



DEPARTMENT OF
ECOLOGY
State of Washington

Quality Assurance Project Plan

Salish Sea Dissolved Oxygen Modeling Approach: Sediment-Water Interactions

January 2015

Publication No. 15-03-103

Publication Information

Each study conducted by Ecology must have an approved Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). The plan describes the objectives of the study and the procedures to be followed to achieve those objectives. After completing the study, Ecology will post the final report of the study to the Internet.

This QAPP is available on Ecology's website at <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1503103.html>

Ecology's Activity Tracker Code for this study is 14-017.

Author and Contact Information

Mindy Roberts and Greg Pelletier
P.O. Box 47600
Environmental Assessment Program
Washington State Department of Ecology
Olympia, WA 98504-7710

Tarang Khangaonkar and Wen Long
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
1100 Dexter Avenue North, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98109

For more information contact: Communications Consultant, phone 360-407-6834.

Washington State Department of Ecology - www.ecy.wa.gov/

- Headquarters, Olympia 360-407-6000
- Northwest Regional Office, Bellevue 425-649-7000
- Southwest Regional Office, Olympia 360-407-6300
- Central Regional Office, Yakima 509-575-2490
- Eastern Regional Office, Spokane 509-329-3400

Any use of product or firm names in this publication is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the author or the Department of Ecology.

Accommodation Requests:

To request ADA accommodation including materials in a format for the visually impaired, call Ecology at 360-407-6834. Persons with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. Persons with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341.

1.0 Title Page and Table of Contents

Quality Assurance Project Plan

Salish Sea Dissolved Oxygen Modeling Approach: Sediment-Water Interactions

January 2015

Approved by:

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Signature: Will Kendra, Client, Statewide Coordination Section, EAP | Date: January 2015 |
|--|--------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Signature: Mindy Roberts, Author / Project Manager, SCS, EAP | Date: January 2015 |
|---|--------------------|

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Signature: Greg Pelletier, Author / Principal Investigator, SCS, EAP | Date: December 2014 |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Signature: Tarang Khangaonkar, Author / Principal Investigator, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory | Date: January 2015 |
|--|--------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Signature: Wen Long, Author / Principal Investigator, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory | Date: January 2015 |
|--|--------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Signature: Karol Erickson, Modeling and Information Support Unit, SCS, EAP | Date: January 2015 |
|---|--------------------|

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Signature: Robert F. Cusimano, Western Operations Section, EAP | Date: December 2014 |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Signature: Andrew Kolosseus, Water Quality Program | Date: December 2014 |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Signature: Bill Kammin, Ecology Quality Assurance Officer | Date: January 2015 |
|--|--------------------|

Signatures are not available on the Internet version.
EAP: Environmental Assessment Program
SCS: Statewide Coordination Section

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 1.0 Title Page and Table of Contents..... | 1 |
| 2.0 Abstract..... | 5 |
| 3.0 Background..... | 6 |
| 3.1 Study Area and Surroundings | 6 |
| 4.0 Project Description..... | 12 |
| 4.1 Project Goals | 13 |
| 4.2 Project Objectives | 13 |
| 4.3 Information Needed and Sources..... | 14 |
| 4.4 Target Population..... | 14 |
| 4.5 Study Boundaries | 14 |
| 4.6 Tasks Required..... | 15 |
| 4.7 Practical Constraints | 15 |
| 4.8 Systematic Planning Process..... | 15 |
| 4.9 Intended Use of the Model..... | 15 |
| 5.0 Organization and Schedule | 16 |
| 5.1 Key Individuals and their Responsibilities | 16 |
| 5.2 Special Training and Certifications | 16 |
| 5.3 Organization Chart..... | 16 |
| 5.4 Project Schedule..... | 16 |
| 5.5 Limitations on Schedule | 16 |
| 5.6 Budget and Funding..... | 16 |
| 6.0 Quality Objectives | 19 |
| 7.0 Sampling Process Design (Experimental Design) | 20 |
| 7.1 Model Selection | 20 |
| 7.2 Model Theory..... | 21 |
| 7.3 Model Development and Testing..... | 29 |
| 7.4 Computational Requirements..... | 30 |
| 8.0 Sampling Procedures | 37 |
| 9.0 Measurement Procedures | 37 |
| 10.0 Quality Control Procedures..... | 37 |
| Field | 37 |
| Laboratory..... | 37 |
| 11.0 Data Management Procedures | 37 |
| 11.1 Model Information Management Procedures | 38 |
| 12.0 Audits and Reports..... | 39 |
| 13.0 Data Verification and Validation | 40 |
| 13.1 Model Calibration and Evaluation | 40 |
| 14.0 Data Quality (Usability) Assessment..... | 47 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 14.1 Model Output Quality (Usability) Assessment..... | 47 |
| 15.0 References..... | 48 |
| Appendices..... | 53 |
| Appendix A. Detailed Description of Sediment Diagenesis Model | 54 |
| Appendix B. Comparison of Ecology’s SedFlux.xlsm with Professor James Martin’s SED_JLM.FOR..... | 83 |
| Appendix C. Glossary, Acronyms, and Abbreviations..... | 92 |

List of Figures and Tables

Page

Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1. Puget Sound and the Straits of the Salish Sea with land areas discharging to marine waters within the model domain. | 7 |
| Figure 2. Salish Sea model computational grid. | 8 |
| Figure 3. Washington State water quality standards for marine dissolved oxygen. | 11 |
| Figure 4. Sediment diagenesis schematic. | 12 |
| Figure 5. Basic structure of the sediment flux model (Martin and Wool, 2013). | 23 |
| Figure 6. Process flow diagram for creating FVCOM NetCDF output. | 32 |
| Figure 7. Process flow diagram for creating FVCOM NetCDF output. | 33 |
| Figure 8. FVCOM-ICM process flow diagram in a cloud-computing environment. | 36 |
| Figure 9. Process for updating and applying the Salish Sea model if no recalibration is needed (left side) or if recalibration is needed (right side)..... | 41 |

Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Organization of project staff and responsibilities. | 17 |
| Table 2. Proposed schedule for completing final report. | 18 |
| Table 3. Project budget funded by NEP grant. | 18 |
| Table 4. Parameter summary for rate constants and kinetics parameters of the sediment flux model. | 43 |

Acknowledgements

This project is funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under assistance agreement PC-00J20101 -4 to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

2.0 Abstract

Low concentrations of dissolved oxygen have been measured throughout the Salish Sea. Recent modeling investigations indicate that low concentrations occur throughout much of the Salish Sea due to the Pacific Ocean and natural conditions. However, some regions of South and Central Puget Sound are also influenced by human nutrient contributions. Sediment-water interactions strongly influence oxygen levels. The previous modeling studies externally specify the sediment-water exchanges and adjustments to account for changes in external loading. That approach cannot distinguish the loading and sediment effects of individual sources.

The purpose of this model development is to add the capability to dynamically simulate the sediment-water exchanges in a process called sediment diagenesis. Material fluxes to the sediment from the water column fuel biogeochemical processes that release some of the nutrients back to the water column and consume oxygen in the process. We will set up and test the model code to ensure that sediment-water exchanges are incorporated appropriately.

We will apply the revised model to the Salish Sea and compare against monitoring data to assess the model skill. If needed, we will recalibrate the dissolved oxygen model. The revised model will be used to reevaluate scenarios to identify the relative influences of climate effects, local human nutrient sources, and the Pacific Ocean on dissolved oxygen. Results also will be used to develop new boundary conditions for the South and Central Puget Sound model.

3.0 Background

3.1 Study Area and Surroundings

The Salish Sea refers to the region covered by Puget Sound, the Strait of Georgia, and the Strait of Juan de Fuca (Figure 1). Pacific Ocean water enters the Salish Sea primarily through the Strait of Juan de Fuca, with a lesser exchange around the north end of Vancouver Island in Canada through Johnstone Strait. The marine water model domain (Figure 2) includes portions of the U.S. and Canada.

Freshwater from the Salish Sea watershed enters through rivers, streams, and other inflows, where they mix with the marine waters (Mohamedali et al., 2011). The Fraser River represents the largest single source of freshwater overall and much of the 4,200 m³/s of Canadian freshwater inflow in 2006. The largest source of freshwater to Puget Sound is the Skagit River. U.S. watershed inflows totaled 1,500 m³/s to Puget Sound and an additional 300 m³/s to the Straits in 2006 with some interannual variability. These freshwaters deliver nitrogen, predominantly in nitrate form, to the estuarine environment. In 2006, U.S. watersheds delivered 27,500 kg/d of dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) to Puget Sound and an additional 7,300 kg/d to the Straits from the combined effect of natural and human sources. Canadian watersheds delivered 44,400 kg/d of DIN, dominated by the Fraser River with 33,500 kg/d. These include the combined effect of natural and human sources within the watersheds.

Wastewater treatment plants also discharge freshwater and nitrogen. Marine point sources deliver much less flow than the watersheds. U.S. marine point sources produce 20 m³/s and Canadian marine point sources about 16 m³/s (Mohamedali et al., 2011). However, nitrogen is more concentrated in treatment plant effluent and can be 10 to 30 mg/L of total nitrogen, nearly all of which is DIN. This results in loads from treated wastewater of 34,700 kg/d from U.S. treatment plants and 29,100 kg/d of DIN from Canadian treatment plants in 2006. Nearly all of the wastewater is from municipal wastewater; a small fraction is from industrial wastewater.

The largest wastewater inputs serve the largest metropolitan areas. Five treatment plants serve the greater Vancouver, BC population of 2.2 million people and produced 25,800 kg/d of DIN in 2006. Two outfalls serve the Seattle metropolitan area with about 1.8 million people, delivering 19,500 kg/d of DIN in 2006.

Estuarine waters exhibit highly complex circulation patterns. These reflect the intricate horizontal shape of the Salish Sea as well as the bathymetry. Shallow sills occur at the entrances to various basins, including Hood Canal, Admiralty Inlet, and the Tacoma Narrows. Shallow water depths coupled with large tidal exchanges result in strong currents and vertical mixing. Stratification affects vertical mixing throughout the Salish Sea as well.




Figure 1. Puget Sound and the Straits of the Salish Sea with land areas discharging to marine waters within the model domain.




Figure 2. Salish Sea model computational grid.

3.1.1 Logistical problems

There are no logistical problems expected such as field work or property access. We have access to all appropriate modeling software.

3.1.2 History of study area

Sackmann (2009) detailed the history of the study area. In summary, low dissolved oxygen has been measured in several locations within the Salish Sea. A fundamental question is whether human contributions are responsible for or contributing to the decline in oxygen levels over time. Local sources of nitrogen have tripled in comparison with natural nitrogen sources (Mohamedali et al., 2011). This effort is the first to evaluate the relative contributions of local sources to impacts from the Pacific Ocean and changing climate.

3.1.3 Parameters of concern

Dissolved oxygen is the primary parameter of concern. However, it is the discharge and production enhanced by nitrogen and carbon that is of concern. Nitrogen from local natural and human sources, the Pacific Ocean, and atmospheric sources can spur phytoplankton growth. As the phytoplankton dies, sinks to the bottom as organic matter, and decays, the process uses up oxygen. Therefore, nitrogen and carbon contributions to organic matter processing are the primary contaminants of concern.

3.1.4 Results of Previous Studies

Ecology recently completed an analysis of the relative influences of human nutrient sources and Pacific Ocean influences on dissolved oxygen concentrations in Puget Sound, the Strait of Georgia, and the Strait of Juan de Fuca. This region is collectively known as the Salish Sea. The calibrated model was applied to a series of scenarios to isolate the influence of different sources now and into the future (Roberts et al., 2014). Results indicate that human nitrogen contributions from the U.S. and Canada have the greatest impacts on dissolved oxygen in South and Central Puget Sound. Marine point sources cause greater decreases in dissolved oxygen than watershed inflows compared with natural conditions.

Separately, Ecology developed a three-dimensional circulation and water quality model of South and Central Puget Sound with an external boundary at Edmonds. The calibrated model was applied to a series of scenarios to isolate the effects of different sources, including local human nutrient sources (Ahmed et al., 2014). We used the Salish Sea model to assess the change in water quality at the Edmonds boundary that would result from eliminating human sources in the Salish Sea under natural conditions. The relationship was then used to adjust the boundary to account for different external load scenarios.

The Salish Sea model was calibrated by specifying sediment-water exchanges of nitrogen and oxygen (Khangaonkar et al., 2012 a,b). Very little is known about sediment fluxes in Puget Sound (Sheibley and Paulson, 2014). Most available information focuses on shallow regions of Puget Sound in the late summer, but those express a wide range of magnitudes. The Budd Inlet

Scientific Study (Aura Nova Consultants et al., 1998) provided the most complete year-round assessment of fluxes and found that fluxes generally peak in the late summer months but display high variability.

To assess sediment-water exchanges under different load scenarios, we calculated scalars (scaling factors) from a mass balance of external loads to the region south of Whidbey Island where the majority of the U.S. human sources originate. However, these scalars reflected total loads of nitrogen and were not specific to an individual source. We applied the sediment scalars to the entire region and were unable to develop spatially heterogeneous sediment fluxes.

3.1.5 Regulatory criteria or standards

The Clean Water Act (CWA) established a process to identify and clean up polluted waters. The CWA requires each state to develop and maintain water quality standards that protect, restore, and preserve water quality. Water quality standards consist of (1) a set of designated uses for all waterbodies, such as salmon spawning, swimming, and fish and shellfish harvesting; (2) numeric and narrative criteria to achieve those uses; and (3) an antidegradation policy to protect high quality waters that surpass these conditions.

Ecology has established designated uses for the marine waters of the Salish Sea. These are established to protect aquatic life, shellfish harvesting, recreational uses, and miscellaneous uses.

Having adequate DO is essential for aquatic life. The water quality standards for marine DO are found in WAC 173-201A-210(1)(d) and have two parts. Numeric DO criteria are applied as a 1-day minimum DO concentration in milligrams per liter (mg/L). The criteria are applied such that concentrations must be greater than a specific threshold, which varies by location and aquatic life category to be protected, at all times of year and locations in the water column. Figure 3 maps designated uses and the first part of the DO standard:

- Extraordinary quality: 7.0 mg/L
- Excellent quality: 6.0 mg/L
- Good quality: 5.0 mg/L
- Fair quality: 4.0 mg/L

The second part of the DO standard in WAC 173-201A-210(1)(d)(i) overrides numeric DO criteria. The second part states that “[w]hen a water body’s dissolved oxygen (DO) is lower than the numeric criterion in the dissolved oxygen standard (or within 0.2 mg/L) of the criteria) and that condition is due to natural conditions, then human actions considered cumulatively may not cause the DO of that water body to decrease more than 0.2 mg/L.”

We compare regional model results with the criteria to understand the relative impacts of alternative sources. However, we use the nested South Puget Sound model (Roberts et al., 2014) for a more detailed comparison to the standards.




Figure 3. Washington State water quality standards for marine dissolved oxygen.

4.0 Project Description

Sediment diagenesis refers to the process where biogeochemical processes transform the nutrients delivered to the sediments from particles settling from the water column and release a portion of the nutrients back into the water column (Figure 4). The process also consumes oxygen. A portion of the nutrients are buried as well, where they are permanently lost from the active system.




Figure 4. Sediment diagenesis schematic.

The Pacific Ocean, natural sources, and human activities are sources of nutrients to the Salish Sea. Nutrients that reach the euphotic zone, where there is sufficient light, spur phytoplankton growth. These nutrients include a combination of inputs from rivers and the surface waters of incoming tides, as well as deeper sources of nutrients from deep discharges and the bottom waters of incoming tides that are mixed up into the water column. This vertical mixing is especially important across shallow sills, such as the Tacoma Narrows and Admiralty Inlet. Buoyant processes can also mix deeper nutrients into surface waters.

As the algae bloom, they transform dissolved material into particulate matter. As the algae die, they settle to the bottom. Zooplankton that feed on the algae also produce wastes that settle to the bottom as a flux of particles. These combined fluxes fuel processes within the sediments.

A variety of physical and biogeochemical processes act on the organic matter in the sediments. The organic matter decomposes in the sediment. Plants and animals physically rework the

sediments. Decomposition and oxidation of organic matter transforms nutrients and release them back to the water column. Sediment oxygen levels decline from bottom water concentrations to near zero within a few centimeters of the surface, which produces strong gradients. These gradients contribute to diffusion into the sediments as oxygen is used to fuel decomposition of organic matter. This exerts a sediment oxygen demand (SOD) on the water column. The decomposition of organic nitrogen generates ammonium and also creates a gradient that pushes ammonium out of the sediments and into the water column.

Sediment diagenesis refers to the decomposition of organic matter that is deposited from the water column into the sediments, the sediment processes that transform organic matter into other forms, and the fluxes between the sediments and water that result. In addition, not all of the particle flux is returned to the water column. A portion of the particles are lost from the system as deep burial.

The Salish Sea model externally specifies the sediment fluxes of nitrogen and oxygen (Khangaonkar et al., 2012 a,b). These were adjusted to account for changes in external nutrient loading and flow while evaluating alternative natural, current, and future loads (Roberts et al., 2014). Higher loads would cause additional phytoplankton growth, higher particulate deposition to the sediments, and higher exchanges of nitrogen and oxygen. This phase of model development will incorporate sediment processes directly so that they are calculated internally to the model and reflect changes in loading or other processes.

4.1 Project Goals

The overall modeling goal is to improve the performance of the Salish Sea dissolved oxygen model by incorporating sediment processes to better identify and quantify factors and processes that influence dissolved oxygen. In addition to developing and implementing the code changes needed to simulate this process, this process will also extensively test the revised code to verify the correct model connections and behavior under idealized conditions. The revised model will then be applied to the calibration period. If this comparison finds major differences in model skill, then the Salish Sea dissolved oxygen model may need to be recalibrated.

4.2 Project Objectives

The final calibrated model will be applied to the Salish Sea scenarios to evaluate the relative effect of human nutrient sources and the Pacific Ocean. Specific objectives include the ability to:

- Assess oxygen levels under natural conditions, including the influences of sediments.
- Distinguish relative impacts of current human sources of nitrogen.
- Project future oxygen conditions that reflect sediment processes.

The Salish Sea model will also be used to refine boundary conditions for the South and Central Puget Sound dissolved oxygen model, a separate subsequent project.

4.3 Information Needed and Sources

Sackmann (2009 and 2011) and Roberts et al. (2014) describe the information needed for the original FVCOM-ICM model formulation, model inputs, and calibration data. The same information will be used in this project.

Section 7.2 and Appendix A describe the sediment flux model framework. Most of the information needed will come from the literature. However, the following information will be used to calibrate and evaluate the Salish Sea model with the sediment processes incorporated:

- Sediment trap data for water column sediment fluxes.
 - Gries and Osterberg (2011)
 - Norton (2009)
 - Paulson et al. (1991)
 - Baker et al. (1985)
 - Baker et al. (1982)
- Sedimentation rates based on radioisotope core dating.
 - Brown (2014, personal communication)
 - Toxics Cleanup Program (2012)
 - Pelletier and Mohamedali (2009)
 - RETEC Group (2006)
- Puget Sound benthic flux data.
 - Sheibley and Paulson (2014)
 - King County (2012)
 - Roberts et al. (2008)
- Sediment and porewater chemistry (e.g., total organic carbon, nitrogen, ammonium, total volatile solids, sulfides).
 - Ecology's Environmental Information Management (EIM) System (www.ecy.wa.gov/eim)
 - Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Program remedial investigation studies
 - Ecology's marine sediment ambient monitoring program
 - Greengrove (2005)

Section 13.1 describes how these data will be used for model calibration and evaluation.

4.4 Target Population

The target conditions (population) are DO concentrations and changes from natural conditions.

