



United States
Department of
Agriculture




Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service

Conservation Effects
Assessment Project
(CEAP)

June 2006

Model Simulation of Soil Loss, Nutrient Loss, and Change in Soil Organic Carbon Associated with Crop Production



Steven R. Potter
Texas Agricultural Experiment Station
Blackland Research Center
Temple, TX

Susan Andrews
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Greensboro, NC

Jay D. Atwood
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Blackland Research Center
Temple, TX

Robert L. Kellogg
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Beltsville, MD

Jerry Lemunyon
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Blackland Research Center
Temple, TX

Lee Norfleet
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Blackland Research Center
Temple, TX

Dean Oman
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Beltsville, MD

Note: After the senior author, co-authors are listed in alphabetical order.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Acknowledgements

The National Nutrient Loss and Soil Carbon (NNLSC) database and this report were created by a team of Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and Texas Agricultural Experiment Station (TAES) staff that included important contributions from team members other than the authors. Theresa Pitts, TAES, programmed the modeling system and conducted the model runs. Jimmy Williams, TAES, provided technical assistance on how to properly set up EPIC to make the model runs and made revisions to the EPIC model specifically for this study. Todd Campbell, ISU CARD, provided programming support for I-EPIC throughout the project. Joaquin Sanabria, TAES, assisted with the development of the soil and climate clustering procedure. Bill Effland (NRCS) and Terry Sobecki (formerly NRCS) also contributed to the project. Roberta Parry, Office of Water, EPA, assisted with the report preparation. Lynn Owens, NRCS, edited the report and provided the layout; Wendy Pierce, NRCS, prepared the graphics for printing; and Suzi Self provided editorial assistance.

The project could never have been completed, however, without the substantial contribution of Don Goss, TAES, who passed away in November, 2001. Don was the original principal investigator on this project when it was first initiated in 1997. Don helped design the analytical approach and did the soil and climate clustering.

The report benefited from review and comment on draft versions of the report by more than 40 people from government agencies and academia including scientists, administrators, policy analysts, and natural resource managers. Special thanks go to: Phil Gassman, ISU-CARD; J.L. Hatfield, Seth Dabney, and Wayne Reeves, USDA ARS; Clay Ogg and Tom Davenport, EPA; Otto Doering, Purdue University; Skip Hyberg and Alex Barbarika, USDA FSA; Verel Benson, FAPRI; Steve Plotkin, University of Massachusetts Extension; NRCS staff from the East, West, and Central National Technology Support Centers; and Jerry Bernard, David C. Moffitt, Chris Gross, and Jim Richardson, NRCS.

Management support for this project was provided by: Bill Dugas, former Director, Blacklands Research and Extension Center, TAES; Wayne Maresch, Director, Resources Inventory and Analysis Division, NRCS; Maury Mausbach, former Deputy Chief for Soil Survey and Resource Assessment, NRCS; and Bill Puckett, Deputy Chief for Soil Survey and Resource Assessment, NRCS.

Model Simulation of Soil Loss, Nutrient Loss, and Change in Soil Organic Carbon Associated with Crop Production

Contents	Executive summary	1
	Introduction	9
	Modeling approach and methods	10
	Overview of approach.....	10
	EPIC model	13
	Summary of crops and cropland acres included in the study	17
	Representing soil characteristics in the model	22
	Representing weather in the model	28
	Representing topographic characteristics and field drainage in the..... model	32
	Representing crop growth characteristics in the model	32
	Representing field operations in the model	35
	Representing tillage in the model	36
	Representing conservation practices in the model.....	39
	Representing irrigation in the model	41
	Representing commercial fertilizer applications in the model	41
	Representing manure applications in the model.....	51
	Maps of per-acre estimates of model output	54
	Maps of total loading estimates	60
	Surface water runoff, percolation, and evapotranspiration	61
	Modeling the hydrologic cycle	61
	Model simulation results for water inputs	62
	Model simulation results for surface water runoff, percolation,..... and ET	69
	Sediment loss from water erosion	73
	Modeling sediment loss	73
	Model simulation results for sediment loss.....	74
	Assessment of critical acres for sediment loss.....	89
	Wind erosion	91
	Modeling wind erosion.....	91
	Model simulation results for wind erosion	91
	Assessment of critical acres for wind erosion	100

