

Computation of Time-Series Suspended-Sediment Concentrations and Loads Using In-Stream Turbidity and Streamflow

Patrick Rasmussen, USGS Kansas Water Science Center Lawrence, Kansas

Presented by Andy Ziegler

Real-Time Water-Quality Workshop June 8, 2011 St. John's, Newfoundland, CA

U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Geological Survey

Turbidity-SSC Guidelines

- First deviation from USGS techniques using streamflow to compute fluvial-sediment discharge by Porterfield since 1972...
- Sub-daily time-series suspended-sediment concentration computed from turbidity
- Published USGS Techniques and Methods (June 2009, revised in 2011)

http://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/tm3c4/



Contributing Authors

Patrick Rasmussen, KS WSC John R. Gray, OSW Doug Glysson, OWQ Andrew Ziegler, KS WSC



Guidelines and Procedures for Computing Time-Series Suspended-Sediment Concentrations and Loads from In-Stream Turbidity-Sensor and Streamflow Data

Chapter 4 of Book 3, Applications of Hydraulics Section C, Sediment and Erosion Techniques



Techniques and Methods 3-C4

U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Geological Survey



Three steps to computing SSC

- Compile model calibration data set
- Develop a site-specific single or multiple linear regression model
- Compute a time series of suspendedsediment concentration and load



Step 1 – Model calibration data set

Calibration data set

Turbidity time-series record

- Fixed in-stream sensor (Wagner and others, 2006)
- Turbidity cross-section measurements
- Turbidity includes-
 - Nephelometry
 - Optical Backscatter
- SSC of samples
 - Depth integrated, EDI or EWI (Nolan and others, 2005; Edwards and Glysson, 1999)
 - Sample full range of hydrologic conditions
- Streamflow time-series record



Step 1 – Model calibration data set Fixed in-stream sensor (Wagner and others, 2006)



Guidelines and Standard Procedures for Continuous Water-Quality Monitors: Station Operation, Record Computation, and Data Reporting



Techniques and Methods 1-D3

U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Geological Survey

Downloading 1.96 MB of 2.53 MB

- Don't "over calibrate" optical sensors
- If recalibration needed, usually a problem with the standard
- New wipers are more robust
- Sensor stays clean in velocity

Step 1 – Model calibration data set Fixed in-stream sensor (Wagner and others, 2006)









Kansas River DeSoto, Kansas

Step 1 – Model calibration data set Turbidity cross-section measurements



Step 1 – Model calibration data set Turbidity cross-section measurements

Measurements must represent the entire stream

http://pubs.usgs.gov/ tm/tm3c4/

≈USGS



Step 1 – Model calibration data set Turbidity measurements- nephelometry and optical backscatter

| | | A | В | С | D | E | F | G | Н | 1 | J | - | | |
|-------------|----|----------|--|--|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---------|-------|--|--|
| | 1 | Version: | January 2007 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | | Method Short Name | Method Source (NWQL, EPA, ASTM, Std. Meth., etc.) | Method Number | NWIS New Method Code | NWIS Old Method Code | Is Method Approved? (meets require- ments in OWQ Tech Memo 98.05) | Static / Submersible / Process | Comments | Website | - Wi | | |
| | 71 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 72 | 63680 | Eureka Environmental, Sensor model Trimeter, FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS031 | A | N/A | | Uses Analite NEP9500 Series turbidity probe | | | | |
| | 73 | 63680 | Forest Technology Systems, Sensor Model DTS-12, FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS032 | В | N/A | Dynamic | May not be technically compliant with ISO 7027, based on noise ratios | | | | |
| | 74 | 63680 | Greenspan, sensor model TS 100, FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS034 | С | N/A | Dynamic | | | | | |
| | 75 | 63680 | Greenspan, sensor model TS 300, FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS036 | D | N/A | Dynamic | | | | | |
| Lig | 76 | 63680 | Greenspan, sensor model TS 1200, FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS035 | E | N/A | Dynamic | | | | | |
| (LE or] | 77 | 63680 | HACH, sensor model 2100 N IS (Ratio OFF), FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS040 | F | N/A | Static | With Infra-red filter installed downstream of white light source | | | | |
| Figure | 78 | 63680 | HACH, sensor model 2100 AN IS (Ratio OFF), FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS038 | G | N/A | Static | With Infra-red filter installed downstream of white light source | | | | |
| additic | 79 | 63680 | HACH, sensor model 1720 D/L, FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS037 | Н | N/A | Process | Discontinued | | - | | |
| turbidi | 80 | 63680 | HACH, sensor model Optiquant, FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS041 | L | N/A | Process | | | | | |
| | 81 | 63680 | HACH, sensor model Pocket Turbidimeter, FNU | ISO | 7027 | TS042 | J | N/A | Static | | | | | |
| | | 63680 | HF Scientific, Sensor Model | ISO | 7027 | TS047 | K | N/A | Static | | | - | | |
| | 4 | ► H S | heet1 Sheet2 Sheet3 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 100% | -) (+ |) .:: | | |