4.5 Study Boundaries

See Section 3.1 for a description of the study area. Figure 1 presents the watershed boundary and Figure 2 presents the model grid boundaries.

4.5.1 Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) and 8-digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) numbers for the study area

The study area includes Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) 1 through 19 and eight-digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) numbers 17110001 through 17110021.

4.6 Tasks Required

This project will include several tasks:

- Implement software changes to connect sediment-water interactions to model code.
- Test software changes on idealized systems with analytical solutions.
- Apply updated code to Salish Sea system and check against monitoring data.
- Recalibrate dissolved oxygen (if needed).
- Evaluate relative influences of local human nutrient sources and the Pacific Ocean by revisiting current scenarios described in Roberts et al. (2014).
- Document findings.

4.7 Practical Constraints

There are no or minimal logistical (e.g., field or lab) constraints for this project. Computational requirements and constraints are described in Section 7.4.

4.8 Systematic Planning Process

This QAPP, and the QAPPs approved for related work that has led to this project, reflect the systematic planning process.

4.9 Intended Use of the Model

This Salish Sea model application has two uses. First, the Salish Sea model will be used to develop boundary conditions for the South and Central Puget Sound model that incorporate the influence of sediment diagenesis. Boundary conditions include both water column concentrations at the northern boundary near Edmonds and bottom sediment fluxes throughout South and Central Puget Sound. Salish Sea model output will be used to adjust both the water column and sediment fluxes under alternative loading scenarios. Second, the model will be used to identify the relative influences of local human nutrient sources and the Pacific Ocean on the low concentrations of dissolved oxygen measured in Puget Sound and the Salish Sea. If this effort finds human sources cause >0.2 mg/L impact on dissolved oxygen compared with natural conditions outside of the South and Central Puget Sound model domain, a subsequent effort would be needed to develop load reduction targets possibly requiring more detailed modeling.

5.0 Organization and Schedule

5.1 Key Individuals and their Responsibilities

Table 1 lists the individuals involved in this project. All are employees of Ecology unless otherwise noted.

5.2 Special Training and Certifications

Key personnel involved in the development and application of the sediment diagenesis model have extensive experience in similar model applications, including those described in Ahmed et al. (2014), Long et al. (2014) and Roberts et al. (2014).

5.3 Organization Chart

Table 1 lists the key individuals, their positions, and their responsibilities for this project.

5.4 Project Schedule

Table 2 presents the proposed schedule for this project.

5.5 Limitations on Schedule

The two tasks producing the largest uncertainty in the project schedule are (1) model set up and testing and (2) recalibration (if needed). These will be managed through frequent communication and coordination within the modeling team.

5.6 Budget and Funding

Table 3 presents the project budget funded by the NEP grant. The totals do not include costs for some Ecology staff time funded through other state or federal sources.

Table 1. Organization of project staff and responsibilities.

| Staff (all are EAP except client) | Title | Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Will Kendra EA Program, SCS Phone: 360-407-6698 | Client | Clarifies scopes of the project. Provides internal review of the QAPP and approves the final QAPP. |
| Mindy Roberts MIS Unit, SCS Phone: 360-407-6804 | Project Manager | Writes the QAPP. Oversees model development and application. Participates in model evaluation. Writes the draft report and final report. |
| Greg Pelletier MIS Unit, SCS Phone: 360-407-6485 | Modeling Advisor | Assists in writing model theory portions of the QAPP. Participates in model evaluation. Develops software tests and evaluates results. |
| Teizeen Mohamedali MIS Unit, SCS Phone: 360-715-5209 | Modeling Assistant | Develops boundary conditions, applies the model, and post-processes the results. Participates in model evaluation. Assists in drafting the report. |
| Tarang Khangaonkar Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) Phone: 206-528-3053 | PNNL Project Manager | Oversees software development and testing. Participates in model evaluation. Assists in applying the model and post-processing the results. |
| Wen Long Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Phone: 360-683-4151 | PNNL Model Developer | Revises model software code and conducts tests specified by Ecology. Leads model evaluation. Assists in applying the model and post-processing the results. |
| Karol Erickson MIS Unit, SCS Phone: 360-407-6694 | Unit Supervisor for the Project Manager | Provides internal review of the QAPP, approves the budget, and approves the final QAPP. |
| Will Kendra SCS Phone: 360-407-6698 | Section Manager for the Project Manager | Reviews the project scope and budget, tracks progress, reviews the draft QAPP, and approves the final QAPP. |
| Robert F. Cusimano Western Operations Section Phone: 360-407-6596 | Section Manager for the Study Area | Reviews the project scope and budget, tracks progress, reviews the draft QAPP, and approves the final QAPP. |
| Andrew Kolosseus Water Quality Program Phone: 360-407-7543 | WQP Liaison | Reviews the draft QAPP, coordinates with WQP, and manages the advisory committee. |
| Tom Gries EAP Phone: 360-407-6327 | NEP Quality Assurance Manager | Reviews the draft QAPP and recommends its approval. Comments on draft report describing results of overall project. |
| William R. Kammin Phone: 360-407-6964 | Ecology Quality Assurance Officer | Approves the draft QAPP and approves the final QAPP. |

EAP: Environmental Assessment Program
MIS: Modeling and Information Support
QAPP: Quality Assurance Project Plan
NEP: National Estuary Program
SCS: Statewide Coordination Section

Table 2. Proposed schedule for completing final report.

| Model development | Due date | Lead staff |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Setup and testing complete | Fall 2014 | Greg Pelletier, Wen Lon |
| Application to Salish Sea conditions | Spring 2015 | Modeling team |
| Final report | | |
| Author lead / Support staff | Mindy Roberts / Greg Pelletier/Teizeen Mohamedali | |
| Schedule | | |
| Draft due to supervisor | August 2015 | |
| Draft due to client/peer reviewer | August 2015 | |
| Draft due to external reviewer(s) | September 2015 | |
| Final (all reviews done) due to publications coordinator | October 2015 | |
| Final report due on web | December 2015 | |

Table 3. Project budget funded by NEP grant.

| Task | PNNL budget | Ecology budget* | Project team* |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Quality Assurance Project Plan | \$12,134 | \$7,700 | \$19,800 |
| Model Setup and Testing | \$153,720 | \$47,600 | \$201,300 |
| Model Recalibration | \$68,880 | \$23,100 | \$91,900 |
| Scenarios | \$12,134 | \$23,100 | \$35,200 |
| Report | \$24,268 | \$17,200 | \$41,400 |
| Total | \$271,136 | \$118,600 | \$389,700 |

* Does not include in-kind contributions for Ecology staff funded through other state and federal sources. Rounded to nearest \$100.

6.0 Quality Objectives

The overall modeling goal is to improve the performance of the Salish Sea dissolved oxygen model by incorporating sediment processes to better identify and quantify factors and processes that influence dissolved oxygen. Specific objectives include the ability to assess oxygen levels under natural conditions including the influences of sediments, distinguish relative impacts of current sources, and project future oxygen conditions that reflect sediment processes.

Adding sediment diagenesis does not involve new model input data. Rates and constants will use best available information and will be documented in the project report. Data used for calibration are acceptable if they are obtained from reputable and documented sources such as scientific publications including government documents or other reports that represent appropriate systematic planning processes, documented quality assurance reviews, or peer reviews. We will evaluate all data used to compare with model-developed benthic fluxes and will describe the information sources and use in the final report.

Section 7.3 identifies some quality objectives and describes the model testing proposed to ensure that the model code reproduces results for idealized conditions with analytical solutions. This testing will be conducted prior to evaluation of dynamic boundary conditions for current or potential scenarios. Section 13.1 describes model calibration and evaluation, including sensitivity analyses and targets.

Performance criteria are based on both quantitative and qualitative measures. Quantitative measures will rely on root-mean-squared error (RMSE) and bias assessed throughout the model domain and throughout the period of simulation. Because of the uncertain state-of-the-art in model performance criteria, the inherent error in input and observed data, and the approximate nature of model formulations, absolute criteria for model acceptance or rejection are not appropriate for this effort. We will calibrate the model as described in the original project QAPP (Sackmann, 2009). We will focus on the model's ability to represent overall DO concentrations throughout the study area and seasonal patterns in dissolved oxygen, nutrients, and chlorophyll *a* as a proxy for phytoplankton. Calibration will also focus on reproducing patterns in summer low DO. We will not expect the model to reproduce short-term effects on water quality caused by ephemeral events. The model will be acceptable if it realistically produces variations in water quality within subbasins of the Salish Sea on interannual, seasonal, and possibly intra-seasonal time scales, using a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessments.

Previous efforts have assessed the quality of data used as input or comparison data. We will rely on marine data collected using appropriate quality controls to evaluate RMSE and bias. These include Ecology's ambient monitoring program (www.ecy.wa.gov/apps/eap/marinewq/mwdataset.asp) and the focused South Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Study (Roberts et al., 2008). These have been assessed for quality prior to publication.

As a check on sediment fluxes predicted by the model, we will compare with limited existing data. These include sediment fluxes compiled by Sheibley and Paulson (2014), including fluxes that Ecology measured in South Puget Sound (Roberts et al., 2008). We will identify available

particle flux measurements as well, such as those in Norton (2009) from South Puget Sound inlets.

7.0 Sampling Process Design (Experimental Design)

The standard QAPP template is not applicable; no sampling is planned. See Model Selection, Model Theory, Model Development and Testing, and Model Calibration and Validation for model-related information. Section 13.1 describes Model Calibration and Evaluation.

7.1 Model Selection

Sackmann et al. (2009) describes the initial model selection, set up, and application of the Salish Sea circulation and dissolved oxygen model. We considered several needs in the initial model selection, including the ability to simulate:

- Complex horizontal shapes, including branching basins and inlets.
- Highly variable bathymetry, with deep basins >200 meters, shallow inlets <20 meters, and shallow sills that divide the region into basins.
- Large tidal amplitudes that produce very high velocities in constricted regions.
- Regions that are dry at low tide but that contribute to biogeochemical processes.
- Time-varying river inputs and human sources.
- Physical, chemical, and biological processes that affect dissolved oxygen.

We selected the Finite-Volume Coastal Ocean Model (FVCOM; Chen et al., 2003) to simulate three-dimensional circulation in the Salish Sea using an unstructured grid. FVCOM can simulate wetting and drying and uses a sigma grid system where the vertical layer thickness changes to simulate sea surface height. PNNL developed the linked FVCOM-ICM (Integrated Compartment Model) based on the kinetic equations of CE-QUAL-ICM (Cercio and Cole, 1995). Yang et al. (2010) and Khangaonkar et al. (2011) describe the circulation calibration and Khangaonkar et al. (2012 a,b) describes the water quality model calibration.

Roberts et al. (2014) summarizes the results of scenarios evaluated with the calibrated model and recommended additional sediment model development to support this Salish Sea modeling project as well as the South and Central Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Study (Ahmed et al., 2014). We will continue to develop the Salish Sea model by adding the sediment diagenesis capability.

Several modeling efforts have included sediment diagenesis in freshwater or marine environments. However, none will function with the existing Salish Sea model without model code changes. Frameworks considered for the sediment diagenesis component include Di Toro et al. (1990); Martin and Wool (2013); and Morse and Eldridge (2007).

Sediment flux models range from simple empirical relationships (Fennel et al, 2006) to complex process simulations with time-varying state variables (Boudreau, 1997). Simple representations include assigning constant fluxes of SOD or nutrients (Scully, 2010) or using simple relationships with overlying water concentrations (Imteaz and Asaeda, 2000; Fennel et al., 2006; Hetland and DiMarco, 2008). More complex models may simulate one or two layers, each representing a particular chemical environment (Di Toro, 2001; Emerson et al 1984; Gypens et al, 2008; Slomp et al 1998; Vanderborght et al., 1977). Sediment flux models may also be resolved into numerous layers (Morse and Eldridge, 2006; Boudreau, 1997; Dhakar and Burdrige, 1996; Cai et al., 2010). Multi-layer models have been found to fit observations better than two-layer models with some data sets (Wilson et al., 2013). However, depth resolution entails higher computational demand (Gypens et al., 2008) than two-layer models. Therefore two-layer models are often used as a compromise between computational efficiency and depth-resolution, while providing acceptable accuracy (Testa et al., 2013; Brady et al., 2013).

Water Analysis Simulation Program (WASP) uses the two-layer methods of Di Toro (2001). WASP is one of the most widely used water quality models in the U. S. and throughout the world. Because of the model's capabilities of handling multiple pollutant types, it has been widely applied in the development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). WASP incorporates a sediment diagenesis module (Martin and Wool, 2013) that is based on Di Toro's (2001) framework and is nearly identical to the module that is also used in CE-QUAL-ICM.

Di Toro et al. (1990) developed a model of sediment oxygen demand (SOD) that has gained wide adoption in estuarine modeling frameworks such as those of Cerco and Cole (1995), Chapra (1997), and Martin and Wool (2013). Di Toro's approach (Di Toro, 2001) calculates sediment oxygen demand and the release of nitrogen and phosphorus as functions of the downward flux of carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus from the water column. This approach, well founded in diagenetic theory and supported by field and laboratory measurements, was an important advancement in the field of sediment-water interactions.

We selected the WASP sediment diagenesis routines because they have been found to provide an acceptable level of complexity with sufficient accuracy, are well documented, applied to a wide range of freshwater and marine water systems, broadly vetted by the modeling community, and represent a compromise between computational efficiency and depth-resolution, while providing acceptable accuracy.

7.2 Model Theory

7.2.1 Sediment Flux Model Overview

The sediment flux model (SFM) is based on the well-documented WASP modeling framework developed by USEPA (Martin and Wool, 2013).

The structure for the SFM integrates four processes illustrated in Figure 3:

1. Deposition of particulate organic carbon (C) and nitrogen (N), collectively referred to as particulate organic matter (POM), from the water column into the sediment. This includes all forms of particulate organic matter from phytoplankton and detritus.
2. Decomposition of POM in the sediment, producing dissolved forms of C and N in the sediment pore water. The process of decomposition of POM is called diagenesis.
3. The solutes formed by diagenesis react and are transported between a thin aerobic layer at the surface of the sediment and a thicker anaerobic layer of sediment below the aerobic layer, or are released as gases (methane and nitrogen gas).
4. Solute forms of C and N are returned to the overlying water and dissolved oxygen (DO) from the overlying water is transferred from the overlying water into the sediment to supply the oxidation of solutes (dissolved organic C and ammonium) in the aerobic sediment layer.

The SFM numerically integrates the mass balance equations for chemical constituents in two layers of sediment (Figure 5):

- Layer 1: A relatively thin aerobic layer at the sediment water interface with variable thickness.
- Layer 2: A thicker anaerobic layer with thickness equal to the total sediment depth of 10 cm¹ (Di Toro, 2001) minus the depth of the aerobic layer.

¹ Boudreau (1994) found that worldwide mean from 200 cores in estuarine and marine sediment had bioturbation zone thickness of 9.8 +/- 4.5 cm. Carpenter et al. (1985) found that the thickness of the bioturbated upper layers in sediment cores from the main basin ranged from about 4 to 18 cm. Lavelle et al. (1986) reported that the bioturbated upper layers in Puget Sound ranged from about 5 to 40 cm. The median thickness of the upper bioturbated layer of sediment from 63 cores in these two studies was 12 cm with inter-quartile range of 10 to 30 cm. Di Toro (2001) identifies the bioturbation depth as the depth of the active layer because that is the depth to which sediment solids are mixed leading to greater homogeneity in this region.




Figure 5. Basic structure of the sediment flux model (Martin and Wool, 2013).

POM initially decomposes rapidly in the sediments, but then slows down. In order to capture this process, the settled POM is fractionated to one of three “G classes” based on overall reactivity (Figure 1 in Di Toro, 2001). The three G classes represent a relatively rapidly decomposing labile class (G1), a more refractory form (G2) and a relatively inert form (G3). The decomposition of the three G classes of POM occurs in layer 2. These and other parameter values will be selected based on published values in Di Toro’s (2001) Table 15.5. More recent published values by Testa et al. (2013) and others may be used for guidance to constrain parameter values.

The mass balance equations are solved for the concentration at the present time step during the numerical integration using information from the previous time step and the new deposition of POM during the present time step. Once the concentrations at the present time step are computed, the diagenesis source terms for reactions and transfers are computed. Diagenesis source terms are computed for C and N from the sum of the product of the chemical-specific reaction velocities and computed concentrations in each of the three G classes.

Once the sediment particulate organic matter (C and N) concentrations and source terms are computed for the present time step, the reactions and transfers are computed. Concentrations of ammonia, nitrates, methane, sulfates, and sulfides in sediment layers are computed and then used to compute fluxes to the overlying water column, including sediment oxygen demand from the water by the sediments.

The total chemical (C, N) concentrations are computed from mass balance relationships for each of the two sediment layers. Since the surface layer is thin compared to the active anaerobic layer, fluxes from the surface layer to the water column are faster than fluxes from layer 2 to the surface layer. Therefore, layer 1 is at steady-state in comparison to the slower processes occurring in layer 2. The thickness of the layers is assumed to be constant. The equations are conveniently solved for the new concentrations using a matrix solution.

Once the concentrations have been updated, the flux of the material to the overlying water column is computed. Given the chemical concentrations in layer 1, the SOD and release rates are then computed. However, each of these constituents affects SOD, which in turn affects the surface transfer rate. Therefore, an iterative solution is required. The procedure employed in the sediment diagenesis model is as follows:

1. Start with an initial estimate of the SOD.
2. Solve layer 1 and 2 equations (for ammonia, nitrate, sulfate, sulfide, and methane).
3. Refine the estimate of SOD. A root finding method is used to make the new estimate.
4. Go to step (2) if no convergence.

There are two choices for estimating the initial conditions of concentrations of constituents in the sediment layers:

- Option 1: The initial conditions may be specified by the user as an input to the SFM. Specified initial conditions would ideally be derived from field measurements of POM subdivided into G-classes. In practice, the lack of field data and/or accepted analytical procedures from fractionating G-classes makes this difficult.
- Option 2: Alternatively, the SFM can compute the initial conditions assuming the sediment is at steady-state with the initial depositional fluxes of POM to the sediment layer (based on initial settling fluxes).

A detailed description of the model theory and all of the equations in the SFM are provided in Appendix A excerpted from Martin and Wool (2013).

Major assumptions related to the new diagenesis element of the Salish Sea DO model can be found in Martin and Wool (2013) and Di Toro (2001). We also assume that literature values adequately represent the Salish Sea conditions.

