MATHEMATICAL MODELING OF WATER QUALITY

B. Beck

August 1978

WP-78-29

2361
Laxenburg
Austria

International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis

FOREWARD

by

O. Vasiliev

In many countries the use of water is increasingly restricted by its quality. The improvement and control of water quality in a water body can be achieved by regulation of municipal, industrial and agricultural waste discharges. Waste treatment techniques by chemical and biological processes are highly developed, and while it is technically possible to approach "zero discharge" of wastes from point sources, in most cases it is neither necessary nor economically feasible. The important management decisions in water quality control relate to determining the degree and level of waste treatment that is consistent with the multiple uses of natural and man-made water bodies. This implies the ability to forecast or predict the response of the waste-receiving water to future investments in waste treatment facilities. Therefore, the planning of regional development and the management of water resources systems requires *an analysis of the interaction of waste discharges with the hydrophysical and ecological processes* taking place in the aquatic environment.

The organization of an IIASA workshop on Mathematical Modelling of Water Quality thus fulfilled two objectives: it provided an opportunity for intensive discussion of future research needs in developing hydrophysical and ecological models for water quality; and it allowed some assessment of the present state of scientific knowledge in this subject area. It was hoped in particular that the workshop would promote the establishment of a collaborative international network of research groups interested in the advancement of water quality modelling.

As a basis for discussion it was suggested that the workshop participants might focus their attention on a number of key issues, for example:

- the modelling of eutrophication in water bodies with significant non-point nutrient loading, i.e. agricultural runoff;

- the impact of toxic pollutants on aquatic ecosystems;
- problems of model dimensionality and complexity;
- the relationship between models and the objectives for model application;
- consideration of stochastic phenomena in water quality modelling;
- interfacing the models with planning and management-oriented studies.

All of these topics, among others, can be found in this report on the proceedings of the workshop.

Moreover, it will be evident to the reader that the workshop participants offered many suggestions for future possible directions of the Institute's involvement in water quality modelling activities. We are indeed gratified by this encouraging response and we look forward to a continuing fruitful collaboration and exchange of ideas.

PREFACE

The current Task 2 of IIASA's Resources and Environment Area (REN)--"Models for Environmental Quality Control and Management"--is concerned with hydrophysical and ecological models for water quality. The emphasis in this work is for the present focused upon *identifying, developing, and communicating the state-of-the-art in water quality modeling.* In September, 1977, a Workshop on Mathematical Modeling of Water Quality was therefore organized as one of the initial activities of Task 2. This paper is a summary report of that Workshop; it is not an edited collection of formally presented papers.

The principal objective of the Workshop was to obtain a comprehensive picture of trends and ongoing studies in the broad field of mathematical modeling of water quality. In this sense the Workshop complements Task 2's (REN) state-of-the-art survey which aims both to clarify the capabilities of water quality models, especially as they will eventually relate to management applications, and to accelerate the transfer of existing modeling technologies.

This report on the Workshop proceedings attempts to capture the essence of the key themes emerging from the discussion. It also shows how these themes are related to the future directions of IIASA's studies in water quality modeling.

SUMMARY

This report is intended to summarize the proceedings of an IIASA Workshop on Water Quality Modelling held at Laxenburg during September 13-16, 1977. The Workshop was held as an initial activity within IIASA's research Task on Models for Environmental Quality Control and Management.

In convening the Workshop participants were invited to express their views on the current state of mathematical modelling of water quality. They were also encouraged to speculate on future directions for the subject and to make recommendations for the ways in which such research could be organized in collaboration with IIASA. The report on the Workshop divides broadly into two main sections: the first deals with key themes and salient problems of water quality modelling; the second reproduced the concluding statements of nine ad hoc Working Groups established during the Workshop. These Working Groups considered a number of specific areas such as, for example, deep lakes and reservoirs, impact of toxic pollutants, systems methods in Model Development and analysis, and so forth.

An intermediate section of the report looks briefly at future perspectives in water quality modelling, and in the final section particular reference is made to the Institute's plans for water quality model development and application in example case studies.

ABSTRACT

A summary report on the proceedings of a Workshop on Mathematical Modeling of Water Quality is presented. A number of key themes from the Workshop discussion are reported; themes which deal with the specific details of, for instance, the modeling of temperature profiles and eutrophication, and themes which are concerned with more general techniques of model development and the application of systems analysis. The concluding statements of several ad hoc working groups from the Workshop are included. These statements refer primarily to water quality modeling research in the context of collaboration with and through the medium of IIASA. A selected bibliography is provided for a small number of the informal presentations of Workshop participants. Among other conclusions, the following deserve special mention: the need for a better understanding of sediment/water column interactions in both estuarine and shallow lake systems; the problem of model verification and the constraints of field data; and the requirements for comparative studies and critical appraisal of already existing models by reference to well-documented case studies.

Mathematical Modeling of Water Quality

A report on the proceedings of a Workshop held at
Laxenburg between 13th and 16th September 1977

1. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes some of the key points of the discussion from the Workshop on Mathematical Modeling of Water Quality, which was held at Laxenburg during 13-16 September 1977. The principal reason for convening the Workshop was to obtain a comprehensive picture of trends and ongoing studies in the broad field of mathematical modeling of water quality. It was intended that such a picture would be instrumental in clarifying, to some extent, future directions for IIASA's research Task on "Hydrophysical and Ecological Models for Water Quality". Further, it was hoped that, with the assistance of the Workshop participants, suggestions could be solicited for ways in which collaborative working groups (external to IIASA) might be established as complements of the Institute's in-house research activities. The Workshop was, therefore, very much in the mould of a planning workshop. This report on the proceedings is accordingly a reflection of the conclusions from discussion groups - it is not an edited collection of formally presented papers.

An agenda for the Workshop and a list of participants are given respectively in Appendixes 1 and 2. Our report here starts with an editorial view of some of the salient features of the informal presentations at the Workshop. The intention is that such a summary will capture those aspects of water quality modeling that the participants considered either controversial or critical to future progress of the subject. In section 3 we have attempted briefly to summarize some possible future perspectives for water quality modeling. These are statements which, though they draw upon the discussion of Workshop as reported in section 2, are essentially independent in their outlook. From the Agenda

(Appendix 1) it will be noted that one afternoon of the Workshop program was devoted to informal discussion. Nine ad hoc Working Groups were established and their concluding reports are reproduced in section 4. Finally, section 5 presents our account of how various themes emerging from the Workshop are being incorporated into the Institute's research plans for the development and application of water quality models.

2. WATER QUALITY MODELING - SOME SALIENT PROBLEMS

From the outset it should be admitted that while the Workshop was very broad, it did not embrace all aspects of the development and application of water quality models. For instance, it is fair to say that evidence of work in marine systems was particularly weakly represented at the Workshop. This distillation of the current status and salient problems of water quality modeling is organized along the following lines. Where possible, general themes recurring in one or more of the informal presentations are listed in section 2.1; due reference is given to those presentations that dealt with each theme. (We have, in fact, selected for discussion those presentations which were not intended primarily as statements from the member organizations of IIASA.) Subsequent subsections deal respectively with the approximate division of the detailed technical proceedings into "overview" papers (2.2), reports on the modeling of water quality in rivers and estuaries (2.3), thermal discharge problems (2.4), and lake systems (2.5). In some instances, principally sections 2.4 and 2.5, further discussion of the same or similar topics has been reported for the November (1977) Workshop on Models for Waste Heat Management in Rivers (Harleman, 1977), and for the December (1977) Workshop on Geophysical and Ecological Modeling of Deep Lakes and Reservoirs (Jørgensen and Harleman, 1978). Both Workshops originated as proposals from the ad hoc Working Groups (see sections 4.1 and 4.5).

A selected bibliography of literature supporting some of the presentations is given in Appendix 3; Appendix 4 provides some definitions of terminology in water quality modeling.

2.1 General Themes

In so much as it is possible to classify and separate themes, the following can be identified and listed approximately in the order of the modeling procedure itself (names in parenthese refer to principal speakers and discussants):

Models and modeling objectives - (Orlob, Beck, Whitehead) This issue makes the specific point that the nature of the model should match the nature of the problem and the intended application of the model; it is, therefore, a distinctly different standpoint from the view that a general model can be developed for solving, in general, any given problem.

Distributed - or lumped-parameter models (aggregation) - (Orlob, Bierman, Rinaldi, Thomann). There are several different aspects of the choice between distributed-parameter and lumped-parameter models:

- o There is the questionable reliability of increasing model complexity to 2- and 3-dimensional spatial representations in view of severe data-base restrictions for verification (Orlob, Bierman).
- o The improvement in model performance for more highly aggregated representations, i.e., large spatial segments, for simulation of lake-wide or basin-wide responses; in other words, averaging field observations over large areas increases the ability to perceive deterministic (as opposed to random) patterns of behavior (Thomann).
- o The systematic aggregation of model compartments, or state variables, for the reduction of model order (Rinaldi).

Parameter estimation and sensitivity analysis (Harleman, Whitehead, Rinaldi, Jørgensen). The arguments here centered upon two problems, the first being a dilemma:

- o Should we substitute laboratory chemostat-determined rate constants into models of the field system, with the assumption that the chemostat environment parallels the field situation? Or should we determine parameter values from the in situ field data, with the risk of hidden identifiability problems whereby unique values for parameters cannot be estimated? (Harleman, Whitehead).

- An analysis of the sensitivity of the model responses and predictions to uncertainties in the parameter values (Rinaldi, Jørgensen).

The determination of sufficient model complexity - (Harleman, Jørgensen, Thomann, Grenney, Bierman, Whitehead, Orlob, Beck). Of all the matters raised at the Workshop this, with the benefit of hindsight, seems to have been the problem that attracted most attention. A determination of sufficient model complexity enters the modeling process at two stages:

- During the initial phases, where the analyst must choose a certain level of model complexity before attempting to verify this a priori model against field data (Grenney, Bierman) - for example, one may choose to neglect benthic demand for oxygen, or one may choose to differentiate between species of phytoplankton.
- During the final phases, where the analyst must decide whether his model has been verified and has sufficient complexity for its intended application (Harleman, Jørgensen).