http://water.usgs.gov/owg/FieldManual/Chapter6/6.7 contents.html

Turbidity values different dependent on sensor



Figure 18. Relation between YSI 6026 and YSI 6136 turbidity sensor values, U.S. Geological Survey streamgage on Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas, July 14, 2004, to August 26, 2005.



Optical backscatter





sensor wipers reduce erroneous values and maintenance due to biological growth while eliminating the need for extraneous cleaning and air purge systems. With no potted components, fullyserviceable SOLITAX sc sensors deliver twice the typical sensor life at reduced maintenance cost. Ready-to-install sensor mounting kits allow tank immersion or in-pipe installation.

Turbidity vs OBS



USGS Always store the make and model with data

Step 1 – Model calibration data set

SSC of samples EDI/EWI

Isokinetic sampling

http://water.usgs.gov/owq/Field Manual/chapter4/pdf/Chap4_v2 .pdf





EXPLANATION

- RT TRANSIT RATE (transit rate at each sampling vertical is equal)
- W WIDTH (width of each increment is equal)
- V VOLUME COLLECTED AT EACH VERTICAL PROPORTIONAL TO THE DISCHARGE OF EACH INCREMENT
- SAMPLING VERTICAL OF EACH EQUAL-WIDTH INCREMENT (SAMPLES COLLECTED)—The vertical transit rate relative to sample volume that is proportional to the stream discharge of each increment

Figure 4-4. Equal-width-increment method for collection of water samples (modified from Edwards and Glysson, 1999).

Step 1 – Model calibration data set SSC of samples related to in-stream monitor values



Figure 5. A, Time-series turbidity and streamflow data, August 14–18, 2002, and B, duration of cross-section turbidity and suspendedsediment sample collection, August 15, 2002, at U.S. Geological Survey streamgage on Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas.





Figure 5. A, Time-series turbidity and streamflow data, August 14–18, 2002, and B, duration of cross-section turbidity and suspendedsediment sample collection, August 15, 2002, at U.S. Geological Survey streamgage on Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas.

Step 1 – Model calibration data set SSC samples collected over range in sensor conditions





Step 1 – Model calibration data set

Calibration data set

Turbidity time-series record

- Fixed in-stream sensor (Wagner and others, 2006)
- Turbidity cross-section measurements
- Turbidity includes-
 - Nephelometry
 - Optical Backscatterance
- SSC of samples
 - Depth integrated, EDI or EWI (Nolan and other, 2005; Edwards and Glysson, 1999)
 - Sample full range of hydrologic conditions
- Streamflow time-series record



Step 1 – Compile calibration data set





- Simple linear regression (SLR)
 - Plot data
 - Turbidity is explanatory variable
 - SSC is response variable
 - log₁₀ transformation
 - Symmetry, linear, constant variance
 - Retransformation requires bias correction factor
 - Regression provides expressions of uncertainty
 - Plot data



Turbidity is explanatory variable

SSC is response variable





Untransformed

Transformed





Figure 8. Relations between A, turbidity and suspended-sediment concentration, B, streamflow and suspended-sediment concentration in linear space, C, turbidity and suspended-sediment concentration, and D, streamflow and suspended-sediment concentration in log₁₀ space for U.S. Geological Survey streamgage on Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas, 1999–2005.

Turbidity is MUCH better for computing SSC



- Simple linear regression (SLR)
 - Plot data
 - Turbidity is explanatory variable
 - SSC is response variable
 - log₁₀ transformation
 - Symmetry, linear, constant variance
 - Retransformation requires bias correction factor
 - Regression provides expressions of uncertainty
 - Plot data





Figure 10. Results of simple linear regression analysis for *A*, turbidity and suspended-sediment concentration data, and a comparison of *B*, computed suspended-sediment concentrations and regression residuals, and *C*, probability plot of residuals for U.S. Geological Survey streamgage on Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas, 1999–2005.



