

Effect of spatiotemporal variation of rainfall on dissolved oxygen depletion in integrated catchment studies

Antonio Moreno Rodenas Francois Clemens, Jeroen Langeveld, Marie-Claire ten Veldhuis Francesca Cecinati





1. Water quality integrated catchment management

Model based water management practices. Control of pollution. Design of water systems



OLD management practices Attending to pollution input limitation. Model based design. Not accounting for natural water characteristics. WFD **NEW management** WFD **practices** Ecological and chemical control of water bodies. Integrated assessment of the interaction between the parts of the water system



1. Water quality integrated catchment management







2. The Dommel river



3. Sources of uncertainty

- Input data measurement uncertainty
- Model structure
- Aleatoric uncertainty (non-deterministic/chaotic behavior)
- Parameter calibration
- Code/numerical implementation errors



3. Sources of uncertainty

- Input data measurement uncertainty
- Model structure
- Aleatoric uncertainty (non-deterministic/chaotic behavior)
- Parameter calibration
- Code/numerical implementation errors





4. The Dommel river









- Spatially lumped
- Rainfall-runoff
 - Evaporation
 - Wetting losses, depressions
- Sewer routing
 - Tank in series routing
 - DWF daily pattern
 - DWF mean pollutant concentration vector

Urban catchment







Urban catchment

29 locally lumped catchments Pseudo-distributed







Inflow

WWTP

- ASM2d Biokinetic model Gernaeay and Jøgensen (2004)
- BIOMATH calibration protocol









12





6. Rainfall measurement technologies and errors associated

Rainfall measurements at the inter-urban scale

Rain gauge:



Characteristics:

- Punctual measurement
- Low spatial density
- Accurate

Error sources:

- Wetting loses
- Blockages (leaves, snow)
- Poor maintenance
- Tipping-bucket and high intensity



6. Rainfall measurement technologies and errors associated

Rainfall measurements at the inter-urban scale

C-Band radar:



Characteristics:

- High spatial density sampling
- Volume/area integration (resolution)
- Indirect estimation (from reflectivity)

Error sources:

- Ground-clutter
- Erroneous Z-R relation
- Bright band
- Attenuation
- Many more



Rainfall variability in time and space. Convective – Stratiform storm nature.



Spatial gaussian process

Conditional probability to known measurements.

Predictions which minimize the variance: (krige) BLUE.



Evaluation of the correlation structure of given measuring points (Rain gauge network).



Semivariogram. Assumptions: - Stationarity of the process

- Isotropy

e.g Exponential experimental semivariogam

$$\gamma(d) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } d = 0\\ c\left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{3d}{r}\right)\right) & \text{for } d > 0 \end{cases}$$



Evaluation of the correlation structure of given measuring points (Rain gauge network).



Semivariogram.

- Assumptions:
- Stationarity of the process.
- Isotropy





Conditional probability to known measurements.



$$\hat{r}(x_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i(x_0) r(x_i)$$

Weighted linear interpolation from the known points to every unsampled location.

Punctual Prediction



Our interest goes on estimating an **averaged rainfall intensity at the urban catchment scale**.



Block kriging. Change of spatial Support for the predictions.

 Reduction of the prediction variance



Presence of a covariate: e.g. RADAR



Kriging with external drift.

The average of the regionalized variable is a linear regression of extra variables.

But in our case we still search for the prediction at the block support: **Universal Block kriging**



8. Methods

1. Definition of the block support.

Georeference of the urban catchment drainage area

2. Measured rainfall intensities:

How many stations? Rain gauges Covariates? Radar

- 3. Estimation of the event-averaged correlation structures
- 4. Selection of rainfall accumulation times-spatial density
- 5. Rainfall estimation at each lumped pseudo-distributed catchment.
- 6. Comparison of model results with river Dissolved Oxygen monitoring data.



8. Methods Rainfall Products

Spatial information								
Temporal accumulation	1 RG	13 RG	13 RG + Radar	Averaged Radar				
60 ′	BK1_60	BKall_60	UBK_60	Aradar_60				
30′	BK1_30	Bkall_30	UBK_30	Aradar_30				
10'	BK1_10	Bkall_10	UBK_10	Aradar_10				

Period	2011-08-18_2011-08-31	2012-07-05_2012-08-04	2013-07-25_2013-08-19
Duration	13 days	30 days	25 days

Performance comparison: 2 Metrics

- RMSE at the DO modelled-monitored
- Max oxygen drop difference









10. Preliminary results





10. Preliminary results

Averaged spatial correlation structure:

	Period 1 18/08/2011 - 31/08/2011		Period 2 05/07/2012 - 04/08/2012		Period 3 25/07/2013 - 19/08/2013	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{Time step} \\ (\min) \end{array}$	Sill	Range [km]	Sill	Range [km]	Sill	Range [km]
10	5.10	37.12	2.09	8.61	1.90	59.81
30	2.11	35.39	1.00	15.00	0.82	55.78
60	1.05	38.47	0.61	17.18	0.51	92.88



11. Conclusions-Discussion



- Low sensitivity of the results to the temporal resolution used.
- Effect of spatial resolution. Especially single rain gauge vs spatially distributed rainfall.



11. Conclusions-Discussion

What can we say about these preliminary conclusions? Dependency on:

1- Rainfall event selected. Highly spatially variable?
2- Selection of the rainfall prediction methods.

- Non-gaussianity.
- OK sensitivity to high time resolutions (possible instabilities).
- Correlation anisotropy.
- Averaged correlation structure

3- Real system's characteristics vs Model structure

Are the urban drainage/river dynamics correctly represented? Need of CSO's flow estimations/data to check local-model performance.



THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 607000.