Although there was not necessarily any consensus of opinion, some of the participants felt that in spite of all attempts to the contrary, these two choices are essentially subjective (Beck, Grenney, Bierman). Between the a priori and a posteriori models there may be:

- A gradual increase in model complexity, whereby additional complexity is included only if a simpler model is demonstrably inadequate as a formal representation of the behavior observed in the field data (Whitehead, Beck).

This last attitude is consistent with another view that:

- The complexity of the ecological part of the model should be built upwards from the stronger a priori foundations of the hydrodynamical part of the model - a view which implies confidence in the understanding of the hydrodynamical properties of the given water body (Orlob, Harleman).

And yet while we might expect "progress" to mean increasing sophistication, there was a very strong plea that:

- Model complexity should be reduced, not simply for reasons of computational economy, but primarily for reasons of preserving the ability to comprehend model forecasts (Thomann).

Model verification and validation - (Rinaldi, Jørgensen, Beck, Thomann). In addition to the above, Thomann's second key comment concerned the requirement for more detailed verification of existing water quality models. Others echoed this sentiment and it will become evident from the concluding statements of the ad hoc Working Groups that it is generally thought desirable to see different models verified and compared against the same field data set.

Models for management applications - (Stehfest, Harleman, Rinaldi, Thomann). The discussion was not limited by the title of the Workshop and the following subsections will mention in passing a considerable variety of model applications to the solution of management problems. There was, nevertheless, some debate over the justification for accepting the applied results if the prior verification of the model cannot be demonstrated (Stehfest, Thomann).

2.2 Surveys and Critical Reviews

G.T. Orlob: "State-of-the-Art Review of Mathematical Modeling of Surface Water Impoundments"

This is both an appropriate speaker and topic with which to commence the proceedings; Professor Orlob is Chairman of IIASA's Task Group on the State-of-the-Art Survey of Water Quality Modeling

- a list of the Task Group Members is given in Appendix 5. The general objective of the Survey Task is:

> to enhance the transfer of scientific and technological information on mathematical modeling between researchers/ developers, on the one hand, and potential users on the other.

Among the reasons for initiating such a task Orlob notes a desire to avoid duplication of effort in modeling; and he observes further that, in his experience, models appearing in the refereed literature frequently do not prove to be either the most useful models or the models best documented or most easily transferable from one case study to another. Thus, because reports and documentation on the more useful models tend to receive only limited circulation among the profession, IIASA would seem to be well placed to act as a clearing house, or central registry, for such information.

From a review of the current models for water quality in lakes and reservoirs two weaknesses in particular can be identified:

- *The lack of adequate characterisations of sediment/water column interaction* - clearly in shallow lakes the exchange of nutrients between the benthos and water column, the resuspension of sediments, and matters pertaining to the recirculation of phosphorus, are important factors.
- *The "primitive" state of 2- and 3- spatial dimension models* as attempts at describing the extremely complex hydrodynamic circulation mechanisms in large impoundments.

The one-dimensional models for temperature profiles in small reservoirs, developed principally by Harleman and Orlob and their co-workers during the 1960's, are the models now receiving the widest application in the solution of management problems. (These management problems are frequently concerned with selective reservoir withdrawal policies and with the impact of reservoir construction on downstream water quality.) The application of the models is, however, restricted in the sense that they deal with reservoirs having large detention times with a tendency to become strongly stratified. Despite this restriction, such models have formed the platform for extensions into the field of water quality/ecology modeling - and a natural progression in complexity - so that at present we are facing the fundamental problem of whether a sufficiently comprehensive data base can be found to verify the two- and three-dimensional model forms. With respect to the high cost of data collection, and some perhaps remarkable figures are quoted later in section 2.5, the question arises as to whether models can themselves be used to define economic data collection programs. This indeed they can, especially in terms of desired sampling frequency and experiment duration; the unfortunate fact, however, is that a good experimental design is strongly dependent upon a good a priori knowledge (model) of the system's behavior.

S. Rinaldi: "An Overview of Modeling and Control of River Quality"

Professor Rinaldi introduced his presentation by remarking that he and his colleagues have approached the subject of the Workshop with a perspective that is rather different from that of Orlob. A major objective of his group's work has been to assess the usefulness of control and systems theory applications in the modeling and management of river water quality. As one of the first of several subsequently suggested modeling procedures, Rinaldi identifies three basic steps:

- *Conceptualizing the problem* - wherein "reality" is idealized as a set of simple conceptual models, such as, for example, tanks in series and in parallel, as in a conceptual hydrological model.
- *Parameter estimation* - a step which follows the correct determination of model structure - to which must be added the qualification that parameter values are to be estimated from in situ field data and that estimation of more than about ten different parameter values simultaneously is an almost intractable problem.

- *Model validation* - a step rarely attempted either because of insufficient independent data sets or because models so rarely perform adequately other than with the data for which they have been verified.

On the intractability of parameter estimation in large, complex models the existence of systematic methods of model aggregation - what we might also call model-order reduction techniques - should be noted. Such techniques permit a sensible treatment of the parameter estimation problem given fewer parameters to be evaluated. This desire for simpler models implies, in the case of inland river systems, the use of models which are in lumped-parameter, ordinary differential equation forms. Models of this kind facilitate the application, inter alia, of recursive parameter estimation, state estimation, and state reconstruction algorithms - all topics which are familiar to the control engineer but perhaps unfamiliar to the water resources engineer or sanitary engineer. Lumped-parameter models also allow a consideration of such management problems as the optimal allocation of wastewater treatment and in-stream aeration facilities, and on-line (or real-time) control of water quality. The reason why this is so is because the vast majority of control system synthesis procedures are designed for process models which have time (or some transform thereof) as the *single* independent variable.

The distinctive theme of Rinaldi's presentation is, then, one of seeking rather simple models, but not oversimplifications, which are strongly coupled to the application of the model in resolving issues of management and decision-making.

R.V. Thomann "The Need for New Directions in Water Quality Modeling: The Hazardous Substances Example"

Here the "need for new directions" is interpreted by Professor Thomann in two ways:

- The requirement for more detailed verification of already existing models.

- The need to begin to reduce the complexity of models.

To illustrate the first point the historical development of compartmental models for lakes and estuaries may be sketched. An earlier model for phytoplankton in the Potomac estuary divided the estuary into 23 segments giving a total of approximately 200 simultaneous, nonlinear differential equations to be solved. That number of equations represents merely the biogeochemical portion of the simulation and does not include any modeling of the estuary's hydrodynamical and mixing properties. By the late 1960's/early 1970's, with the transition to the study of lake systems, came the development of a model for Lake Ontario which contains some 700 equations. Hence there seems, in principle, no limit either to the number of ecological compartments or the number of spatial segments that can be accounted for in a model. The only restraint on further increases in model complexity, according to Thomann, is the quite fundamental matter of being able to comprehend the information generated by the model: imagine plotting the yearly variations of ten variables at 67 spatial locations. An analysis of the statistics for verification studies of the model yield the following result: that only by aggregation and reduction in the order of the a priori model (700 equations) can a figure of "50% verification" be increased to a figure of between "80% and 90% verification".

For the hazardous substances example, in which again the role of sediment behavior is identified as particularly important (compare with Orlob), the size of the model can expand very rapidly. Apart from the ever smaller discrete elements into which the spatial (and temporal) continuum is divided, the size of the model is also governed by more and more precise (species-specific) ecological compartments. It is the converse of this latter that brings us to Thomann's appealing concept of an ecological continuum. In other words, by introducing a further independent variable, say trophic length, where this term means the physical length of an organism, instead of further (time, space) dependent compartmental variables, there is the potential for significantly reducing model complexity. Each compartment of an ecological model represents, as it were, a discrete segment of the ecological continuum;

and trophic length, the independent variable, is interpreted as that continuum with minimum and maximum bounds given approximately by small particles and large fish respectively.

The central debate of Thomann's proposal hinges primarily upon some evaluation of the functional forms of a food-chain transfer velocity. That is to say, at what rates are the hazardous substances transferred from one point in the trophic length to another, and how are these rates expressed as functions of trophic length? A secondary debate follows from questions on the matter of field data for model verification and on the extensive data which would probably be required as input information for the model as a predictive planning tool. Since standards on permissible levels of hazardous substance concentrations are about to be made more stringent - the striped bass in Lake Ontario are already excluded from commercial fishing - any insights afforded by the model on concentration in the ecological food chain are nevertheless likely to be of considerable importance in a management context.

2.3 Rivers and Estuaries

M.B. Beck: "Mathematical Modeling of Water Quality: A Case Study in the U.K."

The purpose of the case study (the River Cam in eastern England) in this instance is that it illustrates a certain viewpoint on the modeling process. But first let us say that the modeling process can be separated into the following (compare with Rinaldi, section 2.2):

- Design and implementation of specialised experimentation
- Choice of a priori model
- Model structure identification
- Parameter estimation
- Verification
- Validation

If the problem of organizing a suitable field data base has been overcome, it is argued that model structure identification remains a fundamental technical problem. Model structure identification partly concerns the choice of the number of state variables in the model, and it is also concerned with identifying the correct form of the mathematical expressions in the state equations. Now, the view adopted is that model structure identification can be interpreted as a procedure of repeated hypothesis testing and decision making. There are two points about this view which are of some importance: firstly, it reinforces the notion that modeling is to some extent subjective - it depends on the analyst's decision to accept or reject a hypothesis (model); secondly, it emphasises the fact that the ultimate problem of modeling is the generation of a subsequent hypothesis given that the present hypothesis is inadequate.

The example of the Cam shows how a simple a priori water quality model, based essentially upon the assumptions of Streter and Phelps, evolves within the above framework into a rather more complex model for the dynamic interaction of an algal population with the river's biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations. In contrast to the author's strong reservations about further increases in model complexity, especially when the problem is circumscribed by the high level of uncertainty and inaccuracy in the field data base, a major criticism of the a posteriori model has been its lack of sophistication.

