

### Impacts of Land Use and Land Cover Change on Water Quality in the Big Sioux River Basin: 2006-2016



#### Dinesh Shrestha, Department of Geography, SDSU Advisor: Dr. Darrell Napton

### Background

### Diving forces...

- Biofuel demands
- High corn and soybean prices
- Grain (corn) demand
- Government payments
  - Crop insurance subsidies
  - Disaster payments



# Sediments

BREAKING

South D

rivers in

Fe.

Pasture/rangeland, wastewater treatment or industrial plant

# mong dirtiest

The Associated Press May 7, 2012 ♥ 2 **f** ♥ ■ ● ♡ SIOUX FALLS -— The Big Sioux River snakes 42( hiles down eastern South Dakota.

Latest

Man charged in Ra pleads guilty

### Example





Raccoon River Watershed (Jha et al, 2007)

Topic: Impacts of Land Use and Land Cover Change on Water Quality in the Big Sioux River Basin: 2006-2016

Introduction Background Literature Review Outline **Research Question and Objectives** Methodology **Expected Results** Summary, Conclusion, and Contribution

#### The objectives of the research are to determine:

(1) Land Use and Land Cover (LULC) change in the Big Sioux River (BSR) watershed,

(2) spatial and temporal trends of nitrogen levels in the BSR, and

(3) determine whether there is a correlation between LULC change and changes in nitrogen levels in the river.

#### Additional questions:

- How do we detect temporal trend in water quality?
- How can I use Mann-Kendall test to show the relation between LULC change and changes in nitrates level?

### Grassland to cropland conversion in South Dakota

- Conversion of 1.8 million acres of grassland to cropland, in South Dakota, between 2006 to 2012.
- Most of the conversion took place in the eastern and central SD.





### Nitrogen Level in the BSR

- East Dakota Water Development District (EDWDD) reports increasing trend of nitrogen level in the BSR.
- Elevated nitrogen levels in river water are associated with anthropogenic sources such as synthetic fertilizers, manure, septic waste, and livestock wastewater



• Study Area:

#### The Big Sioux River Watershed

- Location: Lies mostly (6,000 sq. miles) in Eastern SD, (1,500 sq. miles) in Minnesota, and (1,500 sq. miles) in lowa
- 420 miles long river that begins in Roberts County, SD and flows south to Missouri River in Sioux City, Iowa







#### Data Download

- Land Use Data
  - National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) CropScape-Cropland Data Layer (CDL): 2006-2016 [www.nass.usda.gov]
  - Water quality data
    - East Dakota Water Development District, SD
    - US EPA- Surf your Watershed
- Others
  - Arc Grid representing a Digital Elevation Model for the Big Sioux River
  - Climate data [NCEI Map Viewer gis.ncdc.noaa.gov/map/viewer ]
  - Streamflow (discharge) data [ US EPA- Surf your Watershed]

#### Data Digital Elevation Model (DEM)

0 5 10

20

**Dinesh Shrestha** 

DEM (Big Sioux River Watershed)

Legend

DEM

Value

High: 650.034

Low: 334.963

Basin

#### Cropland Data Layer 2007 Watershed and Sub-Watersheds LULC in the Big Sioux River Watershed in 2007 Big Sioux River Watershed, SD Roberts Grant Codington Clark Deuel Hamlin Minnesota Minnesota Brookings Kingsbury Lincoln South Dakota South Dakota Lake Moody Pipestone Murray McCook Minnehaha Pock Turner incol Sioux O'Brien lowa Clay Legend lowa State\_Boundary Legend Plymouth Com and Soybear **Big Sigux River Watersh** Other crops -Big Sioux River Water States Boundary 0 4.759.5 19 28.5 38 08.26.5 13 19 5 26 Developed Ailes Counties in BSR Woodbur Miles -Miles Grassland 40 30





### Data quality

#### CDL Data

- CDL is designed and produced with the intent of monitoring annual land cover, and is widely used for cropland analysis.
- Non-crop areas are also identified but with less specificity and concern over accuracy
- 2006-08: 56m resolution, whereas 2009-15: 30m resolution [resample to smaller scale]

### Nitrogen Data

• The collected data meet the National Water Program Guidance release by EPA.



#### Data Aggregation by Season

- Availability of data
- Robust
- Missing values

| Seasons | Months             |
|---------|--------------------|
| Winter  | Dec, Jan, Feb      |
| Spring  | March, April, May  |
| Summer  | June, July, August |
| Fall    | Sep, Oct, Nov      |



#### **Man-Kendall Test**

- Non parametric trend analysis.
- Derives tau and level of significance
- Helps understand +ve, -ve or not significant trend
- Monotonic
- Estimates the number of stations with increasing and decreasing NO3-N trends
- Permits missing data to evaluate the tendency of change in nitrates



### **Trend Analysis**

- Categorize the 13 sub-watersheds into 3 sub-basins: Upper, Central, and Lower sub-basins.
- Increasing, not significant, and decreasing trend) for each subbasins.
- Determine the stations showing significant **upward** and **downward** trends in nitrate concentrations in the Mann–Kendall.