Nitrogen loss	103	
Modeling the nitrogen cycle.....	103	
Model simulation results for nitrogen inputs	105	
Model simulation results for nitrogen loss	114	
Assessment of critical acres for nitrogen loss	157	
<hr/>		
Phosphorus loss	163	
Modeling the phosphorus cycle.....	163	
Model simulation results for phosphorus inputs	164	
Model simulation results for phosphorus loss.....	171	
Assessment of critical acres for phosphorus loss	193	
<hr/>		
Soil organic carbon and change in soil organic carbon	200	
Modeling the carbon cycle.....	200	
Model simulation results for soil organic carbon	202	
Soil organic carbon as an indicator of soil quality	212	
Assessment of critical acres for soil quality degradation.....	217	
<hr/>		
Priority cropland acres with the highest potential for soil loss, nutrient loss, and soil quality degradation	220	
<hr/>		
References	230	
<hr/>		
Appendix A	Example calculation of weighted average EPIC model outputs assigned to NRI sample points	A-1
<hr/>		
Appendix B	Summary of EPIC application and performance literature	B-1

Tables	Table 1	EPIC-generated variables for NRI cropland sample points	16
	Table 2	Percent of NRI cropland acres included in the study–by crop	18
	Table 3	Percent of NRI cropland acres included in the study–by state	19
	Table 4	Soil characteristics data required by EPIC	23
	Table 5	Representation of 25 soil groups in cropland acres included in the study	27
	Table 6	Weather stations used to represent climate zones	31
	Table 7	Crop growth parameters required by EPIC	33
	Table 8	Comparison of EPIC crop yields to NASS reported crop yields	34
	Table 9	Hypothetical example of an operations schedule for corn that demonstrates heat unit scheduling	35
	Table 10	Example of a specific field operation schedule for irrigated corn in climate zone 27 in NE (URU 7462) with conventional tillage and fall application of nitrogen	36
	Table 11	Representation of three tillage systems in the NNLSC database	38
	Table 12	Representation of tillage systems in the tillage-effects baseline	39
	Table 13	Representation of stripcropping, contour farming, and terraces in the NNLSC database	40
	Table 14	Representation of irrigation in the NNLSC database	42
	Table 15	Example of nutrient application rates used in EPIC model simulations for corn in NE, derived from Cropping Practice Survey data	45
	Table 16	Number of farmer survey samples used to estimate nutrient application rates used in EPIC model simulations	47
	Table 17	Cases where nutrient application rates were imputed from other states or were based on nitrogen-standard application rates	50
	Table 18	Example of manure application rates (irrigated and non-irrigated) and supplemental commercial fertilizer application rates for NE corn	52

Table 19	Representation of manured acres in the model simulations	55
Table 20	Summary of model simulation results for the hydrologic cycle	63
Table 21	Water inputs, ET, surface water runoff, and percolation–by region and crop within regions	64
Table 22	Sediment loss (MUSLE) estimates–by region and by crop within regions	77
Table 23	Comparison of sediment loss estimates (MUSLE) for irrigated crops to estimates for non-irrigated crops	80
Table 24	Effects of tillage practices on estimates of sediment loss	85
Table 25	Effects of three conservation practices on estimates of sediment loss	87
Table 26	Percentiles of sediment loss estimates	90
Table 27	Critical acres for sediment loss	90
Table 28	Wind erosion rate estimates–by region and by crop within regions	95
Table 29	Comparison of wind erosion rates for irrigated crops to rates for non-irrigated crops	97
Table 30	Effects of tillage practices on estimates of wind erosion rates	99
Table 31	Percentiles of wind erosion estimates	101
Table 32	Critical acres for wind erosion	101
Table 33	Sources of nitrogen inputs–by region and by crop	106
Table 34	Sources of nitrogen inputs on a per-acre basis–by region and by crop within regions	111
Table 35	Nitrogen loss estimates–by region and by crop	116
Table 36	Nitrogen loss estimates on a per-acre basis–by region and by crop within regions	117
Table 37	Comparison of nitrogen loss estimates for irrigated crops to estimates for non-irrigated crops	133
Table 38	Percentages by crop of the total for cropland acres, total nitrogen loss, all nitrogen sources, and commercial fertilizer and manure nitrogen source	141

