the reservoir/pond when filled to the principal spillway (ha)
$SAT$	Amount of water in the soil profile when completely saturated (mm H <sub>2</sub> O),
$SAT_{ly}$	Amount of water in the soil layer when completely saturated (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SC$	Storage coefficient for variable storage flow routing
$SD$	Secchi-disk depth (m)
$SD_{co}$	User-defined coefficient to adjust predicted secchi-disk depth
$SED$	Solid build up (kg/curb km)
$SED_{mx}$	Maximum accumulation of solids possible for the urban land type (kg/curb km)
$SND_{day}$	Standard normal deviate for the day
$SNO$	Water content of snow cover on current day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SNO_{100}$	Amount of snow above which there is 100% cover (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SNO_{mlt}$	Amount of snow melt on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SW$	Amount of water in soil profile (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$SW_{ly}$	Soil water content of layer ly (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)

$SW_{ly,excess}$	Drainable volume of water stored layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$T$	Time since the beginning of the storm (hr)
$T_{bare}$	Temperature of soil surface with no cover (°C)
$T_{base}$	Plant's base or minimum temperature for growth (°C)
$T_{dur}$	Duration of the storm (hr)
$T_{DL}$	Daylength (h)
$T_{DL,mn}$	Minimum daylength for the watershed during the year (hrs)
$T_{DL,thr}$	Threshold daylength to initiate dormancy (hrs)
$T_{hr}$	Air temperature during hour (°C)
$T_K$	Mean air temperature in Kelvin (273.15 + °C)
$T_{mlt}$	Threshold temperature for snow melt (°C)
$T_{mn}$	Minimum air temperature for day (°C)
$T_{mn,band}$	Minimum daily temperature in the elevation band (°C)
$T_{mx}$	Maximum air temperature for day (°C)
$T_{mx,band}$	Maximum daily temperature in the elevation band (°C)
$T_{opt}$	Plant's optimal temperature for growth (°C)
$T_{peak}$	Time from the beginning of the storm till the peak rainfall intensity occurs (hr)
$T_{s-r}$	Rain/snow boundary temperature (°C)
$T_{snow}$	Snow pack temperature on a given day (°C)
$T_{soil}$	Soil temperature (°C)
$T_{soil,ly}$	Temperature of layer ly (°C)
$T_{SR}$	Time of sunrise in solar day (h)
$T_{SS}$	Time of sunset in solar day (h)
$T_{ssurf}$	Soil surface temperature (°C)
$T_{wat,K}$	Water temperature in Kelvin (273.15+°C)
$T_{water}$	Average daily water temperature (°C)
$\bar{T}_{AA}$	Average annual soil temperature (°C)
$\bar{T}_{AAair}$	Average annual air temperature (°C)
$\bar{T}_{av}$	Mean air temperature for day (°C)
$\bar{T}_{av,band}$	Mean daily temperature in the elevation band (°C)
$\bar{T}_{water}$	Average water temperature (°C)
$TN$	Total Kjeldahl nitrogen load (moles)
$TN_R$	Total nitrogen reduction (%)
$TP$	Total phosphorus load (moles)
$TP_R$	Total phosphorus reduction (%)
$TT$	Travel time (s)
$TS$	Total solids contained in STE (mg/l)
$TT_{lag}$	Lateral flow travel time (days)
$TT_{perc}$	Travel time for percolation (hrs)
$V$	Volume of water in water body (m <sup>3</sup> H <sub>2</sub> O)
$V_A$	Volume of air (m <sup>3</sup> )
$V_{bnk}$	Volume of water added to the reach via return flow from bank storage (m <sup>3</sup> H <sub>2</sub> O)
$V_{ch}$	Volume of water stored in the channel (m <sup>3</sup> )

$V_{em}$	Volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the emergency spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{evap}$	Volume of water removed from the water body by evaporation during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{flowin}$	Volume of water entering water body on given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{flowout}$	Volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V'_{flowout}$	Initial estimate of the volume of water flowing out of the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{in}$	Volume of inflow during the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{initial}$	Initial volume of water in water body on given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{mx}$	Volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the maximum water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{nor}$	Volume of water held in the wetland when filled to the normal water level ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{out}$	Volume of outflow during the time step ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{pcp}$	Volume of precipitation falling on the water body during the day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{pot,mx}$	Maximum amount of water that can be stored in the pothole ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{pr}$	Volume of water held in the reservoir when filled to the principal spillway ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_S$	Volume of solids ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{sed}$	Volume of solids in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{seep}$	Volume of water lost from the water body by seepage ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{stored}$	Volume of water stored in water body or channel ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_T$	Total soil volume ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{targ}$	Target reservoir volume for a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$V_{tot}$	Total volume of the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_W$	Volume of water ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$V_{wtr}$	Volume of water in the sediment layer ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$W$	Width of channel at water level (m)
$W(t)$	Rate of nutrient loading (kg/day)
$W_{bnkfull}$	Top width of the channel when filled with water (m)
$W_{btm}$	Bottom width of the channel (m)
$W_{btm,fld}$	Bottom width of the flood plain (m)
$WP$	Water content at wilting point (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$WP_{ly}$	Water content of layer $ly$ at wilting point (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$X$	Weighting factor in Muskingum routing
$Y$	Total constituent load (kg)
$Y_{sed}$	Cumulative amount of solids washed off at time $t$ (kg/curb km)
$Z_l$	Soil layer thickness
$a$	Constant in equation used to calculate the cloud cover adjustment factor
$a_1$	Constant in equation used to calculate net emissivity
$a_r$	Unit channel regression intercept ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$a_x$	Regression intercept for a channel of length $L$ and width $W$ ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$aa$	Exponent between 0 and 1 that varies with atmospheric stability and surface roughness that is used in calculating wind speed at different heights

$adj_{0.5\alpha}$	Peak rate adjustment factor
$adj_{hmd}$	Change in relative humidity expressed as a fraction
$adj_{pcp}$	% change in rainfall
$adj_{rad}$	Change in radiation ( $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$adj_{tmp}$	Change in temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$algae$	Algal biomass concentration (mg alg/L)
$ap_{ef}$	Pesticide application efficiency
$aq_{dp}$	Amount of water stored in the deep aquifer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$aq_{sh}$	Amount of water stored in the shallow aquifer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$aq_{shthr,q}$	Threshold water level in shallow aquifer for base flow (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$area_{hru}$	HRU area (ha or km <sup>2</sup> )
$b$	Constant in equation used to calculate the cloud cover adjustment factor
$b_1$	Constant in equation used to calculate net emissivity
$b_H$	Scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in relative humidity caused by the presence or absence of precipitation
$b_{mlt}$	Melt factor for the day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$b_{mlt6}$	Melt factor for June 21 (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$b_{mlt12}$	Melt factor for December 21 (mm H <sub>2</sub> O/day- $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$b_r$	Unit channel regression slope
$b_R$	Scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in solar radiation caused by the presence or absence of precipitation
$b_T$	Scaling factor that controls the degree of deviation in temperature caused by the presence or absence of precipitation
$b_x$	Regression slope for a channel of length $L$ and width $W$
$bact_{lp,fol}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria attached to the foliage (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,perc}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria transported from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,prch}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria present in the reach (#cfu/100mL)
$bact_{lp,pres}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria present in the reservoir (#cfu/100mL)
$bact'_{lp,sed}$	Amount of sediment-attached less persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,sed}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria transported with sediment in surface runoff (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,sestor,i-1}$	Sediment-attached less persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,spsol}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria present in soil solution (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,spsorb}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria in the sorbed pool (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact'_{lp,surf}$	Amount of surface runoff less persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,surf}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria lost in surface runoff (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,surstor,i-1}$	Surface runoff less persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{lp,wsh}$	Amount of less persistent bacteria on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day (# cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )
$bact_{min}$	Minimum daily loss of bacteria (#cfu/m <sup>2</sup> )

- $bact_{p,fol}$  Amount of persistent bacteria attached to the foliage (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{p,perc}$  Amount of persistent bacteria transported from the top 10 mm into the first soil layer (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{prch}$  Amount of persistent bacteria present in the reach (#cfu/100mL)  
 $bact_{pres}$  Amount of persistent bacteria present in the reservoir (#cfu/100mL)  
 $bact'_{p,sed}$  Amount of sediment-attached persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{p,sed}$  Amount of persistent bacteria transported with sediment in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{p,sedstor,i-1}$  Sediment-attached persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{psol}$  Amount of persistent bacteria in the solution pool (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{psorb}$  Amount of persistent bacteria in the sorbed pool (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact'_{p,surf}$  Amount of surface runoff persistent bacteria generated in the HRU on a given day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{p,surf}$  Amount of persistent bacteria lost in surface runoff (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{p,surstor,i-1}$  Surface runoff persistent bacteria stored or lagged from the previous day (#cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bact_{p,wsh}$  Amount of persistent bacteria on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day (# cfu/m<sup>2</sup>)  
 $bcv$  Weighting factor for impact of ground cover on soil surface temperature  
 $bio$  Total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)  
 $bio_{ag}$  Aboveground biomass on the day of harvest (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)  
 $bio_{annual}$  The amount of biomass a tree can accumulate in a single year (kg/ha)  
 $bio_{fulldev}$  The biomass of a fully developed tree stand for the specific tree species (metric tons/ha)  
 $bio_N$  Actual mass of nitrogen stored in plant material (kg N/ha)  
 $bio_{N,opt}$  Optimal mass of nitrogen stored in plant material for the growth stage (kg N/ha)  
 $bio_P$  Actual mass of phosphorus stored in plant material (kg P/ha)  
 $bio_{P,opt}$  Optimal mass of phosphorus stored in plant material for the current growth stage (kg P/ha)  
 $bio_{trg}$  Target biomass specified by the user (kg/ha)  
 $bnk$  Total amount of water in bank storage (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $bnk_{in}$  Amount of water entering bank storage (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $bnk_{revap,mx}$  Maximum amount of water moving into the unsaturated zone in response to water deficiencies (m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $c$  Concentration of nutrient in the water (kg/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $c_k$  Celerity corresponding to the flow for a specified depth (m/s)  
 $c_p$  Specific heat of moist air at constant pressure ( $1.013 \times 10^{-3}$  MJ kg<sup>-1</sup> °C<sup>-1</sup>)  
 $c_{perm}$  Profile-permeability class  
 $c_{soilstr}$  Soil-structure code used in soil classification  
 $c_{sp}$  Coefficient in sediment transport equation  
 $can_{day}$  Maximum amount of water that can be trapped in the canopy on a given day (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $can_{mx}$  Maximum amount of water that can be trapped in the canopy when the canopy is fully developed (mm H<sub>2</sub>O)

- $cbod$  Carbonaceous biological oxygen demand concentration (mg CBOD/L)  
 $cbod_{surf}$  CBOD concentration in surface runoff (mg CBOD/L)  
 $chl_a$  Chlorophyll *a* concentration ( $\mu\text{g chla/L}$ )  
 $cnccoef$  Weighting coefficient used to calculate the retention coefficient for daily curve number calculations dependent on plant evapotranspiration  
 $coef_1$  Weighting coefficient for storage time constant calculation  
 $coef_2$  Weighting coefficient for storage time constant calculation  
 $coef_a$  Empirical water quality factor  
 $coef_b$  Empirical dam aeration coefficient  
 $coef_{crk}$  Adjustment coefficient for crack flow  
 $coef_{ev}$  Evaporation coefficient  
 $conc_N$  Concentration of nitrogen in a layer (mg/kg or ppm)  
 $conc_{NO_3, mobile}$  Concentration of nitrate in the mobile water for a given layer (kg N/mm H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $conc_{orgN}$  Concentration of organic nitrogen in the soil surface top 10 mm (g N/ metric ton soil)  
 $conc_P$  Concentration of phosphorus in a layer (mg/kg or ppm)  
 $conc_{pst,flow}$  Concentration of pesticide in the mobile water (kg pst/ha-mm H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $conc_{sed}$  Concentration of sediment in lateral and groundwater flow (mg/L)  
 $conc_{sed}^*$  “Concentration” of solid particles in the sediment layer (g/m<sup>3</sup>)  
 $conc_{sed, ch, i}$  Initial sediment concentration in the reach (kg/L or ton/m<sup>3</sup>)  
 $conc_{sed, ch, mx}$  Maximum concentration of sediment that can be transported by the water (kg/L or ton/m<sup>3</sup>)  
 $conc_{sed, eq}$  Equilibrium concentration of suspended solids in the water body (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>)  
 $conc_{sedlpbact}$  Concentration of less persistent bacteria attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (# cfu/ metric ton soil)  
 $conc_{sedpbact}$  Concentration of persistent bacteria attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (# cfu/ metric ton soil)  
 $conc_{sed, surf}$  Concentration of sediment in surface runoff (Mg sed/m<sup>3</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O)  
 $conc_{sedP}$  Concentration of phosphorus attached to sediment in the top 10 mm (g P/ metric ton soil)  
 $cov_1$  Snow cover areal depletion curve shape coefficient  
 $cov_2$  Snow cover areal depletion curve shape coefficient  
 $cov_{sol}$  Soil cover index  
 $crk$  Total crack volume for the soil profile on a given day (mm)  
 $crk_{ly}$  Crack volume for the soil layer on a given day expressed as a depth (mm)  
 $crk_{ly, d-1}$  Crack volume for the soil layer on the previous day (mm)  
 $crk_{ly, i}$  Initial crack volume calculated for the soil layer on a given day expressed as a depth (mm)  
 $crk_{max}$  Potential crack volume for the soil profile expressed as a fraction of the total volume  
 $crk_{max, ly}$  Maximum crack volume possible for the soil layer (mm)  
 $d$  Zero plane displacement of the wind profile (cm)  
 $d_1$  Equation coefficient for normalized rainfall intensity distribution before peak intensity is reached

