LimnoTech
Water Environment | Scientists Engineers

501 Avis Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48108
734.332.1200
www.limno.com

Memorandum

From: Dave Dilks

Date: January 6, 2014

Project: SRRTTF

To: SRRTTF

CC:

SUBJECT: **DRAFT: Review of Modeling Tools**

Summary

The Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force (SRRTTF) is developing a comprehensive plan to reduce toxic pollutants in the Spokane River, and has hired LimnoTech to serve as a technical advisor. This memorandum reviews available modeling tools to describe the in-stream fate and transport of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) and polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxin and dibenzofuran (dioxin) levels in the Spokane River. The memorandum is divided into sections corresponding to: 1) Initial screening assessment, 2) Detailed fate and transport models of water column and sediment concentration, and 3) Bioaccumulation assessment.

A consensus was reached at the December 4-5 workshop that first-year modeling efforts would consist of a simple screening-level model capable of predicting PCB concentrations throughout the Spokane River upstream of Lake Spokane. This model will be a one-dimensional steady-state model mass balance model implemented in a spreadsheet. The model will be capable of predicting the extent to which river concentrations will change in response to reduction of any particular direct loading source.

Several potentially applicable detailed fate and transport models frameworks are available to support later phases of this work. We recommend that primary consideration be given to a linked application of the EFDC hydrodynamic model with the WASP water quality model. This recommendation is based upon the fact that these models:

- are fully capable of simulating all of the environmental processes of concern,
- are supported by U.S. EPA, and
- have a wide history of application.

The possibility exists to use existing CE-QUAL-W2 hydrodynamic predictions (instead of EFDC) as a hydrodynamic driver to the WASP model, pending changes to the model code to allow WASP to accept inputs from CE-QUAL-W2.

Several bioaccumulation model frameworks are identified for potential application, if reassessment of existing bioaccumulation factors is desired in the future.

Introduction

The SRRTTF is developing a comprehensive plan to reduce toxic pollutants in the Spokane River, designed to identify specific management actions that can be undertaken to control pollutant loads such that water quality objectives can be attained. Comprehensive plans of this type typically rely upon mathematical models to describe the relationship between pollutant sources and resulting environmental concentrations.

Several water quality model frameworks exist that are potentially applicable for the Spokane River. Based on feedback received at the December 4-5 project workshop, modeling will proceed in a phased fashion. The first year of modeling will consist of a screening-level model of the Spokane River upstream of Lake Spokane. Detailed fate and transport modeling will be delayed until later in the project, when more information is available describing existing sources and environmental concentrations of the pollutants of concern. Application of bioaccumulation models to reassess existing bioconcentration factors may also occur in subsequent phases. A range of candidate bioaccumulation models are identified that can be reviewed in detail in later phases, should the decision be made to reassess existing bioconcentration factors. Given the nature of this project, the review of models is focused on public domain, non-proprietary models.

The remainder of this memorandum describes the screening-level model to be initially applied, followed by an assessment of the available detailed fate and transport models, and list of available bioaccumulation model frameworks. It is divided into sections of:

- Screening-level Model of the Spokane River
- Detailed Fate and Transport Model Frameworks
- Bioaccumulation Model Frameworks

Screening-level Model of the Spokane River

A consensus was reached at the December 4-5 workshop that the first-year modeling efforts would consist of a simple screening-level model capable of predicting PCB concentrations throughout the Spokane River upstream of Lake Spokane. This model will be a one-dimensional steady-state model mass balance model, assuming that loading, dilution and downstream transport are the sole factors determining instream pollutant concentration. Mathematically, the model can be expressed as:

$$C_x = \Sigma W_x / Q_x \quad (1)$$

Where

C_x = Concentration at location x in the Spokane River (M/L^3)
ΣW_x = Cumulative pollutant loading upstream of location x (M/T)
Q_x = River flow at location x (L^3/T)

The model will be implemented in a spreadsheet, and will be capable of predicting the extent to which river concentrations will change in response to reduction of any particular loading source. Although this is a steady state framework and not designed to predict system response time, the model is capable of predicting changes in concentration over the course of a year by repeating Equation 1 for each day of the year using inputs appropriate to each given day.