Input arguments to the SFM subroutine for each time step during the numerical integration in FVCOM-ICM include the following:

- `steadystate` = boolean (true = steady-state model per Di Toro (2001) part II-III; false = time variable model per Di Toro part IV). Steady state will be assumed before the first time step to estimate initial conditions. Time variable solution will be used for each time step following the initial condition.
- `tc` = calculation time step (days) used for time variable model (if `steadystate` = false)

- J_{cin} = flux to sediments from settling organic carbon from phytoplankton and detritus in oxygen equivalent units ($\text{g-O}_2/\text{m}^2/\text{d}$) (NOTE: $\text{g-O}_2/\text{m}^2/\text{d} = \text{g-C}/\text{m}^2/\text{d} * 2.67 \text{ g-O}_2/\text{g-C}$)
- J_{nin} = nitrogen flux in settling phytoplankton and detritus ($\text{g-N}/\text{m}^2/\text{d}$)
- O_{20} = dissolved oxygen in water overlying the sediment ($\text{mg-O}_2/\text{L}$)
- depth = total water depth overlying the sediment (m) (used to calculate methane saturation concentration at in situ pressure)
- T_w = temperature in water overlying the sediment (deg C)
- NH_3 = ammonia N in water overlying the sediment ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)
- NO_3 = nitrate N in water overlying the sediment ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)
- CH_4 = fast reacting dissolved organic carbon and CBODu in the water overlying the sediment in oxygen equivalent units ($\text{mg-O}_2/\text{L}$) (NOTE: $\text{mg-O}_2/\text{L} = \text{mg-C}/\text{L} * 2.67 \text{ mg-O}_2/\text{mg-C}$)
- SAL_w = salinity in the water overlying the sediment (ppt)

Outputs from the SFM during each time step are the following:

- Output sediment concentrations – For time-variable model: these are inputs at the beginning of time step and outputs at the end of the time step. Values are initialized on the first calculation step using the steady-state model)
 - $NH_3Tp_2(1)$ and $NH_3Tp_2(2)$ = total ammonia N in the sediment layers 1 and 2 ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)
 - $NH_3p_2(1)$ and $NH_3p_2(2)$ = dissolved ammonia N in the sediment layers 1 and 2 ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)
 - $NO_3p_2(1)$ and $NO_3p_2(2)$ = dissolved nitrate N in the sediment layers 1 and 2 ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)
 - $CH_4p_2(1)$ = dissolved methane in the aerobic sediment layer 1 (O_2 equivalent units $\text{mg-O}_2/\text{L}$)
 - $HSTp_2(1)$ and $HSTp_2(2)$ = total sulfide in sediment layers 1 and 2 (O_2 equivalent units $\text{mg-O}_2/\text{L}$)
 - $HSp_2(1)$ and $HSp_2(2)$ = dissolved sulfide in sediment layers 1 and 2 (O_2 equivalent units $\text{mg-O}_2/\text{L}$)
 - BEN_STRp_2 = accumulated benthic stress² of organisms living in the aerobic layer (days)
 - $NH_3(1)$ = dissolved ammonia N in the aerobic sediment layer 1 ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)
 - $NH_3(2)$ = dissolved ammonia N in the anaerobic sediment layer 2 ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)
 - $NO_3(1)$ = dissolved nitrate N in the aerobic sediment layer 1 ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)
 - $NO_3(2)$ = dissolved nitrate N in the anaerobic sediment layer 2 ($\text{mg-N}/\text{L}$)

² The decay rate constant for stress will be set to 0.03 /d, based on Di Toro (2001).

- HST(1) * fp1 = particulate sulfide in the aerobic sediment layer 1 (oxygen equivalent units of mg-O₂/L) (NOTE: predicted particulate sulfide may be useful for comparison with measurements of acid volatile sulfide which is the acid extractable component of inorganic sulfide in the sediment)
 - HS(2) * fp2 = particulate sulfide in the anaerobic sediment layer 2 (oxygen equivalent units of mg-O₂/L)
 - POC2(1), POC2(2), and POC2(3) = particulate organic C in G class 1, 2, and 3 in the anaerobic sediment layer 2 (g-O₂/m³) (Note that units are converted to g-C/m³ in the 'input-output' sheet)
 - PON2(1), PON2(2), and PON2(3) = particulate organic N in G class 1, 2, and 3 in the anaerobic sediment layer 2 (g-N/m³)
 - H1 = thickness of the aerobic sediment layer (m) (typically 0.01 m to 0.1 m)
 - BEN_STR = accumulated benthic stress on organisms living in the aerobic sediment layer due to low dissolved O₂ (days)
- Output sediment/water fluxes and layer 1 thickness – Steady-state and time-variable models
 - H1 = thickness of the aerobic sediment layer (m)
 - SOD = sediment oxygen demand flux of dissolved oxygen between the water and sediment (g-O₂/m²/d) (positive is loss of O₂ from water column)
 - Jnh4 = flux of ammonia N between the water and sediment (g-N/m²/d) (positive is source of NH₄-N to water column)
 - Jno3 = flux of nitrate N between the water and sediment (g-N/m²/d) (positive is source of NO₃-N to water column)
 - Jch4 = flux of dissolved methane, fast reacting C, and CBODu between water and sediment in O₂ equivalent units (g-O₂/m²/d) (positive is source of CBOD to water column) (NOTE: g-O₂/m²/d = g-C/m²/d * 2.67 g-O₂/g-C) (methane is not produced in salt water)
 - Jch4g = flux of methane gas bubbles between the water and sediment in O₂ equivalent units (g-O₂/m²/d) (positive is source of CH₄ bubbles to water column) (NOTE: g-O₂/m²/d = g-C/m²/d * 2.67 g-O₂/gC) (methane is not produced in salt water)
 - Jhs = flux of dissolved hydrogen sulfide (COD) between water and sediment in O₂ equivalent units (g-O₂/m²/d) (positive is source of COD to water column) (hydrogen sulfide is not produced in freshwater)

Derivatives for the following existing state variables in the FVCOM-ICM model will be modified to include the source/sink terms for exchanges between the bottom layer of the water column and the sediment:

- Phytoplankton groups (sinking loss from water column and source of Jcin, Jnin, Jpin to sediment)
- Particulate organic C (sinking loss from water column and source of Jcin to sediment)

- Particulate organic N (sinking loss from water column and source of J_{in} to sediment)
- Dissolved oxygen (loss from water column for SOD)
- Ammonium (gain to water column from sediment flux)
- Nitrate + nitrite (loss/gain from water column from sediment flux)
- Fast reacting DOC/CBOD (gain/loss from water column from sediment flux)

7.2.2 Links with FVCOM-ICM

Khangaonkar et al. (2012 a,b) describes the development, testing, and calibration of the water quality model. In summary, FVCOM is used to develop temperature, salinity, free surface heights and elevations, velocity components, and boundary fluxes. These outputs are then used to drive the ICM kinetic equations. ICM uses 19 state variables, including two species of algae, dissolved and particulate carbon, and nutrients to simulate the carbon cycle accounting for algal production and decay and the impact on dissolved oxygen. Phytoplankton primary productivity, inorganic and organic carbon fluxes, and nitrogen sources and sinks are computed and were compared with measured data during model calibration (Khangaonkar et al., 2012b).

We will modify the following subroutines and processes to couple the bottom water layer with the surface sediment layer:

- SED_READ - Subroutine to read control information for SFM.
- SED_INIT - Subroutine to initiate SFM variables and parameters.
- SED_ALLOC - Subroutine to allocate arrays related to SFM.
- SED_DEALLOC - Subroutine to de-allocate arrays related to SFM.
- SED_CALC - Subroutine to carry out SFM calculations by solving time dependent two layer sediment concentration equations for each cell. A new subroutine will be created to handle output of sediment fluxes to output files.
- SEDTSFNL - Subroutine to solve 2x2 set time varying equations for the two sediment layers.
- SEDSSFNL - Subroutine to solve 2x2 set steady-state equations for the two sediment layers (mainly for methane generation in the system, where a 3-layer redox process can be reduced to 2-layer under assumption of steady state).
- MODULE FILE_INFO - Module that defines water column constituents and SFM variables. The SFM arrays will be moved to SFM module and subroutine SED_INIT.
- INIT_FILE_INFO - Subroutine within Module FILE_INFO which defines water column and SFM constituents as well as file units for input and output. We expect to move file units and variables related to SFM to SED_INIT.
- PARWQM - Main program of FVCOM-ICM water quality model which will issue the call to SFM module when it is activated, and also move de-allocation of sediment variables into SED_DEALLOC.

- **ALLOC_WQM** - Subroutine used for allocating both water column water quality variables and variables related to SFM. We will move all SFM variables to **SED_ALLOC**.
- **INPUTS** - Subroutine for reading model input files. This file will be modified to call **SED_READ** for reading SFM related input files.
- **NITROG** - Subroutine for water column nitrogen calculation, where Nitrate (NO₃), Ammonia (NH₄) source terms will include contributions from sediment flux of nitrate, ammonia respectively from the SFM.
- **OXYGEN** - Subroutine for water column oxygen calculation, where oxygen sink terms will include contribution from SFM.

The following implementation/modification steps are expected:

Modularization of current code - Sediment diagenesis fluxes are connected with overlying water settling POM. A clean separation of these modules is important for stepwise testing purposes and better code management.

Input and output control - The CE-QUAL-ICM style of inputs and outputs will be retained for the most part. We will incorporate a new option to read the SFM model control variables using a simplified FORTRAN name list method. The inputs include the following:

- Geometry, time step
- Reaction rates and temperature control
- Mixing rates, diffusion rates, settling rates
- Fractions of G1,G2,G3, partitioning coefficients
- Flags for various scenarios (steady state vs. time-dependent)
- Initial conditions for time-dependent simulation
- Output frequency and variable selection (station time series, history)
- Diagnosis outputs (mass balance, individual fluxes)

Coupling with other components of the model - The fluxes are connected to the water column. In this step, we will ensure that data transfer between these different modules are clearly defined and well organized with switches to turn on or off each connection. The focus will be on coupling SFM with water column eutrophication model in this project. The code will be designed to ensure SAV, benthic algae, suspension feeder and deposition feeder modules may be added in the future.

Parallelization - The FVCOM-ICM code was improved for parallelized operation by PNNL. Parallelization is needed for master processor to distribute and collect information on model inputs and outputs to allow faster runs through the use of multiple processors. Once SFM code is incorporated into FVCOM-ICM, the code with SFM will have to be parallelized.

7.2.3 Processes and parameters considered but not included

We also considered several processes and parameters but will not implement them at this time. These include:

- Submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) – While the ICM code has considered these, we do not have spatial information on the biomass of submerged aquatic vegetation around the Salish Sea. We also lack rate process information governing interactions between submerged aquatic vegetation and water quality. We anticipate that while this could be locally important in regions such as Padilla Bay, submerged aquatic vegetation does not significantly affect sediment diagenesis or dissolved oxygen throughout the system.
- Shellfish – While the ICM code has considered shellfish, we lack fundamental information on shellfish interactions with water quality such as standing stock and rate processes governing native species (Konrad, 2014). More information is available on the Pacific oyster as a commercially valuable species, but these may not be applicable to native shellfish populations. We anticipate shellfish may be locally important in regions with extensive shellfish biomass.
- Phosphorus – ICM includes the capability of simulating soluble reactive phosphorus but does not currently include organic phosphorus. We do not recommend pursuing calibration of phosphorus given that significant resources would be needed to calibrate this state variable and we do not anticipate that phosphorus significantly limits primary productivity.
- Silica – ICM includes the capability of simulating silica but it has not been implemented or calibrated. We do not recommend pursuing calibration of silica given that significant resources would be needed to calibrate this state variable and we do not anticipate that silica significantly limits primary productivity. It may be locally important but is not likely a major influence throughout the system.

7.3 Model Development and Testing

Sackmann et al. (2009) described the model development and testing approach for the original model development, including both the circulation and water quality model components. Information includes ocean boundary conditions, meteorology, river inputs, marine discharges from wastewater treatment plants, and marine profiles and time series for model skill assessment. Khangaonkar et al. (2012 a,b) and Roberts et al. (2014) describe the final information used to calibrate the linked models and to apply the tools to several current and future water quality scenarios. Roberts et al. (2014) describes the method used to adjust sediment fluxes to account for changes in external loading prior to interactively computed fluxes through sediment diagenesis in the SFM.

The SFM developed for the USEPA WASP model has previously undergone rigorous review and testing (Martin, 2002). Professor James Martin at Mississippi State University has developed a stand-alone testing tool called SED_JLM.FOR that provides identical results compared with the WASP SFM. Ecology, in collaboration with Dr. Martin, has also developed an Excel VBA version of the SFM model called ‘SedFlux.xlsm’ that predicts nearly identical results (same within $\pm 0.001\%$) compared with the SED_JLM.FOR (Ecology, 2013). Appendix B presents a comparison of results of Ecology’s SedFlux.xlsm with Martin’s SED_JLM.FOR testing tool.

Implementation and testing of the SFM into the FVCOM-ICM model of the Salish Sea will be conducted in the following steps:

1. The SFM subroutine will be written in Fortran based on the equivalent to the WASP SFM code (e.g., SedFlux.xlsm or SED_JLM)
2. The results of the SFM subroutine will be compared with SedFlux.xlsm for hypothetical conditions for a single model cell under the following tests:
 - a. Steady-state solution of constant deposition of POM and constant overlying water quality
 - b. Time-variable solution using assumed initial conditions for G classes of POM and assumed constant deposition of POM and constant overlying water quality
 - c. Time-variable solution using assumed initial conditions for G classes of POM and assumed time-variable deposition of POM and time-variable overlying water quality
 - d. Time-variable solution using initial conditions computed assuming steady state with assumed constant deposition of POM and constant overlying water quality
 - e. Time-variable solution using initial conditions computed assuming steady state with assumed time-variable deposition of POM and time-variable overlying water quality
3. Results of the SFM subroutine and linked FVCOM-ICM-SFM model will be compared with Ecology's SedFlux.xlsm model for the same test conditions. Testing will be complete if the difference is within $\pm 0.1\%$.

These testing results will be summarized in an interim memo from PNNL to Ecology. This memo will be included as an appendix in the final project report. We will not proceed with applying the revised code to time-variable Salish Sea conditions until tests are completed.

Once the testing is complete, we will link the SFM subroutine with the FVCOM-ICM model of the Salish Sea. The results of the linked model for a one-year simulation of existing conditions during 2006 will be compared with SedFlux.xlsm at one or more locations in the model domain. This is described further in Section 13.1, Model Calibration and Evaluation.

7.4 Computational Requirements

The existing model runs on a server hosted at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. This server was purchased in 2008 and has reached the end of its working life. This section describes several options for meeting the computational needs of the next phase of model development as well as the recommended approach.

The project duration is two years. The initial SFM coding and testing phase will not require extensive computational support. However, application to the Salish Sea conditions, and potentially recalibration, will require advanced computational support during an intense phase of model development. These needs will decrease as the project progresses into scenario evaluation and documentation.

7.4.1 Existing Server Description and Status

The server is a Silicon Mechanics 11 twin server cluster (Rackform nServe). Each node has 8 cores, each with 22 child nodes and 1 head node for a total of 184 cores. The head node provides 32 GB of RAM and each compute child node is 16 GB. The physical dimensions are 47" high, 42" deep, and 24" wide. The power cable is 2x 12 amp, 125V. Child nodes are configured for 610 W, 626 VA, 2081 BTU/h, 5.7 Amps (110V), 3.0 amps (108V). Head nodes are configured for 401 W, 411 VA, 1369 BTU/h, 3.7 amps (110 V), and 2.0 amps (208V).

The storage space needed for a single run is 1.1 TB (33 GB for the circulation model solution, 1 TB for the circulation model NetCDF, and 36 GB for the water quality run). To execute and run the model requires 5.6 TB for export and 11.7 TB for archiving key files.

The server operating system is Linux (CentQS release 5.2). FV-COM and the adapted ICM code are not compatible with a Windows operating system. Current IP address (Eth0): 130.20.35.32. Network speeds are as follows:

- Eth0 Speed: 1.0 Mbps
- Eth1 Speed: 1.0 Mbps
- Infiniband Speed: 5.0 Gbps

Figures 6 and 7 summarize the processes for running both FVCOM and ICM. The figures also include output post-processing to develop interim graphics files for modeling team use as well as report graphics. Ecology staff access the server through a Virtual Private Network (VPN) account. PNNL requires Cyber Security Awareness Training, after which users receive a unique net ID and password along with a fob. Currently, the ICM NetCDF files are transferred to Ecology for post-processing, using a series of archived Matlab scripts.




Figure 6. Process flow diagram for creating FVCOM NetCDF output.





Figure 7. Process flow diagram for creating FVCOM NetCDF output.

7.4.2 Option 1 – Repair Existing Server

Seven of 22 compute nodes failed on the existing server in 2013 and have not yet been replaced. The cost to repair the existing server includes \$3,000 for Silicon Mechanics to send a team to PNNL to conduct the installation and repairs plus \$2,500 per failed node. If all seven failed nodes are replaced, the cost is \$20,500 for the full repair. Another option is to replace only four of the compute nodes and use half the cluster. This would cost \$13,000 to extend the working life of the server for the duration of this project.

7.4.3 Option 2 – Purchase New Server

Servers typically have a working life of 5 years, after which the components are more prone to fail and to require significant maintenance. A new server could replace the existing server, which would cost \$95,000 to match specifications (February 2014). Additional time would be needed to set up and maintain the server. A new server could be hosted at either PNNL or at Ecology.

Hosting at PNNL has the advantage of PNNL's extensive computing environment experience and expertise. Disadvantages include the need for an ongoing contract to pay for maintenance and management of the server and to ensure access for Ecology and others outside of PNNL. Hosting at PNNL also has the disadvantage of requiring access permission from PNNL.

Hosting at Ecology has the advantage of maintaining the equipment where Ecology has an institutional responsibility. One disadvantage is the lack of technical support for Linux-based servers. Another disadvantage is that Ecology's IT services do not support non-Windows operating systems. This would also require that Ecology's modelers maintain the server. Ecology would need to manage VPN access to the server for third parties.

7.4.4 Option 3 – Cloud Computing

Cloud computing offers an alternative to servers hosted at PNNL or Ecology. Cloud computing uses remote servers accessed through an internet connection, a local area network, or wide area network. Model managers set up the cloud hosting environment through a commercial provider such as Amazon, Microsoft, or Google. Cloud computing can be used to transfer initial files, set up model applications, run the model, post-process the results, and transfer final results to model users. Model managers partition the cloud computing environment to distinguish active model development requiring permission to access from information accessible to a broader set of end users. Third parties can access the cloud using pay-as-you-go accounts to transfer the output or to access the working model itself.

The Chesapeake Bay Program recently conducted a pilot application using Amazon Web Services. Results indicate that commercial cloud service providers reduced costs compared with internal hosting, cloud hosting is technically viable for the needs of the Chesapeake Bay Program, and cloud hosting improves the security, auditability, and governance of several systems in use at the Chesapeake Bay Program (Booz Allen Hamilton, 2013). Chesapeake Bay Program migrated to cloud hosting in fall 2013.

PNNL has continued model development and application using the Department of Energy's cloud hosting services in Richland. This required internal PNNL funds to support the work but is not a long-term solution for the Salish Sea Model because access is limited.

Microsoft has developed Azure, its cloud computing platform. We will also explore options to partner with Microsoft Research for this project to assess performance.

Amazon's cloud services are in broad use. We estimate a cost of \$43,000 per year to completely transition to Amazon cloud computing using the current cluster CPUs and storage space. The bulk of the costs are associated with stored data and hourly scans to archive changes to backup. This estimate is based on monthly averages of data transferred to Ecology or PNNL desktops during previous project phases. This is equivalent to 8 CPU head nodes (16 GB RAM); 172 ECU (equivalent of child nodes); and 15 TB of storage. Advantages are that Ecology has an existing account and that the Chesapeake Bay Program has vetted similar needs related to accessibility and reliability of the service.

Other commercial cloud computing options exist in addition to Microsoft's Azure and Amazon's Web Services.

The following steps would be needed to run the Salish Sea Model on a cloud computing platform, with process steps presented in Figure 8:

1. Set up the environment and libraries as needed with account access for 3 Ecology users and 3 PNNL users.
2. Transfer files to the cloud.
3. Apply the models, post-process the output, assess the results quantitatively and qualitatively, and define subsequent model runs.
4. Transfer final model output to Ecology and PNNL for final graphics and animations.




Figure 8. FVCOM-ICM process flow diagram in a cloud-computing environment.

Cloud computing offers several advantages to the Salish Sea Model:

- Third parties can access model results and manipulate the models to run alternative scenarios with pay-as-you-go user accounts.
- Cloud computing does not require server hardware maintenance.