$d_2$	Equation coefficient for normalized rainfall intensity distribution after peak intensity is reached
$d_{50}$	Median particle size of the inflow sediment ( $\mu\text{m}$ )
$d_n$	Day number of year, 1 on January 1 and 365 on December 31
$days_{dry}$	Number of dry days in the month
$days_{pcp,yr}$	Average number of days of precipitation in the subbasin in a year
$days_{tot}$	Total number of days in the month
$days_{wet}$	Number of wet days in the month
$dd$	Damping depth (mm)
$dd_{max}$	Maximum damping depth (mm)
$depth$	Depth of water in the channel (m)
$depth_{bnkfull}$	Depth of water in the channel when filled to the top of the bank (m)
$depth_{dcut}$	Amount of downcutting (m)
$depth_{diff}$	Distance from the bottom of the soil profile to the impervious layer (m)
$depth_{fld}$	Depth of water in the flood plain (m)
$depth_{imp}$	Depth to the impervious layer (mm)
$depth_{ly}$	Depth of the soil layer (mm)
$df$	Depth factor used in soil temperature calculations
$div$	Volume of water added or removed from the reach for the day through diversions ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$dt$	Length of time step (1 day)
$dur_{flw}$	Duration of flow (hr)
$e$	Actual vapor pressure on a given day (kPa)
$e_{mon}$	Actual vapor pressure at the mean monthly temperature (kPa)
$e^o$	Saturation vapor pressure on a given day (kPa)
$e_{mon}^o$	Saturation vapor pressure at the mean monthly temperature (kPa)
$epco$	Plant uptake compensation factor
$esco$	Soil evaporation compensation coefficient
$expsa$	Exponent for impoundment surface area calculation
$f$	Coefficient
$f_{cl-si}$	Factor that gives low soil erodibility factors for soils with high clay to silt ratios
$f_{cld}$	Factor to adjust for cloud cover in net long-wave radiation calculation
$f_{cm}$	Cumulative $f_{mix}$
$f_{csand}$	Factor that gives low soil erodibility factors for soils with high coarse-sand contents and high values for soils with little sand
$f_E$	Combined effect of soil temperature, moisture, and aeration on soil organic matter, residue, and manure decomposition
$f_{gr}$	Growth stage factor in nitrogen fixation equation
$f_{hisand}$	Factor that reduces soil erodibility for soils with extremely high sand contents
$f_{inf}$	Infiltration rate (mm/hr)
$f_{mix}$	Mixing coefficient associated to different tillage tools
$f_{NH4}$	Preference factor for ammonia nitrogen
$f_{no3}$	Soil nitrate factor in nitrogen fixation equation
$f_o$	Aeration factor controlling soil organic matter, residue, and manure decomposition
$f_{orgc}$	Factor that reduces soil erodibility for soils with high organic carbon content

$f_{sw}$	Soil water factor in nitrogen fixation equation
$f_T$	Temperature factor controlling soil organic matter, residue, and manure decomposition
$f_{tool}$	Tillage factor controlling soil organic matter decomposition rate
$f_W$	Moisture factor controlling soil organic matter, residue, and manure decomposition
$fert$	Amount of fertilizer applied (kg/ha)
$fert_{eff}$	Fertilizer application efficiency assigned by the user
$fert_{lpbact}$	Concentration of less persistent bacteria in the fertilizer (# cfu/g manure)
$fert_{minN}$	Fraction of mineral nitrogen in the fertilizer
$fert_{minP}$	Fraction of mineral P in the fertilizer
$fert_{NH4}$	Fraction of mineral N in the fertilizer that is ammonium
$fert_{orgN}$	Fraction of organic N in the fertilizer
$fert_{orgP}$	Fraction of organic P in the fertilizer
$fert_{pbact}$	Concentration of persistent bacteria in the fertilizer (# cfu/g manure)
$fr_{active}$	Fraction of the manure containing active colony forming units
$fr_{actN}$	Fraction of humic nitrogen in the active pool
$fr_{av}$	Fraction of the curb length available for sweeping (the availability factor)
$fr_{bnd}$	Fraction of subbasin area within the elevation band
$fr_{DL}$	Fraction of daylight hours
$fr_{g,mx}$	Fraction of the maximum stomatal conductance, $g_{\ell,mx}$ , achieved at the vapor pressure deficit, $vpd_f$
$fr_{imp}$	Fraction of the subbasin area draining into the impoundment
$fr_{LAI,1}$	Fraction of the maximum plant leaf area index corresponding to the 1 <sup>st</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve
$fr_{LAI,2}$	Fraction of the maximum plant leaf area index corresponding to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve
$fr_{LAImx}$	Fraction of the plant's maximum leaf area index corresponding to a given fraction of potential heat units for the plant
$fr_N$	Optimal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass for current growth stage
$fr_{N,1}$	Normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at emergence
$fr_{N,2}$	Normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at 50% maturity
$fr_{N,3}$	Normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass at maturity
$fr_{N,\sim 3}$	Normal fraction of nitrogen in the plant biomass near maturity
$fr_{N,yld}$	Fraction of nitrogen in the yield
$fr_{NH4}$	Fraction of algal nitrogen uptake from ammonium pool,
$fr_{nit,ly}$	Estimated fraction of nitrogen lost by nitrification
$fr_P$	Fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass
$fr_{P,1}$	Normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at emergence
$fr_{P,2}$	Normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at 50% maturity
$fr_{P,3}$	Normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass at maturity
$fr_{P,\sim 3}$	Normal fraction of phosphorus in the plant biomass near maturity
$fr_{P,yld}$	Fraction of phosphorus in the yield
$fr_{phosyn}$	Fraction of solar radiation that is photosynthetically active
$fr_{PHU}$	Fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant on a given day in the growing season

$fr_{PHU,1}$	Fraction of the growing season corresponding to the 1 <sup>st</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve
$fr_{PHU,2}$	Fraction of the growing season corresponding to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> point on the optimal leaf area development curve
$fr_{PHU,50\%}$	Fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant at 50% maturity ( $fr_{PHU,50\%}=0.5$ )
$fr_{PHU,100\%}$	Fraction of potential heat units accumulated for the plant at maturity ( $fr_{PHU,100\%}=1.0$ )
$fr_{PHU,sen}$	Fraction of growing season at which senescence becomes the dominant growth process
$fr_{pot}$	Fraction of the HRU area draining into the pothole
$fr_{root}$	Fraction of total biomass in the roots on a given day in the growing season
$fr_{trns}$	Fraction of transmission losses partitioned to the deep aquifer
$fr_{vol,ly}$	Estimated fraction of nitrogen lost by volatilization
$fr_{wsh}$	Wash-off fraction for the pesticide
$fr_{wsh,lp}$	Wash-off fraction for the less persistent bacteria
$fr_{wsh,p}$	Wash-off fraction for the persistent bacteria
$fr_{\Delta t}$	Fraction of the time step in which water is flowing in the channel
$g$	Exponent
$g_\ell$	Leaf conductance ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$g_{\ell,mx}$	Maximum conductance of a single leaf ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$g_{mon}$	Skew coefficient for daily precipitation in the month
$gc$	Fraction of the ground surface covered by plants
$h_c$	Canopy height (cm)
$h_{c,mx}$	Plant's maximum canopy height (m)
$h_{drain}$	Height of the tile drain above the impervious zone (mm)
$h_{fall}$	Height through which water falls (m)
$h_{wtbl}$	Water table height (m)
$harv_{eff}$	Efficiency of the harvest operation
$hr$	Hour of day (1-24)
$h_R, h_M$	Humification coefficient of residue and manure
$i$	Rainfall intensity (mm/hr)
$i_{mx}$	Maximum rainfall intensity (mm/hr)
$imp_{con}$	Fraction of the HRU area that is impervious and hydraulically connected to the drainage system
$imp_{dcon}$	Fraction of the HRU area that is impervious but not hydraulically connected to the drainage system
$imp_{tot}$	Fraction of the HRU area that is impervious (both connected and disconnected)
$irr$	Amount of irrigation water added on a given day ( $\text{m}^3 \text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$I_{RC}, I_{MC}$	Input of organic C through residue and manure
$\hat{i}$	Normalized rainfall intensity at time $\hat{t}$
$\hat{i}_{mx}$	Normalized maximum or peak rainfall intensity during the storm
$k$	Von Kármán constant
$k_{bact}$	Bacterial partition coefficient
$k_{bact,perc}$	Bacteria percolation coefficient ( $10 \text{ m}^3/\text{Mg}$ )

$k_{bact,surf}$	Bacteria soil partitioning coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{Mg}$ )
$k_{d,perc}$	Phosphorus percolation coefficient ( $10 \text{ m}^3/\text{Mg}$ )
$k_{d,surf}$	Phosphorus soil partitioning coefficient ( $\text{m}^3/\text{Mg}$ )
$k_i$	Decay constant for rainfall intensity (hr)
$k_\ell$	Light extinction coefficient
$k_{\ell,0}$	Non-algal portion of the light extinction coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1}$ )
$k_{\ell,1}$	Linear algal self shading coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1} (\mu\text{g-chla/L})^{-1}$ )
$k_{\ell,2}$	Nonlinear algal self shading coefficient ( $\text{m}^{-1} (\mu\text{g-chla/L})^{-2/3}$ )
$k_M$	Optimum manure decomposition rate
$k_{NO3,sh}$	Rate constant for removal of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (1/day)
$k_{p,aq}$	Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the water (1/day)
$k_{p,foliar}$	Rate constant for degradation or removal of the pesticide on foliage (1/day)
$k_{p,sed}$	Rate constant for degradation or removal of pesticide in the sediment (1/day)
$k_{p,soil}$	Rate constant for degradation or removal of the pesticide in soil (1/day)
$k_r$	Decay factor ( $\text{m}^{-1} \text{ km}^{-1}$ )
$k_s$	Sediment settling decay constant (1/day)
$k_x$	Maximum apparent soil organic matter decomposition rate
$kk$	Coefficient in urban wash off equation
$m$	Exponential term in USLE LS factor calculation
$m_c$	Percent clay content
$m_s$	Percent sand content
$m_{silt}$	Percent silt content (0.002-0.05 mm diameter particles)
$m_{vfs}$	Percent very fine sand content (0.05-0.10 mm diameter particles)
$minN_{app}$	Amount of mineral nitrogen applied (kg N/ha)
$minN_{app,mx}$	Maximum amount of mineral N allowed to be applied on any one day (kg N/ha)
$minN_{app,mxyr}$	Maximum amount of mineral N allowed to be applied during a year (kg N/ha)
$minP_{act,ly}$	Amount of phosphorus in the active mineral pool (mg/kg or kg P/ha)
$minP_{sta,ly}$	Amount of phosphorus in the stable mineral pool (mg/kg or kg P/ha)
$mon$	Month of the year
$mon_{fld,beg}$	Beginning month of the flood season
$mon_{fld,end}$	Ending month of the flood season
$n$	Manning's roughness coefficient for the subbasin or channel
$n_1$	First shape coefficient in plant nitrogen equation
$n_2$	Second shape coefficient in plant nitrogen equation
$nstrs$	Nitrogen stress for a given day
$orgC_{ly}$	Amount of organic carbon in the layer (%)
$orgC_{surf}$	Organic carbon in surface runoff (kg orgC),
$orgN_{act,fert}$	Amount of nitrogen in the active organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha)
$orgN_{act,ly}$	Nitrogen in the active organic pool (mg/kg or kg N/ha)
$orgN_{frsh,fert}$	Amount of nitrogen in the fresh organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg N/ha)
$orgN_{frsh,surf}$	Nitrogen in the fresh organic pool in the top 10mm (kg N/ha)