### Spatial changes of land use from 2006 to 2016

### **CDL** Analysis

- Reclassification
- Trend of LULC change
- Change Matrix (Contingency Table)

| Reclassification Table |  |  |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Classes                | Categories   |  |
| Corn/Soy               | Corn and Soybeans  |  |
| Other Crops            | Wheat, Alfalfa, Sorghum, Oats,<br>Millet, Pumpkin, Flaxseed,<br>Potatoes, and other crops. |  |
| Water                  | Water, Wetlands  |  |
| Developed              | Open space, low/medium/high density  |  |
| Grassland              | Switchgrass, Grass/Pasture, Fruit<br>Trees, Shrub land, Barren, and<br>others              |  |



Grassland decreased by 917,000 acres



#### Land Use Land Cover Change

- Reclassification
- Trend of LULC change
- Change Matrix



#### Land Use Land Cover Change

- Reclassification
- Trend of LULC change
- Change Matrix

| Table: CDL Data Reclassification into 5 major class types, area in 1,000 of acres, from 2006 to 2016. |              |                  |                |       |           |           |        |
|---|--------------|------------------|----------------|-------|-----------|-----------|--------|
|   |              | 2016             | 2016           | 2016  | 2016      | 2016      |        |
|   |              | Corn/<br>Soybean | Other<br>Crops | Water | Developed | Grassland | Total  |
| 2006  | Corn/Soybean | 50.41            | 2.77           | 0.44  | 1.02      | 2.17      | 56.80  |
| 2006  | Other Crops  | 6.26             | 1.75           | 0.64  | 0.29      | .80       | 13.74  |
| 2006  | Water        | 1.41             | 0.56           | 4.52  | 0.14      | 1.36      | 7.99   |
| 2006  | Developed    | 1.92             | 0_6            | 0.20  | 4.22      | 1.29      | 7.88   |
| 2006  | Grassland    | 2.75             | 0.93           | 0.57  | 8.41      | 8.91      | 13.58  |
|   | Total        | 62.76            | ~ 26           | 1.01  | 6.07      | 18.54     | 100.00 |

### Land Change Ratio

- The change ratio of each land use category = area of each land use category in 2016 / the area of relevant land use in 2006.
  - If the calculated ratio > 1.0, the land use was considered to have expanded since 2006.
  - If the ratio < 1.0, the land use was reduced in relation to conversion to a different land use category.



### Land Change Ratio

| Land uses   | 2006           | 2016    | Change Ratio |
|-------------|----------------|---------|--------------|
| Upper Basin | Acres in 1000  |         | Change Ratio |
| Corn/Soy    | 1831.26        | 2571.88 | 1.40         |
| Other Crops | 1506.32        | 558.79  | 0.37         |
| Water       | 944.98         | 810.57  | 0.86         |
| Developed   | 340.75         | 242.92  | 0.71         |
| Grassland   | <b>896.0</b> 7 | 1332.12 | 1.49         |





### Land Change Ratio

| Land uses<br>Parameter for | 2006    | 2016    | Change Ratio |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|--------------|
| Lower Basin                | Acres i |         |              |
| Corn/Soy                   | 4404.48 | 4409.75 | 1.00         |
| Other Crops                | 150.74  | 127.38  | 0.85         |
| Water                      | 80.15   | 117.64  | 1.47         |
| Developed                  | 446.63  | 380.49  | 0.85         |
| Grassland                  | 644.76  | 687.90  | 1.07         |



### NO3-N trends



### Conclusion

#### Results are important:

- likely to provide a better understanding of the role of LULC change to BSR water quality,
- be important to water supply organizations and farmers in developing improved land management strategies and to ensure clean and affordable public water,
- the results of the pending court case may alter the Corn Belt Farmland management and Water Acts and could have an impact on EDWDD and other water districts

### Acknowledgement

- Department of Geography and Faculties
- Dr. Darrell Napton (Advisor)
- Jay Gilbertson, East Dakota Water Development District
- SDView Mini Grant, SDSU

### References

- Kalcic, Margaret M., Indrajeet Chaubey, and Jane Frankenberger. Defining Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) hydrologic response units (HRUs) by field boundaries. International Journal of Agricultural and Biological Engineering 8, no. 3 (2015): 69-80
- Reitsma, K. D., B. H. Dunn, U. Mishra, S. A. Clay, T. DeSutter, and D. E. Clay. 2015. Land-use change impact on soil sustainability in a climate and vegetation transition zone. Agronomy Journal 107 (6): 2263-2372.
- Wright, Christopher K., and Michael C. Wimberly. 2013. Recent land use change in the Western Corn Belt threatens grasslands and wetlands. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 110 (10): 4134-4139.



### Impacts of Land Use and Land Cover Change on Water Quality in the Big Sioux River Basin: 2006-2016



### Dinesh Shrestha, Department of Geography, SDSU Advisor: Dr. Darrell Napton

\*\*This proposal was awarded with Sigma Xi Graduate Student Research (Proposal) Award, 2017