

**ESTIMATING TRIBUTARY PHOSPHORUS LOADS USING FLOW-
WEIGHTED COMPOSITE STORM SAMPLING**

**By
Katherine McArthur Leitch**

**Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of**

**Master of Science
In
Environmental Engineering**

**Manuscript Prepared For Submission
to
Journal of the American Water Resources Association**

**Dr. Thomas Grizzard, Co-chairman
Dr. Robert Hoehn, Co-chairman
Dr. Daniel Gallagher**

**August, 1998
Blacksburg, Virginia**

**Estimating Tributary Phosphorus Loads Using Flow-Weighted
Composite Storm Sampling**

Katherine McArthur Leitch

ABSTRACT

Quantification of total phosphorus (TP) loads entering a lake or reservoir is important because phosphorus is most often the limiting nutrient in terms of algae growth, thus phosphorus can control the extent of eutrophication. Four methods for assessing the annual tributary phosphorus loads to two different Virginia reservoirs were analyzed, three methods that use tributary monitoring program data and one that uses land-use and rainfall data. In this project, one tributary has been extensively monitored for many years and served as a control on which the other methods were tested. The key difference between this research and previous studies is the inclusion of flow-weighted composite storm sampling instead of simple grab sample analyses of storm flow. Three of the methods employed flow stratification, and the impact of the base flow separation point was examined. It was found that the Regression Method developed in this research was the least sensitive to the base flow separation point, which is a valuable attribute because a wrong choice will not significantly affect the estimate. The Monte Carlo Method was found to underestimate the TP loads. The amount of rainfall impacted the accuracy of the methods, with more error occurring in a year with lower precipitation.

Keywords: Nonpoint source pollution, water quality, tributary load estimation, flow stratification, total phosphorus, regression, Monte Carlo, Schueler's Simple Method, and ratio estimator

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was done with the assistance and support of many people. Many thanks to:

- The Chesterfield County Department of Public Utilities for providing the financial support for this study.
- Dr. Robert Hoehn, Professor Emeritus, and Dr. Thomas Grizzard, Professor, Via Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Virginia Tech, for their financial support, advice, and encouragement.
- Dr. Daniel Gallagher, Professor, Via Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Virginia Tech and Dr. Keying Ye, Professor of Statistics at Virginia Tech, for their advice on the error analysis included in this study.
- Normand Goulet of the Northern Virginia Planning District Committee for providing the land use data of Cub Run's drainage area.
- Harry Post, Research Associate at the Occoquan Watershed Monitoring Laboratory, for providing the raw data and OWML's load estimates for Cub Run.
- George Duval and Weedon Cloe, Plant Manager and Biologist at Swift Creek Water Treatment Plant, respectively, for their willingness to be of assistance and provide needed information.
- Thomas Leitch, my husband, who helps me with everything I do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Phosphorus in the Aquatic Environment	1
Swift Creek Watershed and Reservoir	5
Cub Run	10
Water Quality Models	13
Phosphorus Load-Estimation Techniques.....	20
Summary	33
Literature Review Works Cited	34
MANUSCRIPT.....	37
Introduction	37
Study Sites	38
Load Calculation Methods.....	44
Monte Carlo Method	44
Regression Method	45
Ratio Estimator Method	46
Schueler's Simple Method.....	48
Analysis and Discussion.....	49
Flow Stratification and Method Accuracy.....	49
Error Analysis	60
Application of Methods.....	64
Storm Event Sampling	65
Conclusions	66
Works Cited	68
APPENDIX A.....	70
APPENDIX B	75
APPENDIX C	82
APPENDIX D.....	96

