#### Journal of Environmental Management 166 (2016) 276-284

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Journal of Environmental Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jenvman

## **Research article**

# Pasture BMP effectiveness using an HRU-based subarea approach in SWAT

# Aleksey Y. Sheshukov<sup>\*</sup>, Kyle R. Douglas-Mankin, Sumathy Sinnathamby, Prasad Daggupati

Biological and Agricultural Engineering, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA

#### A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history: Received 28 March 2011 Received in revised form 8 October 2015 Accepted 12 October 2015 Available online xxx

Keywords: Best management practices Grazing management Hydrologic response unit Pasture Livestock SWAT

#### ABSTRACT

Many conservation programs have been established to motivate producers to adopt best management practices (BMP) to minimize pasture runoff and nutrient loads, but a process is needed to assess BMP effectiveness to help target implementation efforts. A study was conducted to develop and demonstrate a method to evaluate water-quality impacts and the effectiveness of two widely used BMPs on a livestock pasture: off-stream watering site and stream fencing. The Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) model was built for the Pottawatomie Creek Watershed in eastern Kansas, independently calibrated at the watershed outlet for streamflow and at a pasture site for nutrients and sediment runoff, and also employed to simulate pollutant loads in a synthetic pasture. The pasture was divided into several subareas including stream, riparian zone, and two grazing zones. Five scenarios applied to both a synthetic pasture and a whole watershed were simulated to assess various combinations of widely used pasture BMPs: (1) baseline conditions with an open stream access, (2) an off-stream watering site installed in individual subareas in the pasture, and (3) stream or riparian zone fencing with an off-stream watering site. Results indicated that pollutant loads increase with increasing stocking rates whereas off-stream watering site and/or stream fencing reduce time cattle spend in the stream and nutrient loads. These two BMPs lowered organic P and N loads by more than 59% and nitrate loads by 19%, but TSS and sediment-attached P loads remained practically unchanged. An effectiveness index (EI) quantified impacts from the various combinations of off-stream watering sites and fencing in all scenarios. Stream bank contribution to pollutant loads was not accounted in the methodology due to limitations of the SWAT model, but can be incorporated in the approach if an amount of bank soil loss is known for various stocking rates. The proposed methodology provides an adaptable framework for pasture BMP assessment and was utilized to represent a consistent, defensible process to quantify the effectiveness of BMP proposals in a BMP auction in eastern Kansas.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

Over 191 million hectares, or more than 50% of pastureland, rangeland, and woodland in the United States, are used for livestock grazing activities (USDA-NASS, 2008). These activities may contribute to impairment of water bodies by polluting nutrients, bacteria, and sediment (Haan et al., 2006; U.S. EPA, 2004). Use of rivers and streams as a primary source of water for livestock leads to increased grazing time in or near the stream, resulting in direct deposition of animal waste into the stream accompanied by bank erosion at stream access and crossing locations. Properly implemented best management practices (BMP) can significantly reduce the pollutant footprint of grazing lands. One goal for grazing management and sediment-control BMPs is to protect sensitive areas of the pasture, such as streams, riparian zones, and ponds, by restricting livestock access.

Common BMPs that support stream protection consist of an alternative off-stream water source, a riparian buffer, and exclusion fencing (U.S. EPA, 2004). The alternative water source attracts livestock away from primary water bodies, such as streams, ponds and lakes, whereas the fencing completely eliminates access to streams and prevents direct animal waste contribution as well as mechanical disturbance to banks that may cause excessive soil erosion. Fencing requires that an alternative off-stream water source exists. Riparian areas along a stream function similar to







<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

*E-mail addresses:* ashesh@ksu.edu (A.Y. Sheshukov), krdmankin@gmail.com (K.R. Douglas-Mankin), Sumathy.Sinnathamby@kda.ks.gov (S. Sinnathamby), pdaggupati@tamu.edu (P. Daggupati).

vegetative filters at the edge of agricultural fields by filtering runoff and trapping pollutants before they reach the stream (Mankin et al., 2007b).

Many studies (Sheffield et al., 1997; Line et al., 2000; Agouridis et al., 2005) observed substantial decrease in sediment losses after stream fencing. For example, Owens et al. (1996) observed that after stream and riparian buffer were fenced, annual TSS concentrations decreased by 50% over the following five years. Line et al. (2000) and Sheffield et al. (1997) reported TSS concentration reductions of more than 80%. In these studies, concentrations of total nitrogen (N) and phosphorous (P) were also reduced by 50%–70%. In all reported cases, reductions in pollutant loads were caused by improvement to stream banks and reduction in the associated bank erosion due to reduction in bank disturbance by cattle. The mineralized components of N and P loads are attached to and transported with sediment; therefore, N and P reductions correlate with reductions in sediment concentrations.

A few field studies were conducted to assess stream waterquality improvement due to restriction of stream access for cattle on grazing fields (Miner et al., 1992; Owens et al., 1996; Sheffield et al., 1997; Line et al., 2000; Agouridis et al., 2005). Miner et al. (1992) and Sheffield et al. (1997) observed above 90% reduction of time cattle spent in stream if the off-stream watering site was introduced. Clawson (1993) reported 81% time reduction and concluded that cattle preferred to drink 75% of the time from trough than from stream. McInnis and McIver (2001) found small reductions in near-stream hoof traffic from off-stream water and salt, but these reductions vielded significant reductions in development of unstable stream banks. Daily use of a stream with no offsite water source in the pasture varied from relatively short periods (4.7 min by Clawson, 1993; 6.7 min by Sheffield et al., 1997; and 14.5 min by Miner et al., 1992) to prolonged periods of above 90 min (Pandey et al., 2009). Such variation in daily stream use leads to differences in water-quality impact and improvements if the stream is fenced or restricted. Agouridis et al. (2005) monitored cattle spatial variability within two pasture fields, and statistically analyzed cattle positions over a 1.5-year period, and concluded a positive correlation between the stream bank erosion and stocking density at 50 stream cross-sectional areas.