Table 39	Sources of nitrogen applied and estimates of nitrogen loss–by soil texture class	142
Table 40	Sources of nitrogen applied and estimates of nitrogen loss–by hydrologic soil group	142
Table 41	Effects of tillage practices on estimates of nitrogen loss, sum of all loss pathways	148
Table 42	Effects of three conservation practices on estimates of nitrogen loss, sum of all loss pathways	150
Table 43	Nitrogen loss estimates (sum of all loss pathways) for the nitrogen-reduction baseline scenario and the minimum nitrogen loss scenario	154
Table 44	Nitrogen loss reductions (nitrogen loss estimates for the nitrogen-reduction baseline scenario minus the minimum nitrogen loss scenario) for each nitrogen loss pathway	155
Table 45	Percentage of model runs in each application rate and timing category for the nitrogen-reduction baseline scenario and the minimum nitrogen loss scenario	156
Table 46	Percentiles of nitrogen lost with waterborne sediment	158
Table 47	Percentiles of nitrogen dissolved in surface water runoff	158
Table 48	Percentiles of nitrogen dissolved in leachate	159
Table 49	Critical areas for nitrogen lost with waterborne sediment	161
Table 50	Critical areas for nitrogen dissolved in surface water runoff	161
Table 51	Critical areas for nitrogen dissolved in leachate	162
Table 52	Sources of phosphorus inputs–by region and by crop	165
Table 53	Sources of phosphorus inputs on a per-acre basis–by region and by crop within regions	166
Table 54	Phosphorus loss estimates–by region and by crop	172
Table 55	Phosphorus loss estimates on a per-acre basis–by region and by crop within regions	179
Table 56	Comparison of phosphorus loss estimates for irrigated crops to estimates for non-irrigated crops	183
Table 57	Percentages by region and crop of the total for cropland acres total phosphorus loss, and total phosphorus inputs	188

Table 58	Sources of phosphorus applied and estimates of phosphorus loss (elemental P)–by soil texture class	189
Table 59	Sources of phosphorus applied and estimates of phosphorus loss (elemental P)–by hydrologic soil group	189
Table 60	Effects of tillage practices on estimates of phosphorus loss, sum of all loss pathways	192
Table 61	Effects of three conservation practices on estimates of phosphorus loss, sum of all loss pathways	194
Table 62	Percentiles of phosphorus lost with waterborne sediment	198
Table 63	Percentiles of phosphorus dissolved in surface water runoff	198
Table 64	Critical acres for phosphorus lost with waterborne sediment	199
Table 65	Critical acres for phosphorus dissolved in surface water runoff	199
Table 66	Soil organic carbon estimates–by region and by crop within regions	203
Table 67	Soil organic carbon levels–by soil texture class	208
Table 68	Percentage of acres gaining and losing soil organic carbon over the 30-yr simulation	208
Table 69	Percentiles for the soil quality degradation indicator	219
Table 70	Critical acres for the soil quality degradation indicator	219
Table 71	Priority cropland acres with the highest potential for sediment loss, wind erosion, nutrient loss, or soil quality degradation	221
Table A–1	Example of how EPIC-generated variables were estimated for NRI cropland sample points	A–2
Table B–1	Summary of selected EPIC application, evaluation, and validation studies	B–3

Figures	Figure 1	Organizational scheme for construction of the>NNLSC database	12
	Figure 2	Schematic representing inputs to, processes in, and outputs from the EPIC model	15
	Figure 3	Number of soil clusters in each 8-digit watershed	25
	Figure 4	Diversity of soils represented in the model for two IA watersheds	26
	Figure 5	Schematic for illustrating the mapping technique used to display per-acre model output results	57
	Figure 6	Hypothetical example of interpolation and resampling process	58
	Figure 7	Hypothetical example of area over-representation and under-representation	59
	Figure 8	Average water inputs, ET, surface water runoff, and percolation–by region	70
	Figure 9	Sediment loss estimates (MUSLE)–by crop within regions	79
	Figure 10	Average per-acre sediment loss estimates (MUSLE)–by hydrologic soil group and soil texture group	83
	Figure 11	Variability in sediment loss estimates (MUSLE) within two IA watersheds	84
	Figure 12	Average per-acre wind erosion rates–by hydrologic soil group and soil texture group	98
	Figure 13	Nitrogen cycle as modeled in EPIC	104
	Figure 14	Sources of per-acre nitrogen inputs–by region	110
	Figure 15	Sources of nitrogen inputs as a percent of the regional total	113
	Figure 16	Sources of per-acre nitrogen inputs–by crop	115
	Figure 17	Average annual per-acre estimates of nitrogen loss–by region	129
	Figure 18	Nitrogen loss as a percentage of the total loss for each region	129
	Figure 19	Average annual per-acre estimates of nitrogen loss–by crop	132
	Figure 20	Regional percentages of the total for cropland areas, all nitrogen sources, commercial fertilizer and manure nitrogen, and total nitrogen loss	140