Detailed Fate and Transport Model Frameworks

Modeling the fate and transport of hydrophobic organic pollutants, such as PCBs and dioxins, requires consideration of hydrodynamics and toxic pollutant kinetic processes. Some models exist that consider both of these aspects as part of an integrated framework; while many practical applications have consisted of a linkage of individual models frameworks specific to each component (i.e. hydrodynamic model results linked to toxic chemical kinetic model). This section

provides a review of available public domain models in each category that have been applied for toxic organic chemical modeling at other sites. Model reviews are divided into categories of:

- Hydrodynamic models
- Toxic pollutant kinetic process models
- Integrated model frameworks

These reviews are followed by recommendation of a modeling framework to be used in future phases of the project.

Hydrodynamic models

There are four general purpose hydrodynamic modeling frameworks that are commonly used to provide input to toxic chemical kinetic models:

- CH3DZ
- Princeton Ocean Model (POM)
- ECOM-3D
- EFDC

The CE-QUAL-W2 model developed for the Spokane River/Lake Spokane dissolved oxygen TMDL currently contains a hydrodynamic framework, but is not currently structured to output its hydrodynamic results in the format that can be read by toxic pollutant kinetic process models.

CH3DZ (Curvilinear Hydrodynamics in 3 Dimensions — Z Plane) is a finite-difference model that computes three-dimensional velocity, salinity, and temperature fields in bays, estuaries, lakes, and rivers. CH3DZ was used as the hydrodynamic component of the Chesapeake Bay water quality model, and was also used to provide three-dimensional hydrodynamic inputs to a water quality model of Lake Washington. http://www.ch-t.com/models.shtml.

The Princeton Ocean Model (POM) is modeling code capable of simulating a wide-range of hydrodynamic conditions: circulation and mixing processes in rivers, estuaries, and lakes. POM is a sigma coordinate, free surface model with embedded turbulence and wave sub-models, and wet-dry capability. http://www.aos.princeton.edu/WWWPUBLIC/htdocs.pom/. ECOM-3D is a close relative of the Princeton Ocean Model, and solves the time dependent, three dimensional equations for the conservation of mass, momentum, salt, heat and turbulence quantities in an incompressible hydrostatic fluid. http://pritchard.marine.usf.edu/TBmodel/ecom3d.html.

The Environmental Fluid Dynamics Code (EFDC) is a state-of-the-art hydrodynamic model that can be used to simulate aquatic systems in one, two, and three dimensions. EFDC uses stretched or sigma vertical coordinates and Cartesian or curvilinear, orthogonal horizontal coordinates to represent the physical characteristics of a water body. It solves three-dimensional, vertically hydrostatic, free surface, turbulent averaged equations of motion for a variable-density fluid. Dynamically-coupled transport equations for turbulent kinetic energy, turbulent length scale, salinity and temperature are also solved. http://www.epa.gov/athens/wwqtsc/html/efdc.html.

All four of these models have sufficient capability to accurately simulate the hydrodynamic features of Spokane River and its impoundments. The primary differences between them for purposes of this application are that the EFDC model is EPA-supported and has been more widely applied in TMDL and similar regulatory settings. Also, software linkages have already been developed between EFDC outputs and the inputs of many water quality models.

The CE-QUAL-W2 model that was applied as part of the Spokane River/Lake Spokane dissolved oxygen TDML is capable of generating the type of hydrodynamic outputs necessary to support toxic chemical modeling, but does not currently provide results in format that can be read by existing toxic chemical models.

Toxic pollutant kinetic process models

There are three widely accepted public domain toxic chemical kinetic modeling frameworks:

- WASP
- AQUATOX
- CE-QUAL-ICM

WASP (Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program), developed and supported by USEPA, is a dynamic compartment-modeling program for aquatic systems, including both the water column and the underlying benthos. WASP allows the user to investigate 1, 2, and 3 dimensional systems, and a variety of pollutant types. The time varying processes of advection, dispersion, point and diffuse mass loading and boundary exchange are represented in the model. WASP also can be linked with hydrodynamic and sediment transport models that can provide flows, depths velocities, temperature, salinity and sediment fluxes. http://www.epa.gov/athens/wwqtsc/html/wasp.html. WASP is the most widely used modeling framework for assessing toxic pollutants, and has often been linked to hydrodynamic model outputs at a range of spatial resolutions. Further, the toxic kinetic routines in WASP serve as the basis for many other water quality models.