Preferential grazing patterns within a pasture cause concentrated points of manure depositions, which affect native levels of soil organic nutrient components. Spatial variation of soil properties also can be due to geological factors or can be imposed by soil management practices. Sauer and Meek (2003) studied spatial variation of soil P in two pasture fields. The impact of morphological factors was found to be secondary to management factors. They also found that the history of grazing activity in the pasture affects nutrient content in soil, thus affecting pollutant runoff. Areas of higher P occur mostly near gates, roads, stream, and watering sites (Sauer and Meek, 2003; Penn et al., 2009). Areas of high slope have greater potential to generate surface runoff, accompanying soil loss, and sediment-attached P than areas with low slope (Haan et al., 2006). Representation of these preferential grazing patterns and morphological features are needed in models to better assess the environmental impact of grazing BMPs.

Phosphorous loss in runoff is considered an important indicator of pasture environmental quality, and several models were developed to assess impacts of grazing BMPs on soil health (USDA-NRCS, 1994; Wade et al., 1998; White et al., 2009; Nelson and Shober, 2012). The Phosphorous Index (PI) model is a qualitative tool to assess various land forms for potential risk of P runoff to water bodies (USDA-NRCS, 1994; Nelson and Shober, 2012). The tool computes P index rating for a pasture area as a sum of eight P loss factors and weighting coefficients. P loss factors range from low to high and split into categories related to soil erosion, runoff, soil test P, P fertilizer application rate and method, and organic P source application rate and method (Lemunyon and Gilbert, 1993). The P index rating result from application of weighted coefficients to interpret the site vulnerability ratings. The tool mainly relies on general pasture information and does not use spatial characteristics or management operations. The Grazing Potential Index model (GPI: Wade et al., 1998) uses land characteristics, pasture proximity to the stream, and forage availability to assess environmental potential. The model statistically distributes cattle within the pasture based on geographical features such as the nearest permanent water source(s), land slopes, and forage availability, and assigns a GPI score to different areas within the watershed. The areas with higher GPI scores are expected to be favored by livestock. Although this model produces spatial representations of grazing patterns, it does not quantitatively calculate nutrient loads to the stream. The Pasture Phosphorous Management (PPM) calculator (White et al., 2009) is a quantitative P assessment tool that uses the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) model to pre-process P loads for individual Hydrologic Response Units (HRU) and lets a user select the corresponding representation of the grazing area. Grazing management operations, stocking rates, and fertilizer applications are inputs to the model on a monthly basis. The PPM Calculator presents a quantitative way to evaluate the P runoff from a pasture; however, it does not account for unique land characteristics at different parts of the pasture, grazing spatial patterns, and direct stream contribution.

To minimize pasture runoff and nutrient loads, many conservation programs, traditional cost-share programs, or cost-effective alternative programs have been established to motivate producers to adopt BMPs (Smith et al., 2007, 2009). Administration of these programs would benefit from a better understanding of the sitespecific pollutant-load reductions associated with the proposed BMPs in order to better evaluate the environmental benefits associated with program costs. The three presented above models cannot be directly used to quantify site-specific environmental impacts of pasture BMPs, which would be beneficial for accurate assessment of field condition. Therefore, the objective of this study was to develop and demonstrate a new method of utilizing sitespecific pasture characteristics and cattle grazing patterns for determining average annual pollutant load and calculating an index of pasture BMP effectiveness. Demonstration and application of this method to pastures in Pottawatomie Creek watershed in eastern Kansas and a single synthetic pasture will be discussed.

#### 2. Methods and materials

#### 2.1. Pasture design

Pasture fields are lands of low-growing vegetation (grasses, shrubs, plants, etc.) utilized for animal grazing. Pasture fields differ in size, topography, soil characteristics, forage type, and grazing management and normally contain an access point to water. A typical water source can be a stream flowing through pasture or an alternative off-stream watering site (a pond or an artificially build trough) (Ohlenbusch and Harner, 2003). A pond or any alternative source of water that is hydrologically disconnected from a stream provides an opportunity to capture majority of animal waste that otherwise would have been excreted directly into the stream. A vegetative buffer or riparian area is a native or created buffer adjacent to a stream to reduce pollutant transport to the streams (U.S. EPA, 2004).

In this study, we defined a pasture to consist of three parts: a grazing area, a riparian area, and a stream. The grazing area represents a main area for cattle to graze. The riparian area can be a buffer zone along the stream or forested inclusions within the

grazing area. The stream area is defined as area that envelops the stream and by its land cover characteristics cannot be interpreted as riparian buffer. If an alternative watering site is present, it is assumed to be located within the grazing area and have no direct outflow to the stream. Both the grazing area and the riparian buffer can be divided further into subareas according to individual land characteristics, such as topography, soil type, land cover, and management operations. Within each subarea, the characteristics are assumed to be uniform.

#### 2.2. Stocking rate

Variability in grazing distribution can be accounted by using individual stocking rates (*SR*) for each subarea. Generally, the average SR for an entire pasture area is expressed as the number of animal units (AU; 1 AU = 1000 kg of animal weight) allocated per unit of land area *A* (1 ha) in one day (Ohlenbusch and Watson, 1994; Redfearn and Bidwell, 1997). For an individual subarea *i* in the pasture, the local stocking rate (*SR<sub>i</sub>*) relates to a daily fraction of the grazing time by:

$$SR_i = [Number of AU][\%Time]/A_i$$
(1)

while average stocking rate  $SR_{AVG}$  for pasture with *N* subareas can be expressed using an area-weighted approach as

$$SR_{AVG} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (SR_iA_i) / \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i$$
<sup>(2)</sup>

#### 2.3. SWAT model

The Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) (Arnold et al., 1998; Neitsch et al., 2004, 2005) is a widely used watershed model (Gassman et al., 2007; Douglas-Mankin et al., 2010) that was utilized in this study to simulate hydrological and water-quality processes at the field (or pasture) and watershed scales. SWAT is a complex continuous simulation model that incorporates a set of both physically and empirically based equations within multiple modules that proceed either independently of each other or use outputs of one module as inputs for another module within one time-step. Both pasture-scale and watershed-scale modules are implemented in SWAT. Based on topography and using the Geographic Information System (GIS) module within ArcGIS (ESRI, 2011) for pre-processing geospatial layers, SWAT delineates a watershed into subwatersheds that are further subdivided into areas of homogeneous soil type, land cover, and slope range, called Hydrologic Response Units (HRU). HRUs are used to simulate all processes that occur at the pasture scale, including hydrologic budget, plant growth, erosion, and nutrient cycles. The amount of water, nutrients, and sediment flowing from the HRUs into streams are accounted at the daily time scale and collected as HRU outputs.