H. Stehfest: "Systems Analysis Studies on the Rhine River Quality"

Continuing along a similar theme, Stehfest addressed the question of whether one should use a complex or a simple model in an applied management context. For the case of the River Rhine it is found that the performance of a 6 compartment ecological model is marginally better than a Streeter-Phelps model in its predictions of steady-state spatial profiles of material concentrations in the German section of the river. Such a marginal difference is not a justification in itself for the exclusive use of the ecological model in the design of, say, a sanitation program for the Rhine. How sensitive, then, is any investment decision to the choice between alternative models as (conflicting) predictive tools of future conditions?

Whereas Stehfest chose to tackle a specifically management-oriented problem, it was the technical details of his modeling approach that attracted most argument. Since the said management problem focuses upon the regulation of levels of in-stream oxygen-demanding matter, it is necessary to explain why nitrification and bottom sediments are not included in either model as sinks of oxygen. The explanation is that trace pollutants substantially inhibit the development of nitrifying organisms and that the velocity of river flow rarely permits significant formation of bottom deposits. The counter to the explanation is that, although substantial nitrification may not be a current problem, it might possibly become one depending upon the particular combination (or sequence) of treatment plants specified by the design sanitation program. For instance, the installation of a partially nitrifying plant, whose discharge would "seed" the river with nitrifiers, upstream of an ammonia-rich discharge which receives no secondary biological treatment, may create potentially deoxygenating conditions in the river. If this kind of future possibility exists, then a consideration of nitrification (as an example) should be included in the model, even though we may recognize that such a part of the model cannot be verified against historical data.

D.R.F. Harleman: "A Real-time Model of the Nitrogen Cycle in Estuaries"

The first of Professor Harleman's two presentations, which in fact preceded the presentation of Stehfest, deals with a subject closely allied with the problem mentioned above. Harleman views the role of the predictive water quality model as one of supplying information to decision makers on the type and degree of treatment to be provided for waste discharges to receiving water bodies.

Yet while this design problem has been traditionally based on the concept of DO-BOD interaction, it is now widely acknowledged that decisions regarding secondary and tertiary treatment processes require a rather broader interpretation of water quality. In particular, there is concern for the removal of not only oxygen-demanding matter, but also for the removal of nutrients such as nitrogen, phosphorus and carbon. The focus of attention on the nitrogen cycle signifies the general agreement that in a majority of river and estuarine situations, nitrogen is the rate-limiting nutrient for phytoplankton growth. As example applications a model of an estuary with idealised (constant) geometry and two wastewater discharges, and a model for an analagous situation on the Potomac estuary were quoted.

The following are three of Harleman's conclusions:

- *The equivalence between models and parameter values for laboratory chemostat experiments and the field situation* - although the assumption of equivalence may provide valuable insights and orders-of-magnitude estimates for the multiplicity of parameters, the validity of the assumption is still illusive and difficult to prove.
- *Coupling the biochemistry with the correct hydrodynamical model* - an averaged form of the system's hydrodynamics should not be substituted into an essentially biochemical model; if any averaging is required then it should be carried out in an a posteriori fashion on the output of a combined hydrodynamical/biochemical model for water quality.
- *Field data collection is a most critical problem* - given limited financial support and facilities it is better, at least for an estuarine system, to channel efforts in the direction of measuring temporal variations at a few field spatial locations, than to attempt boat cruises which cover a large number of spatial locations for very short periods of time.

2.4 Hydrothermal Problems and Waste Heat Discharges

D.R.F. Harleman: "Hydrothermal Studies on Reservoirs Used for Power Station Cooling"

We can perhaps draw upon the first of Harleman's three earlier conclusions (section 2.3) to introduce this his second presentation. The essence of the modeling approach adopted is that a physical laboratory model of the reservoir is constructed and by reference to this physical model a mathematical model is developed. The resulting mathematical model is then evaluated with field data from the actual reservoir. The objective for the application of the model, specifically a model for Lake Anna in Virginia, is to predict vertical temperature profiles and to assess the effectiveness of the reservoir as a cooling pond. The given basis for verification is three year's of field data describing conditions prior to the sequential installation of four 1100 megawatt units of electrical capacity.

The analysis of the laboratory reservoir model reveals two salient features: that for reservoirs with an appreciable inflow and outflow (small detention times) temperature profiles are relatively insensitive to vertical diffusion; and that since surface temperatures are also insensitive to assumptions about vertical diffusivity, it makes little sense to test vertical diffusion models on the basis of surface temperature data. In the case of Lake Anna, which has low inflows and outflows, the surface temperature behavior can be adequately modeled by incorporating an algorithm for the simulation of wind-mixing effects, thus relaxing the sensitivity of the model to assumptions about constant or variable vertical diffusion coefficients.

The solution of the wast heat management problem, which itself involves further development of some basic thermal circulation models, suggests that a small isolated (or nearly isolated) "hot pond" section of the reservoir can effect the major portion of the heat dissipation without undue elevation of the main reservoir temperatures.

O. Vasiliev: "Numerical Models for Hydrothermal Analysis of Water Bodies"

One of the primary purposes of Professor Vasiliev's presentation was to review the developments leading to current investigations of three- and two-dimensional models for analysis of the hydrothermal behavior of water bodies. In this Vasiliev paid particular attention to the contributions of the Institute of Hydrodynamics in Novosibirsk on the prediction of hydrodynamical and temperatural phenomena in cooling water bodies.

For many practical applications there has been, and continues to be, a widespread use of (physical) laboratory hydraulic models (compare with Harleman) for examination both of the water body to be used as a cooling pond and of the more detailed behavior to be expected in the vicinity of intake and outlet structures. There are, however, certain notable limitations on such models: they do not simulate fully all the interactions of the hydrodynamical and hydrothermal processes; and they cannot take into account the effects of wind action on the water body, which determine the two important features of free surface evaporation rates and convective heat exchange through the surface.

A three-dimensional transient (mathematical) model is thus proposed for the characterization of unsteady hydrothermal processes wherein stratification is described via a Boussinesq approximation. One variant of the model includes horizontal turbulent exchange and the other does not. The representation of salinity variations, and their effects on the density distribution, may be adjoined to the basic model if necessary. The coefficients of turbulent exchange are determined by using the turbulence energy balance equation. The problem is numerically solved by the method of fractional steps with the aid of an implicit difference scheme. A method of numerical realization of the latter variant was briefly described and some results of practical computations for cooling water bodies were reported.

There are possibilities for reducing the three-dimensional model to a two-dimensional approximation either by depth averaging or width-averaging. Preliminary results are available for the application of such an approximate three-dimensional model to the Ekibastuz No. 1 Thermal Power Plant cooling reservoir, in Kazahstan (USSR), for the prediction of velocity and temperature distributions.

J. Jacquet: "Studies in France on Water Quality Modeling"

The guiding principles of the water quality modeling studies reported by Jacquet are those concerned with the siting of power plants and with evaluating the effects of temperature changes on an ecosystem. A major objective is to predict, as in Harleman's second presentation, the differences in behavior between the natural and the man-modified system. To meet this objective, models have been developed for prediction of both the near-field and far-field temperature distributions which result from a waste heat discharge. An additional desirable function of these models is the capability of predicting statistical distributions of temperatures. In other words, given historical distributions and sequences of hydrometeorological data, the models are employed to generate time-series of stream temperature in much the same way as hydrologists have been concerned with stream flow forecasting. Both the Seine and Rhone rivers are examples of where this latter kind of modeling has been applied.

A more intensive investigation of water/atmosphere exchanges and the development of thermoclines and reservoir stratification has been initiated. By a fortuitous circumstance a lake formed in an extinct volcano - and therefore the lake has no watershed provided an excellent experimental facility for these purposes. Elsewhere water quality modeling activities are being extended from the basis of temperature models to a consideration of dissolved oxygen models, with special reference to the impact of artifically elevated stream temperatures on increased photosynthetic production. This line of approach thus reflects the historical progression of water quality models reviewed by Orlob (see section 2.2).

2.5 Lakes and Reservoirs

S.E. Jørgensen: "Water Quality Modeling of Lakes"

In this presentation Dr. Jørgensen offered the third, and perhaps most detailed strategy for water quality modeling (compare with Rinaldi, section 2.2, and Beck, section 2.3). This strategy for modeling is composed of the following steps:

- Definition of the goal for model development and application.
- Selection of the state variables
- Development of conceptual flow diagrams
- Development of system state equations
- Parameter sensitivity analysis
- Calibration of model with field data
- Validation of model with a second and further independent set(s) of field data.

The key question to be addressed is one of determining a "sufficient" complexity of the model which meets the stated goal for model application. Broadly speaking, the term "complexity" is interpreted as the number of state variables and the "goal" is specified as the response of the ecological system, e.g., phytoplankton growths, to a change in nutrient input loadings. In order to confer a quantitative value on the notion of sufficient complexity, the concept of ecological buffer capacity is introduced. We can intuitively relate such a concept to the stated goal of the modeling exercise, and formally ecological buffer capacity can be expressed and computed in terms of the exergy of the ecological system. In fact it is more precise to say that exergy, the mechanical energy equivalent of distance from thermodynamic equilibrium, is found to be correlated with ecological buffer capacity. The contribution of each state variable to the total exergy is calculated from given field observations and selection may be made between those variables which make a significant contribution and those which do not. For example, this kind of analysis of a eutrophication model yields the conclusions that sediment is significant but the division of zooplankton into two classes is not significant. Notice here, however, that the analyst is once again involved in a subjective judgment on the required level of model complexity: he must make a decision on what is and what is not significant.

P.G. Whitehead: "Designing the Model to Suit the Nature of the Problem and the Field Data"

Dr. Whitehead's discussion focused upon two Australian case studies:

- The modeling and management of estuarine systems - Western Port Bay, Victoria.
- Analysis of effluent disposal and entrophication problems in the Murrumbidgee - Burrinjuck Lake System, Canberra.