Figure 11. Results of simple linear regression analysis using log-transformed data for *A*, turbidity and suspended-sediment concentration data, and comparison of *B*, estimated log₁₀ suspended-sediment concentration and regression residuals, and *C*, probability plot of residuals for U.S. Geological Survey streamgage on Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas, 1999–2005.

Step 2 – Develop regression model Retransformation requires bias correction factor Regression provides expressions of uncertainty Plot data







Multiple linear regression (MLR)

- If SLR model percentage standard error (MPSE) > 20
- Plot data
 - Streamflow vs. SLR residuals
 - Time vs. SLR residuals
- Use MLR if-
 - MPSE < 20 or < SLR MPSE, and</p>
 - Significant p-value (<0.025) for streamflow</p>
 - Turbidity and streamflow are explanatory variables







 $[n, \text{ number of samples}; R_a^2$, adjusted coefficient of determination; *RMSE*, root-mean-squared error in log units; *MSPE*, model standard percentage error; n/a, not applicable]

| Explanatory variables | п | R ^e a | RMSE | MSPE | p-value for streamflow | t-statistic for streamflow |
|--------------------------|----|------------------|-------|--------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Turbidity | 68 | 0.975 | 0.101 | +25.9, -20.6 | n/a | n/a |
| Turbidity and streamflow | 68 | 0.977 | 0.098 | +25.3, -20.2 | 0.043314 | 2.06 |

R_a², RMSE, and MSPE all improve
p-value for Q is < 0.05, but > 0.025
Plot both model results



SLR Turb

MLR Turb & Q





Figure 15. Comparison of measured and estimated suspended-sediment concentrations and residuals in log space from A, simple and B, multiple linear regression models for U.S. Geological Survey streamgage on Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas.

- Apply regression model to continuous turbidity (and streamflow)
 - Modeled after Q process
 - Compute time-series SSC
 - SSC time interval same as turbidity
 - Multiply retransformed SSC by BCF
 - Missing and truncated turbidity values
 - Compute time-series SSL
 - Multiply SSC by Q and conversion factor
 - Missing streamflow

Update station analysis (appendix 1 of TM3C4)



[NWIS, U.S. Geological Survey National Water Information System; ADAPS, U.S. Geological Survey Automated Data Processing System; QWDATA, U.S. Geological Survey water-quality database; SSC, suspended-sediment concentration; SSL, suspendedsediment load, R², coefficient of determination; RMSE, root-mean-squared error; MSPE, model standard percentage error; PRESS, prediction error sum of squares; VIE, variance inflation factor; R²a, adjusted coefficient of determination; RMVUE, minimum-variance unbiased estimator; ANCOVA, analysis of covariance]

Checklist for time-series suspended-sediment records

| | | | Worked | Reviewed | Approved |
|----|-----|---|--------|----------|----------|
| 1) | Con | npile model calibration data set | | | |
| | a) | Retrieve data from NWIS | | | |
| | | i) Approved time-series data: turbidity and streamflow (from ADAPS) | | | |
| | | ii) Discrete sample data: SSC, sand-silt percentage (from QWDATA) | | | |
| | b) | Assign turbidity and streamflow values to be used in regression | | | |
| | c) | Plot raw data to identify potential outliers (turb against SSC) | | | |
| | d) | Plot samples on turbidity and streamflow duration curves | | | |
| | e) | Compile statistical summary of model calibration data set | | | |
| | f) | Write model-calibration data-set summary in station analysis | | | |
| 2) | Dev | elopment of a regression model | | | |
| | a) | Correlations and scatter plots of all data | | | |
| | b) | Simple linear regression turbidity/SSC, untransformed and log10 | | | |
| | | transformed and regression diagnostics | | | |
| | | (R ^z , R ^z , RMSE, PRESS, MSPE) | | | |
| | c) | Determine proper transformation | | | |
| | d) | Model residual plots | | | |
| | e) | Plot model residual against streamflow, Julian day | | | |
| | f) | Evaluate simple and multiple linear regression models | | | |
| | | (residual plots, VIF, partial F-test, R ² , PRESS, MSPE) | | | |
| | g) | Bias correction factor (Duan or MVUE) | | | |
| | h) | 90-percent prediction interval | | | |
| | i) | Regression model summary in station analysis | | | |
| 3) | Соп | nputation and storage of time-series suspended-sediment | | | |
| | COI | ncentration and load record in NWIS | | | |
| | a) | Set up data descriptors in ADAPS | | | |
| | b) | Enter bias adjusted equation | | | |
| | c) | Select period of suspended-sediment record for application of model | | | |
| | d) | Compute SSC unit value and SSL daily values | | | |
| | e) | Estimate missing SSC or SSL data | | | |
| | f) | Evaluate period of record graphs | | | |
| | g) | Update station analysis | | | |
| 4) | Ann | ual model validation | | | |
| | a) | Plot calibration data set and recent annual data | | | |
| | b) | Compare original model to model with additional data (ANCOVA) | | | |
| | c) | Update model in ADAPS | | | |
| | d) | Determine start date and time of new model | | | |
| | | | | | |