Applying the HRU framework to pasture area, subareas within the pasture can be represented by individual HRUs. For example, pasture (identified in SWAT as PAST) and rangeland (RNGE) land cover represent grazing subareas, and deciduous forest (FRSD) and range-brush mix (RNGB) represent riparian subareas. We note that stream subarea was not simulated in SWAT.

SWAT requires a large number of input parameters that are divided into the groups of watershed-scale and pasture-scale parameters. Many watershed-scale parameters, such as land cover, soil, geographical features, and groundwater parameters, are either loaded directly as attributes of geospatial layers or calculated from them. Twelve pasture-scale parameters that relate to land management and practices in the pasture are presented in Table 1 and applied to grazing and riparian HRUs. The amount of minimum dry above ground biomass at which grazing is permitted, pasture initial conditions, operation schedule, and daily amounts of biomass consumed and trampled are input into the SWAT project database based on the SR and knowledge of animal behavior in the pasture.

Loadings of six specified pollutants (soluble P [defined in SWAT by SOLP], organic P [ORGP], sediment-attached P [SEDP], organic N [ORGN], nitrate [NO<sub>3</sub>–N], and suspended solids [TSS]) for each subarea in the pasture besides the stream subarea are collected from the unit-area HRU outputs ( $\omega$ ). For stream subareas an approach is used based on fractions of nutrients in animal waste that are directly applied to the stream load:

$$\omega_{stream} = \chi \cdot m \cdot SR_{stream} \tag{3}$$

where m = 8.5 kg, and  $\chi$  is percent of the selected nutrient constituent in dry solid manure, 1.0% for NO<sub>3</sub>–N, 3.0% for ORGN, 0.4% for SOLP, 0.7% for ORGP, and 0% for SEDP and TSS according to the ASAE standards (ASAE, 1999) and SWAT database (Neitsch et al., 2005). Total load  $W_{\text{pasture}}$  of each pollutant for the entire pasture can be calculated as:

$$W_{pasture} = \omega_{stream} A_{stream} + \omega_2 A_2 + \omega_3 A_3 + \dots + \omega_N A_N \tag{4}$$

#### 2.4. BMP effectiveness

Various pasture BMPs are designed to improve water-quality conditions in the pasture; reduce P, N, and TSS loads; and optimize grazing management. Among many pasture BMPs such as cross fencing, stream fencing, rotational grazing, and alternative watering sites, only a few can be represented within current continuous water-quality models. In this study, a procedure was developed to simulate two pasture BMPs, both related to reducing stream access: creating off-stream watering sites and fencing streams and/or buffers (Ohlenbusch and Harner, 2003). By establishing an off-stream watering site in upland subareas of the pasture, it increases the fraction of daily time that cattle graze there, which increases SR in the subarea of the alternative watering site and reduces SR in the area near the stream. If fencing is applied, the fenced areas (stream or buffer) are considered inaccessible for grazing, and SR in these areas is set to zero.

Two types of modeling scenarios were introduced in this study. Grazing scenario in a pasture with no implemented BMPs will be called the baseline scenario, while a pasture with implemented fencing or off-stream watering site will be called a BMP scenario. A water-quality impact of implemented BMPs can be calculated by comparing the pollutant loads in baseline and BMP scenarios using either an effectiveness index (EI, %) for a single pollutant or the cumulative effectiveness index (CEI, %) in the case of *M* multiple pollutants:

$$EI_j = \frac{W_j^{baseline} - W_j^{BMP}}{W_j^{baseline}} 100\%, \quad CEI = \sum_{j=1}^M (\phi_j EI_j)$$
(5)

where *j* represents a pollutant and  $\phi_j$  are weighting coefficients according to pollutant ranking table. In this study, the six pollutants (M = 6) specified above as outputs of the SWAT model were considered of equal importance, thus,  $\phi_j = 0.167$ .

#### 3. Study area

#### 3.1. Model setup

The pasture BMP effectiveness method was tested in the 897-

SWAT management operation input parameters and their values within a grazing land (G1, G2) HRU and a riparian buffer (R) HRU (VAR means variable values).

Description	SWAT parameter	HRU	Value	Units
Grass type	PLANT_ID	G1,G2	38	_
Management operation	MGT_OP	G1,G2,R	9	_
Type of animals	MANURE_ID	G1,G2,R	9	_
Daily manure	MANURE_KG	G1,G2,R	VAR	kg/ha
Start of grazing	YEAR,MONTH,DAY	G1,G2,R	VAR	_
Number of grazing days	GRZ_DAYS	G1,G2,R	280	Days
Type of fertilizer	FRT_ID	G1,G2	23	_
Amount of fertilizer	FRT_KG	G1,G2	6.8	kg
Biomass consumed daily	BIO_EAT	G1,G2,R	VAR	kg/ha
Biomass trampled daily	BIO_TRMP	G1,G2,R	VAR	kg/ha
Minimum dry biomass	BIOMIN	G1,G2	500	kg/ha
Initial pasture and buffer conditions	CN2	G1,G2,R	VAR	_