The title of Whitehead's presentation is an adequate statement of his attitude to water quality modeling. The question of sufficient complexity of the model is clearly related to the objective for model application: otherwise, from the basis of an essentially simpl a priori model, the approach is to increase model complexity only when additional dominant modes of behavior can be identified from the given field data. An important feature of this approach is its recognition of the difficulties of distinguishing "deterministic" properties of the system from the substantial uncertainty in the observed system behavior.

As an illustration of the fundamental relationship between models and modeling objectives the Western Port Bay Study demonstrates a certain inconsistency. A simple steady-state water quality model for the inland catchment area, which would describe generally the long-term effects of urban and industrial development, was connected to a three-dimensional dynamic water quality model for the bay. The considerable computational effort of solving the latter does not appear to be justified either in terms of the study's objectives, that is to determine average, long-term impacts of development, or in terms of the input information originating from the steady-state catchment water quality model. In this case a better alternative formulation, according to Whitehead, is the development of a highly aggregated, lumped-parameter, input/output model for salinity distribution in the estuary/bay area.

The mention of an input/output model and its usual association with black box models raises the opportunity to point out a common tendency for misunderstanding. A black box model of system behavior does not necessarily imply a completely stochastic model for there is as much determinism about the relationship between measured (input) disturbance and measured (output) response in a black box model as there is in an internally descriptive, or mechanistic model. Equally so, an internally descriptive model should not preclude some account of the random processes which are inevitably a part of any system's behavior.

V.J. Bierman: "Comments on Water Quality Modeling: Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron, as an Example Study"

The emphasis in Bierman's presentation is underlined in two conclusions:

- That close cooperation is necessary between modelers and experimentalists.
- And that data requirements place a practical upper limit on the complexity of water quality models.

Perhaps "data requirements" in this second point may be interpreted as financial requirements: during the period 1974-76, more than 250,000 data points were obtained from Saginaw Bay at a cost of approximately one million dollars.

A single segment model for the inner portion of Saginaw Bay differentiates the representation of the Bay's ecological system into 5 phytoplankton types, 2 zooplankton types, higher predators, and the three nutrients, phosphorus, nitrogen, and silicon. Two of the primary reasons for choosing this level of (a priori) complexity are that different classes of algae have very different nutrient requirements and that not all of these classes have the same nuisance characteristics. In the course of testing the model against field data interaction between experimental work and model evaluation occurred in a number of forms.

- Since conventional chlorophyll measurements would not provide adequate field data for model calibration, an experimental program for measuring phytoplankton cell volumes was initiated; this permits the resolution of field data into the required categories of phytoplankton species.
- A notably poor correspondence between model response and field measurements was identified as a consequence of unrepresentative sampling occasioned by thick mats of blue-green algae on the water surface.
- Sixteen laboratory chemostat experiments were conducted which explored phytoplankton growth-rate limitation as control was progressively transferred from nitrogen to phosphorus; this permits the acceptance of the hypothesis that a (single substrate) threshold growth kinetics function be employed in the lake model in preference to the use of a (multiple substrate) multiplicative growth kinetics function.

Two of the above points illustrate problems of a more general character. Firstly, note that verification of the model against field observations must sometimes take account of the fact that all elements of the model state vector, e.g., phytoplankton species, are not linearly observed, or are only observed in an aggregative fashion, e.g., by chlorophyll-a measurements. And secondly, although Bierman uses the threshold growth hypothesis, he admits that the number of parameter values to be estimated in the model will allow the multiplicative growth hypothesis to be suitably fitted to the data. In other words, the number of parameters in a model are equivalent to the degrees of freedom available for matching the model to the data.

As a final comment we may remark that (a posteriori) the differentiation between phytoplankton species is most important for distinguishing the behavior of diatoms from the behavior of all other species.

3. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES IN WATER QUALITY MODELING

Is it possible then, to draw any conclusions about the "state-of-the-art" in water quality modeling? Since the title of the preceding section alludes only to salient problems, it might be assumed that the current status of the subject is more one of problems than one of solutions. This is perhaps a misleading view for the following reason. The present state of a subject can only be properly judged on the basis of the historical development of that subject. At the same time it is necessary to judge how the present will determine the likely future of water quality modeling. These are indeed difficult judgements to make. The history of water quality modeling is relatively easy to trace within one particular scientific or engineering discipline, for example, from the sanitary engineering viewpoint. The difficulty, however, is that besides a sanitary/public health engineering background, the history of water quality modeling has been shaped by almost quite separate and independent contributions from the limnological, microbiological, ecological, and hydrological sciences. A part of the present problem, therefore, even in so basic a matter as the rather confused terminology, is the multidisciplinary nature of water quality modeling which in some ways has obscured the historical perspective.

Although we might still anticipate a unification of the subject's literature, a primary conflict for the future, as gauged by this Workshop, may be one of reaching for accuracy through further model complexity, yet striving for applicability through simplification of already existing models. The well-documented case study would seem to be the most desirable kind of model development exercise since it indicates that water quality modeling tends to be problem-oriented and that some form of experimental data collection program will be undertaken. One might observe that hitherto field data in the form of time-series, and the aplication of techniques of time-series analysis and system identification have not been a principal feature of water quality modeling. It might further be expected that future studies will concentrate on integrating water quality models with hydrological models for rainfall-runoff/river flow prediction as the application of models moves towards problems of regional river basin management. In the past there has also been a distinct lack of overlap between models describing those water quality characteristics which are affected by waste disposal and models describing those water quality characteristics which affect the suitability of river water for industrial, municipal, and domestic consumption. A particularly good example of this is dissolved oxygen concentration, so often quoted as the central index of water quality with respect to the effects of effluent discharges, yet a variable which is not in itself a vitally important characteristic in establishing whether river water is fit for human consumption. Models which do not possess this required combination of waste assimilation and public health considerations are inadequate in the sense that they do not allow the problems and opportunities of water re-use in a river basin to be properly explored.

4. REPORTS FROM THE AD HOC WORKING GROUPS

This section reproduces the concluding reports and recommendations from the nine ad hoc working groups which appraised water quality modeling activities under the following classifications:

(1) Deep Lakes and Reservoirs

(2) Shallow Lakes and Reservoirs

(3) Application of Systems Analysis to Eutrophication Problems of Rivers, Lakes, and Reservoirs.

(4) River Systems

(5) Hydrothermal Processes and Thermal Pollution

(6) Estuaries, Coastal Waters, and Inland Seas

(7) Water Quality Planning and Management

(8) Impact of Toxic Pollutants

(9) Systems Methods in Model Development and Analysis

4.1 Deep Lakes and Reservoirs (G.T. Orlob)

During the discussion two major topics were treated:

- o Objectives of IIASA's program of in-house research for the next several years, and
- o Topics for discussion at a special IIASA workshop on "Hydrothermal Process of Deep Lakes and Reservoirs"--subsequently to be held at IIASA in December, 1977 [see Jørgensen and Harleman (1978)].

The setting up of possible task force groups was also considered. The results of these discussions are presented in the form of tentative recommendations, as follows:

In-house Research at IIASA

Research related to modeling of deep lakes and reservoirs should emphasize the resolution of such problems as:

(a) Identification of internal mixing processes and estimation of mixing in terms of measurable in situ properties of the limnological system, e.g., temperature, salinity, and suspended solids, affecting density or velocities (water and wind) and water levels.

(b) Effects of hydrodynamic behavior on biological (ecological) behavior, e.g., effects of thermal stratification in limiting exchange of nutrients in the water column, and effects of internal mixing on nutrient exchange between deposited sediments and the overlying water column.

(c) Characterization of stratified flows in deep, narrow (2D) lakes, i.e., problems where hydromechanical behavior and water quality (density influences) are closely coupled. Examples of interest--destratification.

(d) Influence of major inflows (or outflows) on vertical and longitudinal (or lateral) distribution of water quality in lake or reservoir.

(e) Formation of ice cover, both freezing and thawing processes, and its influence on hydromechanical and ecological processes within the impoundment.

(f) Transfer (or diffusion) of nutrients between sediment in suspension or at rest near the bottom of a deep impoundment and the overlying water column.

(g) Type of model best suited to simulation of water quality processes, i.e., single versus multiparameter models.

The Workshop on Geophysical and Ecological Modeling of Deep Lakes and Reservoirs, 12-15 December, 1977, (specification by M. Markofsky)

The workshop, as proposed, should address the following topics:

(a) Boundary conditions--surface (0_2, $C0_2$, heat transfer benthal, runoff);

(b) Thermal stratification--winter regime;

(c) Numerical methods;

(d) Water quality--limiting parameter versus total cycle description--theory and application;

(e) Retention time in stratified lakes;

(f) Field data collection techniques for model verification and their limitations;

(g) Pumped storage reservoirs;

(h) Construction of reservoirs--water quality constraints;

(i) Reservoir systems;

(j) Reservoir management (selective withdrawal, artificial mixing and oxygenation, pre-and in-reservoir treatment;

(k) Artificial destratification;

(l) Lake description and model choice.

A Possible Task Force Group

This would consider education of decision-makers in the form of "guidelines" for the use of ecological models. Thus, the possible titles "Are BOD-DO Models Enough for Water Quality Prediction in Lakes and Reservoirs", or "Beyond Streeter Phelps--Water Quality Models of Lakes and Reservoirs" were suggested for the Task Force Seminars.

Group Members: G.T. Orlob, USA (Chairman)
M. Markofsky, FRG (Vice Chairman)
E. Bogdanov, Bulgaria
G. Dinelli, Italy
B. Georgiev, Bulgaria
K. Kinnuen, Finland

4.2 Shallow Lakes and Reservoirs (P. Mauersberger)

This report divides into three categories.

Some Characteristic Features of Shallow Lakes

(a) Shallow lakes are strongly affected by wind and wave active. In spite of this fact they may be stratified at least for short periods. This has significant consequences for the ecological system.

(b) Wind is a stochastic "impact" and a primary forcing function. Wave action is also a stochastic process and has an important influence on mixing.

(c) Mass transport processes along the verticle axis are of great importance, especially for the exchange of nutrients between the water body and the sediments.

