

Effects of Reservoir Filling on Sediment and Nutrient Removal in the Lower Susquehanna River Reservoir System: An Input-Output Analysis based on Long-Term Monitoring



Qian Zhang,¹ Robert Hirsch,² William Ball^{1,3}

¹ Dept. of Geography & Environmental Engineering,
Johns Hopkins University (JHU)

² U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Reston VA

³ Chesapeake Research Consortium (CRC)

(*Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2016, in press)

[\[pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/acs.est.5b04073\]](https://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/acs.est.5b04073)

Acknowledgements

Maryland Sea Grant (NOAA)

US Geological Survey

MD Water Resources Research Center

Photo of Conowingo Dam from www.chesapeakeboating.net

STAC Workshop, January 13, 2016

Background

Review of the Lower Susquehanna Watershed Assessment



STAC Review Report

August 2014

Annapolis, Maryland



STAC Publication 14-006


STAC Review Report on LSRWA (No. 14-006)

Section “Reduced deposition associated with reservoir infilling has been neglected”

*“Net trapping efficiency is the sum of increases in average annual scour and decreases in average annual deposition. However, the simulations and calculations in the study only considered the increase in scour ... Without having the model simulate the full range of changes due to the loss of trapping efficiency, the report’s authors have introduced a large uncertainty into the results ... This issue underlies a significant weakness in the report, which is that **it focuses its inquiry on the impact of large, but infrequent, scour events rather on the total impact of the change in trapping efficiency of the reservoir system.**”*

Background

- Need to quantify the broad changes in the reservoir performance based on available data.
- Need to explore the *relative importance* of:
 - (A) *Infrequent events at very high flows ($> 400,000$ cfs or $\sim 11,000$ m³/s) vs.*
 - (B) *Frequent events at moderate and high flows (sub-scour levels).*



Objectives

To provide new insights on sediment and nutrient processing within the reservoir system in the monitored period of 1986-2013 (~30 years)

1

- Identify temporal change in system function: C vs. Q
Graphical analysis of “raw” C , Q data to obtain C , Q relationships

2

- Evaluate trends in particulate loadings above and below the reservoir
WRTDS analysis of C , Q data to obtain “flow-normalized” trends

3

- Conduct input-output analyses across the reservoir (net deposition) *
WRTDS analysis of C , Q data to obtain “true-condition” estimates

4

- Isolate effects of the temporally-varying regression surface: $C(Q, t_{season})$
Application of “stationary” $C(Q, t)$ surfaces to the same long-term Q data


Study sites and data

Monitoring sites:

- **Above reservoir:**
Marietta + Conestoga
(~97% of SRB drainage area)
- **Below reservoir:**
Conowingo
(99% of SRB drainage area)

Available Data (all sites):


- Daily discharge data;
- **SS**, **P**, and **N** data (25-40 sampled days per year)




1. Temporal changes in *C-Q* relationships above & below LSRRS

Suspended Sediment (SS)

* LOWESS curves fitted to C-Q data in periods of 1987-1995, 1996-2004, and 2005-2013



Total Phosphorus (TP)



2. Flow-normalized trends in particulate loadings above & below LSRRS

Suspended Sediment (SS) loadings

“Flow-Normalized” Estimates by Season of Year

Marietta +
Conestoga
(26,460 mi²)




LSRRS




Conowingo
(27,100 mi²)

(Zhang *et al.*, STOTEN, 2013)



Reservoir
Input



Reservoir
Output

2. (cont'd) **Flow-normalized trends** in particulate loadings above & below LSRRS

Marietta +
Conestoga
(26,460 mi²)



LSRRS




Conowingo
(27,100 mi²)


(Zhang *et al.*, STOTEN, 2013)

Total Phosphorus (TP) loadings

“Flow-Normalized” Estimates by Season of Year




Reservoir
Input




Reservoir
Output

3. Input-output analyses: net deposition in the reservoirs over time




3. (cont'd) Input-output analyses: cumulative sediment storage (1929-2013)

Q: What is the broad trend in average net deposition rate?



3. (cont'd) Input-output analyses: **output/input ratios (1987-2013)**




- Boxplots for daily O/I ratios for each year in 1987-2013.
- O/I ratio $< 1 \rightarrow$ net deposition.
- Travel time: we used **35-day moving averages** of both input and output to calculate O/I ratios for mitigating effects of travel time across the reservoir system. (Results insensitive to selection of averaging time.)
- SS and TP O/I ratios have increased in recent years.

Notes:

- **TP** dominated by **PP**
- **TN** dominated by **DN**

3. (cont'd) Input-output analyses: sensitivity to differential highflow sampling


Q: Are trends in O/I ratio biased by the differential highflow sampling at Marietta and Conowingo?



- **Major distinction in sampling:** $15,000-20,000 m^3/s$ -- 3 dates were sampled at Conowingo but not Marietta (*i.e.*, $1996/01/21$, $2004/09/20$, and $2011/09/08$).
- **Sensitivity analysis:** We re-examined Marietta and Conowingo data by using only those samples with $Q < 15,000 m^3/s$. O/I trend results are consistent with those with all samples.

3. (cont'd) Input-output analyses: uncertainty analysis on O/I ratio

Q: What are the uncertainties in the O/I ratio trends?