km<sup>2</sup> Pottawatomie Creek Watershed in eastern Kansas (Fig. 1). The SWAT ver. 2005 model was built for the watershed with the main outlet set at the USGS gaging station 06914100 on Pottawatomie Creek near the town of Scipio, Kansas (USGS, 2009, Fig. 1b). Based on geospatial datasets of 10-m Digital Elevation Model, 30-m NLCD land cover, and SSURGO soil database (Homer et al., 2007; USDA-NRCS, 2005; Sheshukov et al., 2011), the watershed was delineated into seven subwatersheds and 6066 HRUs. Watershed land uses were primarily grazing land (46%) and cropland (30%), and soil was predominantly (80%) silt loam of high runoff potential (hydrologic soil group type D). According to land-ownership parcels in eastern Kansas, the watershed is comprised of 403 sections of land (260 ha, 640 acres) with grazing land occupying on average 163 ha (from 13 ha to 250 ha) of each section (Fig. 1b). Following practices used in eastern Kansas, continuous corn with a mix of conventional and no-till practices were applied to all cropland HRUs, while pasture HRUs had tall fescue grass growing all year and grazed with an average SR of 0.8 AU/ha.

Due to availability of edge-of-field sampling data, a 3.5 ha dairy pasture field in subwatershed 7 composed of tall fescue grass in low slope (80%) and high slope (20%) areas was identified for pasture scale analysis. Three HRUs represented the pasture and 200 dairy cattle were grazed throughout the year. Specific grazing management operation parameters used in the model are provided in Table 1.

Timeseries of daily temperature and precipitation from 1995 to 2005 from two NCDC cooperative weather stations 143008 and 143441 (NCDC, 2009) were collected for weather input in



Fig. 1. Study watershed, showing (a) Pottawatomie Creek Watershed in east-central Kansas; (b) stream network, delineated subwatersheds, grazing area in 260-ha land parcels, weather stations, and USGS gaging station used in streamflow calibration; and (c) aerial image of the Nichols dairy pasture used in sediment and nutrient calibration.

subwatersheds 1–6. For subwatershed 7, daily records from the onsite weather station at the dairy pasture were used instead. The model was run for seven years (1999–2005), with the first 2 years used for model spin-off.

#### 3.2. Model calibration

Two types of calibration procedures were conducted to ensure acceptable performance of the SWAT model at both the watershed and pasture scales. First, the simulated daily streamflow was compared with data from the gaging station at the watershed outlet. The following statistical parameters were used for calibration (Moriasi et al., 2007): the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency coefficient (NSE; Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970), the coefficient of determination  $(R^2)$ , the root mean square error to standard deviation ratio (RSR), and the percent bias (PBIAS). Seven model parameters shown in Table 2 were adjusted during hydrologic calibration process. The final statistics presented in Table 3 was rated from very good (NSE > 0.75; RSR  $\le$  0.50) to good ( $\pm$ 10%  $\le$  PBIAS  $< \pm$ 15%) according to Moriasi et al. (2007). Second, water samples from 2001 to 2005 were used to calibrate the model for sediment and nutrient runoff at the pasture scale (Mankin et al., 2007a, Fig. 1c). An automated sampler (Model 6700; Teledyne Isco, Lincoln, NE, USA) was installed at the edge of the pasture field, and a total of 22 flowweighted water samples were collected on a bi-weekly schedule from multi-day runoff events. Samples were analyzed for total phosphorous (P), nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub>-N), and suspended solids (TSS) using methods described in APHA (1998). The observed concentrations were compared with the SWAT-simulated concentrations of the same pollutants aggregated for each sampling period using area-weighted concentrations from three HRUs comprising the pasture field. Five model parameters (Table 2) were adjusted during the calibration process, which resulted in satisfactory model performance for TSS (PBIAS  $< \pm 55\%$ ) and very good performance for total P and NO<sub>3</sub>-N (PBIAS  $< \pm 25\%$ ) (Table 3; Moriasi et al., 2007). In addition, mean and ranges of observed and calibrated streamflow and pollutant concentrations were compared in Table 3 and showed adequate model performance. Based on the statistics of two calibration procedures, the model was deemed acceptable for simulation of pasture BMP effectiveness.

#### 3.3. Synthetic pasture scenarios

After the SWAT model was built and calibrated at the watershed

#### Table 2

SWAT parameters adjusted during calibration runs in Pottawatomie Creek watershed.

and pasture scales, an example synthetic pasture was configured to evaluate effectiveness of pasture BMPs. The distribution of pasture and forest HRUs and a stream length in the watershed were used as basis to design a synthetic pasture. Based on total area of all pastureland as 51,300 ha, total length of streams crossing through pastureland as 789 km, and assuming typical 10-meter wide floodplain and 15-meter wide riparian zone on each side of the stream, stream area and riparian buffer were found to occupy 1.6% and 4.5% of total pastureland in the watershed, respectively. These percentages were used to define subareas within the synthetic pasture. A synthetic pasture was selected to represent a guartersection (65 ha, 160 acres) of land-ownership parcel and contained an in-stream area (1 ha; defined as S), a riparian zone (3 ha; R), and grazing area (61 ha). To account for land variability, the grazing area was additionally divided into two grazing subareas G1 and G2 of the same soil type.

An average slope of all pastureland was 1.2%, with riparian areas sloped at 0.4%. The subarea G1 was selected to represent low slope topography, whereas G2 covered high-slope area. Areas of G1 and G2 varied for different scenarios and SWAT runs. Three specific HRUs from the SWAT model were selected to represent pasture subareas; two HRUs identified with PAST landuse represented areas G1 and G2, and one HRU with RNGE landuse represented area R. Two HRUs selected for G1 and R had slopes of 0.4% for all runs. The slope of the second pasture HRU for G2 was appropriately adjusted to satisfy the average pasture slope of 1.2%, and SWAT model was reran for each new scenario.

Cattle stocking rate of 0.8 AU/ha/day were used for uniform grazing within the whole synthetic pasture without considering preferential grazing patterns. Daily amount of time that cattle spent in each subarea was strictly based on the area of grazing and riparian subareas, while for not-fenced stream subarea it was assumed at 14 min (1% of each day). This selected duration of stream time was similar to Miner et al. (1992), however, other durations of up to 140 min (10%) were also tested in simulations.