Figure 21	Average annual loss of nitrogen with waterborne sediment–by hydrologic soil group and soil texture class	144
Figure 22	Average annual loss of nitrogen dissolved in surface water runoff–by hydrologic soil group and soil texture class	144
Figure 23	Average annual loss of nitrogen dissolved in leachate–by hydrologic soil group and soil texture class	145
Figure 24	Variability in nitrogen loss estimates (sum of all loss pathways) within two IA watersheds	146
Figure 25	Effects of tillage practices on nitrogen loss estimates–by loss pathway	149
Figure 26	Phosphorus cycle as modeled in EPIC	164
Figure 27	Sources of per-acre phosphorus inputs–by region	168
Figure 28	Sources of per-acre phosphorus inputs–by crop	171
Figure 29	Average annual per-acre estimates of phosphorus loss–by region	178
Figure 30	Average annual per-acre estimates of phosphorus loss–by crop	182
Figure 31	Variability in phosphorus loss estimates (sum of all loss pathways) within two IA watersheds	190
Figure 32	Effects of tillage practices on phosphorus loss estimates–by loss pathway	191
Figure 33	Carbon cycle as modeled in EPIC	201
Figure 34	Per-acre soil organic carbon–by soil texture class and hydrologic soil group	207

Maps	Map 1	Priority cropland acres with highest potential for soil loss, nutrient loss, and soil quality degradation	4
	Map 2	Percent of cropland acres included in study	20
	Map 3	Crop acreage–by region	21
	Map 4	Climate zones used for model simulations	30
	Map 5	Average annual precipitation input for model simulations	67
	Map 6	Average annual irrigation input for model simulations	68
	Map 7	Estimated average annual surface water runoff	71
	Map 8	Estimated average annual percolation	72
	Map 9	Estimated average annual per-acre sediment loss (MUSLE)	75
	Map 10	Estimated average annual tons of sediment loss (MUSLE)	81
	Map 11	Estimated average annual per-acre wind erosion rate	93
	Map 12	Estimated average annual tons of wind erosion	94
	Map 13	Average annual commercial fertilizer application rates for nitrogen in model simulations	107
	Map 14	Average annual manure nitrogen application rates in model simulations	109
	Map 15	Estimated average annual per-acre nitrogen loss summed over all loss pathways	119
	Map 16	Estimated average annual per-acre nitrogen lost to the atmosphere	120
	Map 17	Estimated average annual per-acre nitrogen lost with waterborne sediment	122
	Map 18	Estimated average annual per-acre nitrogen lost with windborne sediment	123
	Map 19	Estimated average annual per-acre nitrogen dissolved in surface water runoff	124
	Map 20	Estimated average annual per-acre nitrogen dissolved in leachate	125
	Map 21	Estimated average annual tons of nitrogen lost to the atmosphere	135

Map 22	Estimated average annual tons of nitrogen lost with windborne sediment	136
Map 23	Estimated average annual tons of nitrogen lost with waterborne sediment	137
Map 24	Estimated average annual tons of nitrogen dissolved in surface water runoff	138
Map 25	Estimated average annual tons of nitrogen dissolved in leachate	139
Map 26	Average annual commercial fertilizer application rates for phosphorus (elemental P) in model simulations	169
Map 27	Average annual manure phosphorus application rates (elemental P) in model simulations	170
Map 28	Estimated average annual per-acre phosphorus loss summed over all loss pathways (elemental P)	174
Map 29	Estimated average annual per-acre phosphorus lost with waterborne sediment (elemental P)	175
Map 30	Estimated average annual per-acre phosphorus lost with windborne sediment (elemental P)	176
Map 31	Estimated average annual per-acre phosphorus dissolved in surface water runoff (elemental P)	177
Map 32	Estimated average annual tons of phosphorus lost with waterborne sediment (elemental P)	184
Map 33	Estimated average annual tons of phosphorus lost with windborne sediment (elemental P)	185
Map 34	Estimated average annual tons of phosphorus dissolved in surface water runoff (elemental P)	186
Map 35	Estimated per-acre soil organic carbon	205
Map 36	Estimated tons of soil organic carbon for cropland acres	206
Map 37	30-year change in per-acre soil organic carbon	210
Map 38	30-year percent change in soil organic carbon	211
Map 39	Soil organic carbon indicator (year 30 score)	216
Map 40	Soil quality degradation indicator for cropland	218

Map 41	Number of onsite environmental outcomes* with most critical 5 percent** of cropland acres for each outcome	224
Map 42	Number of onsite environmental outcomes* with most critical 10 percent** of cropland acres for each outcome	225
Map 43	Number of onsite environmental outcomes* with most critical 15 percent** of cropland acres for each outcome	226
Map 44	Number of onsite environmental outcomes* with most critical 20 percent** of cropland acres for each outcome	227
Map 45	Cropland acres included in the study as a percent of all land uses	228