“Centerline” formed by the annual median of 365 daily ratios in each year from 1987 to 2013

3. (cont'd) Input-output analyses: **uncertainty analysis on O/I ratio**

“Centerline”: annual median of daily O/I ratios

Averages (blue dots) & the 95% confidence intervals (black error bars) (based on estimation with 100 realizations of representative data sets)








- **Trends in annual median O/I**: qualitatively maintained based on the 100 runs.
- **TP ratio > SS ratio**: decreasing retention in recent years is more pronounced for the finer (and more P-enriched) sediments.
- **Slight rise in TN ratio**: an increasingly larger quantity and fraction of **PN** in the reservoir output that deserves further study and management consideration.

3. Input-output analyses: O/I ratios by five flow class

Q: Is the O/I trend associated with highflow only?

Total
Phosphorus
(TP)

(SS: similar)



Conowingo Flow Classes

Q_1 : 25~396 m³/s;

Q_2 : 399~787 m³/s;

Q_3 : 790~1,464 m³/s;

Q_4 : 1,467~7,646 m³/s;

Q_5 : 7,674~20,077 m³/s.

Q_{scour} : ~ 11,000 m³/s



Conowingo Dam on 9/12/2011, 3 days after peak discharge following Tropical Storm Lee (9/1 to 9/5)
REF: pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2012/5185/

3. (cont'd) Input-output analyses: % contributions of loads by five flow classes

Q: What flow class has contributed the most of mass delivery?

Conowingo Flow Classes

Q_1 : 25~396 m³/s;

Q_2 : 399~787 m³/s;


Q_3 : 790~1,464 m³/s;

Q_4 : 1,467~7,646 m³/s;

Q_5 : 7,674~20,077 m³/s.


Q_{scour} : ~ 11,000 m³/s

- Q_4 has dominated the absolute mass delivery of **Vw**, **TN** and **TP** through the system despite its **sub-scour** status.
- Q_4 has also had a major contribution to **SS** delivery.



4. Stationary-model analyses: effects of changing $C(Q, t_{season})$ surface



- Inter-annual comparisons of WRTDS true-condition loadings are influenced by:
 - (A) the particular history of flows occurred in a given year and
 - (B) changes in the concentration regression surface, *i.e.*, $C(Q, t_{season})$.



- To isolate the effects of (B), we developed 3 “stationary” WRTDS models that represent historical conditions in 3 different years -- 1990, 2000, 2010.
- Repeat each 1-year surface over the full record to obtain “stationary” surfaces and apply these to the *same, actual flow history* to estimate loadings.
- Differences in loading estimates reflect the differences in the “stationary” surfaces, *i.e.*, changes in reservoir system function.


4. (cont'd) Stationary-model analyses: **load vs. Q** under 3 reservoir conditions

Differences in *TP loading vs. flow* among 3 scenarios of stationary surface representing 1990, 2000, and 2010 reservoir conditions (SS results: similar)



4. (cont'd) Stationary-model analyses: **load vs. Q** under 3 reservoir conditions


Differences in **net deposition rate vs. flow** among 3 scenarios of stationary surface representing 1990, 2000, and 2010 reservoir conditions



- Diminished net trapping of TP and SS (not shown; but similar patterns) has occurred under a range of flow conditions, including $Q \ll$ “scour threshold”.

4. (cont'd) Stationary-model analyses: storage under 3 reservoir conditions

Predictions of *cumulative SS net deposition* for a **Wet (2011)**, an **Average (2005)**, and a **Dry Year (2001)** by 3 scenarios of stationary surface representing 1990, 2000, and 2010 reservoir conditions



Wet Year (2011)

No net scour if TS Lee had occurred under the 1990 reservoir condition

Normal Year (2005)

No net scour if the high flow had occurred under the 1990 and 2000 reservoir conditions

Dry Year (2001)

(Mildly) reduced net deposition even for the dry-year scenario

Summary

Major Findings

- This **retrospective study** has evaluated reservoir performance in the last 30 years using different modeling approaches, all of which consistently show **decreased net deposition of SS and TP in Conowingo Reservoir**.
- Decreased reservoir trapping has occurred under **a wide range of flow conditions**, including **sub-scour levels**. The moderately high flows (75th~99.5th percentile of flow at Conowingo) has dominated the absolute mass of delivery through the reservoir.
- Moreover, **the recent rise in TN O/I ratio** may reflect an increasingly important role of particulate N that deserves further study.
- These broad changes in net deposition are:
 - a) robust based on uncertainty analysis and
 - b) not sensitive to the differential highflow sampling at Marietta and Conowingo.



Management Implications

- Future progress in Bay restoration will depend on accurate predictions of how upstream inputs to the reservoir system will be **modulated** by reservoir processes.
- Our analyses can help constrain and inform the **development of improved predictive models of reservoir performance**, and particularly the (possible) incorporation of such models in the ongoing upgrade of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model.
- **This retrospective study (1986-2013) does NOT speak for the issue of future reservoir conditions.**
- Additional **monitoring and modeling** of the reservoir is critically needed, including at least:
 - a) Input & output sampling,
 - b) Bathymetry measurements,
 - c) N & P distributions in bottom sediments, and
 - d) N & P transport and fate under different flows.



Acknowledgements

- Bob Hirsch (USGS) and Bill Ball (JHU, CRC) for their contributions to the work
- Joel Blomquist (USGS) for his review comments
- MD Sea Grant, USGS, and MD Water Resources Research Center for funding

Documents in mySTAC WorkZone:

- Zhang, Hirsch, Ball, 2016, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, in press, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.5b04073.
- Zhang, Brady, Ball, 2013, *Sci. Total. Environ.*, 452-453, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.02.012.



QUESTIONS?