Disadvantages include the following:

- Cost predictions are difficult during more intense model calibration periods and less intense model application periods.
- Runtime may increase by 20-30%, compared with the current servers.

7.4.5 Recommended Computational Platform for Sediment Diagenesis and FVCOM-ICM Model Development

We recommend repairing the existing server (replacing 7 nodes) and conducting a pilot application using Amazon Web Services cloud computing platforms (operating system, programming language, database, and web server). Ecology can use a state master contract through the Department of Enterprise Services for this pilot application. We will also explore whether we can pilot the application using Microsoft's Azure cloud computing platforms; however, we do not have an existing contract. The Amazon Web Services pilot will be conducted in parallel with initial model code changes and testing.

1. PNNL sets up the FVCOM-ICM environment with Fortran and NetCDF libraries
2. PNNL sets up a Unix environment., MPI libraries, with the ability to submit jobs with parallel processing
3. PNNL sets up and benchmarks performance tests for both the FVCOM and ICM model components of the existing Salish application.
4. PNNL summarizes the results of the tests in the same memorandum compiling results of the software code changes and testing results and submits to Ecology for review and discussion

The project team will evaluate the benchmark tests, discuss pros and cons of migrating additional application to one or both cloud computing platforms, and implement the change.

PNNL and Ecology will document the server-based and cloud-based computing approaches as an appendix to the final report.

8.0 Sampling Procedures

Not applicable; no sampling is planned.

9.0 Measurement Procedures

Not applicable; no sampling or laboratory analysis is planned.

10.0 Quality Control Procedures

See Section 7.3, Model Development and Testing, and Section 13.1, Model Calibration and Evaluation.

Field

Not applicable; no sampling is planned.

Laboratory

Not applicable; no sampling is planned.

11.0 Data Management Procedures

Procedures for managing newly-generated environmental data do not apply to this project.

11.1 Model Information Management Procedures

11.1.1 Model Software Version Control

The primary models FVCOM and FVCOM-ICM used in this Salish Sea modeling effort are public domain research codes that undergo modification and testing as part of model development (e.g., development and incorporation of the sediment diagenesis kinetics into FVCOM-ICM). To ensure all users work with the most recent tested version, PNNL uses public domain version control software (e.g., SVN) to manage model files and directories over time. Files are stored in a central repository. The repository is much like an ordinary file server, except that it records every change ever made to files and directories. This allows recovery of older versions of the files and examines the history of how and when your data changed, and who changed it. The users conduct development under their own branches before committing the update to the trunk or central repository. SVN repository for this project includes model source codes, pre-processing software, post processing utilities, model application examples and test cases, and related tools and utilities.

11.1.2 Cluster Computer Data Management

All model runs are conducted on Ecology or PNNL high performance cluster computers housed in Seattle or Richland, WA. The model input files with the associated case names are uploaded to the cluster machines by the respective users. The model runs are conducted on these cluster machines through remote login. The models generate large volumes of data. The raw data are processed directly on the cluster computers and processed outputs are downloaded by the individual users to their personal computers for documentation. The data are also stored by each user under their own accounts on the cluster machines and periodically backed up on the 10 TB RAID data storage array.

11.1.3 Project Input and Output Files

Project Share and Transfer: Following the completion of each model scenario, the model input and post-processed output files are posted to the project share directory on the Ecology cluster machine. Users from PNNL and Ecology are provided common access to the share directory. Solution files from this location may be downloaded by individual users for further visualization, processing, and posting on the project websites.

11.1.4 Modeling Project Folders

For each project, standard folders are created on the user's desktop computer under the project directory such as \Monitoring Data, \Model_Input, \Model_Output, Post Processing, References, and Reports. Under \Model_Input and \Model_Output, subfolders are created using recognizable names such as \calibration (with numerous iterations 01, 02 ...). Also included are folders corresponding to model application for the scenarios.

11.1.5 Secondary Backup on USB Data Storage Disks

The project files, model input files, and post processed data files are also periodically backed up on external data storage devices

12.0 Audits and Reports

Although the project will produce a single draft and final report summarizing the results, interim results will be evaluated internally and externally as the project progresses.

The modeling team will meet approximately monthly to review recent progress, evaluate project needs, and revisit next steps to meet project objectives. This provides an internal audit function.

We will present interim results to the project advisory group at key project junctures. These meetings provide review from external parties on key graphics before extensive report writing is completed.

Finally, we will document findings in the final project report. Reports are developed consistent with Ecology's Quality Assurance program and publications guidelines. Key elements include internal review, external review by the project advisory group, and peer review. Peer review must follow strict protocols established by Ecology's Quality Assurance Program. Once reviews are complete, the publications process requires extensive documentation of the review process.

Ecology's document template requires the following elements for the final report:

- Introduction – project description, purpose
- Methods – technical approach, including a summary of sediment diagenesis
- Results – calibration results, sensitivity, uncertainty, scenarios
- Discussion – implications of the results
- Conclusions –
- Recommendations – suggestions on how this information should be used
- References – all cited sources
- Appendices – technical background as needed, such as model code changes or model parameter values; glossary, acronyms, abbreviations, units of measurement

13.0 Data Verification and Validation

Data used as inputs to the model have been verified and are considered usable for the present purpose (see Section 4.3). This section describes how the revised model will be calibrated and evaluated.

13.1 Model Calibration and Evaluation

13.1.1 Methods Overview

Calibration refers to the process of adjusting model parameters within physically defensible ranges until the resulting predictions give the best possible match with observed data. Model evaluation is the process used to determine whether a model and its analytical results are of sufficient quality to serve as the basis for a decision and whether the model is capable of approximating the real system of interest (EPA, 2008). Some efforts refer to this as validation, confirmation, or verification.

Model calibration is an iterative procedure that combines quantitative comparison with measured data and best professional judgment. For example, phytoplankton growth, re-aeration, and BOD will be adjusted to match observed DO data. Chlorophyll a data will represent phytoplankton density and will be used to adjust algal growth, die-off, respiration, and settling. The nitrogen balance will involve adjusting nitrification and organic nitrogen hydrolysis rates, as well as uptake rates by phytoplankton within accepted ranges.

Calibration and evaluation rely on a combination of quantitative statistics for goodness-of-fit and visual comparison of predicted and observed time series and depth profiles (Krause et al., 2005). We will use similar approaches as reported in Roberts et al. (2012) and Ahmed et al. (2014). We will maximize model skill consulting EPA (2009) and the project advisory committee.

Figure 9 summarizes the model setup, testing, and calibration process. Once sediment diagenesis code development and testing are complete, we will run the model for 2006-2007 conditions using the previous dynamic boundary conditions. We will compare predicted results for both water column and sediments against available information collected in Puget Sound and the Straits. First, the updated model skill for water column parameters will be compared against that described in Khangaonkar et al. (2012b). Second, we will compare sediment fluxes and sediment properties with available information, described below and in Section 4.3. No further calibration will occur if the updated model performs as well or better for the water column and if the sediment fluxes and properties are consistent with the range and variability in available information. We will proceed to evaluating current and future scenarios. If the model does not perform as well or better than the previous calibration with the new processes incorporated or if sediment fluxes and properties are not consistent with available information, we will recalibrate the model to the 2006-2007 conditions.




Figure 9. Process for updating and applying the Salish Sea model if no recalibration is needed (left side) or if recalibration is needed (right side).

Red indicates decision points, blue identifies the products, and green indicates the tasks.

Section 4.3 lists information and sources for calibration and evaluation of the SFM. We will compile particle fluxes in the water column and sedimentation rates from cores to characterize the range and variability by location and seasonally. We will compare the predicted range of rates by location and time with these recent and historical fluxes. We will also compare predicted benthic fluxes of oxygen, nitrogen, and carbon with data compiled in Sheibley and Paulson (2014). Due to the sparse observed data and possible low bias of observed fluxes, the predicted fluxes will not be expected to exactly match the observed data, though the observed data will be used as a guide to approximately constrain the model predictions of sediment fluxes. In addition, we will compare predicted sediment and porewater chemistry with available data. These include total organic carbon, nitrogen, ammonium, total volatile solids, and sulfides compiled from Ecology's EIM database and sediment ambient monitoring program; Greengrove (2005); and sediment remedial investigations managed by Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Program.

Initial model setup will use the current calibration values for all water column kinetics parameters with default literature parameter values for the rate constants and kinetics parameters of the sediment flux model. The initial default parameters for the SFM will be taken from the recommended defaults for the USEPA WASP model (Table 4). The table also presents the range of values reported across several estuarine studies by Di Toro (2001), the final calibration values of Testa et al. (2013), and the literature ranges summarized by Testa et al. (2013).

Table 4. Parameter summary for rate constants and kinetics parameters of the sediment flux model.

| Name | Symbol | Units | WASP default per Martin and Wool 2013 | Reported value or range across estuarine studies by DiToro 2001 | Testa et al 2013 | Literature range per Testa et al 2013 |
|---|-------------|-------------------|--|--|---------------------|--|
| solids concentration in aerobic layer 1 | m1 | kgD/L | 0.5 | 0.2 - 1.2 | 0.5 | -- |
| solids concentration in anaerobic layer 2 | m2 | kgD/L | 0.5 | 0.2 - 1.2 | 0.5 | -- |
| bioturbation particle mixing coefficient | Dp | m ² /d | 0.00006 | 0.00006 | 0.00006 | <1e-7 - 5e-5 |
| pore water diffusion coefficient | Dd | m ² /d | 0.0025 | 0.0005 - 0.005 | 0.0005 | 0.6 - 8.64 |
| deep burial velocity | w2 | m/d | 6.85E-06 | 5.5e-6 - 2.1e-5 | 1.92E-05 | 0.02 - 1.0 |
| thickness of sediment anaerobic layer 2 | H2 | m | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | -- |
| Reaction velocities | | | | | | |
| freshwater nitrification velocity | KappaNH3f | m/d | 0.1313 | -- | -- | -- |
| saltwater nitrification velocity | KappaNH3s | m/d | 0.1313 | 0.131 | 0.131 | -- |
| freshwater denitrification velocity in layer 1 | KappaNO3_1f | m/d | 0.1 | 0.1 - 0.2 | -- | -- |
| saltwater denitrification velocity in layer 1 | KappaNO3_1s | m/d | 0.1 | 0.1 - 0.2 | 0.1 - 0.3 | -- |
| denitrification in the anaerobic layer 2 | KappaNO3_2 | m/d | 0.25 | 0.25 - 0.5 | 0.25 | -- |
| methane oxidation in the aerobic layer 1 | KappaCH4 | m/d | 0.7 | -- | -- | -- |
| Half saturation constants | | | | | | |
| nitrification half saturation for NH4N | KM_NH3 | mgN/L | 0.728 | 0.728 | 0.728 | 0.34 - 1.2 |
| nitrification half saturation for O2 | KM_O2_NH3 | mgO2/L | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.368 | 0.032 - 2.0 |
| Partitioning coefficients | | | | | | |
| partition coefficient for NH4 in layer 1 and 2 | KdNH3 | L/kgD | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
| partition coefficient for PO4 in layer 2 | KdPO42 | L/kgD | 20 | 20 - 1000 | 50 - 100 | -- |
| freshwater factor that increases the aerobic layer partition coefficient of inorganic P | dKDPO41f | unitless | 20 | NA | -- | -- |
| saltwater factor that increases the aerobic layer partition coefficient of inorganic P | dKDPO41s | unitless | 20 | 20 - 300 | 100 - 300 | -- |
| critical O2 concentration in layer 2 for adjustment of partition coefficient for inorganic P | O2critPO4 | mgO2/L | 2 | 2 | 2 | -- |
| Temperature coefficients | | | | | | |
| temperature theta for bioturbation mixing between layers 1 and 2 | ThtaDp | unitless | 1.117 | 1.08 - 1.15 | 1.117 | 1.07 - 1.117 |
| temperature theta for pore water diffusion between layers 1 and 2 | ThtaDd | unitless | 1.08 | 1.08 - 1.15 | 1.08 | 1.08 |
| temperature theta for nitrification | ThtaNH3 | unitless | 1.123 | 1.123 | 1.123 | 1.076 - 1.127 |
| temperature theta for nitrification half saturation for NH4N | ThtaKmNH3 | unitless | -- | 1.125 | -- | -- |
| temperature theta for denitrification | ThtaNO3 | unitless | 1.08 | 1.08 | 1.08 | 1.056 - 1.20 |
| temperature theta for methane oxidation | ThtaCH4 | unitless | 1.079 | -- | -- | -- |
| Salinity thresholds | | | | | | |
| salinity above which sulfide rather than methane is produced from C diagenesis | SALTSW | psu | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
| salinity above which saltwater nitrification/denitrification rates are used for aerobic layer | SALTND | psu | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |

| Name | Symbol | Units | WASP | Reported value or range across | | Literature range per | |
|---|------------|----------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----|
| | | | default per Martin and Wool 2013 | estuarine studies by DiToro 2001 | Testa et al 2013 | Testa et al 2013 | |
| Sulfide constants | | | | | | | |
| aerobic layer reaction velocity for dissolved sulfide oxidation | KappaH2Sd1 | m/d | 0.2 | 0.2 | -- | -- | -- |
| aerobic layer reaction velocity for particulate sulfide oxidation | KappaH2Sp1 | m/d | 0.4 | 0.4 | -- | -- | -- |
| temperature coefficient for sulfide oxidation | ThtaH2S | unitless | 1.079 | 1.08 | -- | -- | -- |
| sulfide oxidation normalization constant for O2 | KMHSO2 | mgO2/L | 4 | 4 | -- | -- | -- |
| partition coefficient for sulfide in aerobic layer 1 | KdH2S1 | L/kgD | 100 | 100 | -- | -- | -- |
| partition coefficient for sulfide in anaerobic layer 2 | KdH2S2 | L/kgD | 100 | 100 | -- | -- | -- |
| Fractions of G classes 1 and 2 for settling PON, POC, and POP | | | | | | | |
| fraction of class 1 pon | frpon1 | unitless | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | -- | -- |
| fraction of class 2 pon | frpon2 | unitless | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | -- | -- |
| fraction of class 1 poc | frpoc1 | unitless | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | -- | -- |
| fraction of class 2 poc | frpoc2 | unitless | 0.2 | 0.2 - 0.25 | 0.2 | -- | -- |
| fraction of class 1 pop | frpop1 | unitless | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | -- | -- |
| fraction of class 2 pop | frpop2 | unitless | 0.2 | 0.2 - 0.25 | 0.2 | -- | -- |
| Diagenesis rate constants for G class 1, 2, and 3 N/C/P | | | | | | | |
| G class 1 pon mineralization | kpon1 | day^-1 | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.01 | 0.019 - 0.066 | -- |
| G class 2 pon mineralization | kpon2 | day^-1 | 0.0018 | 0.0018 | 0.0018 | 0.0012 - 0.0088 | -- |
| G class 3 pon mineralization | kpon3 | day^-1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- |
| G class 1 poc mineralization | kpoc1 | day^-1 | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.01 - 0.035 | 0.019 - 0.066 | -- |
| G class 2 poc mineralization | kpoc2 | day^-1 | 0.0018 | 0.0018 | 0.0018 | 0.0012 - 0.0088 | -- |
| G class 3 poc mineralization | kpoc3 | day^-1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- |
| G class 1 pop mineralization | kpop1 | day^-1 | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.01 | 0.019 - 0.066 | -- |
| G class 2 pop mineralization | kpop2 | day^-1 | 0.0018 | 0.0018 | 0.0018 | 0.0012 - 0.0088 | -- |
| G class 3 pop mineralization | kpop3 | day^-1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- |
| Temperature coefficients for G class 1, 2, and 3 mineralization | | | | | | | |
| temperature theta for G class 1 pon | ThtaPON1 | unitless | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.052 - 1.166 | -- |
| temperature theta for G class 2 pon | ThtaPON2 | unitless | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.052 - 1.166 | -- |
| temperature theta for G class 3 pon | ThtaPON3 | unitless | 1.17 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| temperature theta for G class 1 poc | ThtaPOC1 | unitless | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.052 - 1.166 | -- |
| temperature theta for G class 2 poc | ThtaPOC2 | unitless | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.052 - 1.166 | -- |
| temperature theta for G class 3 poc | ThtaPOC3 | unitless | 1.17 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| temperature theta for G class 1 pop | ThtaPOP1 | unitless | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.052 - 1.166 | -- |
| temperature theta for G class 2 pop | ThtaPOP2 | unitless | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.052 - 1.166 | -- |
| temperature theta for G class 3 pop | ThtaPOP3 | unitless | 1.17 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Parameters for partial mixing and benthic stress | | | | | | | |
| reference G1 at which w12base = Dp / H2 at 20 degC for DiToro eqn 13.1 | POC1R | mgO2/gD | 0.2667 | 0.2667 | 0.2667 | -- | -- |
| first-order decay rate constant for benthic stress (d^-1) for DiToro eqn 13.3 | kBEN_STR | day^-1 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | -- | -- |
| particle mixing half-saturation constant for O2 (mgO2/L) | KM_O2_Dp | mgO2/L | 4 | 4 | 2 | -- | -- |

Most of the parameter values for the SFM are commonly accepted to be the same constant values across a large number of studies (e.g., Martin and Wool, 2013; Di Toro, 2001; and Testa et al., 2013) and will not be varied during calibration process. The principle rate parameters and constants that may be derived from observed data in Puget Sound or optimized during calibration include the following:

- Solids concentration will be based on observed data from sediment cores from Puget Sound. Pelletier and Mohamedali (2009) summarized data from 87 cores and reported a median of 0.6 Kg/L and interquartile range of 0.5 – 0.86 Kg/L.
- Deep burial velocity of sediment will be based on observed data from sediment cores from Puget Sound. Pelletier and Mohamedali (2009) summarized data from 87 cores using the Pb-210 method and reported a median of 0.4 cm/yr and interquartile range of 0.17 – 0.81 cm/yr. Additional data describing burial rates include Brown (2014; personal communication); Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Program (2012); and RETEC Group (2006).
- Porewater diffusion coefficients will be constrained within the range of 0.0005 – 0.005 m²/d (Di Toro, 2001, Table 15.5), which is consistent with the recent calculations of Sheibley and Paulson (2014) for Puget Sound sediments.
- Denitrification velocity in layer 1 will be constrained within the range of 0.1 – 0.2 m/d per Di Toro (2001).
- Denitrification velocity in layer 2 will be constrained within the range of 0.25 – 0.5 m/d per Di Toro (2001).
- G class 1 POC diagenesis rates will be constrained within the range of 0.01 – 0.035 d⁻¹ per Testa et al. (2013) and Di Toro (2001).
- Particle mixing half-saturation constant for O₂ will be constrained within the range of 2 – 4 mg/L per Testa et al. (2013).

During the model evaluation process, we will evaluate sensitivity to key parameters to understand the magnitudes of responses to perturbations

13.1.2 Targets and Goals

As described in Section 7.3, results of the SFM subroutine and linked FVCOM-ICM-SFM model will be deemed adequate if the comparison with Ecology's SedFlux.xlsm model shows relative differences within ± 0.1%.

Once the code changes have been tested and accepted, we will assess model performance, using both root mean square error (RMSE) and bias for DO, chlorophyll a (algae), nitrate plus nitrite, and phosphate for the nine stations summarized in Table 3.4 of Khangaonkar et al. (2012b). While we cannot specify the tolerance values for RMSE or bias, we will compare the values with other studies and the previous calibration (Khangaonkar et al., 2012b). Both RMSE and bias are measures of model accuracy. We will evaluate dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll, and nutrient profiles plus time series in the surface and bottom layers. In addition, we will check the vertical fluxes in the bottom water layer and top sediment layer.