(d) Binding and movement of nutrients in the sediments plays an important role in the cycling of matter and in bioproduction. The release of nutrients from sediments has (significantly through fish at the bottom) a direct influence on the entire water column.

(e) The water body and type of sediments may also show horizontal gradients.

Research Problems

(a) Hydrodynamics of transport and diffusion processes:

  - Vertical transport in the water column and across the water--sediment interface (IIASA is asked if it can contribute to this research).

(b) Ecological modeling:

  - Evaluation of available data by simple models including sensitivity analysis;
  - Improvement of measuring methods and improvement in the volume and quality of data, e.g., data concerning the binding and movement of phosphorus (research external to IIASA);
  - Further development of ecological models of (shallow) lakes taking into account the binding and movement of nutrients in the sediments.

Case Studies

Representatives of the NMO's of CSSR, GDR, Hungary, Netherlands and UK propose:

- to intensify the exchange of preprints, reprints and reports;
- to improve the availability of data;
- to organize collaboration through IIASA.

IIASA and its NMO's are encouraged to take part in these activities.

Group Members: P. Mauersberger, GDR (Chairman)
J. Davis, UK
J. Fischer, Hungary
L. Lijklema, Netherlands

4.3 Application of Systems Analysis to Eutrophication Problems of Rivers, Lakes, and Reservoirs (S.E. Jørgensen)

The group proposes that IIASA should conduct a study of lake and river ecology using well documented case studies for inter-comparison of different types of eutrophication models. These case studies need therefore to establish comprehensive data bases at IIASA for testing the models.

The data base must be broad enough to ensure adequate verification as well as validation of the models for each case study and should, if possible, contain a major perturbation of the system, such as a major effluent discharge, so that the predictive capability of the models can be assessed.

The models must be transferred to IIASA as working versions of various documented models.

The project should be carried out by a working group at IIASA with additional assistance from those Institutes or organizations which provide either data for case studies or working versions of models. Such assistance could be realized by short-terms visits to IIASA.

The aims of this project are:

(a) To assess the role that system analysis methods can have in the study of eutrophication;

(b) To identify the structure of a eutrophication model;

(c) To assess the degree of model complexity required to describe the system adequately;

(d) To assess which methods of systems analysis are most suitable to identify the model mechanisms and to estimate model parameters;

(e) To provide understanding of the ecological mechanisms of importance for the eutrophication process;

(f) To examine the transferability of models: although a general model does not exist, it might be possible to transfer parts of models from one case to another.

Several members of the working group have expressed that they are willing to contribute comprehensive data bases as well as documented models.

The selected case studies should include alpine lakes, rivers, shallow lakes and reservoirs; and at least some of the case studies to be considered should not contain spatial variability, since the available methods of analysis can more easily be developed in the context of lumped-parameter models.

This program is considered to be of great interest and could be implemented under UNESCO's Man and Biosphere Project 5--Inland Waters. Consequently, it is suggested that the International Co-ordinating Council of "Man and Biosphere" be informed of this project. (The next session of this Council was planned for 26 October - 1 November, 1977, in Vienna.)

Group Members: S.E. Jørgensen, Denmark (Chairman)
V.J. Bierman, US
J. Davis, UK
H. Löffler, Austria
P. Mauersbeger, GDR
S. Rinaldi, Italy
H. Stehfest, FRG
P.G. Whitehead, Australia

4.4 River Systems (M.B. Beck)

As might be expected this summary report is beset with the problem of delivering a coherent and fair review of the many and diverse interests which were actively discussed. A general observation, however, would be that the Group found it difficult to establish how its interests and IIASA's position could be made compatible within the scope of collaborative studies. The summary sets out, therefore, to catalogue the interests expressed and is concluded by some suggestions for unifying themes.

Interests

(a) The discussion commenced with a desire to stress the similarities between lakes and river systems, particularly so in certain equivalent respects of nutrient and phytoplankton behavior.

(b) Part of the group agreed that methods of system identification and parameter estimation should be applied to well documented case studies.

(c) Others felt that there was a pressing need to clarify the respective performances of the various river water quality models before proceeding with increased model complexity. Indeed there was the possibility that this could be done with data made available at the Institute.

(d) A fourth interest expressed by more than one individual was the suggestion that the "systems" approach could be used to analyze the impact of large civil engineering construction on river basin water quality (specific examples such as successive impoundment of parts of the Rhine and Danube were given).

(e) Several participants thought that real-time operations, i.e., on-line forecasting and control, were an important facet of potential collaborative projects to be undertaken in Task 2.

(f) Although with limited resources only a minimal effort could be expended in this direction, two participants remarked upon the lack of general discussion of the relationships between wastewater treatment and river water quality.

(g) Lastly, but by no means the least significant comment, we felt that consideration of "philosophical" aspects of modeling should not be ignored. Among the philosophical aspects we suspect that a trade-off exists between model complexity and model accuracy; we disagreed about the transferability of models from one system to another; and the opinion was expressed that stochastic features of modeling should receive much more attention in the future.

Suggestions

Upon reflection many of the seven above points fall naturally within the scheme of in-house IIASA studies. However, with respect to collaborative undertakings the most easily accommodated themes are those relating to model comparisons against the same field data set [point (c)], and the exchange of ideas about fundamental problems of modeling.

Group Members: M.B. Beck, UK (Co-Chairman)
S. Rinaldi, Italy (Co-Chairman)
W.J. Grenney, USA
G. Huthmann, FRG
M. Kozak, Hungary
R. Krasnodebski, Poland
N. Matsche, Austria
G. Pinter, Hungary
H. Stehfest, FRG
P.G. Whitehead, Australia

4.5 Hydrothermal Processes and Thermal Pollution (D.R.F. Harleman)

The following topics were suggested by representatives of National Member Organizations as areas for future cooperative research in conjunction with IIASA.

Condenser Water Discharges into a River

Specifically river bank discharges (at various angles relative to the axis of river) in relatively shallow water in which the thermal plume is expected to be attached to the near river bank. Specific problems and possible case studies mentioned were on the Vistula River in Poland and on rivers in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria (where additional problems will arise due to future increase in river depth and reduction of velocity as a consequence of downstream dam construction).

From the conclusions of the Workshop discussions, there are two potentially useful models under development by other members of IIASA; namely, VINTRI and TRIMI - models reported by Dinelli, ENEL (Italy) and Sündermann and Fischer (Hannover, FRG). These are 3-dimensional models, incorporating buoyancy effects, but must be considered as far-field models because of difficulties with the turbulence closure problem related to momentum jet entrainment. Near-field effects may be treated by experimental and analytical studies conducted at MIT (Harleman) and Karlsruhe (Naudascher).

A Specific Proposal: that a meeting at IIASA be organized in November 1977 [subsequently held during November, and reported by D.R.F. Harleman)] for interested individuals to initiate cooperative research, possibly involving periods of residence at IIASA by representatives of both model developers and users.

Use of Lakes and Reservoirs in Conjunction with Electric Energy Production

a) Review state of the art in predicting hydrothermal effects of waste heat addition to ponds, lakes and impoundments. This includes criteria for stratification, effects of wind and internal dikes, surface heat exchange with elevated temperatures, and consumptive water use. Comparison of models developed at MIT, Novosibirsk and others with field data (e.g., from Commonwealth Edison cooling ponds and Lake Anna).

b) Effect of pumped-storage operations with daily cycling of large inflows and outflows on temperature distribution and water quality.

An Italian group is interested in eutrophication due to the accumulation of nutrients in the case of two artificial lakes (upper and lower reservoirs) receiving make-up water (to replace evaporation) from an adjacent river. Otherwise, long-term data on pumped storage reservoirs, as mentioned by a UK representative (J. Davis), may be of interest.

Group Members: D.R.F. Harleman, USA (Chairman)
G. Abraham, Netherlands
E. Bogdanov, Bulgaria
W. Czernuszenko, Poland
G. Dinelli, Italy
K. Fischer, FRG
B. Georgiev, Bulgaria
J. Sündermann, FRG
L. Zahrer, Austria

4.6 Estuaries, Coastal Waters, and Inland Seas (R.V. Thomann)

Recommendations for Further IIASA Activities

a) Sediment transport and water quality, including such topics as transport of nutrients, toxics attached to sediments, bed-sediment interactions, turbidity motions (provided the sediment transport itself is sufficiently well described).

b) Effect of treatment on model coefficients; should the parameters be changed during the investigation?

c) Mixing behavior of stratified flows, including the proper modeling of turbulence and dispersion phenomena.

d) Optimization of total system treatment (including receiving water).

e) Interaction of water quality and fishery resources, e.g., the question of migrating species in transition zones.

f) Hydrodynamic and water quality models operate normally within different scales. Thus how do we convert the fine grid information on the hydrodynamics to the coarse grid of quality models?

g) Case studies

- Criteria for selection of cases:

- Sufficient, well-documented data base (including the inputs);
- Collaboration possible;
- Not too complicated (from the point of view of geometry);
- Well-posed problem (with some chance of success).

- o Proposed Areas
  - The Odra entrance;
  - Near shore zones [in the Baltic(?)];
  - The Black Sea;
  - The Mediterranean(?);
- o Construction of data base at the IIASA(?).

Other questions to be discussed (but not as subjects for recommendation) are:

- Review of water quality management decisions already made (post audit);
- Objective measures for the quality of models;
- Which constituents in water quality modeling and why?

Group Members: R.V. Thomann, USA (Chairman)
G. Abraham, Netherlands
K. Cederwall, Sweden
N. Chlubek, Poland
G. Dinelli, Italy
K. Fischer, FRG
J. Sündermann, FRG

4.7 Water Quality Planning and Management (D.P. Loucks)

There seems to be two general types of water quality models. One type results from a desire to achieve a more comprehensive and complete understanding of the physical, biochemical, and ecological processes that take place in water bodies that receive potential pollutants or nutrients.

In our view IIASA should not attempt to undertake a major program in this type of model development (which might be classified as a form of basic research).