- $orgN_{hum,ly}$  Humic organic nitrogen in the layer (mg/kg or kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{sta,ly}$  Nitrogen in the stable organic pool (mg/kg or kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{stor,i-1}$  Surface runoff organic N stored or lagged from the previous day (kg N/ha)  
 $orgN_{str}$  Organic nitrogen concentration in the stream (mg N/L)  
 $orgN_{surf}$  Amount of organic nitrogen transport to the main channel in surface runoff (kg N/ha)  
 $orgN'_{surf}$  Amount of surface runoff organic N generated in HRU on a given day (kg N/ha)  
 $orgP_{act,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in the active organic pool (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{frsh,fert}$  Amount of phosphorus in the fresh organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{frsh,ly}$  Phosphorus in the fresh organic pool in layer  $ly$  (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{hum,fert}$  Amount of phosphorus in the humus organic pool added to the soil in the fertilizer (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{hum,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in humic organic pool in the layer (mg/kg or kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{sta,ly}$  Amount of phosphorus in the stable organic pool (kg P/ha)  
 $orgP_{str}$  Organic phosphorus concentration in the stream (mg P/L)  
 $p$  Total phosphorus concentration ( $\mu$ g P/L)  
 $p_1$  First shape coefficient in plant phosphorus equation  
 $p_2$  Second shape coefficient in plant phosphorus equation  
 $pai$  Phosphorus availability index  
 $pest$  Actual amount of pesticide applied (kg pst/ha)  
 $pest'$  Effective amount of pesticide applied (kg pst/ha)  
 $pest_{fol}$  Amount of pesticide applied to foliage (kg pst/ha)  
 $pest_{surf}$  Amount of pesticide applied to the soil surface (kg pst/ha)  
 $plaps$  Precipitation lapse rate (mm H<sub>2</sub>O/km)  
 $plaque$  Amount of dead bacteria biomass and residue (kg/ha)  
 $prf$  Peak rate adjustment factor  
 $pst_{bur}$  Amount of pesticide removed via burial (mg pst)  
 $pst_{deg,sed}$  Amount of pesticide removed from the sediment via degradation (mg pst)  
 $pst_{deg,wtr}$  Amount of pesticide removed from the water via degradation (mg pst)  
 $pst_{dif}$  Amount of pesticide transferred between the water and sediment by diffusion (mg pst)  
 $pst_f$  Amount of pesticide on the foliage (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{f,wsh}$  Amount of pesticide on foliage that is washed off the plant and onto the soil surface on a given day (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{flow}$  Amount of pesticide removed in the flow (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{in}$  Pesticide added to the water body via inflow (mg pst)  
 $pst'_{lat}$  Amount of lateral flow soluble pesticide generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{lat,ly}$  Pesticide removed in lateral flow from a layer (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{latstor,i-1}$  Lateral flow pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{lksed}$  Amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst)  
 $pst_{lkwtr}$  Amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst)  
 $pst_{perc,ly}$  Pesticide moved to the underlying layer by percolation (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{rchsed}$  Amount of pesticide in the sediment (mg pst)

- $pst_{rchwtr}$  Amount of pesticide in the water (mg pst)  
 $pst_{rsp,wtr}$  Amount of pesticide removed from sediment via resuspension (mg pst)  
 $pst_{s,ly}$  Amount of pesticide in the soil (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{sed}$  Amount of sorbed pesticide transported to the main channel in surface runoff (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst'_{sed}$  Sorbed pesticide loading generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{sedstor,i-1}$  Sorbed pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{sol}$  Solubility of the pesticide in water (mg/L)  
 $pst_{sol,o}$  Amount of dissolved pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst)  
 $pst_{sorb,o}$  Amount of particulate pesticide removed via outflow (mg pst)  
 $pst_{stl,wtr}$  Amount of pesticide removed from the water due to settling (mg pst)  
 $pst_{surf}$  Pesticide removed in surface runoff (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst'_{surf}$  Amount of surface runoff soluble pesticide generated in HRU on a given day (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{surstor,i-1}$  Surface runoff soluble pesticide stored or lagged from the previous day (kg pst/ha)  
 $pst_{vol,wtr}$  Amount of pesticide removed via volatilization (mg pst)  
 $pstrs$  Phosphorus stress for a given day  
 $q_0^*$  Unit source area flow rate ( $\text{mm hr}^{-1}$ )  
 $q_{ch}$  Average channel flow rate ( $\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$ )  
 $q_{ch}^*$  Average channel flow rate ( $\text{mm hr}^{-1}$ )  
 $q_{ch,pk}$  Peak flow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $q_{in}$  Inflow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $q_{out}$  Outflow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $q_{ov}$  Average overland flow rate ( $\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$ )  
 $q_{peak}$  Peak runoff rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$  or mm/hr)  
 $q_{peak,f}$  Peak rate after transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $q_{peak,i}$  Peak rate before accounting for transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $q_{rel}$  Average daily principal spillway release rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $q_{rel,mn}$  Minimum average daily outflow for the month ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $q_{rel,mx}$  Maximum average daily outflow for the month ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $q_{tile}$  Average daily tile flow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )  
 $r$  Actual earth-sun distance (AU)  
 $r_0$  Mean earth-sun distance, 1 AU  
 $r_1$  First shape coefficient for radiation-use efficiency curve  
 $r_2$  Second shape coefficient for radiation-use efficiency curve  
 $r_a$  Diffusion resistance of the air layer (aerodynamic resistance) ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ )  
 $r_c$  Plant canopy resistance ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ )  
 $r_g$  Gaseous surface renewal rate (1/day)  
 $r_l$  Liquid surface renewal rate (1/day)  
 $r_\ell$  Minimum effective resistance of a single leaf ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ )  
 $r_{\ell-ab}$  Minimum abaxial stomatal leaf resistance ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ )  
 $r_{\ell-ad}$  Minimum adaxial stomatal leaf resistance ( $\text{s m}^{-1}$ )  
 $ratio_{WD}$  Channel width to depth ratio

<i>reff</i>	Removal efficiency of the sweeping equipment
<i>rexp</i>	Exponent for exponential precipitation distribution
<i>rnd</i> <sub>1</sub>	Random number between 0.0 and 1.0
<i>rnd</i> <sub>2</sub>	Random number between 0.0 and 1.0
<i>rock</i>	Percent rock in soil layer (%)
<i>rsd</i> <sub>ly</sub>	Residue in layer <i>ly</i> (kg/ha)
<i>rsd</i> <sub>surf</sub>	Material in the residue pool for the top 10mm of soil on day <i>i</i> (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
<i>sed</i>	Sediment yield on a given day (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>ch</sub>	Amount of suspended sediment in the reach (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>deg</sub>	Amount of sediment reentrained in the reach segment (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>dep</sub>	Amount of sediment deposited in the reach segment (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>flowin</sub>	Amount of sediment added to the water body with inflow (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>flowout</sub>	Amount of sediment transported out of the water body (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>lat</sub>	Sediment loading in lateral and groundwater flow (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>out</sub>	Amount of sediment transported out of the reach (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>stl</sub>	Amount of sediment removed from the water by settling (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>stor,i-1</sub>	Sediment stored or lagged from the previous day (metric tons)
<i>sed</i> <sub>wb</sub>	Sediment in the water body (metric tons)
<i>sedP</i> <sub>stor,i-1</sub>	Sediment-attached P stored or lagged from the previous day (kg P/ha)
<i>sedP</i> <sub>surf</sub>	Amount of phosphorus transported with sediment to the main channel in surface runoff (kg P/ha)
<i>sedP'</i> <sub>surf</sub>	Amount of sediment-attached P loading generated in HRU on a given day (kg P/ha)
<i>slp</i>	Average slope of the subbasin (% or m/m)
<i>slp</i> <sub>ch</sub>	Average channel slope along channel length (m m <sup>-1</sup> )
<i>sno</i> <sub>cov</sub>	Fraction of the HRU area covered by snow
<i>spexp</i>	Exponent in sediment transport equation
<i>starg</i>	Target reservoir volume specified for a given month (m <sup>3</sup> H <sub>2</sub> O)
<i>surlag</i>	Surface runoff lag coefficient
<i>t</i>	Number of hours before (+) or after (-) solar noon
<i>t</i> <sub>1/2,aq</sub>	Aqueous half-life for the pesticide (days)
<i>t</i> <sub>1/2,f</sub>	Half-life of the pesticide on foliage (days)
<i>t</i> <sub>1/2,NO<sub>3</sub>,sh</sub>	Half-life of nitrate in the shallow aquifer (days)
<i>t</i> <sub>1/2,s</sub>	Half-life of the pesticide in the soil (days)
<i>t</i> <sub>1/2,sed</sub>	Sediment half-life for the pesticide (days)
<i>t</i> <sub>half</sub>	Length of time needed for solid build up to increase from 0 kg/curb km to ½ SED <sub>mx</sub> (days)
<i>t</i> <sub>ch</sub>	Time of concentration for channel flow (hr)
<i>t</i> <sub>conc</sub>	Time of concentration for a subbasin (hr)
<i>t</i> <sub>dorm</sub>	Dormancy threshold (hrs)
<i>t</i> <sub>drain</sub>	Time required to drain the soil to field capacity (hrs)
<i>t</i> <sub>i</sub>	Solar time at the midpoint of the hour <i>i</i>
<i>t</i> <sub>ov</sub>	Time of concentration for overland flow (hr)
<i>tile</i> <sub>lag</sub>	Drain tile lag time (hrs).
<i>tile</i> <sub>wtr</sub>	Amount of water removed from the layer on a given day by tile drainage (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)

$tlaps$	Temperature lapse rate ( $^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{km}$ )
$tloss$	Channel transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ H}_2\text{O}$ )
$trap_{ef}$	Fraction of the constituent loading trapped by the filter strip
$trap_{ef,bact}$	Fraction of the bacteria loading trapped by the filter strip
$trap_{ef,sub}$	Fraction of the subsurface flow constituent loading trapped by the filter strip
$tstrs$	Temperature stress for a given day expressed as a fraction of optimal plant growth
$\hat{t}$	Time during the storm expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0)
$\hat{t}_{peak}$	Time from the beginning of the storm till the peak intensity expressed as a fraction of the total storm duration (0.0-1.0)
$\hat{t}_{peak,mean}$	Mean of $\hat{t}_{peakL}$ , $\hat{t}_{peakM}$ , and $\hat{t}_{peakU}$
$\hat{t}_{peakL}$	Minimum time to peak intensity that can be generated
$\hat{t}_{peakM}$	Average time to peak intensity expressed as a fraction of storm duration
$\hat{t}_{peakU}$	Maximum time to peak intensity that can be generated
$u_z$	Wind speed at height $z_w$ ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$u_{z1}$	Wind speed ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) at height $z_1$
$u_{z2}$	Wind speed ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) at height $z_2$
$urb_{coef}$	Wash off coefficient ( $\text{mm}^{-1}$ )
$v_b$	Pesticide burial velocity (m/day)
$v_c$	Average channel velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$v_{ch,pk}$	Peak channel velocity (m/s)
$v_d$	Pesticide rate of diffusion or mixing velocity (m/day)
$v_{lat}$	Velocity of flow at the hillslope outlet ( $\text{mm}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$ )
$v_{ov}$	Overland flow velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$v_p$	Pore velocity in the biozone layer (mm/day)
$v_r$	Pesticide resuspension velocity (m/day)
$v_s$	Pesticide settling velocity (m/day)
$v_{surf}$	Surface runoff flow rate ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )
$v_v$	Pesticide volatilization mass-transfer coefficient (m/day)
$vol_{Qsurf,f}$	Volume of runoff after transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$vol_{Qsurf,i}$	Volume of runoff prior to transmission losses ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$vol_{thr}$	Threshold volume for a channel of length $L$ and width $W$ ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$vpd$	Vapor pressure deficit (kPa)
$vpd_{fr}$	Vapor pressure deficit corresponding to $fr_{g,mx}$ (kPa)
$vpd_{thr}$	Threshold vapor pressure deficit above which a plant will exhibit reduced leaf conductance or reduced radiation-use efficiency (kPa)
$w_1$	Shape coefficient in retention parameter adjustments for soil moisture content
$w_2$	Shape coefficient in retention parameter adjustments for soil moisture content
$w_{actualup}$	Total plant water uptake for the day ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$w_{actualup,ly}$	Actual water uptake for layer $ly$ ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$w_{crk,btm}$	Amount of water flow past the lower boundary of the soil profile due to bypass flow ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )
$w_{deep}$	Amount of water percolating from the shallow aquifer into the deep aquifer (mm $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ )
$w_{demand}$	Water uptake demand not met by overlying soil layers ( $\text{mm H}_2\text{O}$ )