Skill will be assessed against both water column concentrations and available sediment flux and other data. Performance measures include RMSE and bias assessed for:

- Nutrient, dissolved oxygen, and chlorophyll profiles.
- Nutrient, dissolved oxygen, and chlorophyll time series in the surface and bottom layers at representative stations throughout the model domain.

If the model skill worsens compared with Khangaonkar et al. (2012b), we will recalibrate the oxygen model with the diagenesis components in place. We will follow the calibration and evaluation steps identified in Sackmann (2009) beginning with the final calibration values described in Khangaonkar et al. (2012b).

The calibration period for this model application is 2006-07, which was selected for the completeness of data available. As described in Sackmann (2009), several intensive monitoring programs occurred in 2006, such as the South Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Study (Mohamedali et al., 2011) and the Hood Canal Dissolved Oxygen Program (www.hoodcanal.washington.edu/). In addition, Ecology (www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/mar_wat/index.html) and King County (green.kingcounty.gov/marine/routineMonitoring.aspx) conducted ambient monitoring programs of the marine waters of Puget Sound and the Straits. Compared with typical conditions for the period 1999-2012, 2006 had lower DO and 2007 had higher DO than normal. However, the same baseline will be used to compare scenarios, and interannual conditions do not influence the results.

Among the water quality parameters, calibration will focus on representing the DO concentrations well. The overall process will be to describe the bulk of the data, and short-term effects of ephemeral events may not be represented. The highest priority will be to describe the DO levels in the late-summer months, when the lowest levels are expected.

13.1.3 Sensitivity and Uncertainty Analyses

To evaluate model performance and the variability of results, we will perform sensitivity analyses and will analyze uncertainty. Uncertainty can arise from a number of sources that range from errors in the input data used to calibrate the model, to imprecise estimates for key parameters, to variations in how processes are parameterized in the model domain. We will assess and reduce uncertainty consistent with EPA Council on Regulatory Environmental Modeling (2009).

Sensitivity refers to how much results are affected by changes in one or more input parameters. In contrast, uncertainty analysis investigates the lack of knowledge about a certain environmental component or the real value of model parameters. Although sensitivity and uncertainty are closely related, uncertainty is parameter-specific and sensitivity is algorithm-specific with respect to model variables. By investigating the relative sensitivity of model parameters, a user can become knowledgeable of the relative importance of parameters in the model. By knowing the uncertainty associated with parameter values and the sensitivity of the model to specific

parameters, a user will be more informed regarding the confidence that can be placed in the model results (EPA, 2009).

We will evaluate responsiveness of the sediment model components to various assumptions and rate constants within the new sediment module even if no overall oxygen model recalibration is needed. If recalibration is needed, we will also evaluate responsiveness of the model predictions to various assumptions and rate constants governing water column processes. Specific analyses include boundary conditions, meteorological forcing, watershed loads, and process rate parameters. We will increase or decrease parameters by a factor of 2 or an order of magnitude. The final report will document the parameters that have the greatest uncertainty and strongly influence the results, as was done in Roberts et al. (2014).

Numerous sensitivity tests of the water quality model were performed as part of the previous study calibration (Khangaonkar et al., 2012b) which resulted in acceptable model calibration and selection of model coefficients for water column processes. After assessing model performance and possibly recalibrating the model, we will conduct sensitivity tests by perturbing key model parameters, including:

- Phytoplankton kinetics (maximum growth rate, optimum temperature, optimum light, nitrogen half-saturation rates, carbon-to-chlorophyll ratios, sinking rates).
- Zooplankton kinetics (grazing rate).
- Benthic processes (nitrogen and dissolved oxygen flux).

14.0 Data Quality (Usability) Assessment

Not applicable; no sampling is planned.

14.1 Model Output Quality (Usability) Assessment

We will evaluate whether the outcomes have met the project's objectives and will summarize model performance in the final report. We will evaluate whether the water quality model:

- Behaves in a manner that is consistent with the current understanding of processes known to affect water quality in the Salish Sea.
- Realistically reproduces variations in water quality observed within individual subbasins of Puget Sound and the Straits on inter-annual, seasonal, and possibly intra-seasonal timescales.

15.0 References

- Ahmed, A., G. Pelletier, M. Roberts, and A. Kolosseus. 2014. South Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Study: Water Quality Model Calibration and Scenarios. Washington State Department of Ecology. Ecology Publication No. 14-03-004.
<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1403004.html>.
- Baker, E.T., R.A. Feely, M.R. Landry, and M. Lamb. 1985. Temporal variations in the concentration and settling flux of carbon and phytoplankton pigments in a deep fjordlike estuary. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 21:859-877.
- Baker, E.T. 1982. Suspended Particulate Matter in Elliott Bay. NOAA Technical Report ERL 417-PMEL 35. Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, Seattle, WA.
- Booz Allen Hamilton. 2013. Chesapeake Center for Collaborative Computing Concept of Operations, Version 0.7. Prepared for the Chesapeake Bay Program.
- Boudreau, B.P. 1997. Diagenetic models and their implementation. Springer.
- Boudreau, B.P. 1994. Is burial velocity a master parameter for bioturbation? *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*.58(4)1243-1249
- Brady, D.C., J.M. Testa, D.M. Di Toro, W.R. Boynton, W.M. Kemp. 2013. Sediment flux modeling: Calibration and application for coastal systems. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Systems*. 117:107-124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2012.11.003>
- Brown, Sharon. 2014. Environmental Engineer with Toxics Cleanup Program. Personal communication by email, August.
- Cai, W.-J. G.W. Luther III, J.C. Cornwell, A.E. Giblin. 2010. Carbon cycling and the coupling between proton and electron transfer reactions in aquatic sediments in Lake Champlain. *Aquatic Geochemistry*. 16:421-446.
- Carpenter, R., M./L. Peterson, and J.T. Bennett. 1985. ²¹⁰Pb-derived sediment accumulation and mixing rates for the greater Puget Sound region. *Marine Geology*. 64(1985)291-312.
- Cerco, C.F. and T.M. Cole. 1995. User's Guide to the CE-QUAL-ICM Three-Dimensional Eutrophication Model, Release Version 1.0. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, DC. 320 pp.
- Chen, C., H. Liu, R.C. Beardsley. 2003. An unstructured, finite-volume, three-dimensional primitive equation ocean model: Application to coastal ocean and estuaries. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology* 20:159-186.
- Dhakar, S.P. and D.J. Burdige. 1996. Coupled, non-linear, steady state model for early diagenetic processes in pelagic sediments. *Journal of American Science*.296:296-330.

Di Toro, D.M. 2001. Sediment Flux Modeling. Wiley Interscience. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Ecology. 2013. SedFlux – An Excel/VBA model of sediment nutrient fluxes and sediment oxygen demand (SOD). Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia WA.
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/models.html>.

Di Toro, D. M., Paquin, P. R., Subburamu, K., and Gruber D. A. (1990). Sediment oxygen demand model: Methane and ammonia oxidation. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 116 (5), 945–986.

Emerson, S. R. Jahnke, D. Heggie. 1984. Sediment water exchange in shallow water estuarine sediments. *Journal of Marine Systems*. 42:709-730.

EPA Council on Regulatory Environmental Modeling. 2009. Guidance on the Development, Evaluation, and Application of Environmental Models. Council for Regulatory Environmental Models, Washington DC. www.epa.gov/crem/library/cred_guidance_0309.pdf.

Fennel, K. J. Wilkin, J. Levin, J. Moisan, J. O'Reilly, D. Haidvogel. 2006. Nitrogen cycling in the Middle Atlantic Bight: results from a three-dimensional model and implications for the North Atlantic nitrogen budget. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*. 20.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2005GB002456>

Greengrove, C. 2005. Surficial total organic carbon concentration from Puget Sound and the Straits (unpublished data).

Gries, T. and D. Osterberg. 2011. Control of Toxic Chemicals in Puget Sound: Characterization of Toxic Chemicals in Puget Sound and Major Tributaries, 2009-10. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication No. 11-03-008.
<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1103008.html>.

Gypens, N. C. Lancelot, K. Soetaert. 2008. Simple parameterisations for describing N and P diagenetic processes: application in the North Sea. *Progress in Oceanography*. 76: 89-110.

Hetland, R.D., S.F. DiMarco. 2008. How does the character of oxygen demand control the structure of hypoxia on the Texas-Louisiana continental shelf? *Journal of Marine Systems*. 70:49-62.

Imteaz, M.A., T. Asaeda. 2000. Artificial mixing of lake water by bubble plume and effects of bubbling operations on algal bloom. *Water Research*. 34:1919-1929.

Khangaonkar, T., B. Sackmann, W. Long, T. Mohamedali, and M. Roberts. 2012 a. Simulation of annual biogeochemical cycles of nutrient balance, phytoplankton bloom(s), and DO in Puget Sound using an unstructured grid model. *Ocean Dynamics*. (2012) 62:1353–1379.
doi: 10.1007/s10236-012-0562-4
doi: 10.1007/s10236-012-0562-4.

Khangaonkar, T., W. Long, B. Sackmann, T. Mohamedali, and M. Roberts. 2012 b. Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Modeling Study: Development of an Intermediate Scale Water Quality Model. U.S. Department of Energy, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and Washington State Department of Ecology. Ecology Publication No. 12-03-049.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1203049.html>

Khangaonkar, Tarang, Zhaoqing Yang, Taeyun Kim, and Mindy Roberts. 2011. Tidally averaged circulation in Puget Sound sub-basins: Comparison of historical data, analytical model, and numerical model. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 93:305-319.

King County. 2012. Quartermaster Harbor Benthic Flux Study.

<http://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/2012/kcr2320.pdf>.

Konrad, C.P. 2014. Approaches for evaluating the effects of bivalve filter feeding on nutrient dynamics in Puget Sound, Washington: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2013–5237, 22 p. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/sir20135237>.

Krause, D., D.P. Boyle, and F. Base. 2005. Comparison of different efficiency criteria for hydrological model assessment. *Advances in Geoscience* 5:89-97.

Lavelle, J.W. G.J. Massoth, and E.A. Crecelius. 1986. Accumulation rates of recent sediment in Puget Sound, WA. *Marine Geology*. 72(1986)59-70.

Lombard, S. and C. Kirchmer. 2004. Guidelines for Preparing Quality Assurance Project Plans for Environmental Studies. Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, WA. Publication No. 04-03-030.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/0403030.html>

Long, W., T. Khangaonkar, M. Roberts, and G. Pelletier. 2014. Approach for Simulating Acidification and the Carbon Cycle in the Salish Sea to Distinguish Regional Source Impacts. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication No. 14-03-002.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1403002.html>.

Martin, J.L. 2002. A review and evaluation of sediment diagenesis routines for potential incorporation into the Water Analysis Simulation Program (WASP). For Tetra Tech, Inc. Prepared by J.L. Martin, Mississippi State University, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering.

Martin, J.L. and T.A. Wool. 2013. Supplement to Water Analysis Simulation Program User Documentation. WASP Sediment diagenesis Routines: Model Theory and Users Guide. USEPA Region 4, Atlanta GA.

Morse, John W. and Peter M. Eldridge. 2007. A non-steady state diagenetic model for changes in sediment biogeochemistry in response to seasonally hypoxic/anoxic conditions in the “dead zone” of the Louisiana shelf. *Marine Chemistry* 106:239-255.

Norton, D. 2009. Sediment Trap Monitoring in Four Inlets of South Puget Sound. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication No. 09-03-006.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/0903006.html>.

Paulson, A.J., E.T. Baker, R.A. Feely, T.S. Bates, P. Murphy, H.C. Curl Jr., D. Tennant, S. Walker, J.F. Gendron, M.F. Lamb, E.A. Crecelius. 1991. Puget Sound Sediment Trap Data: 1980-1985. NOAA Data Report ERL PMEL-37. Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, Seattle, WA.

Pelletier, G. and T. Mohamedali. 2009. Control of toxic chemicals in Puget Sound Phase 2: Development of simple numerical models. The long-term fate and bioaccumulation of polychlorinated biphenyls in Puget Sound. Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, WA. Publication No. 09-03-015.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/0903015.html>

RETEC Group, Inc. 2006. Supplemental Remedial Investigation & Feasibility Study, Volume 1: RI Report, Whatcom Waterway Site, Bellingham, Washington. Prepared for Port of Bellingham.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/gsp/CleanupSiteDocuments.aspx?csid=219>.

Roberts, M., T. Mohamedali, B. Sackmann, T. Khangaonkar, and W. Long. 2014. Puget Sound and the Straits Dissolved Oxygen Assessment: Impacts of Current and Future Human Nitrogen Sources and Climate Change through 2070. Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, WA. Publication No. 14-03-007.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1403007.html>

Roberts, M., A. Ahmed, G. Pelletier, and D. Osterberg. 2012. Deschutes River, Capitol Lake, and Budd Inlet Temperature, Fecal Coliform Bacteria, Dissolved Oxygen, pH, and Fine Sediment Total Maximum Daily Load Technical Report: Water Quality Study Findings. Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, WA. Publication No. 12-03-008.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1203008.html>

Roberts, M., J. Bos, and S. Albertson. 2008. South Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Study: Interim Data Report. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication No. 08-03-037.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/0803037.html>

Sackmann, B. 2009. Quality Assurance Project Plan: Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Modeling Study: Intermediate-scale Model Development. Washington State Department of Ecology. Publication No. 09-03-110.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/0903110.html>.

Sackmann, B. 2011. Addendum #1 to Quality Assurance Project Plan. Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Modeling Study: Intermediate-scale Model Development. Washington State Department of Ecology. Publication No. 09-03-110Addendum1.

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/0903110Addendum1.html>

Scully, M.E. 2010. The importance of climate variability to wind-driven modulation of hypoxia in Chesapeake Bay. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*. 40:1435-1440.

Sheibley, R.W. and A.J. Paulson. 2014. Quantifying benthic nitrogen fluxes in Puget Sound, Washington—A review of available data: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2014-5033, 44 p., <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/sir20145033>.

Slomp, C.P., J.F.P Malschaert, W. van Raaphorst. 1998. The role of adsorption in sediment-water exchange of phosphate in North Sea continental margin sediments. *Limnology and Oceanography*. 43-832-846.

Testa, J.M, D.C. Brady, D.M. Di Toro, W.R. Boynton, J.C. Cornwell, and W.M Kemp. 2013. Sediment flux modeling: simulating nitrogen, phosphorus, and silica cycles. *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science*. 2013), <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272771413002928>.

Toxics Cleanup Program. 2012. Partial Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study for Port Gamble Bay, WA. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication. <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/gsp/Sitepage.aspx?csid=3444>.

Vanderborcht, J.-P., R Wollast, G. Billen. 1977. Kinetic-models of diagenesis in disturbed sediments. Part 2. Nitrogen diagenesis. *Limnology and Oceanography*. 22:787-793.

WAC 173-201A. Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters in the State of Washington Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, WA. www.ecy.wa.gov/laws-rules/ecywac.html

Wilson, R.F., K. Fennel, and J.P. Mattern. 2013. Simulating sediment-water exchange of nutrients and oxygen: A comparative assessment of models against mesocosm observations. *Continental Shelf Research* 63:69-84.

Yang, Z., T. Khangaonkar, R. Labiosa, and T. Kim. 2010. Puget Sound Dissolved Oxygen Modeling Study: Development of an Intermediate-Scale Hydrodynamic Model. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Publication No. PNNL-18484.

Appendices

Appendix A. Detailed Description of Sediment Diagenesis Model

Introduction

The basic framework of the sediment model consists of two well-mixed sediment layers, underlying each surface water column segment: a thin upper sediment layer (the aerobic layer) and a thicker active (anaerobic) layer (Figure 4). In WASP, the thickness of the active layer is specified by the user (input) and assumed constant among all sediment columns. Three major processes included in the sediment model are:

- Fluxes of particulate organic matter from the water column to the sediments (note that since the upper sediment layer is assumed to have a negligible thickness, the fluxes are deposited directly into the second, or anaerobic layer)
- Mineralization (or diagenesis) of the particulate organic matter
- Reactions and transfers (between sediment layers, to the water column and deep inactive sediments) of the reaction products




Figure A-1. Sediment model framework.

Particulate Organic Matter Fluxes (Deposition)

Fluxes of particulate organic matter (POM) from the water column represent a source term for the sediments. The particulate organic matter fluxes are subdivided into particulate organic carbon (C, in oxygen equivalents), nitrogen (N) and phosphorus forms (POC, PON and POP) and then into separate forms (G-classes) based upon their reactivity.

The flux of POM from the water column to the sediments is computed using the standard WASP transport conventions for the following state variables: CBOD, algae, organic nitrogen and organic phosphorus. In WASP, settling fluxes for these state variables are computed based upon the specified fraction dissolved (which can vary by segment and state variable), specified particulate transport field (for the state variable) and the specified rates of solids transport (flow fields 1 to 3). The particulate organic carbon, in the diagenesis model, is in oxygen equivalent units (CBOD) as opposed to carbon units in similar models. The flux of algae to the sediment model is subdivided into carbon (oxygen equivalents), nitrogen and phosphorus, using specified stoichiometric constants.

Internal sediment state variables for diagenesis are based upon the multi-class G model, in which the organic forms are divided based upon their reactivity into reactive (G1), refractory (G2), and inert (G3) forms (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Therefore the fluxes of particulate organic carbon (oxygen equivalents), nitrogen, and phosphorus are subdivided into G-class fractions, based upon user specified ratios. Due to the negligible thickness of the upper layer, deposition (as described later) is assumed to proceed directly from the water column to the lower (anoxic) sediment layer.

Diagenesis

Diagenesis reactions are assumed to occur in the second (anaerobic) sediment layer. The diagenesis equations are solved for each form of particulate organic matter (POM; forms for N, P and C where C is in oxygen equivalents) and for each G class (1-3) using the same basic formulation. In order to compute the time-varying diagenesis for each modeled variable, a mass balance equation is written as:

Equation 1

$$\frac{\partial C_{T2}}{\partial t} = \frac{J_2}{H_2} - \frac{W_2}{H_2} C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} - K_2 C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} \approx \frac{C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{T2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

where

$C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}$ = total concentration in layer 2 at time $t+\Delta t$

C_{T2}^t = total concentration in layer 2 at time t (from initial conditions or computed value from previous time step)

Δt = time step (from the water quality model converted to internal units)

J_2 = flux from the water column,

H_2 = thickness of the active sediment layer (input variable),

K_2 = reaction velocity (specific to chemical and G class, temperature corrected), and

W_2 = net sedimentation velocity (input variable)

The mass balance equation is solved algebraically for the concentration at the present time step, as:

Equation 2

$$C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} = \frac{J_2 \frac{\Delta t}{H_2} + C_{T2}^t}{1 + K_2 H_2 \frac{\Delta t}{H_2} + W_2 \frac{\Delta t}{H_2}}$$

Once the concentrations at the present time step are computed, the diagenesis source terms for reactions and transfers ($J_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}$) are computed. Diagenesis source terms are computed for C, N and P from the sum of the product of the chemical specific reaction velocities (K_2) and computed concentrations in each of the three G classes. For example:

Equation 3

$$J_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} = \sum_{i=1}^3 K_{2,i} C_{T2,i}^{t+\Delta t} H_2$$

where

$J_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}$ = source term for total chemical in layer 2 at time $t+\Delta t$

$K_{2,i}$ = reaction velocity for total chemical in G class i

$C_{T2,i}^{t+\Delta t}$ = total chemical concentration for G class i

The WASP diagenesis model also contains an option for steady-state computations for use in computing the initial conditions for the model. The steady-state computations involve an iterative solution for kinetic reactions, as discussed in a following section. That is, an initial guess for the solution is specified (the initial conditions) and the computations iterated until the solution converges. The maximum number of allowable iterations and convergence criteria are specified in input. For POM diagenesis, the steady-state solution to Equation 1 is given by:

Equation 4

$$C_{T2} = \frac{\frac{J_2}{H_2}}{K_2 + \frac{W_2}{H_2}}$$

Reactions and Transfers

Overview

Once the sediment particulate organic matter (C, N, and P) concentrations and source terms are

computed for the present time step, as described above, the reactions and transfers are computed. Concentrations of ammonia, nitrates, methane, sulfides, silica, and phosphorus are computed and then used to compute fluxes to the overlying water column.