The baseline and four BMP scenarios were simulated for the synthetic pasture. In the baseline scenario, cattle spent 14 min (1% of 24 h) in stream subarea, 67 min in subarea B, and 1359 min in subareas G1 and G2. The first two BMP scenarios, W1N and W2N, simulated BMPs with off-stream watering site installed in grazing areas G1 and G2, respectively, and no stream fencing. Because of the presence of off-stream watering site, the stream time was assumed to be reduced by 90% as similar to Miner et al. (1992) and Sheffield et al. (1997). Other reductions in stream time (from 50% to

SWAT parameter	Default value	Range tested	Calibrated value	Description
Streamflow at watersh	ned outlet			
CN2	Varies	67-100	-5%	SCS curve number, antecedent moisture condition 2
ESCO	0.95	0-1	0.8	Soil evaporation compensation factor
SURLAG	4	1-12	1	Surface runoff lag coefficient
CANMX	0	_	Forest: 4.2 <sup>a</sup>	Maximum canopy storage (mm H <sub>2</sub> O)
	0	_	Crops: 2.2 <sup>a</sup>	
	0	_	Grass: 3.5 <sup>a</sup>	
RCHRGDP	0.05	0-1	1	Deep aquifer percolation factor
SFTMP	1	-5-5	-1	Snowfall temperature (°C)
SMTMP	1	-5-5	4	Snowmelt temperature (°C)
Pollutant concentration	ons at pasture edge			
SOL_ORGN	0	850-8000	5000 <sup>b</sup>	Initial organic N concentration in soil layer (ppm)
SOL_ORGP	0	150-5000	4000 <sup>c</sup>	Initial organic P concentration in soil layer (ppm)
SOL_SOLP	0	250-1000	750	Initial soluble P concentration in soil layer (ppm)
BIOMIX	0	0-1	0.8	Biological mixing efficiency
BIOMIN	0	0-650	500	Minimum plant biomass for grazing (kg/ha)

<sup>a</sup> Ouyang et al. (2010).

<sup>b</sup> Santhi et al. (2001).

<sup>c</sup> Richards et al. (2008).

Table 3	Ta	bl	e	3	
---------	----	----	---	---	--

Observed streamflow, pollutant concentrations, and statistics for default and final calibration runs in Pottawatomie Creek watershed (n is the number of samples).

		NSE	R <sup>2</sup>	RSR	PBIAS		
Streamflow at watershed outlet							
Mean observed flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s): 2.67 (Ra	ange: 0–172.8)						
Default run	Daily	-5.77	0.16	0.08	429%		
	Monthly	-5.4	0.51	0.42	429%		
	Annual	-5.0	0.5	0.3	400%		
Mean calibrated flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s): 2.35 (0	-139.9)						
Calibrated run	Daily	0.59	0.55	0.02	-12%		
	Monthly	0.83	0.88	0.07	-12%		
	Annual	0.8	0.85	0.05	-12%		
Pollutant concentrations at pasture edge (n = 22)							
Mean observed concentrations for TSS (tn/ha): 97 (14–299); TP (kg/ha): 3.2 (1.0–10.6); NO <sub>3</sub> –N (kg/ha): 1.3 (0.1–3.3)							
Default run	TSS	-0.21	0.2	0.28	-57%		
	TP	-2.0	0.01	0.45	-99%		
	NO <sub>3</sub> -N	-1.64	0.01	0.42	8%		
Mean calibrated concentrations for TSS (tn/ha): 72 (3–178); TP (kg/ha): 2.9 (0–7.2); NO <sub>3</sub> –N (kg/ha): 1.0 (0–5.1)							
Calibrated run	TSS	0.2	0.44	0.23	-26%		
	TP	-0.78	0	0.33	-8%		
	NO <sub>3</sub> -N	-1.0	0.05	0.37	-19%		

100%) were also tested and discussed in section 4. The final two BMP scenarios, W1F and W2F, represented a combination of an offstream watering site in either G1 or G2 complemented by stream fencing. In these two scenarios cattle has no access to stream and spend all daily time grazing in subareas G1 and G2.

#### 4. Results

The SWAT model for the Pottawatomie Creek watershed, calibrated at watershed and pasture scales, was run many times with stocking rates varying from 0 to 3 AU/ha applied to all grazing (RNGE, HAY) and forested (FRSD, RNGB) HRUs. For each run, annual average loads of six pollutants (TSS, SEDP, ORGP, SOLP, ORGN, NO<sub>3</sub>–N) were collected in all HRUs, aggregated to represent the pasture according to Eq. (4), and used to calculate pasture BMP effectiveness indices EI and CEI with Eq. (5). The results were applied to simulate baseline and four BMP scenarios for the following two pasture sets: (1) a single synthetic pasture comprised of four subareas and (2) all 403 pastures in the entire Pottawatomie Creek watershed. Synthetic pasture scenarios and results are presented in details while the statistics of the BMP applications to the entire watershed is summarized and discussed.

Annual average loads for the synthetic pasture are presented in Fig. 2a for the baseline scenario, while the loads for four BMP scenarios are shown in Fig. 2b as deviations from the baseline. The subareas G1, G2, R, and S were set as default at 50 ha, 11 ha, 3 ha and 1 ha, respectively. In addition, range bars in Fig. 2a represent ranges of loads for grazing subarea G1 varying from 0 to 61 ha. Pasture pollutants related to sediment runoff show the largest variation in loads with the change in area of G1, with the loads of TSS and SEDP increasing 14 times from pasture configuration with 100% G1 and no G2 area to the configuration with no G1 and 100% G2 area (Fig. 2a). The high-slope subarea G2 produces 20 times more sediment runoff than G1, thus contributing more to TSS and SEDP loads with a decrease of G1. Loads of other pollutants (ORGP, SOLP, ORGN, NO<sub>3</sub>-N) increased only by about 5% with decrease of G1 indicating that they rely more on either phosphorous and nitrogen concentrations stored in the soil or applied in a form of manure to the soil or directly in the stream. For the default case of G1 area of 50 ha, the stream contribution to total pasture loads was 66% for ORGP, 94% for ORGN, and 21% for NO<sub>3</sub>-N. For SOLP, the major contributor was the grazing subarea G1 at 81%. The conducted additional tests with different sizes of the riparian subarea revealed the decrease of total pasture TSS and SEDP loads with an increase of riparian buffer.

