



SPOLE POLE EAU & TERRITOIRES

Un modèle de prédiction pour détecter les impacts des déversoirs d'orage sur la qualité chimique des cours d'eau danois A chemical fate model for screening impacts from wet-weather discharges on Danish streams

Vezzaro Luca, Schweiger Leonie, Mutzner Lena

# Why this study?



#### This is Denmark

#### **NÔVQ TECH** L'eau dans la ville Urban water

# Why this study?





# **Regulating wet weather discharges**



# Our modelling approach - use open data



DK Environmental portal (https://arealinformation.miljoeportal.dk/)

#### Discharge points Yearly volumes

Hydrological and Information Prediction system (https://hip.dataforsyningen.dk/)

#### Modelled (and measured) monthly flow All Danish streams and creeks

Presented in: Vezzaro, L., Scarpellini, C., Mutzner, L., 2022, 'The power of Open Data – Using free data for a preliminary screening of impact from urban wet-weather discharges on Danish streams', 12th UDM conference, Costa Mesa, CA, USA, 10-12/01/2022

# Nodelling approach – simple fate model Tech





# Modelling approach – simple fate model Tech

- First order processes
- Partitioning (dissolved/particulate)

$$k = f_{sorbed} k_{sed} + f_{diss} k_{vol} + f_{diss} k_{photo} + f_{diss} k_{bio} + f_{diss} k_{hyd}$$



Substance	k_sed	k_bio	k_photo	k_hyd	k_vol	k (1/s)	DT50
	(1/s)	(1/s)	(1/s)	(1/s)	(1/s)		(h)
Barium	1.2E-07					1.2E-07	1642
Cadmium	4.9E-07					4.9E-07	393
Chromium	6.0E-07					6.0E-07	322
Cobalt	4.4E-07					4.4E-07	440
Copper	2.3E-07					2.3E-07	842
Lead	7.7E-07					7.7E-07	250
Mercury	5.2E-07				2.9E-06	3.4E-06	56
Nickel	2.5E-07					2.5E-07	783
Selenium	2.5E-07					2.5E-07	769
Tin	5.0E-07					5.0E-07	387
Uranium	6.9E-10					6.9E-10	280891
Vanadium	6.4E-08					6.4E-08	3012
Zinc	4.4E-07					4.4E-07	439
4-tert-Octylphenol	1.0E-08	1.5E-07	6.9E-07		8.7E-07	1.7E-06	113
Bisphenol A	9.2E-10	2.0E-06			3.4E-12	2.0E-06	96
DEHP	1.7E-08	1.5E-08	1.3E-08	6.4E-13	1.2E-09	4.6E-08	4166
para-Nonylphenol	2.1E-08	1.1E-07			3.0E-06	3.1E-06	62
PFOS	3.1E-09			5.3E-10	5.7E-10	4.2E-09	46994
Anthracene	6.4E-09		2.9E-05		4.2E-06	3.4E-05	6
Benz[a]anthracene	5.0E-07		8.1E-07		3.8E-07	1.7E-06	114
Benzo[a]pyrene	3.8E-07		7.9E-06		1.3E-08	8.3E-06	23
Benzo[b]fluoranthene	8.8E-07		3.3E-08		1.7E-09	9.2E-07	210
Benzo[ghi]perylene	2.0E-07		1.7E-08		4.4E-09	2.2E-07	865
Benzo[k]fluoranthene	8.4E-07	2.5E-08	4.5E-08		2.3E-09	9.1E-07	212
Chrysene	7.1E-07		4.6E-07		7.1E-08	1.2E-06	155
Dibenz[a,h]anthracene	7.1E-07		8.9E-08		9.0E-10	8.0E-07	241
Fluoranthene	1.1E-07	5.2E-07	4.4E-07		8.7E-07	1.9E-06	99
Pyrene	9.0E-08	1.1E-08	1.1E-05		1.1E-06	1.3E-05	15
Carbendazim	8.0E-10	0.0E + 00	1.3E-06		1.1E-13	1.3E-06	150
Chlorpyrifos	7.3E-09	3.1E-07	1.1E-08	1.1E-07	2.7E-06	3.2E-06	61
Cypermethrin	5.1E-08	9.6E-08	1.7E-07		5.1E-09	3.2E-07	599
Diflufenican	4.3E-09		4.4E-09		2.2E-08	3.1E-08	6182
Diuron	3.2E-10	1.8E-07	3.5E-09		4.4E-11	1.9E-07	1029
Imidacloprid	4.8E-10		1.5E-05		1.5E-16	1.5E-05	13
Pentachlorophenol	7.6E-09		1.3E-05		3.0E-09	1.3E-05	15
Diclofenac	3.4E-10	8.3E-08	2.8E-05	1.2E-08	3.8E-13	2.8E-05	7
Estradiol	1.3E-08		5.5E-06		2.6E-12	5.5E-06	35
Estrone	3.9E-09		3.7E-06		2.3E-11	3.7E-06	52
Ibuprofen	4.6E-09	8.2E-07	2.2E-07	2.3E-07	2.1E-08	1.3E-06	148

# How much removal can we expect?

#### Most half lives > 100 h



# no significant removal in rivers expected

# Does it pay off to have fate models?



- Fate model vs simple dilution model (k=0)
- Calculation of fraction of river points where

RQ = c/EQS > 1 How many of the river nodes are above Environmental Quality Standard (EQS)?

# **Does fate model matters?**

![](_page_10_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Heavy metals: EQS based on bioavailable (= dissolved) concentration
- Fate model allows to calculate risk quotients from dissolved concentrations

Removal is not relevant, but partitioning!

# How are the Danish rivers doing?

![](_page_11_Picture_1.jpeg)

- 1.791 rivers receiving wet-weather discharges
- 33.719 modelled river points
- River flows in July (lowest flow)
- 2.686 CSOs, 11.580 SWOs
- Archetype storm event with return period of 0.5 yrs
- Discharge concentrations from 50% and 90% of literature distributions

# How are the Danish rivers doing?

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Not that well
  - Especially for heavy metals and PAHs
- For several substances over 40-50% of river points exceeds EQS

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

### How much can we trust this model?

• Result of Monte Carlo simulations (1.000 runs)

![](_page_13_Figure_3.jpeg)

## How much can we trust this model?

• Monte Carlo simulations (1.000 runs) vs. one simulation (with fixed percentiles)

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

## Conclusions

or CHM

![](_page_15_Picture_1.jpeg)

 Simple screening tool now available to assess potential impacts from WWD discharges
Can quickly find out if discharge can cause an environmental risk or not

 Identify streams with potential risk need which need more detailed modelling/monitoring

#### **Future steps**

- Potential coupling with monitoring/reporting systems (near real-time risk assessment?)
- Look into toxicity mixtures?
- A tool for the whole Europe?