The total chemical concentrations are computed from mass balance relationships for each of the two sediment layers. Since the surface layer is thin (on the order of 0.1 cm) compared to the active anaerobic layer (on the order of 10 cm), it is assumed that layer 1 can be considered at steady-state in comparison to the slower processes occurring in layer 2. From Di Toro (2001; Equations 13.28 and 13.30), the two equations solved are:

Layer 1

Equation 5

$$0 = -s(f_{d1}C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{dO}^{t+\Delta t}) + \omega_{12}(f_{p2}C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1}C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t}) + K_{L12}(f_{d2}C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1}C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t}) - \omega_2 C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{\kappa_1^2}{s} C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t} + J_{T1}^{t+\Delta t} + C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} \dot{H}_1^+ - C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t} (\dot{H}_1^+ + \dot{H}_1^-)$$

Layer 2

Equation 6

$$0 = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1}C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1}C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t}) - \kappa_2 C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} + \omega_2(C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}) - \frac{H_2 C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}}{\Delta t} + J_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{H_2 C_{T2}^t}{\Delta t} + C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} \dot{H}_1^+ - C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} (\dot{H}_2^+ + \dot{H}_1^+)$$

s = surface transfer rate; $SOD/[O_2(0)]$, where SOD =SOD rate and $O_2(0)$ is the overlying water concentration

f_{d1} = fraction dissolved in layer 1

f_{d2} = fraction dissolved in layer 2

f_{p1} = fraction particulate in layer 1

f_{p2} = fraction particulate in layer 2

$C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t}$ = total concentration in layer 1 at time $t+\Delta t$

$C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}$ = total concentration in layer 2 at time $t+\Delta t$

C_{T2}^t = total concentration in layer 2 at time t

$C_{dO}^{t+\Delta t}$ = concentration in overlying water column

K_{L12} = mass transfer coefficient via diffusion

ω_{12} = particle mixing coefficient between layers 1 and 2

ω_2 = sedimentation velocity for layer 2

$J_{T1}^{t+\Delta t}$ = source term for total chemical in layer 1 at time $t+\Delta t$

$J_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}$ = source term for total chemical in layer 2 at time $t+\Delta t$

κ_1^2 = square of reaction velocity in layer 1

κ_2 = reaction velocity in layer 2

\dot{H}_1^- = time derivative for H in layer 1 (*not used*)

\dot{H}_1^+ = time derivative for H in layer 1 (*not used*)

\dot{H}_1 = time derivative for H in layer 1 (*not used*)

\dot{H}_2 = time derivative for H in layer 2 (*not used*)

H_2 = thickness of layer 2

Δt = time step

The two equations and two unknowns can be written in the form:

Equation 7

$$a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 = b_1$$

Equation 8

$$a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 = b_2$$

The equations are solved for the new concentrations ($C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t}$ and $C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}$) using a matrix. The solution to this system of equations is (Chapra and Canale, 1998) as follows:

$$x_1 = \frac{a_{22}b_1 - a_{12}b_2}{a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}}$$
$$x_2 = \frac{a_{11}b_2 - a_{21}b_1}{a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}}$$

where the elements of the matrix are:

Equation 9

$$a_{11} = -s(f_{d1}) - \omega_{12}(f_{p1}) - K_{L12}(f_{d1}) - \omega_2 - \frac{\kappa_1^2}{s}$$

Equation 10

$$a_{21} = +\omega_{12}(f_{p1}) + K_{L12}(f_{d1}) + \omega_2$$

Equation 11

$$a_{12} = +\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) + K_{L12}(f_{d2})$$

Equation 12

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \kappa_2 - \omega_2 - \frac{H_2}{\Delta t}$$

Equation 13

$$b_1 = -J_{T1}^{t+\Delta t} = -s f_{do} C_{T0}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Equation 14

$$b_2 = -J_{T2}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{H_2 C_{T2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

For the steady-state solution, an option in WASP used to compute the initial conditions, the elements of the matrix are modified as follows:

Equation 15

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \kappa_2 - \omega_2$$

Equation 16

$$b_2 = -J_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}$$

The fraction dissolved and particulate in the two layers are computed from:

Equation 17

$$f_{d,1} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{C1} S_1}; f_{p,1} = \frac{\pi_{C1} S_1}{1 + \pi_{C1} S_1}$$
$$f_{d,2} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{C2} S_2}; f_{p,2} = \frac{\pi_{C2} S_2}{1 + \pi_{C2} S_2}$$

where

π_{C1} = partition coefficient for total chemical in layer 1

π_{C2} = partition coefficient for total chemical in layer 2

S_1 = solids concentration in layer 1

S_2 = solids concentration in layer 2

The equations are conveniently solved for the new concentrations ($C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t}$ and $C_{T2}^{t+\Delta t}$) using the matrix solution. Once the concentrations have been updated, the flux of the material to the overlying water column (J) can be computed from:

Equation 18

$$J = s(f_{d1} C_{T1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{do}^{t+\Delta t})$$

The surface transfer rate(s) quantifies the mixing between layer 1 and the overlying water column, which can be related to sediment oxygen demand by Di Toro (2001).

Equation 19

$$SOD = D \left. \frac{d[O_2]}{dz} \right|_{z=0} \approx D \frac{[O_2(0) - O_2(H_1)]}{H_1} = \frac{D}{H_1} [O_2(0)]$$

where

D = rate of oxygen diffusion

O₂(0) = oxygen concentration of the overlying water, and

O₂(H₁) = oxygen concentration at the depth H₁

assuming a straight line approximation of the derivative, so that the mass transfer coefficient (K_{L,O2}) may be estimated from Di Toro (2001).

Equation 20

$$K_{L,O_2} = \frac{D}{H_1} = \frac{SOD}{[O_2(o)]} = s$$

The reaction rate in the aerobic layer is formulated as a first order rate (K₁), where the term in the layer 1 equation is K₁H₁. The depth of the aerobic zone follows the definition of the surface mass transfer coefficient (s=D/H₁) so that K₁H₁=K₁D₁/s so that:

Equation 21

$$\kappa_1 = \sqrt{DK_1}$$

and

Equation 22

$$K_1 H_1 = \frac{\kappa_1^2}{s}$$

which is the term applied to the total chemical in the equation for layer 1 (Equation 5).

The rate of mixing of the sediment by macrobenthos (bioturbation, w₁₂) is estimated by an apparent particle diffusion coefficient (D_p), temperature corrected that varies with the biomass of the benthos. Assuming that the mass of the benthos is proportional to the labile carbon in the sediment (C_{POC,1}^t, or POC, in oxygen equivalents in layer 2 in G class 1),

Equation 23

$$w_{12}^* = D_p \frac{\Theta^{(T-20)} C_{POC,1}^t}{H_2 / 2 C_{POC,R}}$$

where w₁₂^{*} is a particle mixing coefficient that is further modified as discussed below and C_{POC,R} is a reference POC concentration. Note that in the above equation and elsewhere, POC in the WASP code is in units of oxygen equivalents. Also note that the ICM code and Equation 13.1 of Di Toro (2001) use H₂ in denominator, rather than H₂/2, so that the user should use caution in providing the appropriate value for D_p when comparing model codes or inputs.

An additional impact is that if anoxia occurs for periods of time, the benthic population is ultimately reduced or eliminated, so that bioturbation is consequently reduced or eliminated. To include this effect, Di Toro (2001) computes the stress that low dissolved oxygen conditions (benthic stress, S) imposes on the population assuming that the stress accumulates as:

Equation 24

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = -k_s S^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{K_{M,D_p}}{K_{M,D_p} + [O_2(\mathbf{0})]} \approx \frac{S^{t+\Delta t} - S^t}{\Delta t}$$

where

k_s = decay constant for benthic stress,

K_{M,D_p} = particle mixing half-saturation concentration for oxygen

which can be solved for

Equation 25

$$S^{t+\Delta t} = \frac{S^t + \frac{K_{M,D_p}}{K_{M,D_p} + [O_2(\mathbf{0})]} \Delta t}{1 + k_s \Delta t}$$

As $[O_2(0)]$ approaches zero, then $(1-k_s S)$ approaches zero, so that the particle mixing coefficient is similarly reduced, as:

Equation 26

$$w_{12} = w_{12}^* (1 - k_s S^{t+\Delta t})$$

The stress is continued at the minimum value for the year to conform to the observation that once the benthic population has been reduced by low dissolved oxygen, it does not recover until the next year (Di Toro, 2001).

The dissolved phase mixing coefficient between layers 1 and 2 (K_{L12}) is due to passive molecular diffusion that is enhanced by the action of organisms (bio-irrigation). The mixing coefficient is computed from Equation 13.6 (Di Toro, 2001).

Equation 27

$$K_{L12} = \frac{D_D}{H_2 / 2} \Theta^{(T-20)}$$

where

D_D = pore-water diffusion coefficient

$K_{L,B}$ = ratio of bio-irrigation to bio-particle mixing.

Note that the ICM code uses H_2 in denominator, rather than $H_2/2$, so that the user should use caution in providing the appropriate value for D_D when comparing model codes or inputs. The sediment temperature is assumed equal to the temperature of the overlying water column.

The solution of the reaction and transfer equations comprises the bulk of the computations of the diagenesis model. Part of the complexity results from the relationship of the surface transfer coefficient (s) to the sediment oxygen demand (SOD) and dissolved oxygen concentration in the overlying water column $\{O_2(0); s=SOD/[O_2(0)]\}$. Since the SOD is a function of the computed ammonia, nitrate (denitrification), sulfide (salt water) or methane (fresh water) concentrations, an iterative solution is required for those constituents. The procedure for the solution is:

1. Start with an initial estimate of the SOD
 2. Solve layer 1 and 2 equations for ammonia, nitrate, sulfide and methane
 - a. Solve for the ammonia flux by establishing the chemical specific conditions
 - b. Compute the oxygen consumed by nitrification (NCOD)
 - c. Solve for the nitrate flux by establishing the chemical specific conditions
 - d. Compute methane (fresh water) or sulfide (salt water) oxidation
 - i. For salt water, compute sulfide reaction terms and compute SOD due to hydrogen sulfide
 - ii. For fresh water, compute methane flux by establishing the chemical specific
 1. Compare computed and saturation concentrations and correct
 2. Calculate the CSOD due to methane
 - a. Compute the total CSOD due to sulfides or methane
 - b. Compute flux terms
 - c. Compute the total SOD due to the sulfide or methane, adding term for NCOD
 - d. Refine the estimate of SOD. A root finding method is used to make the new estimate
3. Go to step (2) if no convergence

Once the SOD is determined, then the layer 1 and 2 equations for phosphate and silica can be solved and the flux rates determined.

Computation of SOD and related reactions

As discussed above, the SOD is computed iteratively using a function Zbrent from Numerical Recipes (Press et al., 1992), which finds the root of a function without knowing the derivative. The SOD related terms are solved for each iteration, until convergence is attained. The computations require the solution of equations for ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, sulfide (salt water) or methane (fresh water) reactions, along with the carbonaceous and nitrogenous SOD. The computation of each of these terms is briefly presented below.

Ammonia

The two-layer mass balance equations for ammonia are:

Layer 1

Equation 28

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & -s \left(f_{d1} C_{NH4T,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NH4T,o}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + \omega_{12} \left(f_{p2} C_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1} C_{NH4T,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) \\ & + K_{L12} \left(f_{d2} C_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1} C_{NH4T,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - \omega_2 C_{NH4T,1}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{\kappa_{NH4,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_o f_{NH4} f_{d1} C_{NH4T,1}^{t+\Delta t} \end{aligned}$$

Layer 2

Equation 29

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & -\omega_{12} \left(f_{p2} C_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1} C_{NH4T,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - K_{L12} \left(f_{d2} C_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1} C_{NH4T,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) \\ & + \omega_2 \left(C_{NH4T,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - \frac{H_2 C_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t}}{\Delta t} + J_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{H_2 C_{NH4T,2}^t}{\Delta t} \end{aligned}$$

where all terms have been previously defined, with the exception of two terms for the surface layer (f_{NH4} , f_o). Note that the primary difference between the general equations presented previously and the ammonia equations are that the square of the reaction velocity in layer 1 (nitrification) is applied only to the dissolved fraction and is modified by functions based on the oxygen and ammonia concentrations. Note also that there are two separate reaction velocities that may be specified for layer 1 in the diagenesis code ($\kappa_{NH4,1}$), for fresh and salt waters respectively, with the one used based on the salinity (SAL) of the overlying water column as compared to a salinity switch (input). In addition, the reaction velocity for layer 2 is zero. The source term for ammonia in layer 2 is equal to the flux from the diagenesis of PON.

Based upon the two-layer mass balance equations above, the elements in the solution matrix then become:

Equation 30

$$a_{11} = -(f_{d1}) K_{L12} - (f_{p1}) \omega_{12} - \frac{\kappa_{NH4}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_o f_{NH4} f_{d1} - (f_{d1}) s - \omega_2$$

Equation 31

$$a_{21} = +\omega_{12} (f_{p1}) + K_{L12} (f_{d1}) + \omega_2$$

Equation 32

$$a_{12} = +\omega_{12} (f_{p2}) + K_{L12} (f_{d2})$$

Equation 33

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \omega_2 - \frac{H_2}{\Delta t}$$

Equation 34

$$b_1 = -s C_{NH4T,0}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Equation 35

$$b_2 = -J_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{H_2 C_{NH4T,2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

For the steady-state solution, an option in WASP used to compute the initial conditions, the elements of the matrix are modified as follows:

Equation 36

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \omega_2$$

Equation 37

$$b_2 = -J_{NH4T,2}^{t+\Delta t}$$

The fraction dissolved and particulate in the two layers are computed from:

Equation 38

$$f_{d1} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{NH4} S_1}; f_{p1} = \frac{\pi_{NH4} S_1}{1 + \pi_{NH4} S_1}$$
$$f_{d2} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{NH4} S_2}; f_{p2} = \frac{\pi_{NH4} S_2}{1 + \pi_{NH4} S_2}$$

where

π_{NH4} = partition coefficient for ammonia

S1 = solids concentration in layer 1

S2 = solids concentration in layer 2

The modification of the nitrification reaction for dissolved oxygen is computed from:

Equation 39

$$f_o = \frac{O_{2,0}}{O_{2,0} + K_{NH4,O2}}$$

where

$O_{2,0}$ = dissolved oxygen concentration in the overlying water column, and
 K_{NH_4,O_2} = half-saturation concentration of dissolved oxygen in the nitrification reaction

The modification for ammonia concentrations is computed by:

Equation 40

$$f_{NH_4} = \frac{K_{NH_4}}{C_{NH_4,1}^t + K_{NH_4}}$$

where

$C_{NH_4,1}^t$ = ammonia concentration from the previous time step,

K_{NH_4} = half-saturation concentration of ammonia in the nitrification reaction

Note that if K_{NH_4} is specified in input, the f_{NH_4} is computed as above. Otherwise $f_{NH_4}=1$.
 Once the ammonia concentrations have been updated, the flux to the water column is computed from:


Equation 41

$$J_{NH_4} = s(C_{NH_4,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NH_4,0})$$

where J_{NH_4} is the flux to the water column.

In order to compute the oxygen consumption due to the oxidation of ammonia in the aerobic layer, the two-stage reaction can be represented by Chapra (1997) and Di Toro (2001)

Equation 42



so that the consumption of oxygen during the process can be represented by Chapra (1997, Equation 23.3)

Equation 43

$$a_{no} = \frac{1.5(32)}{14} = 3.43 \text{ gO gN}^{-1}$$

Therefore the contribution of the oxidation of ammonia to SOD can be estimated from:

Equation 44

$$NSOD_{NH_4} = a_{no} \frac{\kappa_{NH_4,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{S} f_O f_{NH_4} f_{d1} C_{NH_4,1}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Nitrite

The two-layer mass balance equations for nitrite are:

Layer 1

Equation 45

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & -s \left(C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO_2,0}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + K_{L12} \left(C_{NO_2,2}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - \omega_2 C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t} \\ & - \frac{\kappa_{NO_2,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_O C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{\kappa_{NH_4,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_O f_{NH_4} f_{d1} C_{NH_4,1}^{t+\Delta t} \end{aligned}$$

Layer 2

Equation 46

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & -K_{L12} \left(C_{NO_2,2}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) \\ & + \omega_2 \left(C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO_2,2}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - \frac{H_2 C_{NO_2,2}^{t+\Delta t}}{\Delta t} + \frac{H_2 C_{NO_2,2}^t}{\Delta t} \end{aligned}$$

where all terms have been previously defined. Note that the primary difference between the general equations presented previously and the nitrite equations are that:

- The reaction velocity for nitrite is modified by the dissolved oxygen concentration in the overlying water column (factor f_O).
- All nitrite is assumed dissolved, therefore the fraction particulate is zero and the rate of particle mixing zero.
- The first-stage nitrification loss from layer one becomes a source term for nitrite.
- The reaction velocity for layer 2 is zero.

Note also that unlike reaction rates for ammonia and nitrate-nitrogen, the reaction velocity for nitrite is assumed to not vary between fresh and salt water systems. Note also that this model assumes that the only reaction of NO_2 is nitrification to NO_3 . However, Wetzel (2001, pp. 217 and 513) indicates that denitrification occurs through NO_2 . Any error is assumed small due to the typically small concentration of NO_2 .

Based upon the two-layer mass balance equations above, the elements in the solution matrix then become:

Equation 47

$$a_{11} = -K_{L12} - \frac{\kappa_{NO_2}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_O - s - \omega_2$$

Equation 48

$$a_{21} = K_{L12} + \omega_2$$

Equation 49

$$a_{12} = K_{L12}$$

Equation 50

$$a_{22} = -K_{L12} - \omega_2 - \frac{H_2}{\Delta t}$$

Equation 51

$$b_1 = -s C_{NO2,O}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{\kappa_{NH4,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_o f_{NH4} f_{d1} C_{NH4,1}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Equation 52

$$b_2 = -\frac{H_2 C_{NO2,2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

For the steady-state solution, an option in WASP used to compute the initial conditions, the elements of the matrix are modified as follows:

Equation 53

$$a_{22} = -K_{L12} - \omega_2$$

Equation 54

$$b_2 = \mathbf{0}$$

The modification of the second-stage nitrification reaction by dissolved oxygen is computed from:

Equation 55

$$f_o = \frac{O_{2,0}}{O_{2,0} + K_{NO2,O2}}$$

where

$O_{2,0}$ = dissolved oxygen concentration in the overlying water column, and

$K_{NO2,O2}$ = half-saturation concentration of dissolved oxygen in the second-stage nitrification reaction

Once the nitrite-concentrations have been updated, the flux to the water column is computed from:

Equation 56

$$J_{NO_2} = s(C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO_2,0})$$

where J_{NO_2} is the nitrite flux to the water column. Note that in WASP, nitrite is not a state variable and the water column concentration is assumed to equal zero.

In order to compute the oxygen consumption due to the oxidation of ammonia in the aerobic layer, the second state of the nitrification reaction can be represented by Chapra (1997).

Equation 57



so that the consumption of oxygen during the process can be represented by Chapra (1997, Equation 23.4).