Benefits of the reduction in stream time were apparent when examining net nutrient loads from BMP scenarios when compared to their respective baseline scenarios (Fig. 2b). The reduction in stream time for scenarios W1N and W2N relative to the baseline scenario reduced the pollutant stream contribution by 90% and reduced organic nutrient loads by 85% for ORGN, 59% for ORGP, and 19% for NO<sub>3</sub>—N, whereas SOLP, TSS, and SEDP loads remained practically unaffected. Fencing a stream in scenarios W1F and W2F completely eliminated access to stream, thus increased stocking rates and manure deposition in grazing subareas. However, the fencing led to only an incremental decrease in pollutant loads in contrast with a substantial reduction caused by the off-stream watering site.

The impact of pasture topography on BMP effectiveness is presented in Fig. 3 for four BMP scenarios by varying the area of G1 from 0% to 100% (61 ha) coverage. The CEI increased with the increase of G1 area for all BMPs reaching its maximum value when G1 area occupies 100% of the grazing land. Similar to the analysis of pollutant loads presented in Fig. 2, the presence of off-stream watering site in scenarios W1N and W2N had a much stronger impact on BMP effectiveness (CEI ranged from 19.7% to 31%) and pollutant load reductions than impacts caused by additional stream fencing. Two fencing scenarios (W1F, W2F) consistently produced higher CEIs than a non-fencing scenario (W1N, W2N) for any percentage of G1 area, however, the difference in CEI was only 1.8% for zero G1 subarea, and increased to 3.4% for G1 subarea occupying 100%. A placement of the watering site in a low-slope area G1 was slightly more efficient than placing it in the high-slope area G2, with CEI increasing with the increase of contribution of G1 in grazing area. This was also confirmed by assessing BMPs in all pastures in the watershed; average CEI reduced from 38% for low-slope (0.01%) pasture to 31% for high-slope (6%) pasture.

Major factors influencing load calculations were the daily grazing times in pasture subareas, especially in the stream. The stream time was assumed in the synthetic pasture configuration as 1% of daily time or 14 min for the baseline scenario; it was additionally reduced by 90% (1.4 min) for scenarios W1N and W2N with off-stream watering site, or completely eliminated (0 min) for scenarios W1F and W2F with stream fencing. The pre-BMP baseline stream time and its reduction as a result of BMP scenarios can be considered site specific and may vary seasonally. The sensitivity of BMP efficiency to the variability in stream time was evaluated in Fig. 4 by plotting CEI as a function of the reduction in stream grazing time in W1N scenario. The daily stream grazing time varied from 7 min (curve 1) to 120 min (curve 4) for synthetic pasture



**Fig. 2.** (a) Annual average loads of total suspended solids (TSS), organic P (ORGP), sediment-attached P (SEDP), soluble P (SOLP), organic N (ORGN), and nitrates (NO<sub>3</sub>–N) for baseline scenario of the synthetic pasture, and (b) load changes from the baseline for four BMP scenarios. Subareas G1, G2, R, S were set as default at 50 ha, 11 ha, 3 ha, and 1 ha, respectively, while range bars in (a) represent grazing subarea G1 varying from 0 to 61 ha.

scenarios. The CEI gradually increased as the stream time increased, which reflects the fact that overall pollutant reduction was responsive to implementation of the off-stream watering site. However, there were diminishing returns for each increment of stream time increase; the relative magnitude of reductions decreased as stream time increased. In addition, CEI increased for greater reductions in stream time for any given pre-BMP stream grazing time. A 100% reduction in time represents the case of



**Fig. 3.** Pasture BMP cumulative effectiveness index (CEI, %) for four BMP scenarios as a function of the percentage of subarea G1 in total grazing area.

completely halting the stream access for grazing, which is similar to stream fencing in W1F scenario. The increase in CEI that results from greater reductions in stream time confirms intuition. However, also evident in Fig. 4 is that the rate of increase in CEI per unit of reduction in time increases slightly as pre-BMP stream time increases. For example, a shift from 50% to 100% stream time reduction led to a 13% CEI increase for curve 1 (7 min) compared to a 18% CEI increase for curve 3 (30 min). Thus, settings in which cattle initially (pre-BMP) spend more time in the stream may show a greater response per unit of reduction in stream time resulting from a given BMP.

Similar behavior was observed while evaluating all 403 pastures in the watershed. The range of CEI for W1N scenario with 14min stream time is presented in Fig. 4 as a shaded area, while the mean trend is shown by the dashed line. Comparing with curve 2 for the synthetic pasture, the watershed overall exhibited better response and from 5 to 10% higher BMP effectiveness to off-stream watering site installation.

## 5. Discussion

Studying the baseline scenario revealed that accounting for stream subarea in configuring a pasture can increase nutrient contribution from pasture and substantially improve estimation of BMP efficiency. Localized high-slope grazing areas in a pasture may affect hillslope hydrology, increase soil erosion and transported pollutants.

The results presented in section 4 demonstrated that an offstream watering site can positively affect concentrations of animal waste in the stream by attracting livestock to spend longer times away from the stream. Stream fencing provided additional reduction in pollutant loads; although, the increase in effectiveness was marginal compared to the impact of an off-stream watering site. These results correspond with the findings of Sheffield et al.



Fig. 4. BMP cumulative effectiveness index (CEI, %) for W1N scenario in Pottawatomie Creek watershed and synthetic pasture. The CEI is calculated for various daily stream grazing times as a function of stream time reduction (based on increasing use of an alternative watering site). The shaded area and dashed line illustrate range and a mean of CEI for 403 pastures in Pottawatomie Creek watershed, while solid lines show CEI for synthetic pasture.

