

SWAT+ water quality and quantity modelling systems for Latvia and Lithuania Uldis Bethers, Juris Seņņikovs, SIA «PAIC» LIFE IP CleanEST International conference, 25-26/Oct, Narva, Estonia

EU LIFE Programme integrated project

"Implementation of River Basin Management Plans of Latvia towards good surface water status"





State Regional evelopment Agency Republic of Latvia







Pasaules Dabas Fonds





CONTENTS

- 1. Background why & when
- 2. Components of SWAT+ modelling system
- 3. Input data & model setups
- 4. Modelling frame
- 5. Cal/Val
- 6. Results & Postprocessing





















1. Why&when

- 2012-2013: SWAT for Lithuania (EPA)
- 2014-2015: SWAT/LT in RBMP (consortium)
- 2020-2022: SWAT+ for Latvia (GoodWater)
- 2021-2022: SWAT to SWAT+ in LT (EPA)





State Regional elopment Agency public of Latvia



mental gonal Hendry of Agriculture Regulate of Lativa



LATYUAS VALSTS HER









2. Components of water quality modelling system

- Input data (preprocessed and harmonised)
- Data storage system (database, versioning of components)
- SWAT+ model software
- System of scripts (building model system, executing runs)
- Postprocessing (PAICSWAT & QGIS)



















3. Data – terrain (harmonized to 5m grid)



3. Data – land use incl crops (LV 33, LT 56 classes)



3. Data – soils (aggregated LV 54, LT 86 classes)



3. Data – river network & model setup

Watersheds 179/106 Catchments 3780/1237 HRU 500'000











Mentry of Asricultur

LOAVAL HOVA

3. Model setups watersheds & catchments



3. Other data/models

Transboundary flows Fertilisation model (mineral, manure) Agricultural practice (plant management model) Atmospheric deposition Meteorological obs





State Regional Development Agency Republic of Latvia















4. Modelling frame

- Storage: Postgre database, SVN versioning system
- SWAT+ Fortran code debugged (100+ errors!), Github
- Python scripts:
- Building system from data
- Executing run
- Extracting results
- Postprocessing (PAICSWAT for timeseries & QGIS templates)



5. Calibration/validation

- Regionalisation, calibration in regions: NSE&PBIAS for Q, N&P concentrations (!)
- Validation: transfer of coefficients, NSE&PBIAS criteria



5. Cal/Val: obs data (N-NO3)





5. Val: overall maps (LT)



CX

CXII



6. Results

In stream N-NO3

Reach concentrations

NO3

- 0,1-0,2 — 0,2-0,5
- 0,5-0,7
- 1,0-1,2
- 1,2-1,5 1,5-1,7
- 1,7-2,0
- 3,0-5,0
- _____ 5,0-10,0 _____ >10,0





LVG

State Regional Development Agency Republic of Latvia



6. Results

Crop yield





6. Results: source apportionment (N-NO3 LV)



6. Results: source apportionment (N, P LT)



6. Results: method for optimisation of measures: list of measures, translate to parameter change















Name	Cost, EUR/m^2
0.NoMeasure	0
1.Catch crops	0.0087
2.Plant cover in winter	0.0058
3.Planting of winter crops	0.0022
4.Crop rotation	0
5.Buffer zones	0.002
6.Reduced fertilization	0.0004
7.Limited fertilization on high risk areas	0.001
8.Non-plough technology	-0.0051
9.Substituting autumn ploughing with spring ploughing	0.0014
10.Postponing a sod ploughing to late autumn	0.0006
11.Converting arable land into perennial grasslands	0.0248
12.Converting arable land and grasslands to forests	0.0175
13.Catch crops+Reduced fertilization	0.0091
14.Plant cover in winter+Buffer zones	0.0078
15.Plant cover in winter+Limited fertilization on high risk areas	0.0068
16.Plant cover in winter+Buffer zones+Limited fertilization on high risk areas	0.0088
17.Planting of winter crops+Reduced fertilization	0.0026
18.Crop rotation+Reduced fertilization	0.0004
21.Crop rotation+Buffer zones	0.002
22.Buffer zones+Limited fertilization on high risk areas	0.003
23.Crop rotation+Buffer zones+Limited fertilization on high risk areas	0.003
24.Reduced fertilization+Non-plough technology	-0.0047
25.Catch crops+Limited fertilization on high risk areas	0.0097
26.Catch crops+Buffer zones+Limited fertilization on high risk areas	0.0117
27.Limited fertilization on high risk areas+Non-plough technology	-0.0041
28.Buffer zones+Postponing a sod ploughing to late autumn	0.0026
29.Reduced fertilization+Postponing a sod ploughing to late autumn	0.001
30.Buffer zones+Reduced fertilization+Postponing a sod ploughing to late autumn	0.003

-0.0027

6. Results: genetic optimisation (cost, reduction)

Optimization – optimized nitrate concentrations



- Concentrations reduced significantly
- Not in all river stretches concentrations reach target value
- If pointsource contribution is high, significant reduction of agricultural pollution are necessary to reach the target

UNIVERSITY OF LATVIA

:40

Optimization target concentration of N-NO3 2.3 mg/l

Optimized NO3 concentration
0.133169 - 0.50000
0.500001 - 1.00000
1.000001 - 1.98833
1.968834 - 2.30000
2.300001 - 3.00000
3.00001 - 3.00000
5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.000000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.00000
0.5.0000
0.5.00000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.0000
0.5.000
0.5.0000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.0000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5.000
0.5

6. Results: distribution of measures

0.No Measure 02 Plant cover in winter

03.Planting of winter crops 04.Crop rotation

06 Reduced fertilization

08 Non-piouah technolog

- 8 out of 12 single measures and 13 out of 17 combined measures are considered as optimum at least in some of the HRUs Measures @ HRU measures.name
- Non-plough technology • (having negative cost) selected for subbasins where the minor improvements of water quality was necessary
- Catch crops, plant cover in winter and similar in moderately polluted stretches
- Conversion to grasslands and forests in subbasins with high point-source contribution







EU LIFE Programme integrated project "Implementation of River Basin Management Plans of Latvia towards good surface water status"

Thank you!



The integrated project "Implementation of River Basin Management Plans of Latvia towards good surface water status" (LIFE GOODWATER IP, LIFE18 IPE/LV/000014) has received funding from the LIFE Programme of the European Union and the State Regional Development Agency Republic of Latvia.

The information reflects only the LIFE GOODWATER IP project beneficiaries' view and the European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA) is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

