

UNRBA
Modeling and
Regulatory Support
Path Forward Committee
Meeting
December 2016





Project Status

- > Developed model package selection criteria
 - PFC approved during October meeting
 - Memorandum was distributed to stakeholders in November
- > Evaluated model packages using a two step process
 - Quantitative analysis based on scores and weights
 - Qualitative evaluate based on MRSW discussion
- > Today we would like to
 - Get PFC input on the scores and weights
 - Present the MRSW recommendations for the model packages
 - Approve four of the five modeling frameworks under consideration



Step 1. Quantitative Analysis

- > Scoring metrics were assigned based on the number of potential answers
 - 5 answers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
 - 3 answers (1, 3, 5)
 - 2 answers (2, 4)
 - Also included “Informational” answers
- > Weights were used to rank the importance of a criteria
 1. Criteria was identified as important by the MRSW, PFC, DWR, or stakeholders but is not related to the UNRBA project
 2. Criteria supports a key modeling goal
 3. Criteria was identified as high priority by MRSW, PFC, DWR, or stakeholders and supports a key modeling goal
 4. Criteria is a key modeling goal



Summary of Scores for Step 1

- > Raw scores
 - Total raw scores
- > Weighted scores
 - Total weighted scores
 - Total for criteria with a weight = 4
 - Total for criteria with a weight = 3
 - Total for criteria with a weight = 4 or 3



Step 2. Qualitative Evaluation

- > The MRSW used the results of Step 1 to identify the highest ranking groups of models
- > Selected models for recommendation based on a discussion of
 - Pros and cons of models within the highest scoring group
 - Gaps associated with the highest ranking models and how they could be filled with other models
 - Consideration of input from stakeholders
 - Likely acceptance by State and Federal agencies



Summary of MRSW Recommendations

- > **WARMF** – Watershed modeling package
- > **EFDC** – Complex, mechanistic lake nutrient response modeling package
- > **WARMF-LAKE** – Moderate or simple lake nutrient response modeling package
- > **Empirical/Bayesian/Probabilistic** – Lake designated use model
- > **CASM/ecosystem model** (depending on additional cost and availability of data)



MRSW Recommendation for the **WARMF** Watershed Modeling Package

- > Direct access to the model developers if any special coding is required
- > Ability to incorporate revised models being developed by the City of Durham (Ellerbe, Little Lick, and Eno River subwatersheds)
- > Inclusion of a lake modeling component that can serve as one of the independent lake water quality models
- > Past use for regulatory purposes in the Southeast
- > Likely acceptability by State and Federal agencies



MRSW Recommendation for the **EFDC** Lake Nutrient Response Model

- > Two similar models ranked highest in this evaluation (EFDC and DELFT)
- > EFDC is recommended for the complex, mechanistic model
 - Past use of the model for development of the Falls Lake Nutrient Management Strategy
 - Consistency with model applications may be better received by some stakeholders
 - The agencies are more familiar with EFDC



MRSW Recommendation for the **WARMF-LAKE** Nutrient Response Model

- > The MRSW recommends selection of a moderate or simple lake nutrient response model to
 - Corroborate modeling results (multi-modeling approach)
 - Develop a simpler model with shorter run times to assist with
 - Sensitivity analyses
 - Model scenario evaluation
 - Interface with cost-benefit model
- > WARMF-LAKE was selected because of its
 - Ability to simulate more processes than BATHTUB (the other model considered)
 - Inclusion in the WARMF modeling package
 - Ability to directly link with the watershed model



MRSW Recommendation for the **EPB** Designated Use Modeling

- > EFDC and WARMF-LAKE will predict lake water quality
- > The MRSW recommends an empirical/probabilistic/Bayesian model to evaluate designated uses
 - Aquatic life
 - Drinking water
 - Recreation
- > Model will be based on empirical relationships and input from subject matter experts



MRSW Recommendation for CASM/ **Ecosystem Modeling**

- > Provide a mechanistic simulation of how changing water quality would affect the food web
- > These models are generally heavily parameterized and may require additional monitoring studies
- > Ecosystem model could be driven by the EFDC hydrodynamic and water quality simulations
- > The MRSW recommends considering CASM or a similar model, depending on the data requirements and costs



PFC Discussion of MRSW Recommendations

- > **WARMF** – Watershed modeling package
- > **EFDC** – Complex, mechanistic lake nutrient response modeling package
- > **WARMF-LAKE** – Moderate or simple lake nutrient response modeling package
- > **Empirical/Bayesian/Probabilistic** – Lake designated use model
- > **CASM/ecosystem model** (depending on additional cost and availability of data)



List of Upcoming Deliverables and Corresponding PFC Meetings

- > January
 - Conceptual multi-modeling plan
- > April
 - Draft Modeling QAPP
- > June
 - Two Year Work Plan