(1997), Line et al. (2000), and Agouridis et al. (2005). For  $SR_{AVE} = 0.8 \text{ AU/ha}$ , keeping livestock away from the stream reduced organic components of P and N by 85% and 59%, nitrates by 19%, however, TSS and SEDP remained almost unchanged which contradicted the other experimental studies (Sheffield et al., 1997). The disparity between the results mainly occurred due to not accounting for stream bank erosion in SWAT, a potentially significant contributor to stream TSS. A reduction in grazing time near a stream should decrease trampling and other deteriorating effects on banks that were found important by Sheffield et al. (1997) and Agouridis et al. (2005) but not explicitly included in the SWAT model. We predict that accounting for bank erosion by incorporating stream bank soil loss components in Eq. (4) would increase the BMP effectiveness of both fencing and off-stream watering site practices. Regardless of this shortcoming, the methodology presented in this paper provides a viable tool to assist expert management teams in evaluating the effectiveness of an off-stream watering site and stream fencing. As an example, this approach was used in making management decisions to award producers for BMP implementation on producer pasture fields as part of the livestock BMP auction (U.S. EPA, 2009). The awarded installation of the offstream watering site not only produced high effectiveness index but also appeared to be the most cost-efficient compared to other BMP proposals. In contrast, the stream fencing and riparian buffer fencing was associated with higher cost and, in the end, turned out to be less cost-efficient.

#### 6. Conclusions

In this study, a modeling approach of pasture BMP effectiveness was developed based on HRU-based representation of individual pasture subareas including stream, riparian zone, and various slope grazing lands. Based on the HRU distribution in the SWAT model built for Pottawatomie Creek Watershed in eastern Kansas, four scenarios with combinations of off-stream watering site and stream fencing BMPs were evaluated in synthetic pasture and a whole watershed.

The presence of the off-stream watering site reduced the time cattle spent in the flood plain area as well as the overall pollutant load in the stream. This resulted in the cumulative effectiveness index being above 20% for all BMP scenarios, with an additional gain of 2% if the stream was fenced. Sediment contribution from stream bank erosion was not accounted in the methodology due to limitations of the SWAT model, but can be incorporated in the approach if an amount of bank soil loss is known for various stocking rates. The methodology was applied to evaluate BMP proposals in a BMP auction conducted in an eastern Kansas watershed.

#### Acknowledgments

The authors thank Mr. Josh Roe (watershed economist), Mr. Herschel George (watershed specialist), and Dr. Verel Benson (Benson Consulting) for multiple discussions leading to development of livestock BMP ranking methodology, and reviewers for valuable comments that led to improvement of the manuscript.

#### References

- Agouridis, C.T., Edwards, D.R., Workman, S.R., Bicudo, J.R., Koostra, B.K., Vanzant, E.S., Taraba, J.L., 2005. Streambank erosion associated with grazing practices in the humid region. Trans. ASABE 48 (1), 181–190.
- APHA, 1998. In: Clesceri, L.S., Greenberg, A.E., Eaton, A.D. (Eds.), Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, twentieth ed. American Public Health Association, Washington, D.C.
- Arnold, J.G., Srinivasan, R., Muttiah, R.S., Williams, J.R., 1998. Large area hydrologic model development and assessment part 1: model development. J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc. 34 (1), 73–89.
- ASAE Standards, 1999. fourtyfifth ed., American Society of Agricultural Engineers, St. Joseph, Mich..
- Clawson, J.E., 1993. The Use of Off-stream Water Developments and Various Water Gap Configurations to Modify the Watering Behavior of Grazing Cattle. M.S. Thesis. Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.
- Douglas-Mankin, K.R., Srinivasan, R., Arnold, J.G., 2010. Soil and Water Assessment

Tool (SWAT) model: current developments and applications. Trans. ASABE 53 (5), 1423-1431.

ESRI, 2011. ArcMap 10. Environmental Systems Resource Institute, Redlands, California.

- Gassman, P.W., Reves, M.R., Green, C.H., Arnold, J.G., 2007. The Soil and Water Assessment Tool: historical development, applications, and future research directions. Trans. ASABE 50 (4), 1211-1250.
- Haan, M.M., Russell, J.R., Powers, W.J., Kovar, J.L., Benning, J.L., 2006. Grazing management effects on sediment and phosphorus in surface runoff. Rangel, Ecol. Manag. 59, 607-615.
- Lorent, M., Born, S.J., Sty, J., Coan, M., Hossain, N., Larson, C., Herold, N., McKerrow, A., VanDriel, J.N., Wickham, J., 2007. Completion of the 2001 national land cover database for the conterminous United States, Photogramm, Eng. Remote Sens. 73 (4), 337-341.
- Lemunyon, J.L., Gilbert, R.G., 1993. The concept and need for a phosphorus assessment tool. J. Prod. Agric. 6 (4), 483-486.
- Line, D.E., Harman, W.A., Jennings, G.D., Thompson, E.J., Osmond, D.L., 2000. Nonpoint-source pollutant load reductions associated with livestock exclusion. J. Environ. Qual. 29 (6), 1882–1890. Mankin, K.R., Hutchinson, S.L., Harner, J.P., Clark, P.A., Barnes, P.L., 2007a. Perfor-
- mance Evaluation of Wetlands in Northeast Kansas Final Report. KDHE Contract No. 2001-0001 (Part 4). Kansas Dept. of Health and Environment, Bureau of Water, Topeka, Kansas.
- Mankin, K.R., Ngandu, D.M., Barden, C.J., Hutchinson, S.L., Geyer, W.A., 2007b. Grassshrub riparian buffer removal of sediment, P, and N from simulated runoff. J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc. 43 (5), 1108-1116.
- McInnis, M.L., McIver, J., 2001. Influence of off-stream supplements on streambanks of riparian pastures. J. Range Manage 54 (6), 648-652.
- Miner, J.R., John, C.B., Moore, J.A., 1992. Will a water trough reduce the amount of time Hay-Fed livestock spend in the stream (And therefore improve water quality)? Rangelands 14 (1), 35–38.
- Moriasi, D.N., Arnold, J.G., Van Liew, M.W., Bingner, R.L., Harmel, R.D., Veith, T.L., 2007. Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations. Trans. ASABE 50 (3), 885–900.
- Nash, J.E., Sutcliffe, J.V., 1970. River flow forecasting through conceptual models: part I. A discussion of principles. J. Hydrol. 10 (3), 282-290.
- NCDC, 2009. Climate-radar Data Inventories. National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC. Available at: http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/ncdc.html. Accessed in November 2010.
- Neitsch, S.L., Arnold, J.G., Kiniry, J.R., Williams, J.R., 2005. Soil and Water Assessment Tool Theoretical Documentation Version 2005. Grassland, Soil and Water Research Laboratory, USDA-ARS & Blackland Research and Extension Center, Texas A&M University, Temple, Texas.
- Neitsch, S.L., Arnold, J.G., Kiniry, J.R., Srinivasan, R., Williams, J.R., 2004. Soil and Water Assessment Tool Input/Output File Documentation Version 2005. Grassland, Soil and Water Research Laboratory, USDA-ARS, Temple, Texas.
- Nelson, N.O., Shober, A.L., 2012. Evaluation of phosphorus indices after twenty years of science and development. J. Environ. Qual. 41 (6), 1703-1710.
- Ohlenbusch, P.D., Harner III, J.P., 2003. Grazing Distribution. MF-515. Kansas State University. Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service, Manhattan, KS.
- Ohlenbusch, P.D., Watson, S.D., 1994. Stocking Rate and Grazing Management. MF-1118. Kansas State University, Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service, Manhattan, Kansas.
- Ouyang, W., Skidmore, A.K., Hao, F., Wang, T., 2010. Soil erosion dynamics response to landscape pattern. Sci. Total Environ. 408, 1358-1366.