AQUATOX, developed and supported by USEPA, predicts the fate of a wide range of pollutants and their effects on the ecosystem. AQUATOX is an ecosystem model, and includes numerous types of plants, invertebrates and fish. AQUATOX, in contrast to the other models described here treats the biota as interacting with the chemical/physical system. http://water.epa.gov/scitech/datait/models/aquatox/index.cfm. The primary advantage to AQUATOX is its unique ability to simulate bioaccumulation and biological effects. Its primary disadvantage is that it is not commonly linked to hydrodynamic models, and is most commonly applied at a coarse segmentation scale where detailed hydrodynamics are not considered.

CE-QUAL-ICM was developed by the US Army Corps of Engineers, and initially developed as a component of the model package employed to study eutrophication processes in Chesapeake Bay. Subsequent to employment in the Bay study, the model code was generalized to include consideration of toxics. The toxics model (ICM/TOXI) resulted from incorporating the toxic chemical routines from EPA's WASP model into the transport code for ICM, incorporating a more detailed benthic sediment model, and enhancing linkages to sediment transport models. ICM/TOXI includes: physical processes such as sorption to DOC and three solid classes, volatilization, and sedimentation; and chemical processes such as ionization, hydrolysis, photolysis, oxidation, and biodegradation. http://el.erdc.usace.army.mil/elmodels/icminfo.html. The advantages to ICM/TOXI are that is readily linked to hydrodynamic model outputs at a range of spatial resolutions, and that it possesses the capability to simulate benthic sediment processes at a greater level of detail than the other two models discussed here. Its disadvantages are that it requires use of the CH3DZ hydrodynamic model and that it has not been as widely applied as the WASP model framework.

Integrated Model Frameworks

The EFDC model, in addition to the hydrodynamic capabilities discussed above, also possesses the capability to simulate sediment transport and toxic kinetic processes. As such, it has the capability to meet all Spokane-specific needs in a single integrated modeling framework. Another advantage to applying EFDC in an integrated fashion is that its capabilities of simulating sediment transport processes are superior to those contained in WASP or AQUATOX.

There are two disadvantages to using the integrated EFDC modeling package. First, hydrodynamic and water quality calculations are fully coupled, such that every model simulation must conduct calculations for both components. This is in contrast to a linked model framework such as EFDC-WASP where, once the hydrodynamic model is calibrated, future water quality simulations can be conducted without the need for re-rerunning model hydrodynamics. Because hydrodynamic calculations are much more computationally intensive than water quality calculations, it is much more computationally efficient to use a linked model framework in situations like Spokane where the influence of sediment transport dynamics or other water quality variables on hydrodynamic predictions can be considered to be insignificant (or marginal) relative to other factors.

Model Recommendations

This section begins by assessing the available models in each of the three categories (hydrodynamic, water quality, integrated framework), and then provides overall recommendations for moving forward.

EFDC is the preferred hydrodynamic modeling framework, because

- It is fully capable of simulating the key hydrodynamic features of the Spokane River and its impoundments
- It has been much more widely applied than the other hydrodynamic models
- It is officially supported by USEPA
- None of the other hydrodynamic models offer unique capabilities that override the advantages listed above

Each of the water quality models considered have unique features that merit their consideration. AQUATOX provides a detailed description of bioaccumulation and biological effects of toxic pollutants, but is less well suited for considering finer-scale hydrodynamics. CE-QUAL-ICM/TOXI possesses the capability to simulate benthic sediment processes at a greater level of detail than the other two stand-alone water quality models, but requires linkage to the CH3DZ hydrodynamic model. WASP is widely applied and contains kinetics that serve as the basis for most other toxic models, but has lesser capabilities in describing benthic sediment transport.

Application of EFDC in an integrated manner provides a detailed description of benthic sediment transport, but this integrated framework is not as widely applied and will be computationally inefficient.

The linked EFDC-WASP framework is recommended for this project, as it meets all project needs, is widely applied, and is EPA supported. Its primary limitations (less rigorous simulation of benthic sediment transport than EFDC or ICM/TOXI, and less rigorous simulation of bioaccumulation and biological effects) are not considered significant detriments, because:

- Resuspension of buried historical contamination is not a major issue in Spokane. Sediments in the riverine segment are scoured downstream during periods of high flow. Historical sediment contamination in Lake Spokane is located at sufficient water depths that resuspension is not an important process to consider.
- The environmental endpoint of concern for this project is the water quality standard. EFDC-WASP is capable of predicting water column concentrations for comparison to these standards, and can provide estimated fish tissue concentrations through the use of established bioaccumulation factors.