$w_{inf}$	Amount of water entering the soil profile on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{mobile}$	Amount of mobile water in the layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{perc,ly}$	Amount of water percolating to the underlying soil layer on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{pump,dp}$	Amount of water removed from the deep aquifer by pumping (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{pump,sh}$	Amount of water removed from the shallow aquifer by pumping (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{rchrg}$	Amount of water entering the aquifer via recharge (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{rchrg,sh}$	Amount of water entering the shallow aquifer via recharge (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{revap}$	Amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{revap,mx}$	Maximum amount of water moving into the soil zone in response to water deficiencies on day $i$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{seep}$	Total amount of water exiting the bottom of the soil profile (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{up,ly}$	Potential water uptake for layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w'_{up,ly}$	Adjusted potential water uptake for layer $ly$ (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w''_{up,ly}$	Potential water uptake when the soil water content is less than 25% of plant available water (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{up,z}$	Potential water uptake from the soil surface to a specified depth, $z$ , on a given day (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{up,zl}$	Potential water uptake for the profile to the lower boundary of the soil layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$w_{up,zu}$	Potential water uptake for the profile to the upper boundary of the soil layer (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
$width_{filtstrip}$	Width of filter strip (m)
$wstrs$	Water stress for a given day expressed as a fraction of total water demand
$yld$	Crop yield (kg/ha)
$yld_{act}$	Actual yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
$yld_{est,N}$	Nitrogen yield estimate (kg N/ha)
$yld_{est,Nprev}$	Nitrogen yield estimate from the previous year (kg N/ha)
$yld_N$	Amount of nitrogen removed in the yield (kg N/ha)
$yld_P$	Amount of phosphorus removed in the yield (kg P/ha)
$yld_{yr,N}$	Nitrogen yield target for the current year (kg N/ha)
$yr_{cur}$	The number of years of development the tree has accrued (years)
$yr_{fulldev}$	The number of years for the tree species to reach full development (years)
$yr_{sim}$	Year of simulation (1 to $yr_{tot}$ )
$yr_{tot}$	Total number of calendar years simulated
$yrs$	Number of years of rainfall data used to obtain values for monthly extreme half-hour rainfalls
$z$	Depth below soil surface (mm)
$z_1$	Height of wind speed measurement (cm)
$z_2$	Height of wind speed measurement (cm)
$z_{ch}$	Inverse of the channel side slope
$z_{fld}$	Inverse of the flood plain side slope
$z_g$	Thickness of the gas film (m)
$z_l$	Thickness of the liquid film (m)
$z_{l,ly}$	Depth from the surface to the bottom of the soil layer (mm)

$z_{mid,ly}$	Depth from the soil surface to the middle of the layer (mm)
$z_{om}$	Roughness length for momentum transfer (cm)
$z_{ov}$	Roughness length for vapor transfer (cm)
$z_p$	Height of the humidity (psychrometer) and temperature measurements (cm)
$z_{root}$	Depth of root development in the soil (mm)
$z_{root,mx}$	Maximum depth for root development in the soil (mm)
$z_{tot}$	Depth to bottom of soil profile (mm)
$z_w$	Height of the wind speed measurement (cm)
$zd$	Ratio of depth in soil to damping depth
$\alpha$	Gram of live bacteria growth to gram of BOD in STE (conversion factor)
$\alpha$	Short-wave reflectance or albedo
$\alpha_0$	Ratio of chlorophyll $a$ to algal biomass ( $\mu\text{g chla}/\text{mg alg}$ )
$\alpha_{0.5}$	Maximum half-hour rainfall expressed as a fraction of daily rainfall
$\alpha_{0.5L}$	Smallest half-hour rainfall fraction that can be generated on a given day
$\alpha_{0.5mean}$	Mean of $\alpha_{0.5L}$ , $\alpha_{0.5mon}$ , $\alpha_{0.5U}$
$\alpha_{0.5mon}$	Average maximum half-hour rainfall fraction for the month
$\alpha_{0.5U}$	Largest half-hour rainfall fraction that can be generated on a given day
$\alpha_1$	Fraction of algal biomass that is nitrogen ( $\text{mg N}/\text{mg alg biomass}$ )
$\alpha_2$	Fraction of algal biomass that is phosphorus ( $\text{mg P}/\text{mg alg biomass}$ )
$\alpha_3$	Rate of oxygen production per unit of algal photosynthesis ( $\text{mg O}_2/\text{mg alg}$ )
$\alpha_4$	Rate of oxygen uptake per unit of algae respired ( $\text{mg O}_2/\text{mg alg}$ )
$\alpha_5$	Rate of oxygen uptake per unit $\text{NH}_4^+$ oxidation ( $\text{mg O}_2/\text{mg N}$ )
$\alpha_6$	Rate of oxygen uptake per unit $\text{NO}_2$ oxidation ( $\text{mg O}_2/\text{mg N}$ )
$\alpha_{bnk}$	Bank flow recession constant or constant of proportionality
$\alpha_{gw}$	Baseflow recession constant
$\alpha_{hill}$	Slope of the hillslope segment (degrees)
$\alpha_{pet}$	Coefficient in Priestley-Taylor equation
$\alpha_{plant}$	Plant albedo (set at 0.23)
$\alpha_{soil}$	Soil albedo
$\alpha_{tc}$	Fraction of daily rainfall that occurs during the time of concentration
$\beta_0$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_1$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_2$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_3$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_4$	Coefficient for USGS regression equations for urban loadings
$\beta_{deep}$	Aquifer percolation coefficient
$\beta_{denit}$	Rate coefficient for denitrification
$\beta_{eqP}$	Slow equilibration rate constant ( $0.0006 \text{ d}^{-1}$ )
$\beta_{min}$	Rate coefficient for mineralization of the humus active organic nutrients
$\beta_n$	Nitrogen uptake distribution parameter
$\beta_{N,1}$	Rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ or $\text{hr}^{-1}$ )
$\beta_{N,1,20}$	Rate constant for biological oxidation of ammonia nitrogen at $20^\circ\text{C}$ ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ or $\text{hr}^{-1}$ )
$\beta_{N,2}$	Rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ or $\text{hr}^{-1}$ )

$\beta_{N,2,20}$	Rate constant for biological oxidation of nitrite to nitrate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{N,3}$	Rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to ammonia nitrogen (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{N,3,20}$	Local rate constant for hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{NO3}$	Nitrate percolation coefficient
$\beta_p$	Phosphorus uptake distribution parameter
$\beta_{P,4}$	Rate constant for mineralization of organic phosphorus (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{P,4,20}$	Local rate constant for organic phosphorus mineralization at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\beta_{pst}$	Pesticide percolation coefficient
$\beta_{rev}$	Revap coefficient
$\beta_{rsd}$	Rate coefficient for mineralization of the residue fresh organic nutrients
$\beta_{sa}$	Coefficient for impoundment surface area equation
$\beta_{trns}$	Rate constant for nitrogen transfer between active and stable organic pools (1×10 <sup>-5</sup> )
$\beta_w$	Water-use distribution parameter
$\chi_i(j)$	3 × 1 matrix for day $i$ whose elements are residuals of maximum temperature ( $j = 1$ ), minimum temperature ( $j = 2$ ) and solar radiation ( $j = 3$ ),
$\Delta$	Slope of the saturation vapor pressure curve (kPa °C <sup>-1</sup> )
$\Delta_{algae}$	Change in algal biomass concentration (mg alg/L)
$\Delta_{bio}$	Potential increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)
$\Delta_{bio_{act}}$	Actual increase in total plant biomass on a given day (kg/ha)
$\Delta g_{\ell,dcl}$	Rate of decline in leaf conductance per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit (m s <sup>-1</sup> kPa <sup>-1</sup> )
$\Delta LAI_i$	Leaf area added on day $i$ (potential)
$\Delta LAI_{act,i}$	Actual leaf area added on day $i$
$\Delta NH_4_{str}$	Change in ammonium concentration (mg N/L)
$\Delta NO_2_{str}$	Change in nitrite concentration (mg N/L)
$\Delta orgN_{str}$	Change in organic nitrogen concentration (mg N/L)
$\Delta orgP_{str}$	Change in organic phosphorus concentration (mg P/L)
$\Delta Ox_{str}$	Change in dissolved oxygen concentration (mg O <sub>2</sub> /L)
$\Delta pst_{lkwtr}$	Change in pesticide mass in the water layer (mg pst)
$\Delta pst_{lksed}$	Change in pesticide mass in the sediment layer (mg pst)
$\Delta pst_{rchwtr}$	Change in pesticide mass in the water layer (mg pst)
$\Delta pst_{rchsed}$	Change in pesticide mass in the sediment layer (mg pst)
$\Delta rsd$	Biomass added to the residue pool on a given day (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
$\Delta rue_{dcl}$	Rate of decline in radiation-use efficiency per unit increase in vapor pressure deficit (kg/ha·(MJ/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> ·kPa <sup>-1</sup> or (10 <sup>-1</sup> g/MJ)·kPa <sup>-1</sup> )
$\Delta solP_{str}$	Change in solution phosphorus concentration (mg P/L)
$\Delta t$	Length of the time step (s)
$\delta$	Solar declination (radians)
$\delta$	Exponential coefficient (unitless)
$\delta_1$	Equation coefficient for rainfall intensity before peak intensity is reached (hr)
$\delta_2$	Equation coefficient for rainfall intensity after peak intensity is reached (hr)
$\delta_{gw}$	Delay time or drainage time for aquifer recharge (days)
$\delta_{ntr,ly}$	Residue decay rate constant

$\varepsilon$	Emissivity
$\varepsilon'$	Net emittance
$\xi$	Field capacity coefficient 2 (unitless).
$\varepsilon_a$	Atmospheric emittance
$\varepsilon_{bact:sed}$	Bacteria enrichment ratio
$\varepsilon_{C:N}$	Residue C:N ratio in the soil layer
$\varepsilon_{C:P}$	Residue C:P ratio in the soil layer
$\varepsilon_{C:sed}$	Carbon enrichment ratio
$\varepsilon_i$	3 × 1 matrix of independent random components
$\varepsilon_{N:sed}$	Nitrogen enrichment ratio
$\varepsilon_{P:sed}$	Phosphorus enrichment ratio
$\varepsilon_{pst:sed}$	Pesticide enrichment ratio
$\varepsilon_{sr}$	Radiation term for bare soil surface temperature calculation
$\varepsilon_{vs}$	Vegetative or soil emittance
$\Phi$	Field capacity coefficient 1 (unitless),
$\phi$	Latitude in radians
$\phi_{air}$	Air-filled porosity expressed as a fraction
$\phi_d$	Drainable porosity of the soil (mm/mm)
$\phi_f$	Porosity of the soil layer filled with water when the layer is at field capacity water content (mm/mm)
$\phi_{soil}$	Porosity of the soil (mm/mm)
$\gamma$	Psychrometric constant (kPa °C <sup>-1</sup> )
$\gamma$	Respiration rate coefficient (unitless).
$\gamma_{ntr,ly}$	Nutrient cycling residue composition factor for layer <i>ly</i>
$\gamma_{reg}$	Plant growth factor (0.0-1.0)
$\gamma_{sw,ly}$	Nutrient cycling water factor for layer <i>ly</i>
$\gamma_{sw,thr}$	Threshold value of nutrient cycling water factor for denitrification to occur
$\gamma_{tmp,ly}$	Nutrient cycling temperature factor for layer <i>ly</i>
$\gamma_{wu}$	Water deficiency factor
$\eta$	Evaporation coefficient (0.6)
$\eta$	Linear coefficient (kg/ha)
$\eta_{cec,ly}$	Volatilization cation exchange capacity factor
$\eta_{midz,ly}$	Volatilization depth factor
$\eta_{nit,ly}$	Nitrification regulator
$\eta_{sw,ly}$	Nitrification soil water factor
$\eta_{tmp,ly}$	Nitrification/volatilization temperature factor
$\eta_{vol,ly}$	Volatilization regulator
$\phi$	Mortality rate coefficient (unitless).
$\varphi$	Scaling factor for impact of soil water on damping depth
$\varphi_n$	Scaling factor for nitrogen stress equation
$\varphi_p$	Scaling factor for phosphorus stress equation
$\kappa_1$	CBOD deoxygenation rate (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_{1,20}$	CBOD deoxygenation rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )

$\kappa_2$	Reaeration rate for Fickian diffusion (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_{2,20}$	Reaeration rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_3$	Settling loss rate of CBOD (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_{3,20}$	Settling loss rate of CBOD at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\kappa_4$	Sediment oxygen demand rate (mg O <sub>2</sub> /(m <sup>2</sup> ·day))
$\kappa_{4,20}$	Sediment oxygen demand rate at 20°C (mg O <sub>2</sub> /(m <sup>2</sup> ·day) or mg O <sub>2</sub> /(m <sup>2</sup> ·hr))
$\lambda$	Latent heat of vaporization (MJ kg <sup>-1</sup> )
$\ell$	Lag coefficient that controls influence of previous day's temperature on current day's temperature
$\ell_1$	First shape coefficient for optimal leaf area development curve
$\ell_2$	Second shape coefficient for optimal leaf area development curve
$\ell_{crk}$	Lag factor for crack development during drying
$\ell_{sno}$	Snow temperature lag factor
$\mu$	Specific yield of the shallow aquifer (m/m)
$\mu_{10m}$	Mean wind speed for the day at height of 10 meters (m s <sup>-1</sup> )
$\mu_a$	Local specific growth rate of algae (day <sup>-1</sup> )
$\mu_{a,20}$	Local specific algal growth rate at 20°C (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\mu_{lpfol,die,20}$ (1/day)	Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lpfol,grw,20}$ (1/day)	Rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lpfol,net}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage (1/day)
$\mu_{lpfol,net,20}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lprch,die}$	Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in streams (1/day)
$\mu_{lprch,die,20}$ (1/day)	Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in streams at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lpres,die}$	Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in water bodies (1/day)
$\mu_{lpres,die,20}$ (1/day)	Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in water bodies at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lpsol,die,20}$ (1/day)	Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lpsol,grw,20}$	Rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lpsol,net}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution (1/day)
$\mu_{lpsol,net,20}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lpsorb,die,20}$	Rate constant for die-off of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{lpsorb,grw,20}$	Rate constant for re-growth of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)

$\mu_{psorb,net}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (1/day)
$\mu_{psorb,net,20}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of less persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{max}$	Maximum specific algal growth rate (day <sup>-1</sup> or hr <sup>-1</sup> )
$\mu_{mon}$	Mean daily rainfall (mm H <sub>2</sub> O) for the month
$\mu_{pfol,die,20}$	Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{pfol,grw,20}$	Rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{pfol,net}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage (1/day)
$\mu_{pfol,net,20}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria on foliage at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{prch,die}$	Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in streams (1/day)
$\mu_{prch,die,20}$	Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in streams at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{pres,die}$	Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in water bodies (1/day)
$\mu_{pres,die,20}$	Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in water bodies at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{psol,die,20}$	Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{psol,grw,20}$	Rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{psol,net}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution (1/day)
$\mu_{psol,net,20}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria in soil solution at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{psorb,die,20}$	Rate constant for die-off of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{psorb,grw,20}$	Rate constant for re-growth of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{psorb,net}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria sorbed to the soil (1/day)
$\mu_{psorb,net,20}$	Overall rate constant for die-off/re-growth of persistent bacteria attached to soil particles at 20°C (1/day)
$\mu_{dew_{mon}}$	Average dew point temperature for the month (°C)
$\mu_{Dmx_{mon}}$	Average daily maximum temperature of the month on dry days (°C)
$\mu_{Drad_{mon}}$	Average daily solar radiation of the month on dry days (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> )
$\mu_{mn_{mon}}$	Average daily minimum temperature for the month (°C)
$\mu_{mx_{mon}}$	Average daily maximum temperature for the month (°C)
$\mu_{rad_{mon}}$	Average daily solar radiation for the month (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> )
$\mu_{tmp_{mon}}$	Mean air temperature for the month (°C)
$\mu_w$	Wind speed (m/s)
$\mu_{Wmx_{mon}}$	Average daily maximum temperature of the month on wet days (°C)
$\mu_{wnd_{mon}}$	Average wind speed for the month (m s <sup>-1</sup> )
$\mu_{Wradiation_{mon}}$	Average daily solar radiation of the month on wet days (MJ m <sup>-2</sup> )

$v$	Apparent settling velocity (m/day)
$\theta$	Moisture content of biozone (mm)
$\theta_{bact}$	Temperature adjustment factor for bacteria die-off/re-growth
$\theta_e$	Fraction of water volume that excludes anions
$\theta_f^t$	Field capacity at the end of the day (mm)
$\theta_f^{t-1}$	Field capacity at the beginning of the day (mm)
$\theta_s^{t-1}$	Saturated moisture content at the beginning of the day (mm)
$\theta_{si}$	Initial soil porosity with zero plaque (mm)
$\theta_v$	Volumetric moisture content (mm/mm)
$\theta_z$	Zenith angle (radians)
$\rho_0(j,k)$	Correlation coefficient between variables $j$ and $k$ on the same day where $j$ and $k$ may be set to 1 (maximum temperature), 2 (minimum temperature) or 3 (solar radiation)
$\rho_1(j,k)$	Correlation coefficient between variable $j$ and $k$ with variable $k$ lagged one day with respect to variable $j$
$\rho_a$	Local respiration rate of algae (day $^{-1}$ )
$\rho_{a,20}$	Local algal respiration rate at 20°C (day $^{-1}$ or hr $^{-1}$ )
$\rho_{air}$	Air density (kg m $^{-3}$ )
$\rho_b$	Soil bulk density (Mg m $^{-3}$ )
$\rho_{bm}$	Density of live bacterial biomass (~1000 kg/m $^3$ $\square \square \square$ )
$\rho_s$	Particle density (Mg m $^{-3}$ )
$\rho_w$	Density of water (1 Mg m $^{-3}$ )
$\sigma$	Xalibration parameter to convert total solids in STE to <i>plaque</i> (unitless)
$\sigma$	Stefan-Boltzmann constant ( $4.903 \times 10^{-9}$ MJ m $^{-2}$ K $^{-4}$ d $^{-1}$ )
$\sigma_l$	Local settling rate for algae (m/day)
$\sigma_{l,20}$	Local algal settling rate at 20°C (m/day or m/hr)
$\sigma_2$	Benthos (sediment) source rate for soluble P (mg P/m $^2$ -day or mg P/m $^2$ -hr)
$\sigma_{2,20}$	Benthos (sediment) source rate for soluble phosphorus at 20°C (mg P/m $^2$ -day or mg P/m $^2$ -hr)
$\sigma_3$	Benthos (sediment) source rate for ammonium (mg N/m $^2$ -day or mg N/m $^2$ -hr)
$\sigma_{3,20}$	Benthos (sediment) source rate for ammonium nitrogen at 20°C (mg N/m $^2$ -day or mg N/m $^2$ -hr)
$\sigma_4$	Rate coefficient of organic nitrogen settling (day $^{-1}$ or hr $^{-1}$ )
$\sigma_{4,20}$	Local settling rate for organic nitrogen at 20°C (day $^{-1}$ or hr $^{-1}$ )
$\sigma_5$	Rate coefficient for organic phosphorus settling (day $^{-1}$ or hr $^{-1}$ )
$\sigma_{5,20}$	Local settling rate for organic phosphorus at 20°C (day $^{-1}$ or hr $^{-1}$ )
$\sigma_{mon}$	Standard deviation of daily rainfall (mm H <sub>2</sub> O) for the month
$\sigma_{mn_{mon}}$	Standard deviation for daily minimum temperature during the month (°C)
$\sigma_{mx_{mon}}$	Standard deviation for daily maximum temperature during the month (°C)
$\sigma_{rad_{mon}}$	Standard deviation for daily solar radiation during the month (MJ m $^{-2}$ )
$\omega$	Angular velocity of the earth's rotation (0.2618 radians h $^{-1}$ )
$\omega_{tmp}$	Angular frequency in soil temperature variation
$\Psi_{wf}$	Wetting front matric potential (mm)



## **APPENDIX B**

## **REFERENCES**

---

- Allen, R.G. 1986. A Penman for all seasons. *J. Irrig. and Drain Engng.*, ASCE, 112(4): 348-368.
- Allen, P.M., J. Arnold, E. Jakubowski. 1999. Prediction of stream channel erosion potential. *Environmental and Engineering Geoscience* 5:339-351.
- Allen, R.G., M.E. Jensen, J.L. Wright, and R.D. Burman. 1989. Operational estimates of evapotranspiration. *Agron. J.* 81:650-662.
- American Public Health Association. 1985. Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater, 16<sup>th</sup> edition. American Public Health Association, Inc.
- American Society for Testing and Materials. 1995. Annual book of ASTM standards, Vol. 04.08, Designation: D 5852-5. American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, PA. p. 653-657.
- Anderson, E.A. 1976. A point energy and mass balance model of snow cover. NOAA Technical Report NWS 19, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, National Weather Service.
- Arabi M, Frankenberger JR, Engel BE, Arnold JG. 2008. Representation of agricultural conservation practices with SWAT. *Hydrological Processes* 22(16): 3042-3055.
- Arnold, J.G., P.M. Allen, and G. Bernhardt. 1993. A comprehensive surface-groundwater flow model. *J. Hydrol.* 142:47-69.
- Arnold, J. G., R. Srinivasan, R. S. Muttiah, and J. R. Williams. 1998. Large area hydrologic modeling and assessment: Part I. Model development. *J. American Water Resources Assoc.* 34:73-89.
- Arnold, J.G. and J.R. Williams. 1995. SWRRB—A watershed scale model for soil and water resources management. p. 847-908. In V.P. Singh (ed) Computer models of watershed hydrology. Water Resources Publications.
- Arnold, J.G., J.R. Williams and D.R. Maidment. 1995. Continuous-time water and sediment-routing model for large basins. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 121(2):171-183.

- Arnold, J.G., J.R. Williams, A.D. Nicks, and N.B. Sammons. 1990. SWRRB: A basin scale simulation model for soil and water resources management. Texas A&M Univ. Press, College Station, TX.
- Azevedo, J., and P.R. Stout. 1974. Farm animal manures: An overview of their role in the agricultural environment (Service Manual no. 44). University of California, Agricultural Experiment Station Extension.
- Bagnold, R.A. 1977. Bedload transport in natural rivers. Water Resources Res. 13(2):303-312.
- Barfield BJ, Blevins RL, Fogle AW, Madison CE, Inamdar S, Carey DI, Evangelou VP. 1998. Water quality impacts of natural filter strips in karst areas. *Transactions of the ASAE* 41(2): 371-381.
- Barnard, J.D. 1948. Heat units as a measure of canning crop maturity. The Canner 106:28.
- Barrow, N.J. and T.C. Shaw. 1975. The slow reactions between soil and anions. 2. Effect of time and temperature on the decrease in phosphate concentration in soil solution. Soil Sci. 119:167-177.
- Bengston, L. 1981. Snowmelt-generated runoff in urban areas. p. 444-451. In B.C. Yen (ed.) Urban stormwater hydraulics and hydrology: proceedings of the Second International Conference on Urban Storm Drainage, held at Urbana, Illinois, USA, 15-19 June 1981. Water Resources Publications, Littleton, CO.
- Bond, C., Maguire, R., and Havlin, J. (2006). "Change in soluble phosphorus in soils following fertilization is dependent on initial Mehlich-3 phosphorus." *J. Environ. Qual.*, 35(5), 1818.
- Boswell, V.G. 1926. The influence of temperature upon the growth and yield of garden peas. Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 23:162-168.
- Boswell, V.G. 1929. Factors influencing yield and quality of peas—Biophysical and biochemical studies. Maryland Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 306.
- Bouma, J. and J. Loveday. 1988. Chapter 5: Characterizing soil water regimes in swelling clay soils. p. 83-96. In L.P. Wilding and R. Puentes (ed).