The second type of water quality model is oriented toward planning, management and/or real-time control. The core of such models are derived from the first type of water quality predictive model, but are usually simplified versions of them. In the case of planning models there are variables representing various management alternatives and their economic and other impacts. For water quality planning and control the simplest model that provides the information needed seems to be the best model. (It is no accident that most consultants appear to use some form of the Streeter-Phelps model for dissolved oxygen and BOD prediction, or the rational formula for runoff prediction, since they are easily understood and do not require extremely expensive data collection and analysis exercises.) Can decision-makers appreciate, for example, the difference between a minimum dissolved oxygen concentration of 4.5 or 3.5 mg/l or a reliability of 90 or 95%? We suspect not, especially given the impact that institutional or bureaucratic objectives and future economic and technologic uncertainties have on the planning process.

In our view, IIASA is in an excellent position to make a contribution in water quality management and control modeling, specifically towards developing experience in assessing the appropriateness of various models to various planning problems or situations. The best model will depend on the information needed, which will differ for different water bodies, on management alternatives and on possible institutional objectives and constraints. Only through case studies can we learn more about how to predict the appropriate model complexity and how to improve the quality of information derived from models for the planning process. We understand IIASA has made contacts with some organizations in member countries who wish assistance in using models to help evaluate water quality management alternatives of actual river systems. We strongly urge IIASA to pursue these contacts and become involved in case studies in water quality planning.

Another significant improvement in the state-of-the-art of water quality management modeling could come from the development of models that can be used when planning objectives are unknown at the beginning of the planning process, and change during the process. Research is also needed in the combined interactive use of optimization models for preliminary definition and evaluation of alternatives, and more complex simulation models for more detailed and precise evaluation. We believe IIASA could contribute to this needed systems methodology.

Group Members: P. Loucks, USA (Chairman)
L. de Mare, Sweden
M.J. Gromiec, Poland.

4.8 Impact of Toxic Pollutants (M.J. Gromiec)

Many water quality constituents are toxic at certain concentrations and interact directly with living components of the ecological system thus causing death or severe stress to these components, and limiting the use of water resources.

A state-of-the-art of water quality models for toxic pollutants is in a preliminary state of development. However, a few water quality models are currently available for various toxicants. In addition, a body of literature exists in the area of modeling the fate of radioactive substances in the environment. Also, functions relating toxic pollutant concentration, type of exposure, and survival or effect are available from literature on toxicity and may be incorporated into water quality models.

With growing industrialization and an increasing number of new toxic compounds there is a great need for development of water quality/ecological system models which could be used for prediction of safety levels and for establishement of water quality criteria. The area of possible investigations should include:

a) heavy metals;

b) chlorinated hydrocarbons, oils;

c) pesticides, herbicides, and insecticides;

d) new toxic organic compounds together with their biodegradability;

e) radionucleides.

It is proposed that a small working group be established to clarify and refine the necessary directions for toxic substance model development at IIASA. This group would

a) review present state of modeling and related models in water areas;

b) determine case study candidates and data bases;

c) suggest a specific program of model development to IIASA.

This group should complete its work within six months.

Group Members: M.J. Gromiec, Poland (Chairman)
S.E. Jørgensen, Denmark
C. von Stempel, FRG
R.V. Thomann, USA.

4.9 Systems Methods in Model Development and Analysis (E. Halfon)

Objective

If one or more case studies are agreed upon and a data set is available, then the members of this group will provide their expertise in model development and its verification.

Methods

a) Identification of a black box nonlinear model by the GMDH (Group Method of Data Handling) Method; this will provide information on the relative influence of the state variables and thus an estimation of the model order and structure.

b) Identification of model structure by stability analysis and modeling in state space.

c) Estimation of model parameters; definition of an ecologically valid objective function and the weights to be used--a corollary of this research might be the verification* of a model.

d) Other identification methods.

e) Coordination of research so that the results are ecologically valid; also comparison of results of many methods on one set of data can produce insight on the system and help other researchers in model development.

f) These techniques can also be used in model verification and thus the group can contribute in standardization of methods for model verification and validation.

Rationale

The fact that the group can work on the same data set implies that the results can be compared. Also, each investigator will be able to contribute to the project from his own institute without loss of continuity. Further individual or group visits to IIASA will result in productive research.

If a test case is agreed upon and provided scientists will be working on this case at IIASA, then collaboration with other groups could be significant. In addition, since this group is interested in methodological (systems) problems, then collaboration with several groups (research projects) can be initiated.

Group Members: E. Halfon (Chairman)
N. Adachi, Japan
J. de Graan, Netherlands
R. Krasnodebski, Poland
H. Tamura, Japan

---

*The Group defines verification as a set of tests made to establish that the developed model works as expected.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this closing statement on the Workshop it is appropriate to try and illustrate how the recommendations of the Working Group discussions are being, or can be, accommodated within the research activities of the Institute. When the Workshop was originally conceived, it was seen as an opportunity for gathering interest and participation in the development and application of water quality models. Where participation is possible it should clearly be viewed in the context of *collaborative research* which both encompasses and stimulates those studies conducted at Laxenburg by the in-house, core, research staff. An oft-quoted criticism of our research plans is that they address too big a problem (or problems) with too little manpower. So if we were to respond to all the suggestions listed throughout this report we should indeed be attempting once again to spread our resources too widely over too large an area of activity. It is true that global or universal problems are the subjects of our research plan; yet we recognize that what can be achieved is no more than the sum total of the efforts of just a few individuals. It is also true that we are not insensitive to the carefully reasoned counsel of the Workshop discussion and Working Group reports - how, therefore, are the future plans for the Task a response to this advice? In fact, the number of directions in which this Task, "Models for Environmental Quality Control and Management (Hydrophysical and Ecological Models for Water Quality)", could proceed is remarkable for its size and great variety. The following are a sample of the additional and modified foci of attention which are currently being drafted into a longer-term (five-year) research plan.

Perhaps most significantly, the Hungarian delegation to the Institute's Council Meeting of November, 1977, proposed Lake Balaton as a specific water quality case study in which the objectives would eventually be to manage the problems of eutrophication through the application of systems analysis (compare with section 4.3). The agreement reached between the Hungarian institutions and IIASA delineates the following areas for cooperation:

- Comparison of existing eutrophication models against field data for Lake Balaton (compare with section 4.3).
- Development and application of improved models with special reference to phosphorus exchange between water and bottom sediments, to stochastic non-point nutrient loading, and to wind-induced mixing mechanisms (compare with section 4.2).

Two case studies from Task 1 of Resources and the Environment, "Regional Water Management", intersect with the topic of water quality managment (compare with section 4.7). It is hoped that a study located in Sweden will permit the exploitation of water quality models at the planning/design phase of management, while a joint proejct with the Ohre River Board in Czechoslovakia may call upon the use of water quality models in a real-time operational forecasting and control situation (compare with section 4.4). Elsewhere, time-series field data available from experimental programs in the UK will facilitate the realistic application of system identification and parameter estimation techniques in model development (compare with section 4.9).

For the intermediate future a need can be identified for work to be initiated in the area of estuaries and coastal waters (compare with section 4.6), if the Task is to achieve its objectives for a balanced and comprehensive coverage of case studies in water quality modeling. And lastly, as a topic arising naturally from studies of the impact of waste discharges on the environment, a significant re-orientation of the Task might be provided by the problem of modeling the movement of toxic substances through aquatic ecosystems (compare with section 4.8). In any event, the intention to seek advice and participation in those matters may be clearly stated once again. We expect that the ad hoc Working Groups, though not formally constituted, will be equally responsive.

REFERENCES

Harleman D.R.F. (1977), *Models for Waste Heat Management in Rivers*, Summary Report on a Working Group Meeting, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, November.

Jørgensen S.E. and Harleman D.R.F. (1978), *Geophysical and Ecological Modeling of Deep Lakes and Reservoirs*, Workshop Report, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg.

APPENDIX 1: WORKSHOP AGENDA

Tuesday, 13 September	10.00	OPENING ADDRESS by Dr. R. Levien, Director of IIASA.
	10.30 -11.15	Overview of IIASA's research on *Resources and Environment*, by Prof. O. Vasiliev, IIASA.
	11.30 -12.30	*State-of-the-Art Review of Mathematical Modeling of Surface Water Impoundments*, by G.T. Orlob.
	14.30	*A Real-Time Model of the Nitrogen-Cycle in Estuaries*, by D.R.F. Harleman.
	15.30 -16.15	*An Overview of Modeling and Control of River Quality*, by S. Rinaldi.
	16.30 -17.30	Informal Presentations by Workshop Participants representing IIASA National Member Organizations.
Wednesday, 14 September	09.00	*Numerical Models for Hydrothermal Analysis of Water Bodies*, by O. Vasiliev.
	09.45 -10.45	*The Need for New Directions in Water Quality Modeling: The Hazardous Substances Example*, by R.V. Thomann.
	11.00	*Studies in France on Water Quality Modeling*, by J. Jacquet.
	11.45 -12.30	Informal Presentations by Workshop Participants representing IIASA National Member Organizations.
	14.30 -17.30	Ad hoc Working Group Discussions

Thursday 15 September	09.00	*Information on IIASA's State-of-the-Art Survey of Water Quality Modeling,* by G.T. Orlob.
	09.45	*Mathematical Modelling of Water Quality; A Case Study in the U.K.,* by M.B. Beck.
	10.45	*Water Quality Model of Lake Biwa and the Yodo River System,* by N. Adachi.
	11.15 -12.30	*Modeling Activities in Canada,* by E. Halfon.
		Water Quality Modeling in Hungary, by G. Pinter.
		Application of Water Quality Models, by M. Kozak.
		Water Quality Modeling in Finland, by K. Kinnuen.
		Work in Italy on Water Quality Problems Arising from Industrial Plant Effluents, by G. Dinelli.
	15.45 -17.30	*Review of the Activities in Water Quality Modeling in FRG,* by G. Huthmann.
		Water Quality Modeling in Czechoslovakia, by J. Habrovski.
		Mathematical Modeling Case Studies in Utah, by W.J. Grenney.
		A Scheme for Optimal Water Quality Control in a River System, by R. Krasnodebski.
		Modeling and Identification of River Quality Systems Using Distributed Lag Models, by H. Tamura.