≈USGS

SSC varies 3 orders of magnitude Q varies 4 orders of magnitude SSL varies 6 orders of magnitude! Impossible to sample this variability without continuous!

Appendixes 33

Example 1. Complete Review Package for Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas

WATER-QUALITY MONITOR STATION ANALYSIS 2005 WATER YEAR SUSPENDED-SEDIMENT RECORD 07144100 Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick. Kansas

MODEL-CALIBRATION DATA SET—All data were collected using USGS protocols and are stored in USGS NWIS databases. The regression model is based on 68 concurrent measurements of nurbidity and streamflow and SSC samples collected from November 1998 ftmough June 2005. Samples were collected throughout the range of continuously observed hydrologic and turbidity conditions. Turbidity and streamflow values are time-averaged approved unit values corresponding with the duration of sample collection. A comparison of cross-section mean and corresponding time-series monitor readings is provided. Water-quality data were collected using an YSI 6600 monitor with a 6026 turbidity sensor (FNU). Selected data values used to develop the regression models were removed on the basis of sample evaluation. Five SSC values were removed from the data set because of turnscription errors, sampling errors, and a sample compromised diming shipping. Three data values were affected by sensor limitations (within 10 percent of the sensor maxima) and, therefore, were removed from the data set. Summary statistics and the complete model-cabibration data set are provided.

MODEL DEVELOPMENT—Initially, data plots of the response variable (SSC) and possible explanatory variables turbidity and streamflow indicate both are correlated to SSC. Regression analysis was done using S-Pus software, and the final output is provided. Turbidity and streamflow were examined together as explanatory variables for estimating SSC, but the p-values for streamflow were larger than 0.025. Different combinations of untransformed and log₁-transformed data were evaluated. Log₂, transformed turbidity and SSC were selected as the best model on the basis of residual plots, *BSCP*, and p-value for streamflow. Residual plots for evaluating variance, normality, homoscedasticity, and curvature are provided. For log₁₀-transformed models, estimated values were multiplied by a calculated retransformation bias correction factor (Duan, 1983). Ninety-percent prediction intervals are provided for evaluating uncertainty of the estimates.

MODEL SUMMARY—Summary of final regression analysis for suspended-sediment concentration at Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick, Kansas.

$\log_{10}(SSC) = 0.943 \log_{10}(Turb) + 0.130,$

where

SSC = Suspended-sediment concentration, in milligrams per liter; and

Turb = Turbidity (YSI 6026), in formazin nephelometric units.

Model information:

Number of measurements = 68, root-mean-squared error (RMSE) = 0.10, model standard percentage error (MSPE) = +25.9 and -20.6 percent 90-percent prediction intervals = ± 14 percent, adjusted coefficient of determination ($R^2 \downarrow = 0.98$, PRESS = 0.663. Dural's bias correction factor = 1.03.

Coefficients:

| | Coefficient | Standard error | t-statistic | p-value | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|----------|--|--|
| Intercept | 0.130 | 0.041 | 3.02 | 0.0035 | | |
| log10(Turb) | 0.943 | 0.018 | 50.9 | 1.13E-54 | | |

34 Computing Time-Series Suspended-Sediment Concentrations and Loads from Turbidity-Sensor and Streamflow Data

Correlation matrix of coefficients:

| Intercept | log10(Turb) |
|-----------|---------------------------|
| 1 | |
| -0.9588 | 1 |
| | Intercept 1 -0.9588 |

SSC RECORD—The record is computed using a regression model and ADAPS software. Data are computed at 15-minute intervals. The record is complete for the year except as noted. The turbidity monitor was removed for a short period in December-February to avoid ice damae.

Daily values for partial days were updated where data existed during the expected time for the occurrence of the maximum or minimum, if at least 12 hours of values were available for the day, and if values were present adjacent to the extreme for the day.