- Vertisols: their distribution, properties, classification and management. Texas A&M University Printing Center, College Station, TX.
- Bouwer, H. 1969. Infiltration of water into nonuniform soil. Journal Irrigation and Drainage Div., ASCE 95(IR4):451-462.
- Bowie, G.L. W.B. Mills, D.B. Porcella, C.L. Campbell, J.R. Pagenkopf, G.L. Rupp, K.M. Johnson, P.W.H. Chan, and S.A. Gherini. 1985. Rates, constants, and kinetic formulations in surface water quality modeling, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. EPA/600/3-85/040, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Athens, GA.
- Bradbury, N.J., A.P. Whitmore, P.B.S. Hart, and D.S. Jenskinson, 1993. Modelling the fate of nitrogen in crop and soil in the years following application of <sup>15</sup>N-labelled fertilizer to winter wheat. *J. Agric. Sci.* 121:363-379.
- Brakensiek, D.L. 1967. Kinematic flood routing. *Transactions of the ASAE* 10(3):340-343.
- Bronswijk, J.J.B. 1989. Prediction of actual cracking and subsidence in clay soils. *Soil Science* 148:87-93.
- Bronswijk, J.J.B. 1990. Shrinkage geometry of a heavy clay soil at various stresses. *Soil Science Soc. Am. J.* 54:1500-1502.
- Brown, L.C. and T.O. Barnwell, Jr. 1987. The enhanced water quality models QUAL2E and QUAL2E-UNCAS documentation and user manual. EPA document EPA/600/3-87/007. USEPA, Athens, GA.
- Brunt, D. 1932. Notes on radiation in the atmosphere. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.* 58: 389-418.
- Brunt, D. 1952. Physical and dynamical meteorology, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. University Press, Cambridge.
- Brutsaert, W. 1975. Comments on surface roughness parameters and the height of dense vegetation. *J. Meterol. Soc. Japan* 53:96-97.
- Bruun, S. and J. Luxhoi, 2006. Letter to the Editor on –Can incubations be use to measure meaningful pools of soil organic matter? *Soil Sci Soc Am J*, 70:2164.

- Bumgarner, J.R., McCray, J.E., 2007. Estimating Biozone Hydraulic Conductivity in Wastewater Soil-infiltration Systems using Inverse Numerical modeling. *Water Research*, 41(11): 2349-2360.
- Campbell, G.S. 1985. Soil physics with BASIC: transport models for soil-plant systems. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Carslaw, H.S. and J.C. Jaeger. 1959. Conduction of heat in solids. Oxford University Press, London.
- Chapra, S.C. 1997. Surface water-quality modeling. McGraw-Hill, Boston.
- Chow, V.T. 1959. Open-channel hydraulics. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Chow, V.T., D.R. Maidment, and L.W. Mays. 1988. Applied hydrology. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, NY.
- Chu T, Shirmohammadi A, Abbott L, Sadeghi A, Montas H. 2005. Watershed level BMP evaluation with SWAT model. In proceedings of the *American Society of Agricultural Engineers Annual International Meeting*. July 17-20, 2005, Tampa, Florida, USA. ASABE Publication number 052098.
- Churchill, M.A., H.L. Elmore, and R.A. Buckingham. 1962. The prediction of stream reaeration rates. *International Journal of Air and Water Pollution*. 6: 467-504.
- Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET), 2007. [http://www.epa.gov/castnet/docs/CASTNET\\_factsheet\\_2007.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/castnet/docs/CASTNET_factsheet_2007.pdf)
- Cluis, D., P. Couture, R. Bégin, and S.A. Visser. 1988. Potential eutrophication assessment in rivers; relationship between produced and exported loads. *Schweiz. Z. Hydrol.* 50:166-181.
- Collins, H.P., E.T. Elliott, K. Paustian, L.G. Bundy, W.A. Dick, D.R. Huggins, D.R., A.J.M Smucker, and E.M. Paul, 2000. Soil carbon pools and fluxes in long-term corn belt agroecosystems. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 32:157-163.
- Cope, J.T., C.E. Evans, and H.C. Williams. 1981. Soil test fertility recommendations for Alabama crops. *Alabama Agric. Station Circular No. 251.*

- Cross, H.Z. and M.S. Zuber. 1972. Prediction of flowering dates in maize based on different methods of estimating thermal units. *Agronomy Journal* 64:351-355.
- Cunge, J.A. 1969. On the subject of a flood propagation method (Muskingum method). *J. Hydraulics Research* 7(2):205-230.
- Danckwerts, P.V. 1951. Significance of liquid-film coefficients in gas absorption. *Ind. Eng. Chem.* 43:1460-1467.
- Dillaha TA, Reneau RB, Mostaghimi S, Lee D. 1989. Vegetative filter strips for agricultural nonpoint source pollution control. *Transactions of the ASAE* 32(2): 513-519.
- Dingman, S.L. 1994. Physical hydrology. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Domenico, P.A. and F.W. Schwartz. 1990. Physical and chemical hydrology. John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- Doorenbos, J. and W.O. Pruitt. 1977. Guidelines for predicting crop water requirements. FAO Irrig. and Drain. Paper No. 24, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. FAO, Rome.
- Dorioz JM, Wang D, Poulenard J, Trévisan D. 2006. The effect of grass buffer strips on phosphorus dynamics--A critical review and synthesis as a basis for application in agricultural landscapes in France. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 117(1): 4-21.
- Dosskey MG, Helmers MJ, Eisenhauer DE, Franti TG, Hoagland KD. 2002. Assessment of concentrated flow through riparian buffers. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 57(6): 336-343.
- Dosskey MG, Helmers MJ, Eisenhauer DE, Franti TG, Hoagland KD. 2002. Assessment of concentrated flow through riparian buffers. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 57(6):336-343.
- Driver, N.E. and G.D. Tasker. 1988. Techniques for estimation of storm-runoff loads, volumes, and selected constituent concentrations in urban watersheds in the United States. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey: Books and Open-File Reports Section 88-191.

- Dudal, R. and H. Eswaran. 1988. Chapter 1: Distribution, properties and classification of vertisols. p. 1-22. In L.P. Wilding and R. Puentes (ed). Vertisols: their distribution, properties, classification and management. Texas A&M University Printing Center, College Station, TX.
- Duffie, J.A. and W.A. Beckman. 1980. Solar engineering of thermal processes. Wiley, N.Y.
- Dunn, I.S. 1959. Tractive resistance of cohesive channels. Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Division, ASCE 85 (SM 3), 1-24.
- Easterling, W.E., N.J. Rosenberg, M.S. McKenney, C.A. Jones, P.T. Dyke, and J.R. Williams. 1992. Preparing the erosion productivity impact calculator (EPIC) model to simulate crop response to climate change and the direct effects of CO<sub>2</sub>. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 59:17-34.
- Eaton, B. C. and R. G. Millar. 2004. Optimal alluvial channel width under a bank stability constraint. Geomorphology, 62:35-45.
- Einstein, H.A. 1965. Final Report Spawning Grounds. U. of California, Hydr. Eng. Lab., 16p.
- Engman, E.T. 1983. Roughness coefficients for routing surface runoff. Proc. Spec. Conf. Frontiers of Hydraulic Engineering.
- Fiering, M.B. 1967. Streamflow synthesis. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Foster, G.R., L.J. Lane, J.D. Nowlin, J.M. Laflen, and R.A. Young. 1980. A model to estimate the sediment yield from file-sized areas: Development of model. CP-80-10. Intl. Inst. For Applied Systems Analysis. A-2361. Lexenburg, Austria.
- Galarneau, E.; Bidleman, T. F.; Blanchard, P. Seasonality and interspecies differences in particle/gas partitioning of PAHs observed by the Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network (IADN). Atmos. Environ. 2006, 40, 182-197.
- Galloway, J.N., A.R. Townsend, J.W. Erisman, M. Bkunda, Z. Cai, J.R. Freney, L.A. Marinelli, S.P. Seitzinger, M.A. Sutton, 2008. Transformation of the Nitrogen Cycle: Recent trends, questions, and potential solutions. Science 320, 889-892.

- Godwin, D.C., C.A. Jones, J.T. Ritchie, P.L.G. Vlek, and L.G. Youngdahl. 1984. The water and nitrogen components of the CERES models. p. 95-100. In Proc. Intl. Symp. on Minimum Data Sets for Agrotechnology Transfer, March 1983, Patancheru, India. Intl. Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics.
- Goel, P.K., R.P. Rudra, B. Gharabaghi, S. Das, and N. Gupta. 2004. Pollutants removal by vegetative filter strips planted with different grasses 2004 ASAE/CSAE Annual International Meeting, August 1-4, 2004, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. ASAE Publication number 042177.
- Green, W.H. and G.A. Ampt. 1911. Studies on soil physics, 1. The flow of air and water through soils. Journal of Agricultural Sciences 4:11-24.
- Haltiner, G.J. and F.L. Martin. 1957. Dynamical and physical meteorology. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Hanson, G.J. 1990. Surface erodibility of earthen channels at high stresses. Part II-Developing an *in situ* testing device. Trans. ASAE 33:132-137.
- Hanson, G.J. 1991. Development of a jet index method to characterize erosion resistance of soils in earthen spillways. Trans. ASAE 34:2015-2020.
- Hanson, G. J. and A. Simon. 2001. Erodibility of cohesive streambeds in the loess area of the Midwestern USA. Hydrological Processes, 15:23-38.
- Hargreaves, G.H. 1975. Moisture availability and crop production. Trans. ASAE 18: 980-984.
- Hargreaves, G.L., G.H. Hargreaves, and J.P. Riley. 1985. Agricultural benefits for Senegal River Basin. J. Irrig. and Drain. Engr. 111(2):113-124.
- Hargreaves, G.H. and Z.A. Samani. 1982. Estimating potential evapotranspiration. Tech. Note, J. Irrig. and Drain. Engr. 108(3):225-230.
- Hargreaves, G.H. and Z.A. Samani. 1985. Reference crop evapotranspiration from temperature. Applied Engineering in Agriculture 1:96-99.
- Hargreaves, G.L., G.H. Hargreaves, and J.P. Riley. 1985. Agricultural benefits for Senegal River Basin. J. Irrig. and Drain. Engr. 111(2):113-124.

- Harmel D, Potter S, Ellis P, Reckhow K, Green C. 2006. Compilation of measured nutrient load data for agricultural land uses in the United States. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(5): 1163-1178.
- Harrison, L.P. 1963. Fundamental concepts and definitions relating to humidity. In A. Wexler (ed.) *Humidity and moisture*, Vol. 3. Reinhold Publishing Company, N.Y.
- Hassink, J. and A.P. Whitmore. 1997. A model of the physical protection of organic matter in soils. *Soil. Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 61:131-139.
- Helmers MJ. 2003. *Two-dimensional overland flow and sediment trapping in a vegetative filter*. Ph.D Dissertation University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE USA.
- Hershfield, D.M. 1961. Rainfall frequency atlas of the United States for durations from 30 minutes to 24 hours and return periods from 1 to 100 years. U.S. Dept. Commerce Tech. Paper No. 40.
- Higbie, R. 1935. The rate of adsorption of a pure gas into a still liquid during short periods of exposure. *Trans. Amer. Inst. Chem. Engin.* 31:365-389.
- Higgins, J.M. and B.R. Kim. 1981. Phosphorus retention models for the Tennessee Valley Authority reservoirs. *Wat. Resour. Res.* 17:571-576.
- Holland, E. A., B. H. Braswell, J. M. Sulzman, and J.-F. Lamarque. 2005a. Nitrogen Deposition onto the United States and Western Europe. Data set. Available on-line [<http://www.daac.ornl.gov>] from Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, U.S.A. doi:10.3334/ORNLDAAAC/730.
- Hooghoudt, S.B. 1940. Bijdrage tot de kennis van enige natuurkundige grootheden van de grond. *Versl. Landbouwkd. Onderz.* 46: 515-707.
- Hubbert, M.K. 1940. The theory of groundwater motion. *Journal of Geology* 48: 785-944.
- Huber, W.C. and R.E. Dickinson. 1988. Storm water management model, version 4: user's manual. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Athens, GA.
- Iqbal, M. 1983. An introduction to solar radiation. Academic Press, N.Y.