The possibility exists to use existing CE-QUAL-W2 hydrodynamic predictions instead of EFDC as a driver to the WASP model, although this approach would require changes to the CE-QUAL-W2 model code (and perhaps changes to WASP, as well) to allow WASP to accept CE-QUAL-W2 inputs.

Bioaccumulation Model Frameworks

Discussions at various SRRTTF meetings have expressed an interest in potentially reassessing the appropriateness of existing statewide bioconcentration factors as they apply to the Spokane River and Lake Spokane. This reassessment, should it be eventually conducted, would benefit from the application of a bioaccumulation model capable of defining the site-specific relationship between pollutant concentrations in the water column, sediment, and biota. This section presents a list of candidate bioaccumulation model frameworks to be considered should reassessment of existing bioconcentration factors be desired.

The Electric Power Research Institute (ERPI) recently conducted a review of bioaccumulation models that provides a good list of candidate models for future consideration. EPRI (2013) restricted their review to models meeting the following selection criteria:

- Aquatic domain: The model domain must encompass aquatic ecosystems and must possess the capability to predict chemical bioaccumulation in the associated aquatic food web (i.e., from plankton to fish).
- Processes representation: The model must represent uptake and loss mechanisms that determine bioaccumulation through the food chain.
- Availability: The model must be non-proprietary.
- Support: The model must have adequate support (document support, human support or both).
- Application: The model must have the capability to be applied to a range of sites, as opposed to being developed for a single, site-specific, application.
- Peer review: The model must have undergone peer review process through either publication in a journal article, an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) report, or other appropriate government (federal or state) agency report.

EPRI (2013) identified a total of eleven candidate bioaccumulation models meeting the above criteria, with three of the models capable of assessing only mercury. The remaining eight candidate models capable of assessing PCBs and dioxin are:

- BASS v2.2, (Barber, 2008)
- ECOFATE 1.0β1, (Gobas, 1998)
- TRIM.FaTE 3.3, (U.S.EPA, 2002)
- AQUATOX 3.1, (U.S.EPA, 2012)
- AQFDCHN 1.0, (AQEA, 2013)
- FISHRAND 4.0, (E-Risk Sciences, 2012)
- AQUAWEB 1.3, (Arnot and Gobas, 2004)
- FOODWEB 2.0, (Campfens and Mackay, 1997)

References

Arnot JA and FAPC Gobas. 2004. A food web bioaccumulation model for organic chemicals in aquatic ecosystems. Env Tox Chem 23(10): 2343-2355.

AQEA (Anchor Quantitative Environmental Analysis). 2013. Documentation: Bioaccumulation Model AQFDCHN v. 1.0. Pages 21. Anchor QEA, LLC, Montvale, NJ.

Barber MC. 2008. Bioaccumulation and Aquatic System Simulator (BASS) User's Manual Version 2.2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Exposure Research Laboratory, Ecosystems Research Division, Athens, GA. EPA/600/R-01/035 update 2.2.

Campfens, J. and D. Mackay. 1997. Fugacity-based model of PCB bioaccumulation in complex aquatic food webs. Environmental Science and Technology 31: 577-583.

E-Risk Sciences, 2012. FishRand-Migration (FR-M) Probabilistic Bioaccumulation Module. User's Manual Version 4.0. March, 2012.

EPRI, 2013. Review of Bioaccumulation Models of Mercury and Polychlorinated Biphenyls in Aquatic Systems, EPRI, Palo Alto, CA:2013. 3002001198.

Gobas FAPC, Pasternak JP, Lien K, Duncan RK. 1998. Development and field validation of a multimedia exposure assessment model for waste load allocation in aquatic ecosystems: application to 2,3,7,8-tetrachloro-p-dioxin and 2,3,7,8tetrachlorodibenzofuran in the Fraser River watershed. Environ Sci Technol 32: 2442 - 2449.

U.S. EPA. 2012. AQUATOX (Release 3.1). Modeling Environmental Fate and Ecological Effects in Aquatic Ecosystems. Volume 2. Technical Documentation. EPA-823-R-09-004; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water - Office of Science and Technology, Washington, D.C.

U.S. EPA 2002. TRIM.FaTE Technical Support Document Volume I: Description of Module. EPA-453/R-02-011a. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. Research Triangle Park, NC. September 2002.