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
<u>Literature Review</u>	
L-1. Swift Creek Watershed and Tributaries	6
L-2. Schematic of Phosphorus Balance Used in Input-Output Models.....	15
L-3. Vollenweider Model (1975) Plot (OWML, 1997)	18
<u>Manuscript</u>	
1. Cumulative Probability Distribution of Cub Run's 1997 Mean Daily Flows	50
2. Cub Run's 1996 Gaged TP Load with Varying Base Flow Separation Point	52
3. Cub Run's 1997 Gaged TP Load with Varying Base Flow Separation Point	53
4. Swift Creek's 1996 Gaged TP Load with Varying Base Flow Separation Point	55
5. 1996 and 1997 Combined Cub Run Gaged Total Phosphorus Estimation Method Comparison	57
6. Gaged Total Phosphorus Estimation Method Comparison using the 85th Percentile as the Base Flow Separation Point	59
<u>Appendices</u>	
A-1. Schematic of Monte Carlo Method for Gaged TP Load Estimation	71
A-2. Schematic of Regression Method for Gaged TP Load Estimation.....	72
A-3. Schematic of Ratio Estimator Method for Gaged TP Load Estimation	73
A-4. Schueler's Simple Method (1987) for TP Load Estimation	74
B-1. Gaged Total Phosphorus Estimation Method Comparison using the 75th Percentile as the Base Flow Separation Point	77
B-2. Gaged Total Phosphorus Estimation Method Comparison using the 80th Percentile as the Base Flow Separation Point	78
B-3. Gaged Total Phosphorus Estimation Method Comparison using the 85th Percentile as the Base Flow Separation Point	79
B-4. Gaged Total Phosphorus Estimation Method Comparison using the 90th Percentile as the Base Flow Separation Point	80
B-5. Gaged Total Phosphorus Estimation Method Comparison using the 95th Percentile as the Base Flow Separation Point	81
C-1. Cumulative Probability Distribution of Cub Run's 1996 Mean Daily Flows	83
C-2. Cumulative Probability Distribution of Cub Run's 1997 Mean Daily Flows	84

C-3.	Example of Cumulative Probability Distribution for One of Swift Creek Reservoir's Tributary's 1996 Mean Daily Flows.....	85
C-4.	Example of Cumulative Probability Distribution for One of Swift Creek Reservoir's Tributary's 1997 Mean Daily Flows.....	86
C-5.	Running Median of Cub Run's Monte Carlo's 1996 Gaged Load.....	87
C-6.	Running Median of Cub Run's Monte Carlo's 1997 Gaged Load.....	88
C-7.	Running Median of Swift Creek Reservoir's 1996 Gaged Load.....	89
C-8.	Running Median of Swift Creek Reservoir's 1997 Gaged Load.....	90
C-9.	Swift Creek Reservoir's 1996 Direct Runoff TP Load	91
C-10.	Swift Creek Reservoir's 1997 Direct Runoff TP Load.....	92
C-11.	Box Plot of Cub Run's 1996 and 1997 Monte Carlo Results.....	95
C-12.	Box Plots of Swift Creek Reservoir's 1996 and 1997 Gaged Monte Carlo Results	95
D-1.	Cub Run Relationship Between Log(Total P Load) vs. Log(Total Flow Volume) in 1996	98
D-2.	Residuals Plot for Cub Run 1996 Log-Log Relationship	99
D-3.	Cub Run Relationship Between Log(Total P Load) vs. Log(Total Flow Volume) in 1997	100
D-4.	Residuals Plot for Cub Run 1997 Log-Log Relationship	101
D-5.	Example Plot for Log(Total P Load) vs. Log(Total Flow Volume) for One of Swift Creek Reservoir's Tributaries	102
D-6.	Example Residuals Plot for Log-Log Relationship of One of Swift Creek Reservoir's Tributaries.....	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
<u>Literature Review</u>	
L-1. Numbers of Sampling Events in Cub Run and Swift Creek Watershed during 1996 and 1997.....	12
L-2. Base Flow Separation Points Found in the Literature	31
<u>Manuscript</u>	
1. Rainfall Data in Inches.....	41
2. Mean Daily Flow Characteristics for Tributaries in 1996 and 1997.....	42
3. Load Estimates and Standard Errors in Pounds of TP using the 85th Percentile Baseflow Separation Point	62
<u>Appendices</u>	
B-1. Gaged TP Load in Pounds	76
C-1. One-way ANOVA Results for Significance of Seasonal Stratification.....	93
C-2. One-Tail T-Test Probability Results to Test if a High Storm Flow TP Database Should be Used in the Monte Carlo Method for 1996.....	94
C-3. One-Tail T-Test Probability Results to Test if a High Storm Flow TP Database Should be Used in the Monte Carlo Method for 1997.....	94
D-1. R-Square Values for Relationships Relating Total P Load (lbs) to Total Flow Volume (cf).....	97
D-2. Comparison of Unsampld Storm Load Estimates in 1996 in lbs of P when the 85th Percentile Baseflow Separation Point was Used.....	104
D-3. Comparison of Gaged Load Estimates in 1996 in lbs of P when the 85th Percentile Baseflow Separation Point was Used.....	104