- Jenkinson, D.S., 1990. The turnover of organic carbon and nitrogen in soil. Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society, B. 329:361-368.
- Jenkinson D.S. and L.C. Parry, 1989. The nitrogen cycle in the Broadbalk wheat experiment: a model for the turnover of nitrogen through the soil microbial biomass. Soil. Biol. Biochem 21:535-541.
- Jensen, M.E. (ed.) 1974. Consumptive use of water and irrigation water requirements. Rep. Tech. Com. on Irrig. Water Requirements, Irrig. and Drain. Div., ASCE.
- Jensen, M.E., R.D. Burman, and R.G. Allen (ed). 1990. Evapotranspiration and irrigation water requirements. ASCE Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice No. 70, ASCE, N.Y.
- Johnson, K.H. 1977. A predictive method for ground water levels. Master's Thesis, Cornell University, Ithica, N.Y.
- Jones, C.A. 1983. A survey of the variability in tissue nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations in maize and grain sorghum. Field Crops Res. 6:133-147.
- Jones, C.A. 1985. C-4 grasses and cereals. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York. 419 pp.
- Jones, C.A. C.V. Cole, A.N. Sharpley, and J.R. Williams. 1984. A simplified soil and plant phosphorus model. I. Documentation. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 48:800-805.
- Julian, J. P. and R. Torres. 2006. Hydraulic Erosion of Cohesive river banks. Geomorphology, 76:193-206.
- Jury, W.A., W.R. Gardner, and W.H. Gardner. 1991. Soil physics, 5<sup>th</sup> edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, N.Y.
- Kemanian, A.R., and C.O. Stöckle. 2010. C-Farm: A simple model to estimate the carbon balance of soil profiles. Europ. J. Agron. 32:22-29.
- Knisel, W.G. 1980. CREAMS, a field scale model for chemicals, runoff and erosion from agricultural management systems. USDA Conservation Research Rept. No. 26.
- Kodoatie, Robert J. 2000. Sediment transport relations in alluvial channels. Thesis (Ph. D.)--Colorado State University, 285pp.

- Koelsch RK, Lorimor JC, Mankin KR. 2006. Vegetative treatment systems for management of open lot runoff: Review of literature. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture* 22(1): 141-153.
- Koorevaar, P., G. Menelik, and C. Dirksen. 1983. Elements of Soil Physics. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Krutz LJ, Senseman SA, Zablotowicz RM, Matocha MA. 2005. Reducing herbicide runoff from agricultural fields with vegetative filter strips: a review. *Weed Science* 53(3): 353–367.
- Lamb, D. and Van Bowersox, 2000. The national atmospheric deposition program: an overview. *Atmospheric Environment* 34:1661-1663.
- Lane, L.J. 1982. Distributed model for small semi-arid watersheds. *J. Hydraulic Eng., ASCE*, 108(HY10):1114-1131.
- Lane, L.J. 1983. Chapter 19: Transmission Losses. p.19-1–19-21. In Soil Conservation Service. National engineering handbook, section 4: hydrology. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Larson, L.L., and E.L. Peck. 1974. Accuracy of precipitation measurements for hydrologic modeling. *Water Resources Research* 10:857-863.
- Lee KH, Isenhart TM, Schultz RC, Mickelson SK. 2000. Multispecies riparian buffers trap sediment and nutrients during rainfall simulations. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 29(4): 1200-1205.
- Lehmann, Christopher M.B. and Van Bowersox. 2003. National Atmospheric Deposition Program Quality Management Plan. National Atmospheric Deposition Program Office at the Illinois State Water Survey. NADP QA Plan 2003-01. Champaign, IL
- Leonard, R.A., W.G. Knisel., and D.A. Still. 1987. GLEAMS: Groundwater loading effects of agricultural management systems. *Trans. ASAE*. 30:1403-1418.
- Leonard, R.A. and R.D. Wauchope. 1980. Chapter 5: The pesticide submodel. p. 88-112. In Knisel, W.G. (ed). CREAMS: A field-scale model for chemicals, runoff, and erosion from agricultural management systems. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Conservation research report no. 26.

- Lewis, W.K. and W.G. Whitman. 1924. Principles of gas absorption. *Ind. Eng. Chem.* 16:1215-1220.
- Loehr, R.C. 1970. Drainage and pollution from beef cattle feedlots (Proceedings paper No. 7726). *Journal of the Sanitary Engineers Division, American Society of Civil Engineers*, 96 (SA6): 1295-1309.
- Magette WL, Brinsfield RB, Palmer RE, Wood JD. 1989. Nutrient and sediment removal by vegetative filter strips. *Transactions of the ASAE* 32(2): 663-667.
- Magoon, C.A. and C.W. Culpepper. 1932. Response of sweet corn to varying temperatures from time of planting to canning maturity. U.S.D.A. tech. Bull. 312.
- Matalas, N.C. 1967. Mathematical assessment of synthetic hydrology. *Water Resources Res.* 3(4):937-945.
- Mayer PM, Steven K. Reynolds J, Canfield TJ, McCutchen MD. 2005. *Riparian buffer width, vegetative cover, and nitrogen removal effectiveness: A review of current science and regulations*. Environmental Protection Agency Document number EPA/600/R-05/118, US Government Printing Office: Washington, DC 20402-9328.
- McCray, J.E., Kirkland, S.L., Siegrist, R.L., Thyne, G.D., 2005. Model Parameters for Simulating Fate and Transport of On-Site Wastewater Nutrients. *Ground Water*, 43(4): 628-639.
- McCree, K.J. 1972. The action spectrum, absorption and quantum yield of photosynthesis in crop plants. *Agric. Met.* 9:191-216.
- McElroy, A.D., S.Y. Chiu, J.W. Nebgen, A. Aleti, and F.W. Bennett. 1976. Loading functions for assessment of water pollution from nonpoint sources. *Environ. Prot. Tech. Serv.*, EPA 600/2-76-151.
- McGill, W.B., H.W. Hunt, R.G. Woodmansee, and J.O. Reuss. 1981. PHOENIX: a model of the dynamics of carbon and nitrogen in grassland soils. In Clark F.E. and Rosswall T. (Eds.) *Terrestrial Nitrogen Cycles: Processes, Ecosystem, Strategy and Management Impacts*, *Ecol. Bull.* (Stockholm) 33:49-115.

- Mein, R.G. and C.L. Larson. 1973. Modeling infiltration during a steady rain. *Water Resources Research* 9(2):384-394.
- Menzel, R.G. 1980. Enrichment ratios for water quality modeling. p. 486-492. *In* W.G. Knisel (ed.) CREAMS, A field scale model for chemicals, runoff, and erosion from agricultural management systems. U.S. Dept. Agric. Conserv. Res. Rept. No. 26.
- Merriam-Webster, Inc. 1996. Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary, 10<sup>th</sup> edition. Merriam-Webster, Inc. Springfield, MA.
- Minitab-Inc. 2006. Minitab statistical software, release 15 for windows. State College, Pennsylvania.
- Mitchell, A.R. 1992. Shrinkage terminology: escape from 'normalcy'. *Soil. Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 56:993-994.
- Molinias, A. and B. Wu. 2001. Transport of Sediment in large sand-bed rivers. *Journal of Hydraulic research*, 39: 135-146.
- Monsi, M. and T. Saeki. 1953. Über den Lictfaktor in den Pflanzengesellschaften und sein Bedeutung fur die Stoffproduktion. *Japan J. Bot.* 14:22-52.
- Monteith, J.L. 1965. Evaporation and the environment. p. 205-234. *In* The state and movement of water in living organisms. 19<sup>th</sup> Symposia of the Society for Experimental Biology. Cambridge Univ. Press, London, U.K.
- Monteith, J.L. 1972. Solar radiation and productivity in tropical ecosystems. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 9:747-766.
- Monteith, J.L. 1977. Climate and the efficiency of crop production in Britian. *Phil. Trans. Res. Soc. London Ser. B* 281:277-329.
- Monteith, J.L. 1981. Evaporation and surface temperature. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.* 107:1-27.
- Morison, J.I.L. 1987. Intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentration and stomatal response to CO<sub>2</sub>. p. 229-251. *In* E. Zeiger, G.D. Farquhar and I.R. Cowan (ed.) Stomatal function. Standford University Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Morison, J.I.L. and R.M. Gifford. 1983. Stomatal sensitivity to carbon dioxide and humidity. *Plant Physiol.* 71:789-796.

- Munns, D.N. and R.L. Fox. 1976. The slow reaction which continues after phosphate adsorption: Kinetics and equilibrium in some tropical soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 40:46-51.
- Muñoz-Carpena R, Parsons JE, Wendell GJ. 1999. Modeling hydrology and sediment transport in vegetative filter strips. *Journal of Hydrology* 214(1999): 111-129.
- Muñoz-Carpena R, Parsons JE. 2005. *VFSMOD-W Vegetative Filter Strips Hydrology and Sediment Transport Modeling System Model Documentation and Users Manual*. University of Florida. Gainesville, FL. Available online at: <http://carpena.ifas.ufl.edu/vfsmod/doc200/vfsm-draft.pdf>.
- Murray, F.W. 1967. On the computation of saturation vapor pressure. *J. Appl. Meteor.* 6:203-204.
- NADP/NTN, 1995 and 2000. National Atmospheric Deposition Program / National Trends Network, <http://nadp.sws.uiuc.edu>.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey Staff. 1996. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Nearing, M.A., B.Y. Liu, L.M. Risso, and X. Zhang. 1996. Curve number and Green-Ampt effective hydraulic conductivities. *Water Resources Bulletin* 32:125-136.
- Neitsch, S.L., Arnold, J.G., Kiniry, J.R., Williams, J.R., 2010. Soil and Water Assessment Tool Input/Output File Documentrtation. Grassland, Soil and Water Research Service, Temple, TX.
- Nicks, A.D. 1974. Stochastic generation of the occurrence, pattern and location of maximum amount of daily rainfall. p. 154-171. *In Proc. Symp. Statistical Hydrology*, Tucson, AZ. Aug.-Sept. 1971. USDA Misc. Publ. 1275. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.
- Nicks, A.D., L.J. Lane, and G.A. Gander. 1995. Chapter 2: Weather generator. p. 2.1-2.22. *In* D.C. Flanagan and M.A. Nearing (ed.) USDA-Water Erosion Prediction Project: Hillslope profile and watershed model documentation.

- NSERL Report #10, National Soil Erosion Research Laboratory, West Lafayette, IN.
- Northern Virginia Planning District Commission. 1979. Guidebook for screening urban nonpoint pollution management strategies: a final report prepared for Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Northern Virginia Planning District Commission, Falls Church, VA.
- Nürnberg, G.K. 1984. The prediction of internal phosphorus load in lakes with anoxic hypolimnia. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 29:111-124.
- O'Connor, D.J. and W.E. Dobbins. 1958. Mechanism of reaeration in natural streams. *Trans. ASCE.* 123:641-684.
- Overton, D.E. 1966. Muskingum flood routing of upland streamflow. *Journal of Hydrology* 4:185-200.
- Owens, M. R.W. Edwards, and J.W. Gibbs. 1964. Some reaeration studies in streams. *International Journal of Air and Water Pollution* 8:469-486.
- Paine, M.D. 1973. Confined animals and public environment (Great Plains Beef Cattle Feeding Handbook, GPE-7000/EC-72-246). Lincoln: University of Nebraska, College of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service.
- Panuska, J.C. and D.M. Robertson. 1999. Estimating phosphorus concentration following alum treatment using apparent settling velocity. *Lake and Reserv. Manage.* 15:28-38.
- Parajuli, P.B., K.R. Mankin, and P.L. Barnes. 2008. Applicability of targeting vegetative filter strips to abate fecal bacteria and sediment yield using SWAT. *Agricultural Water Management* 95:1189-1200.
- Parkyn S. 2004. *Review of riparian buffer zone effectiveness*. Technical Paper No: 2004/05. New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Parton, W.J., J.W.B. Stewart, and C.V. Cole. 1988. Dynamics of C, N, P and S in grassland soils. a model. *Biogeochem.* 5:109-131.
- Paul E.A., S.J. Morris, R.T. Conant, and A.F. Plante, 2006. Does the acid hydrolysis-incubation method measure meaningful soil organic carbon pools? *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 70:1023–1035.

