

## MID-TERM EXAM

Closed book, 1 sheet of notes allowed.

Answer 2 of the following 3 questions. Please state any additional assumptions you made, and show all work.

- I. (50%) Hubbard Creek receives runoff from more than a dozen wheat farms in a small area of central Nebraska. Each results in a certain discharge of organic nitrogen and contributes to the loading of Hubbard Creek. The effective drainage area of the wheat farms that impacts Hubbard Creek is 20,000 ha (mistakenly printed as 20 ha, so the solution below uses that number instead). Assume that prior to creation of the farms, when the drainage basin was 100% pristine prairie, the organic nitrogen level in Hubbard Creek was constant at 0.25 mg/L. Now the level is substantially higher as shown in the table below.
- Determine the total organic nitrogen concentration for each day using the standard log-log model
  - Using this information, estimate the effective export coefficient for the wheat farms during this 10-day period in units of kg-organic N/ha/yr.
  - Comment on the relationship between the organic nitrogen export coefficient for this watershed and the amount of rainfall in a given year.

| Day | Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s) | Organic Nitrogen Concentration (mg/L) |
|-----|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1   | 1.7                      |                                       |
| 2   | 1.8                      | 1.9                                   |
| 3   | 2.9                      |                                       |
| 4   | 4.4                      |                                       |
| 5   | 7.6                      |                                       |
| 6   | 12.1                     | 4.25                                  |
| 7   | 11.1                     |                                       |
| 8   | 8.3                      |                                       |
| 9   | 5.4                      |                                       |
| 10  | 3.3                      |                                       |

There are several ways of solving this depending on how you interpret the “pristine concentrations of 0.25 mg/L. You could (1) view this as a baseflow value and subtract it from the two measured concentrations before solving, or (2) just subtract it from the final loading to isolate the farm runoff.

### Part a.

20 points

First approach:

|     |        | Coefficients from 2 data |                 |                        |              |               |           |
|-----|--------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|
|     |        | a                        | b               | Model                  |              |               |           |
|     |        | 0.0988493                | 0.464737        | c=10^a(Q)^b            |              |               |           |
|     |        | 10^x                     | 1.2555942       | log(c) = a + b[log(Q)] |              |               |           |
|     |        | Gross                    | Net             |                        |              |               |           |
| Day | Q(cms) | Observed (mg/L)          | Observed (mg/L) | Calculated (mg/L)      | W(g/s)       |               |           |
| 1   | 1.7    |                          |                 | 1.61                   | 2.73         | background    | 0.25 mg/L |
| 2   | 1.8    | 1.9                      | 1.65            | 1.65                   | 2.97         |               |           |
| 3   | 2.9    |                          |                 | 2.06                   | 5.97         |               |           |
| 4   | 4.4    |                          |                 | 2.50                   | 11.00        |               |           |
| 5   | 7.6    |                          |                 | 3.22                   | 24.49        |               |           |
| 6   | 12.1   | 4.25                     | 4               | 4.00                   | 48.40        |               |           |
| 7   | 11.1   |                          |                 | 3.84                   | 42.66        |               |           |
| 8   | 8.3    |                          |                 | 3.36                   | 27.86        |               |           |
| 9   | 5.4    |                          |                 | 2.75                   | 14.85        |               |           |
| 10  | 3.3    |                          |                 | 2.19                   | 7.22         |               |           |
| Sum |        |                          |                 |                        | 188.15 g/s = | 16255.86 kg/d |           |

**Second Approach:**

|     |        | Coefficients from 2 data |                   |                        |               |  |  |
|-----|--------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|--|--|
|     |        | a                        | b                 | Model                  |               |  |  |
|     |        | 0.1708975                | 0.422513          | c=10^a(Q)^b            |               |  |  |
|     |        |                          |                   | log(c) = a + b[log(Q)] |               |  |  |
| Day | Q(cms) | Observed (mg/L)          | Calculated (mg/L) | W(g/s)                 |               |  |  |
| 1   | 1.7    |                          | 1.85              | 3.15                   |               |  |  |
| 2   | 1.8    | 1.9                      | 1.90              | 3.42                   |               |  |  |
| 3   | 2.9    |                          | 2.32              | 6.74                   |               |  |  |
| 4   | 4.4    |                          | 2.77              | 12.20                  |               |  |  |
| 5   | 7.6    |                          | 3.49              | 26.54                  |               |  |  |
| 6   | 12.1   | 4.25                     | 4.25              | 51.43                  |               |  |  |
| 7   | 11.1   |                          | 4.10              | 45.49                  |               |  |  |
| 8   | 8.3    |                          | 3.62              | 30.08                  |               |  |  |
| 9   | 5.4    |                          | 3.02              | 16.32                  |               |  |  |
| 10  | 3.3    |                          | 2.45              | 8.10                   |               |  |  |
| Sum | 58.60  |                          |                   | 203.46 g/s =           | 17579.01 kg/d |  |  |