Friday, 16 September	09.00	*Water Quality Modeling of Lakes,* by S.E. Jørgensen.
	09.30 -12.30	*Examples of Water Quality Modeling in the GDR,* by P. Mauersberger.
		Water Quality Modeling of Lake Balaton, by J. Fisher.
		Comments on Water Quality Modeling: Saginaw Bay, Lake Huran, as an Example Study, by V.J. Bierman.
		Hydrothermal Studies on Reservoirs Used for Power Station Cooling, by D.R.F. Harleman.
		Water Quality Problems and Recent Studies in Bulgaria, by B.V. Georgiev.
		Solving the Convection Diffusion Equation by Means of a Monte Carlo Method, by J. Sündermann.
		Water Quality Modeling in Austria, by N. Matsche.
		Designing the Model to Suit the Nature of the Problem and the Field Data, by P.G. Whitehead.
	14.30 -16.00	Closing Session: formulation of conclusions and reports from ad hoc Working Groups.

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

V.J. Bierman
Environmental Projection Agency
9311 Groh Road
Grosse Ile, Michigan 48138
USA

W.J. Grenney
Utah Water Research Laboratory
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322
USA

D.R.F. Harleman
Ralph M. Parsons Laboratory
for Water Resources and Hydrodynamics
Dept. of Civil Engineering,
Bldg. 48-311
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
USA

D.P. Loucks
School of Civil & Environmental
Engineering, Cornell University
Hollister Ithaca, New York 14853
USA

G.T. Orlob
Resource Management Associates
3706 Mt. Diablo Blvd. Suite 200
Lafayette, California 94549
USA

R. Reynolds
California Department of Water
Resources
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California
USA

R.V. Thomann
Manhattan College
Environmental Engineering and
Science Graduate Program
Bronx, New York 10471
USA

L.N. Falkovskaya-Chernysheva
Institute of Water Problems
of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Sadovo-Chernogryazskaya Str. 13/3
103064 Moscow, K-64, USSR

A.L. Leonov
State Institute of Oceanography
Kropotkinski per. 6
1[illegible] Moscow, USSR

H. Löffler
Institut für Limnologie und Gewässerschutz
der Österreichischen Akademie der
Wissenschaften
Berggasse 18/13
1040 Vienna, Austria

N. Matsche
Institut für Wasserversorgung, Abwasserreinigung
und Gewässerschutz der Technischen Universität Wien
Karlsplatz 13
1040 Vienna, Austria

W. Schimon & L. Zahrer
Bundesministerium für Land- und Forstwirtschaft
Stubenring 1
1010 Vienna, Austria

E. Bogdanov
Institute of Water Problems
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
ul. Acad. Bonchev, Block IV
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria

B.V. Georgiev
Institute of Water Problems
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
ul. Acad. Bonchev, Block IV
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria

E. Halfon
Canada Centre for Inland Waters
867 Lakeshore Road, P.O. Box 5050
Burlington, Ontario, Canada

K. Kinnuen
National Board of Waters
Pohjoisesplanadi 37 A
Helsinki, Finland

J. Niemi
National Board of Waters
Pohjoisesplanadi 37 A
Helsinki, Finland

J. Jacquet
Electricite de France
6 Quai Watier
78400 Chatou
France

N. Adachi
IRIA
Domaine de Voluceau
Rocquencourt
78150 Le Chesnay
France

K. Fischer
Institute of Fluid Mechanics
Technical University Hannover
Callinstr. 32, 3000 Hannover, FRG

G. Huthmann
Federal Institute of Hydrology
Kaiserin-Augusta-Anlagen 15-17
D-5400 Koblenz, FRG

M. Markofsky
Institut für Hydromechanik
Universität Karlsruhe
Kaiserstrasse 12, D-75 Karlsruhe, FRG

H. Stehfest
Abteiling für Angewandte Systemanalyse
Kernforschungszentrum Karlsruhe
Postfach 3640, D-7600 Karlsruhe, FRG

C. von Stempel
Institut für Radiohydrometrie
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
D-8042 Neuherberg, FRG

J. Sündermann
Institute of Fluid Mechanics
Technical University
Callinstr. 32, 3000 Hannover, FRG

P. Mauersberger
The Academy of Sciences of the GDR
GDR

J. Fischer
Institute of Computer Science and Automation
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Kende 13-17
H-1052 Budapest XI, Hungary

M. Kozak
Institute of Water Management and Construction
Budapest Technical University
Mueegyeteoz f93
LH-111 Budapest, Hungary

G. Pinter
Research Centre for Water
Resource Development
Dept. of International Affairs
Hungarian National Water Authority
foe utca 48-50
H-1394, Budapest, Hungary

G. Dinelli
Aerodynamics and Heat Transfer Office
ENEL - CRTN
Bastioni di Porta Volta 10
20121 Milano, Italy

S. Rinaldi
Centro Teoria dei Sistemi
Via Ponsio 34/5
20133 Milano, Italy

H. Tamura
Dept. of Precision Engineering
Osaka University
Yamada-kami, Suita
Osaka 565, Japan

G. Abraham
Waterloopkundig Laboratorium
P.O. Box 177, Delft
Netherlands

J.G. de Graan
Rijksinstituut voor Drinkwatervoorziening
P.O. Box 150, Leidschendam,
Netherlands

L. Lijklema
Afdeling CT
Technische Hogeschool Twente
P.O. Box 217
Enschede, Netherlands

N. Chlubek
Politechnika Szczecinska
ul. Putaskiego 10
70-322 Szczecin, Poland

W. Czernuszenko
Institute of Meteorology and Water
ul. Podlesna 61
01-673 Warsaw, Poland

M. Gromiec
Institute of Meteorology and Water Management
ul. Podlesna 61
01-673 Warsaw, Poland

R. Krasnodebski
Institute of Meteorology and Water Management
Wroclaw, Poland

K. Cederwall
Hydraulics Department
Royal Institute of Technology
Fack
100 44 Stockholm, Sweden

L. de Mare
Dept of Water Resources Engineering
Lund Institute of Technology
Fack
220 07 Lund, Sweden

M.B. Beck
University Engineering Dept.
Control and Management Systems Division
Mill Lane, Cambridge CB2 1RX, UK

J. Davis
Water Research Centre
Medmenham Laboratory
P.O. Box 16, Henley Road
Medmenham, Marlow
Bucks., SL7 2HD, UK

H.J. Richards
Central Water Planning Unit
Dept. of the Environment
Reading, UK

J. Habrovsky
Czechoslovak Centre for the Environment
Bratislava, CSSR

R. Chrast
Czechoslovak Centre for the Environment
Bratislava, CSSR

P.G. Whitehead
Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies
Austrialian National University
P.O. Box 4, Canberra
ACT 2600, Australia

S.E. Jørgensen
Langkaer Vaenge 9
3500 Vaerløse, Copenhagen
Denmark

APPENDIX 3: A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

While it is by no means complete, this selected bibliography attempts to provide references to literature which both supports and amplifies the material of some of the Workshop presentations.

Beck, M.B. (1976), Identification and Parameter Estimation of Biological Process Models, in G.C. Vansteenkiste, ed., *System Simulation in Water Resources*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 19-43.

Beck, M.B. (1977), Problems of River Water Quality Modelling and Control: A Review, in H. Akashi, ed., *Reprints IFAC Symposium on Environmental Systems Planning, Design, and Control*, Pergamon, Oxford, 341-349.

Beck, M.B. (1978), Random Signal Analysis in an Environmental Sciences Problem, *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 2, 1, 23-29.

Bierman, V.J. (1976), Mathematical Model of the Selective Enhancement of Blue-Green Algae by Nutrient Enrichment, in R.P. Canale, ed., *Modeling Biochemical Processes in Aquatic Ecosystems*, Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1-31.

Bierman, V.J., and D.M. Dolan (1976), Mathematical Modeling of Phytoplankton Dynamics in Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron, in *Proceedings of Conference on Environmental Modeling and Simulation*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, EPA 600/9-76-016, 773-779.

Bork, I., and E. Maier-Reimer (1978), On the Spreading of Power Plant Cooling Water in a Tidal River, Applied to the River Elbe, *Advances in Water Resources*, 1, 3, 161-168.

Bowles, D.S., and W.J. Grenney (1978), Steady-State River Quality Modeling by Sequential Extended Kalman Filters, *Water Resources Research*, 14, (in press).

Brocard, D.N., G.H. Jirka, and D.R.F. Harleman (1977), A Model for the Convective Circulation in Side Arms of Cooling Lakes, *Technical Report 233*, R.M. Parsons Laboratory for Water Resources and Hydrodynamics, Dept. of Civil Engineering, MIT.

Di Giarno, F.A., L. Lijklema, and G. van Straten (1978), Wind Induced Dispersion and Algal Growth in Shallow Lakes, *Ecological Modelling*, 4, 2/3, 237-252.

Halfon, E. (1978), Mathematical Modeling of Phosphorus Dynamics Through Integration of Experimental Work and System Theory, in D. Scavia, ed., *Perspectives in Aquatic Ecosystem Modeling*, Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, (in press).

Halfon, E., and D.C.L. Lam (1978), The Effects of Advection Diffusion Processes on the Eutrophication of Large Lakes, a Hypothetical Example: Lake Superior, *Ecological Modelling*, 4, 2/3, 119-132.

Harleman, D.R.F. (1977), Real-time Models for Salinity and Water-Quality Analysis in Estuaries, in *Studies in Geophysics: Estuaries, Geophysics and the Environment*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington.

Hurley Octavio, K.A., G.H. Jirka, and D.R.F. Harleman (1977), Vertical Heat Transport Mechanisms in Lakes and Reservoirs, *Technical Report 227*, R.M. Parsons Laboratory for Water Resources and Hydrodynamics, Department of Civil Engineering, MIT.

Ikeda, S., and N. Adachi (1978), A Dynamic Water Quality Model of Lake Biwa - A Simulation Study of the Lake Eutrophication, *Ecological Modelling*, 4, 2/3, 151-172.