Equation 58

$$a_{no_2} = \frac{0.5(32)}{14} = 1.14 \text{ gO gN}^{-1}$$

Therefore the contribution of the oxidation of ammonia to SOD can be estimated from:

Equation 59

$$NSOD_{NO_2} = a_{no_2} \frac{\kappa_{NO_2,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_O C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Nitrate

The two-layer mass balance equations for nitrate are:

Layer 1

Equation 60

$$0 = -s(C_{NO_3,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO_3,0}^{t+\Delta t}) + K_{L12}(C_{NO_3,2}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO_3,1}^{t+\Delta t}) - \omega_2 C_{NO_3,1}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{\kappa_{NO_3,1}^2}{s} C_{NO_3,1}^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{\kappa_{NO_2,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_O C_{NO_2,1}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Layer 2

Equation 61

$$\mathbf{0} = -K_{L12} \left(C_{NO3,2}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO3,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + \omega_2 \left(C_{NO3,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO3,2}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - \frac{H_2 C_{NO3,2}^{t+\Delta t}}{\Delta t} - \kappa_{NO3,2} C_{NO3,2}^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{H_2 C_{NO3,2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

where all terms have been previously defined. Note that the primary difference between the general and nitrate equations is that there is no sorption so the total and dissolved concentrations are equal. For nitrate, there is a reaction velocity due to denitrification for both layers 1 and 2.

The second-stage nitrification rate becomes a source term for layer 1. Note also that there are two separate denitrification reaction velocities specified for each layer ($\kappa_{NO3,1}$ and $\kappa_{NO3,2}$), for fresh and salt waters with the one used based on the salinity (SAL) as compared to a salinity switch (SALTND, input).

Based upon the two-layer mass balance equations above, the elements in the solution matrix then become:

Equation 62

$$a_{11} = -K_{L12} - \frac{\kappa_{NO3,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} - s - \omega_2$$

Equation 63

$$a_{21} = K_{L12} + \omega_2$$

Equation 64

$$a_{12} = K_{L12}$$

Equation 65

$$a_{22} = -K_{L12} - \kappa_{NO3,2} \theta^{T-20} - \omega_2 - \frac{H_2}{\Delta t}$$

Equation 66

$$b_1 = -s C_{NO3,0}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{\kappa_{NO3,1}^2 \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_o C_{NO2,1}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Equation 67

$$b_2 = -\frac{H_2 C_{NO3,2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

For the steady-state solution, an option in WASP used to compute the initial conditions, the elements of the matrix are modified as follows:

Equation 68

$$a_{22} = -K_{L12} - \kappa_{NO3,2} \theta^{T-20} - \omega_2$$

Equation 69

$$b_2 = 0$$

Once the nitrate concentrations have been updated, the flux to the water column is computed from:


Equation 70

$$J_{NO3} = s(C_{NO3,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{NO3,0})$$

where J_{NO3} is the flux to the water column.


The process of denitrification requires a carbon source as indicated by Di Toro (2001, Equation 9.16)

Equation 71



so that the carbon to nitrogen stoichiometric coefficient (a_{cn}) is 1.071 gC gN^{-1} . The oxidation of methane in the aerobic zone may be represented by:

Equation 72



so the oxygen to carbon stoichiometric coefficient (a_{oc}) is $2.67 \text{ g O g C}^{-1}$.

If all of the carbon produced by the diagenesis reaction was converted to methane and fully oxidized, the maximum SOD that could be produced would be:

Equation 73

$$J_{O_2,C} = J_{C,2}^{t+\Delta t}$$

where in WASP, J_c is in oxygen equivalents.

However, this maximum is reduced by the carbon utilized during denitrification, so that the maximum oxygen utilization becomes:

Equation 74

$$J_{O_2,C} = J_{C,2}^{t+\Delta t} - a_{oc} a_{cn} \left[\frac{\kappa_{NO3,1} \Theta^{T-20} C_{NO3,1}^{t+\Delta t}}{S} + \kappa_{NO3,2} \Theta^{T-20} C_{NO3,2}^{t+\Delta t} \right]$$

where $a_{oc}a_{cn}$ is 2.857.

Sulfides

Note that sulfide reactions are only computed in the WASP model for salt water systems (salinity greater than a salt switch, SALTSW). The two-layer mass balance equations for sulfide are:

Layer 1

Equation 75

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & -s \left(f_{d1} C_{H2S,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{H2S,0}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + \omega_{12} \left(f_{p2} C_{H2S,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1} C_{H2S,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + K_{L12} \left(f_{d2} C_{H2S,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1} C_{H2S,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) \\ & - \omega_2 C_{H2S,1}^{t+\Delta t} - f_o \left[\frac{\kappa_{D,H2S,1}^2}{S} f_{d1} + \frac{\kappa_{P,H2S,1}^2}{S} f_{p1} \right] C_{H2S,1}^{t+\Delta t} \end{aligned}$$

Layer 2

Equation 76

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & -\omega_{12} \left(f_{p2} C_{H2S,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1} C_{H2S,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - K_{L12} \left(f_{d2} C_{H2S,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1} C_{H2S,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + \omega_2 \left(C_{H2S,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{H2S,2}^{t+\Delta t} \right) \\ & - \frac{H_2 C_{HS,2}^{t+\Delta t}}{\Delta t} + J_{HS,2}^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{H_2 C_{HS,2}^t}{\Delta t} \end{aligned}$$

where all terms have been previously defined. Note that the primary difference between the ammonia and sulfide equations is that there are separate reaction velocities in layer 1 for the dissolved and particulate forms.

Based upon the two-layer mass balance equations above, the elements in the solution matrix then become:

Equation 77

$$a_{11} = -(f_{d1})K_{L12} - (f_{p1})\omega_{12} - \frac{(\kappa_{HS,D}^2 f_{D,1} + \kappa_{HS,P}^2 f_{P,1})\theta^{T-20}}{S} \mathbf{f}_O - (f_{d1})s - \omega_2$$

Equation 78

$$a_{21} = +\omega_{12}(f_{p1}) + K_{L12}(f_{d1}) + \omega_2$$

Equation 79

$$a_{12} = +\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) + K_{L12}(f_{d2})$$

Equation 80

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \omega_2 - \frac{H_2}{\Delta t}$$

Equation 81

$$b_1 = \mathbf{0}$$

Equation 82

$$b_2 = -J_{OC} - \frac{H_2 C_{HS,2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

where the $J_{HS,2}$ flux (Equation 76) is expressed as an oxygen equivalent flux (J_{OC}) computed from Equation 74. For the steady-state solution, an option in WASP used to compute the initial conditions, the elements of the matrix are modified as follows:

Equation 83

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \omega_2$$

Equation 84

$$b_2 = -J_{OC}$$

The fraction dissolved and particulate in the two layers are computed from:

Equation 85

$$f_{d1} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{HS,1}S_1}; f_{p1} = \frac{\pi_{HS,1}S_1}{1 + \pi_{HS,1}S_1}$$

$$f_{d2} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{HS,2}S_2}; f_{p2} = \frac{\pi_{HS,2}S_2}{1 + \pi_{HS,2}S_2}$$

where

$\pi_{HS,1}$ = partition coefficient for sulfides in layer 1

$\pi_{HS,2}$ = partition coefficient for sulfides in layer 2

S1 = solids concentration in layer 1

S2 = solids concentration in layer 2

The dissolved oxygen correction to the surface reaction is computed from (with K_{MHS, O_2} being the sulfide oxidation normalization constant):

Equation 86

$$f_o = \frac{O_{2,0}}{K_{MHS, O_2}}$$

The primary other difference is that partition coefficients are specified separately for the two layers, so that:

Equation 87

$$f_{d,1} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{H_2S,1}S_1}; f_{p,1} = \frac{\pi_{H_2S,1}S_1}{1 + \pi_{H_2S,1}S_1}$$

Equation 88

$$f_{d,2} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{H_2S,2}S_2}; f_{p,2} = \frac{\pi_{H_2S,2}S_2}{1 + \pi_{H_2S,2}S_2}$$

where

$\pi_{H_2S,1}$ = partition coefficient for sulfide in layer 1

$\pi_{H_2S,2}$ = partition coefficient for sulfide in layer 2

S1 = solids concentration in layer 1

S2 = solids concentration in layer 2

There is no external source term for sulfides in layer 1. The source term for layer 2 is computed from the carbon diagenesis term (Equation 74), in oxygen equivalents and corrected for denitrification, since denitrification requires a carbon source and is a sink for carbon. Once the sulfide concentrations have been updated, the flux to the water column is computed from:

Equation 89

$$J_{H_2S} = s f_{D1} C_{H_2S,1}^{t+\Delta t}$$

where J_{H_2S} is the flux to the water column. The SOD due to carbonaceous demand is then computed from:

Equation 90

$$CSOD_{HS} = \frac{(\kappa_{HS,D}^2 f_{D,1} + \kappa_{HS,P}^2 f_{P,1}) \theta^{T-20}}{s} f_o C_{H_2S,1}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Methane

In WASP, methane fluxes are only computed for freshwater systems (where the salinity (SAL) is less than a specified quantity (SALTSW)). The first consideration in the computation of methane fluxes is that the maximum methane production, in oxygen equivalents, is related to the carbon diagenesis (J_{OC}), corrected for denitrification (Equation 74). Assuming complete oxidation, the maximum carbonaceous SOD that can be exerted is (Chapra 2000, Di Toro 2001):

Equation 91

$$CSOD_{max} = \sqrt{2K_{L12} C_s J_{O_2}}$$

or (for computed $CSOD_{max} > J_{O_2}$)

Equation 92

$$CSOD_{max} = J_{O_2}$$

where K_{L12} was defined previously and C_s the saturation methane concentration, computed from (Di Toro, 2001, Equation 10.51)

Equation 93

$$C_{CH_4,SAT} = 100 \left(1 + \frac{H_o}{10} \right) 1.024^{(20-T)}$$

where H_o is the depth of the water column over the sediment. As indicated, if the computed $CSOD_{max}$ exceeds the available carbon flux (J_{OC} in oxygen equivalents and corrected for denitrification), then $CSOD_{max}$ is set equal to that flux ($CSOD_{max} = J_{OC}$).

The flux of dissolved methane at the sediment water interface can be computed from (Chapra 2000, Eq. 25.43; Di Toro, 2001 Eq. 10.32):

Equation 94

$$J_{out} = CSOD_{max} Sech(\lambda_c H_1)$$

where (Di Toro, 2001, Equation 10.39)

Equation 95

$$\lambda_c H_1 = \frac{\kappa_{CH_4,1} \theta^{(T-20)/2}}{s}$$

Note that the temperature correction in the above equation is reflected in the ICM code (Cerco and Cole, 1995) and elsewhere. The hyperbolic secant (Sech) is computed as:

Equation 96

$$Sech(x) = \frac{2}{e^x + e^{-x}}$$

Methane may be oxidized, producing sediment oxygen demand, or exchanged with the water column in either gaseous or dissolved form. The carbonaceous SOD can be computed from:

Equation 97

$$CSOD_{CH_4} = CSOD_{max} (1 - Sech(\lambda_c H_1))$$

and the fluxes of dissolved and gaseous methane can be computed from:

Equation 98

$$J[CH_4(aq)] = CSOD_{max} - CSOD_{CH_4}; \quad J[CH_4(g)] = J_{OC} - J[CH_4(aq)] - CSOD_{CH_4}$$

SOD

Once the concentrations of materials affecting oxygen are computed, and the stoichiometric relationships described above applied, the SOD is computed from:

Equation 99

$$SOD = CSOD_{HS} + CSOD_{NH_4} + CSOD_{NO_2}$$

for salt water systems or

Equation 100

$$SOD = CSOD_{CH_4} + CSOD_{NH_4} + CSOD_{NO_2}$$

for freshwater systems, where the oxygen demands due to sulfide (Equation 90), methane (Equation 97), and nitrification (Equation 44 and Equation 59) were defined previously. Note that in the iterative solution for s , the SOD computed this computational step is compared to that from the previous iteration and, as discussed above, if it differs by more than a specified amount, a new value of s is computed and the solution iterated.

Computation of phosphate and silica

As discussed above, the SOD is computed iteratively in order to determine the value of s (the surface sediment transfer rate). Once completed, the concentrations of phosphate and ammonia, which do not affect SOD, are computed. The computations for phosphate and silica are similar to those described above and briefly presented below.

Silica

The two-layer mass balance equations for silica are:

Layer 1

Equation 101

$$\mathbf{0} = -s \left(f_{d1} C_{Si,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{Si,O}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + \omega_{12} \left(f_{p2} C_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1} C_{Si,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + K_{L12} \left(f_{d2} C_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1} C_{Si,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - \omega_2 C_{Si,1}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Layer 2

Equation 102

$$\mathbf{0} = -\omega_{12} \left(f_{p2} C_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1} C_{Si,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - K_{L12} \left(f_{d2} C_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1} C_{Si,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + \omega_2 \left(C_{Si,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - \kappa_3 C_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{H_2 C_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t}}{\Delta t} + J_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{H_2 C_{Si,2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

where all terms have been previously defined. Note that the primary difference between the general equations presented previously and the silica equations is that there are no silica source terms or reactions in the aerobic layer. In the anaerobic layer (layer 2), the reaction rate is applied only to the dissolved fraction.

Based upon the two-layer mass balance equations above, the elements in the solution matrix then become:

Equation 103

$$a_{11} = -(f_{d1})K_{L12} - (f_{p1})\omega_{12} - \omega_2$$

Equation 104

$$a_{21} = +\omega_{12}(f_{p1}) + K_{L12}(f_{d1}) + \omega_2$$

Equation 105

$$a_{12} = +\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) + K_{L12}(f_{d2})$$

Equation 106

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \omega_2 - \kappa_3 - \frac{H_2}{\Delta t}$$

Equation 107

$$b_1 = -S C_{Si,0}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Equation 108

$$b_2 = -J_{Si}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{H_2 C_{Si,2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

For the steady-state solution, an option in WASP used to compute the initial conditions, the elements of the matrix are modified as follows:

Equation 109

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \omega_2 - \kappa_3$$

Equation 110

$$b_2 = -J_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t}$$

The fraction dissolved and particulate in the two layers are computed from:

Equation 111

$$f_{d1} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{Si,1}S_1}; f_{p1} = \frac{\pi_{Si,1}S_1}{1 + \pi_{Si,1}S_1}$$

$$f_{d2} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{Si,2} S_2}; f_{p1} = \frac{\pi_{Si,2} S_2}{1 + \pi_{Si,2} S_2}$$

where

$\pi_{Si,1}$ = partition coefficient for Silica in layer 1

$\pi_{Si,2}$ = partition coefficient for Silica in layer 2

S1 = solids concentration in layer 1

S2 = solids concentration in layer 2

The partition coefficient in the anaerobic layer is set to an input value. For layer 1, the aerobic layer, if the oxygen concentration in the overlying water column exceeds a critical concentration (specified in input), then the partition coefficient is increased to represent the trapping of silica, or sorption onto iron oxyhydroxide. If the dissolved oxygen is below the critical value, then the sorption coefficient in layer 1 goes to zero as in (Di Toro, 2001, Eq. 7.18)

Equation 112

$$\pi_{Si,1} = \pi_{Si,2} (\Delta\pi_{Si,1}) \text{ for } [O_2(\mathbf{0})] > [O_2(\mathbf{0})]_{crit,Si}$$

and

Equation 113

$$\pi_{Si,1} = \pi_{Si,2} (\Delta\pi_{Si,1})^{\beta_{Si}} \text{ for } [O_2(\mathbf{0})] \leq [O_2(\mathbf{0})]_{crit,Si}$$

$$\text{where } \beta_{PO4} = \frac{[O_2(\mathbf{0})]}{[O_2(\mathbf{0})]_{crit,PO4}}$$

and $\Delta\pi_{Si}$ is a specified incremental change.

The expression for silica dissolution in the anaerobic layer, modified by the Michaelis-Menton dependency of the dissolution rate on particulate silica, is given by (Di Toro, 2001, Eq. 7.16):

Equation 114

$$S_{Si} = k_{Si} \Theta^{(T-20)} \frac{P_{Si}}{P_{Si} + K_{m,PSi}} (C_{Si,sat} - f_{d,2} C_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t})$$

where

P_{Si} = the biogenic silica diagenesis flux to which detrital silica was added

$K_{m,PSi}$ = half saturation constant (KMPSI)

k_{Si} = rate of silica dissolution (KADSA from water quality model)

$C_{Si,sat}$ = saturation concentration for silica ($C_{SI,sat}$, an input value)

Based on Equation 114, the loss term (κ_3) and source term for the sediments ($J_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t}$) are then specified as:

Equation 115

$$\kappa_3 = k_{Si} \Theta^{(T-20)} f_{d,2} \frac{P_{Si}}{P_{Si} + K_{m,PSi}}$$

and

Equation 116

$$J_{Si,2}^{t+\Delta t} = k_{Si} \Theta^{(T-20)} \frac{P_{Si}}{P_{Si} + K_{m,PSi}} C_{Si,sat}$$

Once the silica concentrations have been updated, the flux to the water column is computed from:

Equation 117

$$J_{Si} = s \left(C_{Si,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{Si,0} \right)$$

where J_{Si} is the flux to the water column.

Phosphate

The two-layer mass balance equations for phosphate are:

Layer 1

Equation 118

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & -s \left(f_{d1} C_{PO4,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{PO4,0}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + \omega_{12} \left(f_{p2} C_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1} C_{PO4,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) \\ & + K_{L12} \left(f_{d2} C_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1} C_{PO4,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - \omega_2 C_{PO4,1}^{t+\Delta t} \end{aligned}$$

Layer 2

Equation 119

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & -\omega_{12} \left(f_{p2} C_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{p1} C_{PO4,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) - K_{L12} \left(f_{d2} C_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t} - f_{d1} C_{PO4,1}^{t+\Delta t} \right) + \omega_2 \left(C_{PO4,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t} \right) \\ & - \frac{H_2 C_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t}}{\Delta t} + J_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t} + \frac{H_2 C_{PO4,2}^t}{\Delta t} \end{aligned}$$

where all terms have been previously defined. Note that the primary difference between the general equations presented previously and the phosphate equations is that there are no reactions in either layer.

Based upon the two-layer mass balance equations above, the elements in the solution matrix then become:

Equation 120

$$a_{11} = -(f_{d1})K_{L12} - (f_{p1})\omega_{12} - (f_{d1})s - \omega_2$$

Equation 121

$$a_{21} = +\omega_{12}(f_{p1}) + K_{L12}(f_{d1}) + \omega_2$$

Equation 122

$$a_{12} = +\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) + K_{L12}(f_{d2})$$

Equation 123

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \omega_2 - \frac{H_2}{\Delta t}$$

Equation 124

$$b_1 = -s C_{PO4,0}^{t+\Delta t}$$

Equation 125

$$b_2 = -J_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t} - \frac{H_2 C_{PO4,2}^t}{\Delta t}$$

For the steady-state solution, an option in WASP used to compute the initial conditions, the elements of the matrix are modified as follows:

Equation 126

$$a_{22} = -\omega_{12}(f_{p2}) - K_{L12}(f_{d2}) - \omega_2$$

Equation 127

$$b_2 = -J_{PO4,2}^{t+\Delta t}$$

The fraction dissolved and particulate in the two layers are computed from:

Equation 128

$$f_{d,1} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{PO4,1}S_1}; f_{p,1} = \frac{\pi_{PO4,1}S_1}{1 + \pi_{PO4,1}S_1}$$

$$f_{d,2} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi_{PO4,2}S_2}; f_{p,1} = \frac{\pi_{PO4,2}S_2}{1 + \pi_{PO4,2}S_2}$$

where

- $\pi_{PO4,i}$ = partition coefficient for silica in layer i (PIE2)
- S1 = solids concentration in layer 1 (M1)
- S2 = solids concentration in layer 2 (M2)

The partition coefficient in the anaerobic layer is set to an input value. For layer 1, the aerobic layer, if the oxygen concentration in the overlying water column exceeds a critical concentration (O_2CRIT , specified in input), then the partition coefficient is increased to represent the trapping of phosphates, or sorption onto iron oxyhydroxide. If the dissolved oxygen is below the critical value, then the sorption coefficient in layer 1 goes to zero as in (Di Toro, 2001, Eq. 6.19).