Owens, L.B., Edwards, W.M., Van Keuren, R.W., 1996. Sediment losses from a

pastured watershed before and after stream fencing. J. Soil Water Conserv. 51 (1), 90–94.

- Pandey, V., Kiker, G.A., Campbell, K.L., Williams, M.J., Coleman, S.W., 2009. GPS monitoring of cattle location near water features in south Florida. Appl. Eng. Agric. 25 (4), 551-562.
- Penn, C.J., Bryant, R.B., Needelman, B., Kleinman, P., 2009. Spatial distribution of soil phosphorus across selected New York dairy farm pastures and Hay Fields. Soil Sci. 172 (10), 797–810.
- Redfearn, D.D., Bidwell, T.G., 1997. Stocking Rate: the Key to Successful Livestock Production. Fact Sheet F-2871. Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service, Stillwater, Oklahoma,
- Richards, C.E., Munster, C.L., Vietor, D.M., Arnold, J.G., White, R., 2008. Assessment of a turfgrass sod best management practice on water quality in a suburban watershed. J. Environ. Manage 86, 229-245.
- Santhi, C., Arnold, J.G., Williams, J.R., Dugas, W.A., Srinivasan, R., Hauck, L.M., 2001. Validation of the SWAT model on a large river basin with a point and nonpoint sources. J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc. 37 (5), 1169-1188.
- Sauer, T.J., Meek, D.W., 2003. Spatial variation of plant-available phosphorus in pastures with contrasting management. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 67 (3), 826–836. Sheffield, R.E., Mostaghimi, S., Vaughan, D.H., Collins Jr., E.R., Allen, V.G., 1997. Off-
- stream water sources for grazing cattle as a stream bank stabilization and water quality BMP. Trans. ASABE 40 (3), 595–604.
- Sheshukov, A.Y., Daggupati, P., Douglas-Mankin, K.R., Lee, M.-C., 2011. High spatial resolution soil data for watershed modeling: 1. Development of a SSURGO-ArcSWAT utility. J. Nat. Environ. Sci. 2 (2), 15–24. Smith, C.M., Nejadhashemi, A.P., Leatherman, J.C., 2009. Using a BMP auction as a
- tool for the implementation of conservation Practices. J. Ext. 47 (4).
- Smith, C.M., Peterson, J.M., Leatherman, J.C., 2007. Attitudes of great plains producers about best management practices, conservation programs, and water quality. J. Soil Water Conserv. 62 (5), 97A–103A.
- USDA-NASS, 2008. Kansas agricultural Statistics: Kansas County Data. USDA National Agric. Statistics Service, Washington, D.C.. Available at: http://www.nass. usda.gov/QuickStats/Create\_County\_Indv.jsp. Accessed in January 2009.
- USDA-NRCS, 1994. The Phosphorus Index a Phosphorous Assessment Tool. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Available at: http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/ecs/nutrient/pindex.html. Accessed in November 2010.
- USDA-NRCS, 2005. Soil Data Mart. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.. Available at: http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/Default.aspx. Accessed in January 2009.
- U.S. EPA, 2004. National Water Quality Inventory: Report to Congress (305b Report): 2004 Reporting Cycle. Available at: http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/ guidance/cwa/305b/. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Accessed in November 2010.
- U.S. EPA, 2009. Marais des Cygnes Basin, KS and MO, Targeted Watersheds Grant Program. U.S. Environmental Pollution Agency. Available at: http://www.epa. gov/twg. Accessed in January 2011.
- USGS, 2009. Daily Streamflow for the Nation. U.S. Geological Service, Washington, D.C.. Available at: http://nwis.waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis. Accessed November 2010.
- Wade, T.G., Schultz, B.W., Wickham, J.D., Bradford, D.F., 1998. Modeling the potential spatial distribution of beef cattle grazing using a geographic information System. J. Arid. Environ. 38 (2), 325-334.
- White, M.J., Storm, D.E., Smolen, M.D., Zhang, H., 2009. Development of a quantitative pasture phosphorous management tool using the SWAT model. J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc. 45 (2), 397-406.