Jirka, G.H., D.N. Brocard, K.A. Hurley Octavio, M. Watanabe, and D.R.F. Harleman (1977), Analysis of Cooling Effectiveness and Transient Long-Term Simulations of a Cooling Lake (with Applications to the North Anna Power Station), *Technical Report 232*, R.M. Parsons Laboratory for Water Resources and Hydrodynamics, Department of Civil Engineering, MIT.

Jolankai, G. (1976), The Role of Transversal Effluent Mixing in the Simulation Models of Water Pollution Control, in *Research in Water Quality and Water Technology*, Research Centre for Water Resources Development (VITUKI), Budapest, 3, 90-128.

Jørgensen, S.E. (1976), A Eutrophication Model for a Lake, *Ecological Modelling*, 2, 147-165.

Jorgensen, S.E., and H. Mejer (1977), Ecological Buffer Capacity, *Ecological Modelling*, 3, 39-61.

Jørgensen, S.E., H. Mejer, and M. Friis (1978), Examination of a Lake Model, *Ecological Modelling*, 4, 2/3, 253-278.

Lam, D.C.L., and E. Halfon (1978), Lake Superior Model of Primary Production Including Circulation Influences, *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 2, 1, 30-40.

Najarian, T.O., and D.R.F. Harleman (1977), Real Time Simulation of Nitrogen Cycle in an Estuary, *Proceedings American Soc. Civ. Engrs., J. Env. Eng. Div.*, 103, EE4, 523-538.

Rinaldi, S., and R. Soncini-Sessa (1977), *Optimal Allocation of In-Stream Aeration*, Research Report, RR-77-7, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria.

Rinaldi, A., and R. Soncini-Sessa (1978), Sensitivity Analysis of Generalized Streeter Phelps Models, *Advances in Water Resources*, 1, 3, 141-146.

Rinaldi, S., R. Soncini-Sessa, H. Stehfest, and H. Tamura (1978), *Modeling and Control of River Quality*, McGraw-Hill, Düsseldorf, (forthcoming).

Somlyody, L. (1976), Examination of Mixing in Water Streams Using Mass Flux Constant Curves, *Acta Technica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 82, 1/2, 197-210.

Somlyody, L. (1977), Dispersion Measurement on the Danube, *Water Research*, 11, 411-417.

Stehfest, H. (1977), *Mathematical Modelling of Self-Purification of Rivers*, Professional Paper, PP-77-11, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria.

Stehfest, H. (1978), *On the Monetary Value of Ecological River Quality Models*, Research Report, RR-78-1, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria.

Thomann, R.V., and R.P. Winfield (1976), On the Verification of a Three-Dimensional Phytoplankton Model of Lake Ontario, in *Proc. of Conference on Environmental Modeling and Simulation*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, EPA 600/9-76-016, 568-572.

Thomann, R.V. (1978), *Size Dependent Model of Hazardous Substances in Aquatic Food Chain*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, (in press).

Vasiliev, O.F. (1976), Three-dimensional Numerical Model for Hydrothermal Analysis of Cooling Ponds, International Advanced Course, Heat Disposal from Power Generation, International Centre for Heat and Mass Transfer, Beograd, Yugoslavia; also in *Thermal Effluent Disposal from Power Generations*, Hemisphere Publishing Corp., Washington, 1977, 115-133.

Vasiliev, O.F. (1976), Two-dimensional Numerical Model for Hydrothermal Analysis of Water Bodies, International Advanced Course, Heat Disposal from Power Generation, International Centre for Heat and Mass Transfer, Beograd, Yugoslavia; also in *Thermal Effluent Disposal from Power Generations*, Hemisphere Publishing Corp., Washington, 1977, 115-133.

Vasiliev, O.F., and V.I. Kvon (1977), Numerical Modelling of Flows and Heat Exchange in Cooling Ponds, in *Proc. of the XVII Congress of the International Association for Hydraulic Research*, Baden-Baden, 2, 1-8.

Vasiliev, O.F., V.I. Kvon, I.I. Makarov, (1976), Gidrotermichesrit rezhim vodoemov-okhladitelei teplovykh i atomnykh elektrostantsii (Hydrothermical Regime of Cooling Reservoirs, Thermal and Atomic Power Stations), in *Izvestiya of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Series: Energetics and Transport*, M, N4, 102-109.

Whitehead, P.G., and P.C. Young (1975), A Dynamic Stochastic Model for Water Quality in Part of the Bedford-Ouse River System, in G.C. Vansteenkists, ed., *Computer Simulation of Water Resources Systems*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 417-438.

Whitehead, P.G. (1976), Dynamic Models in the Planning Role, in G.C. Vansteenkiste, ed., *System Simulation Water Resources*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 83-98.

Whitehead, P.G. (1978), Mathematical Modelling and the Planning of Environmental Studies, in G.C. Vansteekiste, ed., *Simulation and Modeling of Land, Air, and Water Resources Systems*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (forthcoming).

APPENDIX 4: TERMINOLOGY - SOME EXPLANATIONS

With so many diverse scientific and engineering disciplines represented at the Workshop it is not surprising that there was some confusion over the terminology of (water quality) modeling. The following list of terms and their definitions is given as clarification of the terminology generally adhered to in this report. Where more than one term is employed for roughly the same concept this will be indicated by additional words or phrases in parentheses.

Black Box (input/output, time-series) Model

A black box model of a system assumes no a priori knowledge of the internal physical, chemical, or biological phenomena that govern that system's behavior. For the input/output situation the model accounts only for what the input disturbance is observed to do to the output response (compare with internally-descriptive model); as an example, we can imagine a black box model which relates a time-series of in-lake chlorophyll-a measurements to a time-series of point-source phosphorus loadings. A black box model is rarely a general description of process behavior and its validity is usually restricted to the range and conditions of the experimental data set from which which it is derived.

Internally Descriptive (mechanistic) Model

As its name suggests, an internally descriptive model exploits much more, if not all, of the a priori information on the physical, chemical, or biological mechanisms that govern process behavior. In this sense an internally descriptive model is capable of describing how the input forcing functions (disturbances) are related to the state and output responses of a system (see also state variable and linear observations). Such a model is generally capable of universal applicability and has an apparent grounding in theory or "the laws of nature".

Linear Observations

It is mostly assumed that the state of water quality in a system can be directly, or linearly, measured (in the presence of an additive kind of random measurement error). That is to say, we can measure DO concentration and temperature as the state of a reach of river; by the same token, this implies that the output response of the system is straightforwardly the measured variations in that system's state. A more complex situation for model verification arises, however, when the state of the system is not linearly observed. For instance, if the state of the system includes blue-green algae and diatoms as separate states, and if output response is measured as chlorophyll-a concentration, then the model predictions of blue-green algae and diatom concentrations will have to be added together and this sum prediction compared with the chlorophyll-a measurement. To some extent, therefore, model verification (against field data) is required to distinguish between the way that a system behaves and the way in which that behavior is observed.

Model Order

Not to be confused with the order of a differential equation, model order is here defined as the number of elements (variables) in the system's state vector.

Model Structure Identification

A broad definition of model structure identification can be given as the problem of establishing how the measured system inputs are related (mathematically) to the system's state variables and how these latter are in turn related both to themselves and to the measured system outputs. Implicit in this definition is the assumption that these relationships are to be identified by reference to a set of field data. Model structure identification is partly concerned with the selection of the number of state variables and partly concerned with the selection of appropriate forms for the mathematical expressions included in the model.

An example of the latter is discussed in the text (section 2.5, Bierman): choosing between the expressions for the multiplicative growth hypothesis and the threshold growth hypothesis is precisely the problem of model structure identification. In short, model structure identification as a concept is akin to the problem of deciding whether to draw a straight line or a curve through a set of data.

Parameter (coefficient)

Model parameters are those constants, e.g., reaeration coefficient, maximum specific growth-rate constant, appearing in the model equations.

Parameter Estimation

Parameter estimation is understood as the use of algorithms for estimating the model parameter values given a set of in situ field data for the measured model inputs and outputs.

State (compartment) Variable

These are quatities, usually functions of both time and space, such as salinity concentration or temperature, which characterize the essential properties and behavior of a system.

State Estimation

Since all measurements are subject to chance error and since a system may be disturbed in an unknown or uncertain fashion, state estimation is the use of algorithms for the provision of some "best" estimate of the system's state variables. Jointly with this best estimate, the algorithms also compute a measure of expected error in that estimate.

State Reconstruction

Suppose we have a model for nitrification in a river which includes mass balances (state equations) for *nitrosomonas* and nitrobacter bacteria. State reconstruction is the use of algorithms whereby estimates of nitrosomonas and nitrobacter concentrations can be reconstructed from field measurements of ammonia, nitrite, and nitrate concentrations. In other words, it is the reconstruction of information about state variables which cannot be measured.

System Identification

This is not really a term but a subject in its own right. System identification covers all matters which relate to the derivation of mathematical models from field data, where field data are assumed usually to be available in the form of time-series measurements. System identification thus embraces model structure identification, parameter estimation, verification, and validation, among other topics.

Validation

Validation is the testing of a model's adequate performance, or otherwise, against two or more independent sets of field data.

Verification (calibration)

Having carried out a model structure identification and a parameter estimation phase of analysis, verification sets out to check that the statistical properties of the model fitting errors are such that there is no further "information" in these errors which is not attributable to chance or random behavior. This is, perhaps, a rather narrow interpretation of verification. Section 4.9, however, gives a slightly broader definition whereby verification is understood as a set of tests made to establish that the model works as expected. Calibration, on the other hand, might best be described as a process which includes both parameter estimation and verification.

APPENDIX 5: IIASA's TASK GROUP ON STATE-OF-THE-ART SURVEY OF WATER QUALITY MODELING

List of Group Members

G.T. Orlob (Chairman)
M.J. Gromiec
J. Jacquet
S.E. Jørgensen
D.P. Loucks
P. Mauersberger
O. Vasiliev
M.B. Beck (Secretary)