Equation 129

$$\pi_{PO4,1} = \pi_{PO4,2} (\Delta\pi_{PO4,1}) \text{ for } [O_2(\mathbf{0})] > [O_2(\mathbf{0})]_{crit}$$

and

$$\pi_{PO4,1} = \pi_{PO4,2} (\Delta\pi_{PO4,1})^{\beta_{PO4}} \text{ for } [O_2(\mathbf{0})] \leq [O_2(\mathbf{0})]_{crit}$$

$$\text{where } \beta_{PO4} = \frac{[O_2(\mathbf{0})]}{[O_2(\mathbf{0})]_{crit,PO4}}$$

and $\Delta\pi_{PO4}$ is a specified incremental change (which is set to either a freshwater or saltwater input value).

The source term for layer 2 is a result of the phosphate produced by sediment diagenesis to which is added the flux of inorganic phosphorus from the water column. Once the phosphate concentrations have been updated, the flux to the water column is computed from:

Equation 130

$$J_{PO4} = s(C_{PO4,1}^{t+\Delta t} - C_{PO4,0})$$

References for Appendix A

- Cerco, C.F., and T. Cole. 1993. Three-dimensional eutrophication model of Chesapeake Bay. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*. 119:1006-1025.
- Cerco, C.F. and T.M. Cole. 1991. "Thirty year simulation of Chesapeake Bay Dissolved Oxygen," in *Environmental Hydraulics*, J. H. Lee and Y. K. Cheung, eds. Balkema, Rotterdam, 771-776.
- Cerco, C.F. and T.M. Cole. 1992. "Thirty year simulation of Chesapeake Bay eutrophication," In *Estuarine and Coastal Modeling*, M. L. Spaulding, K. Bedford, A. Blumberg, R. Chen, and C. Swanson, eds. ASCE, 116-126.
- Cerco, C.F. 1995. "Response of Chesapeake Bay to nutrient load reductions," ASCE J. Environmental Engineering Div. 121(8), 549-557.
- Cerco, C.F. and T.M. Cole. 1995. "User documentation for Release Version 1.0 of the CE-QUAL-ICM Three Dimensional Eutrophication Model," Technical Report EL-95-1, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Chapra, S.C. 1997. *Surface Water-Quality Modeling*, McGraw-Hill, New York, New York, 844 pp.
- Di Toro, D.M. 2001. *Sediment Flux Modeling*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, New York. 624 pp.
- Di Toro, D. M., Paquin, P. R., Subburamu, K. and Gruber, D.A. 1990. Sediment oxygen demand model: methane and ammonia oxidation. *J. Environ. Engr. ASCE*, 116:945-986.
- Di Toro, D.M. and J.F. Fitzpatrick. 1993. Chesapeake Bay sediment flux model. Tech. Report EL-93-2, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi, 316 pp.
- Di Toro, D.M., J. F. Fitzpatrick and T.R. Isleib. 1994. "A model of manganese and iron fluxes from sediments," Contract Report W-94-1, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi, 76 pp.
- USACE. 2001. "Development of a Suspension Feeding and Deposit Feeding Benthos Model for Chesapeake Bay, Developed by the USACE Waterways Experiment Station for the Chesapeake Bay Program (contract report DACW39-96-D-0001), 177 pp.

Appendix B. Comparison of Ecology's SedFlux.xlsm with Professor James Martin's SED_JLM.FOR

The sediment flux model (SFM) developed for the USEPA WASP model has previously undergone rigorous review and testing (Martin, 2002). Professor James Martin at Mississippi State University has developed a stand-alone testing tool called SED_JLM.FOR that provides identical results compared with the WASP SFM. Ecology, in collaboration with Dr. Martin, has also developed an Excel VBA version of the SFM model called 'SedFlux.xlsm' that predicts nearly identical results (same within +/- 0.001%) compared with the SED_JLM.FOR for both time-variable and steady-state solutions (Ecology, 2013).

This appendix documents the results of comparison of Martin's SED_JLM.FOR with Ecology's SedFlux.xlsm tool for the time-variable model using the following test inputs using a model time step of 0.01 days:

Deposition fluxes from overlying water into the sediment:

Jcin = 0.3 gO₂/m²/d (deposition of POC)

Jnin = 0.005 gN/m²/d (deposition of PON)

Jpin = 0.003 gP/m²/d (deposition of POP)

Overlying water quality:

O₂₀ = 5 mg/L (dissolved oxygen)

Depth = 2 m (depth of water)

Tw = 15 deg C (temperature)

NH₃₀ = 0.015 mgN/L (ammonium N)

NO₃₀ = 0.1 mgN/L (nitrate + nitrite)

PO₄₀ = 0.004 mgP/L (soluble reactive P)

CH₄₀ = 0 mg/L (dissolved organic C)

SAL_w = 30 psu (salinity)

Table B-1 presents the assumed initial conditions. Table B-2 presents the assumed kinetic rate parameter values.

Figures B-1 through B-10 show the comparison of results for SED_JLM and SedFlux.xlsm.

Table B-1. SedFlux.xls - Input of initial conditions (only used for Time Variable 2 option)

| Name | Symbol | Units | Input value |
|--|---------|--------------------|-------------|
| Particulate organic C, N, and P in layer 2 | | | |
| G class 1 POC in layer 2 | POC2(1) | gO2/m ³ | 100.000 |
| G class 2 POC in layer 2 | POC2(2) | gO2/m ³ | 800.000 |
| G class 3 POC in layer 2 | POC2(3) | gO2/m ³ | 9100.000 |
| G class 1 PON in layer 2 | PON2(1) | gN/m ³ | 10.000 |
| G class 2 PON in layer 2 | PON2(2) | gN/m ³ | 80.000 |
| G class 3 PON in layer 2 | PON2(3) | gN/m ³ | 910.000 |
| G class 1 POP in layer 2 | POP2(1) | gP/m ³ | 2.500 |
| G class 2 POP in layer 2 | POP2(2) | gP/m ³ | 20.000 |
| G class 3 POP in layer 2 | POP2(3) | gP/m ³ | 227.500 |
| Dissolved constituents in layer 1 and 2 porewater | | | |
| Dissolved ammonia N in layer 1 porewater | NH3(1) | mgN/L | 0.000 |
| Dissolved ammonia N in layer 2 porewater | NH3(2) | mgN/L | 0.000 |
| Dissolved nitrate+nitrite N in layer 1 porewater | NO3(1) | mgN/L | 0.000 |
| Dissolved nitrate+nitrite N in layer 2 porewater | NO3(2) | mgN/L | 0.000 |
| Dissolved phosphate P in layer 1 porewater | PO4(1) | mgP/L | 0.000 |
| Dissolved phosphate P in layer 2 porewater | PO4(2) | mgP/L | 0.000 |

Table B-2. SedFlux.xls - Input of rate parameter values

| Name | Symbol | Units | Input value |
|---|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| solids concentration in aerobic layer 1 | m1 | kgD/L | 0.5 |
| solids concentration in anaerobic layer 2 | m2 | kgD/L | 0.5 |
| bioturbation particle mixing coefficient | Dp | m ² /d | 0.00006 |
| pore water diffusion coefficient | Dd | m ² /d | 0.0025 |
| deep burial velocity | w2 | m/d | 6.85E-06 |
| thickness of sediment anaerobic layer 2 | H2 | m | 0.1 |
| Reaction velocities | | | |
| freshwater nitrification velocity | KappaNH3f | m/d | 0.1313 |
| saltwater nitrification velocity | KappaNH3s | m/d | 0.1313 |
| freshwater denitrification velocity in layer 1 | KappaNO3_1f | m/d | 0.1 |
| saltwater denitrification velocity in layer 1 | KappaNO3_1s | m/d | 0.1 |
| denitrification in the anaerobic layer 2 | KappaNO3_2 | m/d | 0.025 |
| methane oxidation in the aerobic layer 1 | KappaCH4 | m/d | 0.7 |
| Half saturation constants | | | |
| nitrification half saturation for NH4N | KM_NH3 | mgN/L | 0.728 |
| nitrification half saturation for O2 | KM_O2_NH3 | mgO2/L | 0.37 |
| Partitioning coefficients | | | |
| partition coefficient for NH4 in layer 1 and 2 | KdNH3 | L/kgD | 1 |
| partition coefficient for PO4 in layer 2 | KdPO42 | L/kgD | 20 |
| freshwater factor that increases the aerobic layer partition coefficient of inorganic P | dKDPO41f | unitless | 20 |
| saltwater factor that increases the aerobic layer partition coefficient of inorganic P | dKDPO41s | unitless | 20 |
| critical O2 concentration in layer 2 for adjustment of partition coefficient for inorganic P | O2critPO4 | mgO2/L | 2 |
| Temperature coefficients | | | |
| temperature theta for bioturbation mixing between layers 1 and 2 | ThtaDp | unitless | 1.117 |
| temperature theta for pore water diffusion between layers 1 and 2 | ThtaDd | unitless | 1.08 |
| temperature theta for nitrification | ThtaNH3 | unitless | 1.123 |
| temperature theta for denitrification | ThtaNO3 | unitless | 1.08 |
| temperature theta for methane oxidation | ThtaCH4 | unitless | 1.079 |
| Salinity thresholds | | | |
| salinity above which sulfide rather than methane is produced from C diagenesis | SALTSW | psu | 1 |
| salinity above which saltwater nitrification/denitrification rates are used for aerobic layer | SALTND | psu | 1 |
| Sulfide constants | | | |
| aerobic layer reaction velocity for dissolved sulfide oxidation | KappaH2Sd1 | m/d | 0.2 |
| aerobic layer reaction velocity for particulate sulfide oxidation | KappaH2Sp1 | m/d | 0.4 |
| temperature coefficient for sulfide oxidation | ThtaH2S | unitless | 1.079 |
| sulfide oxidation normalization constant for O2 | KMH2SO2 | mgO2/L | 4 |
| partition coefficient for sulfide in aerobic layer 1 | KdH2S1 | L/kgD | 100 |
| partition coefficient for sulfide in anaerobic layer 2 | KdH2S2 | L/kgD | 100 |
| Fractions of G classes 1 and 2 for settling PON, POC, and POP | | | |
| fraction of class 1 pon | frpon1 | unitless | 0.65 |
| fraction of class 2 pon | frpon2 | unitless | 0.25 |
| fraction of class 1 poc | frpoc1 | unitless | 0.65 |
| fraction of class 2 poc | frpoc2 | unitless | 0.2 |
| fraction of class 1 pop | frpop1 | unitless | 0.65 |
| fraction of class 2 pop | frpop2 | unitless | 0.2 |
| Diagenesis rate constants for G class 1, 2, and 3 NC/P | | | |
| G class 1 pon mineralization | kpon1 | day ⁻¹ | 0.035 |
| G class 2 pon mineralization | kpon2 | day ⁻¹ | 0.0018 |
| G class 3 pon mineralization | kpon3 | day ⁻¹ | 0 |
| G class 1 poc mineralization | kpoc1 | day ⁻¹ | 0.035 |
| G class 2 poc mineralization | kpoc2 | day ⁻¹ | 0.0018 |
| G class 3 poc mineralization | kpoc3 | day ⁻¹ | 0 |
| G class 1 pop mineralization | kpop1 | day ⁻¹ | 0.035 |
| G class 2 pop mineralization | kpop2 | day ⁻¹ | 0.0018 |
| G class 3 pop mineralization | kpop3 | day ⁻¹ | 0 |
| Temperature coefficients for G class 1, 2, and 3 mineralization | | | |
| temperature theta for G class 1 pon | ThtaPON1 | unitless | 1.1 |
| temperature theta for G class 2 pon | ThtaPON2 | unitless | 1.15 |
| temperature theta for G class 3 pon | ThtaPON3 | unitless | 1.17 |
| temperature theta for G class 1 poc | ThtaPOC1 | unitless | 1.1 |
| temperature theta for G class 2 poc | ThtaPOC2 | unitless | 1.15 |
| temperature theta for G class 3 poc | ThtaPOC3 | unitless | 1.17 |
| temperature theta for G class 1 pop | ThtaPOP1 | unitless | 1.1 |
| temperature theta for G class 2 pop | ThtaPOP2 | unitless | 1.15 |
| temperature theta for G class 3 pop | ThtaPOP3 | unitless | 1.17 |
| Parameters for partial mixing and benthic stress | | | |
| reference G1 at which w12base = Dp / H2 at 20 degC for DiToro eqn 13.1 | POC1R | gO2/m ³ | 0.2667 |
| first-order decay rate constant for benthic stress (d ⁻¹) for DiToro eqn 13.3 | kBEN_STR | day ⁻¹ | 0.03 |
| particle mixing half-saturation constant for O2 (mgO2/L) | KM_O2_Dp | mgO2/L | 4 |




Figure B-1. Sediment oxygen demand (SOD) (positive is flux from water into sediment).




Figure B-2. Sediment-water flux of ammonium (JNH₄) (positive is flux from sediment into water).




Figure B-3. Sediment-water flux of nitrate+nitrite (JNO₃+JNO₂) (negative is flux from water into sediment).




Figure B-4. Sediment-water flux of phosphate (JPO₄) (positive is flux from sediment into water).




Figure B-5. Sediment-water flux of sulfide (JHS) (positive is flux from sediment into water).




Figure B-6. Sediment layer 2 G-classes of particulate organic C (POC). POC in layer 2 in G class 1 is POC2(1), G class 2 is POC2(2), and G class 3 is POC2(3).




Figure B-7. Sediment layer 2 G-classes of particulate organic N (PON). PON in layer 2 in G class 1 is PON2(1), G class 2 is PON2(2), and G class 3 is PON2(3).




Figure B-8. Sediment layer 2 G-classes of particulate organic P (POP). POP in layer 2 in G class 1 is POP2(1), G class 2 is POP2(2), and G class 3 is POP2(3).




Figure B-9. Dissolved ammonium in sediment pore water in layer 1 (NH₃(1)) and layer 2 (NH₃(2)).




Figure B-10. Dissolved nitrate+nitrite in sediment pore water in layer 1 (NO₃(1)) and layer 2 (NO₃(2)).




Figure B-11. Dissolved phosphate in sediment pore water in layer 1 (PO4(1)) and layer 2 (PO4(2)).

Appendix C. Glossary, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

Glossary

Clean Water Act: A federal act passed in 1972 that contains provisions to restore and maintain the quality of the nation's waters. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act establishes the TMDL program.

Dissolved oxygen (DO): A measure of the amount of oxygen dissolved in water.

Effluent: An outflowing of water from a natural body of water or from a human-made structure. For example, the treated outflow from a wastewater treatment plant.

Eutrophic: Nutrient- rich and high in productivity resulting from human activities such as fertilizer runoff and leaky septic systems.

Model skill: Measures of the ability of a model to reproduce characteristics in the processes and parameters being simulated.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES): National program for issuing, modifying, revoking and reissuing, terminating, monitoring, and enforcing permits, and imposing and enforcing pretreatment requirements under the Clean Water Act. The NPDES program regulates discharges from wastewater treatment plants, large factories, and other facilities that use, process, and discharge water back into lakes, streams, rivers, bays, and oceans.

Nonpoint source: Pollution that enters any waters of the state from any dispersed land-based or water-based activities. This includes, but is not limited to, atmospheric deposition, surface-water runoff from agricultural lands, urban areas, or forest lands, subsurface or underground sources, or discharges from boats or marine vessels not otherwise regulated under the NPDES program. Generally, any unconfined and diffuse source of contamination. Legally, any source of water pollution that does not meet the legal definition of "point source" in section 502(14) of the Clean Water Act.

Nutrient: Substance such as carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus used by organisms to live and grow. Too many nutrients in the water can promote algal blooms and rob the water of oxygen vital to aquatic organisms.

Parameter: A physical chemical or biological property whose values determine environmental characteristics or behavior.

Point source: Sources of pollution that discharge at a specific location from pipes, outfalls, and conveyance channels to a surface water. Examples of point source discharges include municipal wastewater treatment plants, municipal stormwater systems, industrial waste treatment facilities, and construction sites where more than 5 acres of land have been cleared.

Pollution: Contamination or other alteration of the physical, chemical, or biological properties of any waters of the state. This includes change in temperature, taste, color, turbidity, or odor of

the waters. It also includes discharge of any liquid, gaseous, solid, radioactive, or other substance into any waters of the state. This definition assumes that these changes will, or are likely to, create a nuisance or render such waters harmful, detrimental, or injurious to (1) public health, safety, or welfare, or (2) domestic, commercial, industrial, agricultural, recreational, or other legitimate beneficial uses, or (3) livestock, wild animals, birds, fish, or other aquatic life.

Streamflow: Discharge of water in a surface stream (river or creek).

Surface waters of the state: Lakes, rivers, ponds, streams, inland waters, salt waters, wetlands and all other surface waters and water courses within the jurisdiction of Washington State.

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL): A distribution of a substance in a waterbody designed to protect it from not meeting (exceeding) water quality standards. A TMDL is equal to the sum of all of the following: (1) individual wasteload allocations for point sources, (2) the load allocations for nonpoint sources, (3) the contribution of natural sources, and (4) a margin of safety to allow for uncertainty in the wasteload determination. A reserve for future growth is also generally provided.

Watershed: A drainage area or basin in which all land and water areas drain or flow toward a central collector such as a stream, river, or lake at a lower elevation.

303(d) list: Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act requires Washington State to periodically prepare a list of all surface waters in the state for which beneficial uses of the water – such as for drinking, recreation, aquatic habitat, and industrial use – are impaired by pollutants. These are water quality-limited estuaries, lakes, and streams that fall short of state surface water quality standard and are not expected to improve within the next two years.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|--|
| C | Carbon |
| DIN | Dissolved inorganic nitrogen (sum of nitrate, nitrite, and ammonium) |
| DOC | Dissolved organic carbon |
| e.g. | For example |
| Ecology | Washington State Department of Ecology |
| EPA | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency |
| et al. | And others |
| FVCOM | Finite-volume Coastal Ocean Model |
| ICM | Integrated Compartment Model |
| i.e. | In other words |
| MQO | Measurement quality objective |
| N | Nitrogen |
| NPDES | (See Glossary above) |
| PNNL | Pacific Northwest National Laboratory |
| POM | Princeton Ocean Model |
| QA | Quality assurance |
| RMSE | Root mean square error |

| | |
|------|--------------------------------|
| SOD | Sediment oxygen demand |
| TMDL | (See Glossary above) |
| TOC | Total organic carbon |
| WAC | Washington Administrative Code |
| WRIA | Water Resource Inventory Area |
| WWTP | Wastewater treatment plant |

Units of Measurement

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| m ³ /s | cubic meters per second, a unit of flow |
| g | gram, a unit of mass |
| kg | kilograms, a unit of mass equal to 1,000 grams |
| kg/d | kilograms per day |
| kgD | kilograms of detritus |
| m | meter |
| mgd | million gallons per day |
| mg/L | milligrams per liter (parts per million) |
| mL | milliliters |
| mmol | millimole or one-thousandth of a mole |
| mole | an International System of Units (IS) unit of matter |
| psu | practical salinity units |
| ug/L | micrograms per liter (parts per billion) |