- Pemberton, E. L. and J. M. Lara. 1971. A procedure to determine sediment deposition in a settling basin. Section E: Intake Works and Desilting Basins. Sedimentation Section, Division of Planning Coordination, Bureau of Reclamation, U. S. Department of the Interior.
- Penman, H.L. 1956. Evaporation: An introductory survey. Netherlands Journal of Agricultural Science 4:7-29.
- Perrin de Brichambaut, Chr. 1975. Cahiers A.F.E.D.E.S., supplément au no 1. Editions Européennes Thermique et Industrie, Paris.
- Phillips, E.E. 1950. Heat summation theory as applied to canning crops. The
- Pitt, R. 1979. Demonstration of non-point pollution abatement through improved street cleaning practices. EPA-600/2-79-161 (NTIS PB80-108988), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH.
- Plate, E.J. 1971. Aerodynamic characteristics of atmospheric boundary layers. U.S. Atomic Energy Comm., Critical Review Series, TID-25465. 190 pp.
- Posada. 1995. Transport of Sands in Deep Rivers. Thesis (Ph. D.)--Colorado State University, 158pp.
- Priestley, C.H.B. and R.J. Taylor. 1972. On the assessment of surface heat flux and evaporation using large-scale parameters. Mon. Weather Rev. 100:81-92.
- Quinn P, Beven K, Chevallier P, Planchon O. 1991. The prediction of hillslope flow paths for distributed hydrological modelling using digital terrain models. *Hydrological Processes* 5(1): 59-79.
- Rallison, R.E. and N. Miller. 1981. Past, present and future SCS runoff procedure. p. 353-364. In V.P. Singh (ed.). Rainfall runoff relationship. Water Resources Publication, Littleton, CO.
- Rajan, S.S.S. and R.L. Fox. 1972. Phosphate adsorption by soils. 1. Influence of time and ionic environment on phosphate adsorption. Commun. Soil. Sci. Plant Anal. 3:493-504.
- Rast, W. and Lee, G.F. 1978. Summary analysis of the North American project (US portion) OECD eutrophication project: nutrient loading-lake response

- relationships and trophic state indices. USEPA Corvallis Environmental Research Laboratory, Corvallis, OR. EPA-600/3-78-008.
- Rawls, W.J. and D.L. Brakensiek. 1985. Prediction of soil water properties for hydrologic modeling. p. 293-299. In E.B. Jones and T.J. Ward (eds). Watershed management in the 80's. ASCE, New York, N.Y.
- Reddy, K.R., R. Khaleel, M.R. Overcash, and P.W. Westerman. 1979. A nonpoint source model for land areas receiving animal wastes: II. Ammonia volatilization. Trans. ASAE 22:1398-1404.
- Richardson, C.W. 1981. Stochastic simulation of daily precipitation, temperature, and solar radiation. Water Resources Res. 17(1):182-190.
- Richardson, C.W. 1982. Dependence structure of daily temperature and solar radiation. Trans. ASAE 25(3):735-739.
- Richardson, C.W. and D.A. Wright. 1984. WGEN: a model for generating daily weather variables. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, ARS-8.
- Ritchie, J.T. 1972. A model for predicting evaporation from a row crop with incomplete cover. Water Resour. Res. 8:1204-1213.
- Rosenburg, N.J., B.L. Blad, and S.B. Verma. 1983. Microclimate: the biological environment, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Ross, J. 1975. Radiative transfer in plant communities. p. 13-55 In J.L. Monteith (ed.) Vegetation and the atmosphere, Vol. 1. Academic Press, London.
- Sangrey, D.A., K.O. Harrop-Williams, and J.A. Klaiber. 1984. Predicting ground-water response to precipitation. ASCE J. Geotech. Eng. 110(7): 957-975.
- Seligmand, N.G. and H. van Keulen. 1981. PAPRAN: A simulation model of annual pasture production limited by rainfall and nitrogen. p. 192-221. In M.J. Frissel and J.A. van Velds. (eds) Simulation of nitrogen behaviour of soil-plant systems, Proc. Workshop. Wageningen, Jan.-Feb. 1980.
- Sharpley, A.N. 1982. A prediction of the water extractable phosphorus content of soil following a phosphorus addition. J. Environ. Qual. 11:166-170.

- Sharpley, A.N., C. Gray, C.A. Jones, and C.V. Cole. 1984. A simplified soil and plant phosphorus model. II. Prediction of labile, organic, and sorbed P amounts. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 48:805-809.
- Sharpley, A.N. and J.K. Syers. 1979. Phosphorus inputs into a stream draining an agricultural watershed: II. Amounts and relative significance of runoff types. *Water, Air and Soil Pollution* 11:417-428.
- Sharpley, A.N. and J.R. Williams, eds. 1990. EPIC-Erosion Productivity Impact Calculator, 1. model documentation. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Tech. Bull. 1768.
- Siegrist, R.L. et al., 2005. Quantifying Site-Scale Processes and Watershed-Scale Cumulative Effects of Decentralized Wastewater Systems. Project No. WU-HT-00-27. Prepared for the National Decentralized Water Resources Capacity Development Project, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, by the Colorado School of Mines.
- Sloan, P.G. and I.D. Moore. 1984. Modeling subsurface stormflow on steeply sloping forested watersheds. *Water Resources Research*. 20(12): 1815-1822.
- Sloan, P.G., I.D. Morre, G.B. Coltharp, and J.D. Eigel. 1983. Modeling surface and subsurface stormflow on steeply-sloping forested watersheds. *Water Resources Inst. Report 142*. Univ. Kentucky, Lexington.
- Smedema, L.K. and D.W. Rycroft. 1983. Land drainage—planning and design of agricultural drainage systems, Cornell University Press, Ithica, N.Y.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1964. Chapter 17: Flood routing, Section 4, Hydrology, National engineering handbook. U.S. Department of Agriculture. U.S. Gov't Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1972. Section 4: Hydrology *In* National Engineering Handbook. SCS.
- Soil Conservation Service Engineering Division. 1986. Urban hydrology for small watersheds. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Technical Release 55.

- Six, J., R.T. Conant, E.A. Paul, and K. Paustian. 2002. Stabilization mechanisms of soil organic matter: Implications for C-saturation of soils. *Plant and Soil* 241:155-176.
- Stanhill, G. and M. Fuchs. 1977. The relative flux density of photosynthetically active radiation. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 14:317-322.
- Stefan, H.G. and E.B. Preud'homme. 1993. Stream temperature estimation from air temperature. *Water Resources Bulletin* 29(1): 27-45.
- Stockle, C.O. and J.R. Kiniry. 1990. Variability in crop radiation-use efficiency associated with vapor-pressure deficit. *Field Crops Res.* 25:171-181.
- Stockle, C.O., J.R. Williams, N.J. Rosenberg, and C.A. Jones. 1992. A method for estimating the direct and climatic effects of rising atmospheric carbon dioxide on growth and yield of crops: Part 1—Modification of the EPIC model for climate change analysis. *Agricultural Systems* 38:225-238.
- Stricker, H. and W. Brutsaert. 1978. Actual evapotranspiration over summer period in the 'Hupsel Catchment.' *J. Hydrol.* 39:139-157.
- Szeicz, G. 1974. Solar radiation for plant growth. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 11:617-636.
- Tetens, O. 1930. Über einige meteorologische Begriffe. *Z. Geophys.* 6:297-309.
- Thomann, R.V. and J.A. Mueller. 1987. Principles of surface water quality modeling and control. Harper & Row Publishers, New York.
- Thomas, G.W. and M. McMahon. 1972. The relation between soil characteristics, water movement and nitrate concentration of ground water. Univ. of Kentucky Water Resources Institute Research Report No. 52, Lexington, KY.
- Thornthwaite, C.W. 1948. An approach toward a rational classification of climate. *Geographical Review* 38:55-94.
- USDA Soil Conservation Service. 1972. National Engineering Handbook Section 4 Hydrology, Chapters 4-10.
- USDA Soil Conservation Service. 1983. National Engineering Handbook Section 4 Hydrology, Chapter 19.

- USEPA. 1980. Lake restoration in Cobbossee watershed. Capsule Rept. Office of Water Planning and Standards Div., ORD, Cincinnati, OH. EPA-624/2-80-027.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1983. Results of the nationwide urban runoff program; Volume 1 final report. NTIS PB84-185552, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- USGS, 1994: 1:250,000-scale Hydrologic Units of the United States. USGS Open-File Rep. 94-0236 [Available on line at <http://water.usgs.gov/GIS/metadata/usgswrd/XML/huc250k.xml>]
- Venetis, C. 1969. A study of the recession of unconfined aquifers. Bull. Int. Assoc. Sci. Hydrol. 14(4): 119-125.
- Vanoni, V.A. (Ed.). 1977. Sedimentation Engineering. ASCE, New York. 745pp.
- Verberne, E.L.J., J. Hassink, P. de Willigen, J.J.R. Groot., and J.A. Van Veen, 1990. Modelling organic matter dynamics in different soils. Netherlands J. Agric. Sci. 38:221-238.
- Walker, W.W. and J. Kiihner. 1978. An empirical analysis of factors controlling eutrophication in midwestern impoundments. Paper presented at the International Symposium on the Environmental Effects of Hydraulic Engineering Works, Univ. of Tenn., Knoxville.
- Watson, D.J. 1947. Comparative physiological studies on the growth of field crops. 1. Variation in net assimilation rate and leaf area index between species and varieties and within and between years. Ann. Bot. N.S. 11:41-76.
- Wenger S. 1999. *A review of the scientific literature on riparian buffer width, extent and vegetation*. Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia. Athens, GA.
- Weintraub, L. et al., 2002. Modifications of WARMF to Assess the Efficacy of Onsite Wastewater Systems on Public Health, WEFTEC, Chicago, IL.
- Westerstrom, G. 1981. Snowmelt runoff from urban plot. p. 452-459. In B.C. Yen (ed.) Urban stormwater hydraulics and hydrology: proceedings of the Second International Conference on Urban Storm Drainage, held at

- Urbana, Illinois, USA, 15-19 June 1981. Water Resources Publications, Littleton, CO.
- Westerstrom, G. 1984. Snowmelt runoff from Porson residential area, Lulea, Sweden. p. 315-323. *In* Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Urban Storm Drainage held at Chalmers University, Goteborg, Sweden, June 1984.
- White MJ and Arnold JG. 2009. Development of a simplistic vegetative filter strip model for sediment and nutrient retention at the field scale. *Hydrol. Process.* 23, 1602-1616.
- Whitman, W.G. 1923. The two-film theory of gas adsorption. *Chem. Metallurg. Eng.* 29:146-148.
- Williams, J.R. 1969. Flood routing with variable travel time or variable storage coefficients. *Trans. ASAE* 12(1):100-103.
- Williams, J.R. 1975a. Sediment routing for agricultural watersheds. *Water Resour. Bull.* 11(5):965-974.
- Williams, J.R. 1975b. Sediment-yield prediction with universal equation using runoff energy factor. p. 244-252. *In* Present and prospective technology for predicting sediment yield and sources: Proceedings of the sediment-yield workshop, USDA Sedimentation Lab., Oxford, MS, November 28-30, 1972. ARS-S-40.
- Williams, J.R. 1980. SPNM, a model for predicting sediment, phosphorus, and nitrogen yields from agricultural basins. *Water Resour. Bull.* 16(5):843-848.
- Williams, J.R. 1995. Chapter 25. The EPIC Model. p. 909-1000. *In* Computer Models of Watershed Hydrology. Water Resources Publications. Highlands Ranch, CO.
- Williams, J.R. and H.D. Berndt. 1977. Sediment yield prediction based on watershed hydrology. *Trans. ASAE* 20(6): 1100-1104.
- Williams, J.R. and R.W. Hann. 1973. HYMO, a problem-oriented computer language for building hydrologic models. *Water Resour. Res.* 8(1):79-85.

- Williams, J.R. and H.D. Berndt. 1977. Sediment yield prediction based on watershed hydrology. *Trans. ASAE* 20(6): 1100-1104.
- Williams, J.R. and R.W. Hann. 1978. Optimal operation of large agricultural watersheds with water quality constraints. *Texas Water Resources Institute, Texas A&M Univ., Tech. Rept. No. 96.*
- Williams, J.R., C.A. Jones and P.T. Dyke. 1984. A modeling approach to determining the relationship between erosion and soil productivity. *Trans. ASAE* 27(1):129-144.
- Williams, J.R., A.D. Nicks, and J.G. Arnold. 1985. Simulator for water resources in rural basins. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 111(6): 970-986.
- Winter, T.C. 1981. Uncertainties in estimating the water balance of lakes. *Water Resources Bulletin* 17:82-115.
- Wischmeier, W.H., C.B. Johnson, and B.V. Cross. 1971. A soil erodibility nomograph for farmland and construction sites. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 26:189-193.
- Wischmeier, W.H. and D.D. Smith. 1965. Predicting rainfall-erosion losses from cropland east of the Rocky Mountains. *Agriculture Handbook 282. USDA-ARS*
- Wischmeier, W.H., and D.D. Smith. 1978. Predicting rainfall losses: A guide to conservation planning. *USDA Agricultural Handbook No. 537. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, D. C.*
- Wright, J.L. and M.E. Jensen. 1972. Peak water requirements of crops in Southern Idaho. *J. Irrig. and Drain. Div., ASCE*, 96(IR1):193-201.
- Yang, C. T. 1996. *Sediment Transport Theory and practice*. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., New York.
- Zanini, L., Robertson, W. D., Ptacek, C. J., Schiff, S. L., and Mayer, T. (1998). "Phosphorus characterization in sediments impacted by septic effluent at four sites in central Canada." *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology*, 33(3-4), 405-429.