

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. Watershed discretization for WEPP	2
Figure 2.1. WEPP watershed description	25
Figure 2.2. WEPP watershed formats	25
Figure 2.3. Slope length effect affected by management system.....	28
Figure 3.1. Treynor watershed pictures	50
Figure 3.2. Three-dimensional view of Treynor W2 watershed.....	52
Figure 3.3. Watkinsville P2 watershed: runoff and sediment collection equipment.....	54
Figure 3.4. Watkinsville P1 watershed.....	56
Figure 3.5. Watkinsville P2 watershed.....	56
Figure 3.6. Watershed modeling with GIS and WEPP	60
Figure 3.7. Channel verification with aerial photography.....	62
Figure 3.8. Channel network critical source area (CSA) vs. watershed area	63
Figure 3.9. Flowpaths in watershed modeling.....	65
Figure 3.10. Soil loss predicted by WEPP as a function of slope and length using soil and management conditions of Watkinsville watershed P2	66
Figure 3.11. Soil loss predicted by WEPP as a function of hillslope length for different uniform slopes using soil and management conditions of Watkinsville watershed P2.....	67
Figure 3.12. Top hillslope of Watkinsville watershed P2, number of flowpaths in ranges of lengths at 1m resolution	68
Figure 3.13. Length of flowpaths with vector directions. (A) Independent flow direction. (B) Center to center flow direction. (C) Continuous flow direction.....	69
Figure 3.14. Representative slope profiles using 3 different methods to represent slope values from multiple flowpaths along the hillslope profile.....	71
Figure 3.15. Schematic of WEPP-GIS interface.....	74
Figure 3.16. Intersecting flowpaths draining into channel in watershed.....	75
Figure 3.17. Weighted detachment in Holly Springs WC1 watershed from 1970 to 1977 computed on a cell by cell basis using WEPP on each flowpath.	77
Figure 4.1. Total sediment loss from each watershed (normalized by watershed area and number of events)	81
Figure 4.2. Comparison of hillslope sediment yield between methods (channels excluded)	81
Figure 4.3. Sediment detachment and deposition from flowpath application of WEPP on Treynor watershed W2 over a 6 year period	89
Figure 5.1. Hillshade views of different resolutions of Treynor watershed W2.....	97
Figure 5.2. Slope values of Treynor W2 watershed with different resolutions	98

Figure 5.3. Distribution of flowpath lengths at different resolutions for Watkinsville watershed P2.....	100
Figure 5.4. The Chanleng and Calcleng methods for watershed discretization	103
Figure 5.5. Average P-values for differences between measured and simulated runoff for different methods and resolutions.....	110
Figure 5.6. Average P-values showing comparisons between measured and simulated watershed sediment yields for different resolutions and simulation methods	111
Figure 5.7. Average yearly runoff for Treynor W2 watershed. Error bars indicate the range of simulated runoff results for the different resolutions (5, 10, 15, and 20 m)	113
Figure 5.8. Average hillslope annual runoff values for the Holly Springs and Watkinville watersheds	114
Figure 5.9. Hillslope sediment yields with 3 different methods and 4 different resolutions	115
Figure 5.10. Hillslope sediment yields for 3 methods and 4 resolutions for the Treynor W2 watershed	116
Figure 5.11. Watershed and hillslope boundary delineation of Watkinsville P2 watershed as affected by DEM resolution	116
Figure 5.12. Soil loss with distance and slope profile of left hillslope of Watkinsville P2 watershed for Chanleng and Calcleng methods under simulations with different DEM resolutions.....	118
Figure 5.13. Soil loss with distance and slope profile of right hillslope of Watkinsville P2 watershed for Chanleng and Calcleng methods under simulations with different DEM resolutions.....	119
Figure 5.14. Soil loss with distance and slope profile of the top hillslope of Watkinsville P2 watershed for Chanleng and Calcleng methods under simulations with different DEM resolutions.....	119
Figure 5.15. Average P-values showing comparisons between measured and simulated watershed runoff for different event sizes and simulation methods	122
Figure 5.16. Average P-values showing comparisons between measured and simulated watershed sediment yield for different event sizes and simulation methods	124
Figure 5.17. Average P-values for interactions between resolution and event size.....	126