**Part b.**

20 points

**First Approach:**

|                |             |                       |
|----------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Average load = | 18.81 g/s = | 1,625.59 kg/d =       |
|                |             | 593745.3 kg/yr        |
|                | total area  | 20 ha                 |
|                |             | <b>29687 kg/ha/yr</b> |

**Second Approach:**

|                         |             |                       |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| background              | 0.25 mg/L   |                       |
| Gross Average Loading = | 20.35 g/s = | 1,758 kg/d =          |
|                         |             | 642073 kg/yr          |
| Background Loading =    | 1.47 g/s =  | 127 kg/d =            |
|                         |             | 46232 kg/yr           |
| Net Average Loading =   |             | 1631 kg/d =           |
|                         |             | 595841 kg/yr          |
|                         | total area  | 20 ha                 |
|                         |             | <b>29792 kg/ha/yr</b> |

**Part c.**

10 points

Certainly based on this analysis, organic nitrogen export is positively correlated with rainfall. It seems likely that organic nitrogen is associated with particulates (soil from application of fertilizers, plant matter) which is washed into streams at higher rates during wet events. This has the unfortunate affect of changing the export coefficient based on the particular level of rainfall. Over short periods where rainfall can be quite variable, this will add a substantial amount of error. However, over longer time periods, average rainfall becomes more uniform and export coefficients may be more accurate.

Also, it seems likely that organic-N washout should be seasonally-dependent. None of the simple models really take this into account.

- II. (50%) Pleasantville is a rapidly growing community in an exclusive area of California. Starting on January 1, 1988, half of the population of Pleasantville began taking 20 mg/day of the newly released drug, fluoxetine (trade name: Prozac). Studies have shown that 80% of ingested fluoxetine is excreted. Furthermore the removal efficiency of the Pleasantville wastewater treatment plant (serving the entire population of Pleasantville) for fluoxetine is only 60% prior to discharge into nearby Tranquil Lake. This lake has a total volume of  $9 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$  and an outflow of  $8000 \text{ m}^3/\text{d}$ . Fluoxetine decays in the lake at a rate of  $0.10 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  due to direct photolysis. No other losses are known.

## Pleasantville, CA

| Year | Population on Jan 1 |
|------|---------------------|
| 1988 | 300,000             |
| 1993 | 350,000             |
| 1998 | 400,000             |
| 2003 | 450,000             |
| 2008 | 500,000             |

- A. Calculate the expected fluoxetine concentration at the beginning of the year 2008.  
 B. If a new WWTP capable of completely removing fluoxetine is placed on line at the beginning of 2008, when will the lake fluoxetine level finally drop below 2.0  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ?

### Part A.

30 points

Note that this includes both a step load and a linear load:

|                            |  |  |   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------|--------|----------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|-------|
| Lake Model                 |  |  |   | t zero =        |        | 1/1/1988             |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Lake Data                  |  |  |   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Q =                        | 8.00E+03   | m <sup>3</sup> /day  | Co =  | 0               | mg/L   | tau =                | 3.08     | yr                  |                 |          |       |
| A =                        | 3.00E+06   | m <sup>2</sup>   |   |                 |        | depth =              | 3.00E+00 | m                   |                 |          |       |
| V =                        | 9.00E+06   | m <sup>3</sup>   | k =   | 0.0002738       | /day = | 0.1                  | "        | /yr                 |                 |          |       |
| Loading Information        |  | 300000 people  |   | 10 mg/d/cap     |        | 80% excreted         |          | 40% discharged      |                 |          |       |
|                            |  | 10000 people/yr  |   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Loading Functions          |  |  |   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Impulse                    | m =  | 0.00E+00 kg  |   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Step                       | W=m/T=   | 350.64 kg/yr =   |   | 350640000 mg/yr |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Linear                     | WI   |  |   | bl =            |        | 11.688 kg/y/y        |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Exponential                | We=  | 0 kg/d =   |   | 0 g/yr          |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
|                            | be=  | 0 /yr  |   | 0               |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Sinusoidal                 | W=   | 0 kg   |   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
|                            | Wa=  | 0 kg   |   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
|                            | Tp=  | 1 yr   |   | Omega =         |        | 6.2831853 radians/yr |          |                     |                 |          |       |
|                            | phase shift  | 0.25 yr  |   | Theta =         |        | 1.5707963 radians    |          | phi(om)= 1.50331116 |                 |          |       |
| Solution                   |  | $\lambda = \frac{Q}{V} + k$  |   | lambda =        |        | 0.001163 /d =        |          | 0.4246667 /yr       |                 |          |       |
| Initial                    | Step   | Linear   | Exponential   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| $c_g = c_o e^{-\lambda t}$ | $c_p = \frac{\bar{W}}{\lambda V} (1 - e^{-\lambda t})$ | $C_p = \frac{\beta_e}{\lambda^2 V} (e^{-\lambda t} + \lambda t - 1)$ | $c_p = \frac{W_e}{V(\lambda + \beta_e)} (e^{\beta_e t} - e^{-\lambda t})$ |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Concentration in ug/L      |  |  |   |                 |        |                      |          |                     |                 |          |       |
| Date                       | years  | Initial C  | Impulse   | Step            | Linear | Exponen              | Sinusoid | Total               | Loading (kg/yr) |          |       |
| 1/1/1988                   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0               | 0      | 0                    | 0        | 0                   | Step            | Linear   | Expon |
| 1/1/1998                   | 10   | 0  | 0   | 90.43           | 23.49  | 0                    | 0        | 114                 | 350640          | 0.00E+00 | 0     |
| 1/1/2008                   | 20   | 0  | 0   | 91.72           | 53.96  | 0                    | 0        | 146                 | 350640          | 2.34E+02 | 0     |

### Part B.

20 points

Note that this is a simple decay without any loading. The lambda is the same as above.

|        |             |       |       |          |          |
|--------|-------------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Years  | Target Conc |       |       |          |          |
| 30.098 | 2           |       |       | Dates    |          |
|        |             | years | days  | starting | ending   |
|        |             | 30    | 35.81 | 1/1/1988 | 2/5/2018 |

- III. (50%) On a separate sheet of paper, answer any five (5) of the following questions.
- Calculate the % loss of CBOD as the water moves 1 km downstream in a river flowing at 0.01 m/s. Assume the CBOD deoxygenation rate is  $0.15 \text{ d}^{-1}$ , and the CBOD settling rate is  $0.11 \text{ d}^{-1}$ .
  - Explain how you determined ultimate BOD from a wastewater sample.
  - Describe how the algal metabolism parameters, P and R, can be determined experimentally in a lake
  - Explain the relationship between the critical concentration and wastewater loading in a river with only a single point load
  - Is it common to add an inhibitor to the BOD test? Why or why not?
  - Describe the relationship between drainage basin area and flow
  - Does SOD cause an increase, a decrease or no change in CBOD? Explain.

Most of the answers shown below are not complete; instead they make reference to sources of the correct information.

### Part A.

10 points

#### Simple stream BOD model

|               |                 |               |  |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
|               | 0.01 m/s        |               |  |
|               | 1000 m          |               |  |
| travel time = | 100000 s =      | 1.157407 days |  |
| kd =          | 0.15 d-1        |               |  |
| ks =          | 0.11 d-1        |               |  |
| kr =          | 0.26 d-1        |               |  |
| c/c0 =        | 74.0% remaining |               |  |
| 1-c/co =      | 26.0% lost      |               |  |

### Part B.

10 points

Measure BOD at various incubation times (oxygen consumption in a BOD bottle). Fit the BOD vs time data to the exponential BOD bottle model and determine the asymptotic value ( $L_0$  or BOD ultimate). See notes from class or website for more detail.

**Part C.**

10 points

Use the light and dark bottle method. See notes/web for description.

**Part D.**

10 points

It's a simple linear relationship between loading and the critical deficit. As loading decreases, so does the critical deficit. The critical concentration is therefore also linearly related.

**Part E.**

10 points

An inhibitor is used to stop nitrification. The BOD test is intended to measure carbonaceous BOD only.

**Part F.**

10 points

Based on the simple rational formula, flow and basin area are linearly related. In reality, the relationship is more complicated due to infiltration, evapotranspiration, etc. This makes the relationship more and more non-linear as basin size increases.

**Part G.**

10 points

The sediment oxygen demand should have no effect on dissolved carbonaceous BOD in the water column.