312 days of record out of 365 days (85 percent) will be published.

REMARKS-

A new turbidity sensor, YSI model 6136, was installed to collected concurrent turbidity measurements. These measurements will be used to convert YSI model 6136 values to the YSI model 6026 to compute SSC with the new 6136 sensor.

- · T.B. Bennett collected field data.
- · Cross-section survey results can be retrieved from NWIS, database 02.

 The Excel[®] "Field Measurement Summary" spreadsheet for this site and water year summarizes the number of site visits, calibration results, and calculations of the magnitude of fouling and calibration drift.

Computed: P.P. Rasmussen, November 1, 2005 Checked: C.J. Lee, November 22, 2005 Reviewed: T.J. Rasmussen, November 26, 2005



Continue monitoring turbidity

- Continuously at a single point
- Periodic cross-sectional measurements

Continue collecting SSC samples

- > 4 per year
- Over the hydrologic range







Employing new model

- Do not recompute historic SSC UVs
- Determine start date
- Update station analysis
- New model form
 - Compare old and new
 - May need to recompute SSC Uvs
 - Simple is usually best



- Evaluate new turb/SSC pairs with old pairs annually
 - ANCOVA analysis of covariance
 - Similar distribution verifies current regression
 - Differences may indicate a change in sediment sources/transport and a need for new regression
 - Additional data may not significantly change the model, but does improve uncertainty



New model

- When to end old and start new
- Moving window
- Annual
- Do not recompute approved SSC unit values
- Update station analysis



Upstream at Halstead,

2003 - log(SSC) = 0.945 log(Turb, YSI 6026) + 0.132

2011 - log(SSC) = 0.852 log(Turb, YSI 6136) + 0.591

At Sedgwick,

 $2003 - \log SSC = 0.716 \log(Turb, YSI 6026) + 0.19 \log(Q) + 0.18$

2011 - log(SSC) = 0.906log(Turb,YSI 6136) + 0.427



Table 11. Percent Difference in Annual Loads Calculated using Updated and Old Regression Models for Little Arkansas River at Highway 50near Halstead (site 07143672), Kansas, 1999-2010.

| X 7 | 1000 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2002 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2000 | 2000 | 2010 | |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|
| Year | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | Average |
| ear 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 201 onstituent % Difference ardness 1% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 2% 2% 1% 1% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 2% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% <th></th> <th></th> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hardness | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| Dissolved Solids | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% |
| Total Suspended Solids | -1% | 0% | -3% | -2% | -2% | -2% | 1% | 3% | 1% | -1% | 1% | 1% | 0% |
| Calcium | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Sodium | -6% | -7% | -9% | -12% | -10% | -13% | -9% | -1% | -27% | -4% | -8% | -13% | -10% |
| Alkalinity | 13% | 10% | 9% | 1% | 7% | 3% | 6% | -9% | 7% | 9% | 12% | 5% | 6% |
| Bicarbonate | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| Chloride | -7% | -7% | -10% | -12% | -11% | -14% | -10% | -2% | -29% | -5% | -8% | -14% | -11% |
| Sulfate | -4% | -4% | -5% | -5% | -4% | -5% | -5% | -2% | -6% | -4% | -5% | -5% | -4% |
| Total Organic Nitrogen | 0% | 1% | -2% | -1% | -1% | 0% | 2% | 6% | 3% | 1% | 3% | 3% | 1% |
| Total Phosphorus | 5% | 6% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 5% | 8% | 11% | 8% | 6% | 8% | 8% | 6% |
| Escherichia Coli Bacteria | 18% | 19% | 17% | 18% | 18% | 18% | 19% | 20% | 19% | 18% | 19% | 19% | 19% |
| Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 3% | 5% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 7% | 9% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 5% |
| Arsenic | -12% | -12% | -12% | -13% | -12% | -13% | -13% | -19% | -11% | -14% | -12% | -12% | -13% |
| Atrazine | 0% | -2% | -4% | -6% | -4% | -1% | -6% | 3% | -9% | 1% | -6% | -4% | -3% |
| Suspended-Sediment | 4% | 6% | 1% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 10% | 14% | 10% | 6% | 10% | 11% | 7% |

HWY50 models robust– -mostly single explanatory variables models -most years within 10%

 Table 12. Percent Difference in Annual Loads Calculated using Updated and Old Regression Models for Little Arkansas River near Sedgwick (site 07144100), Kansas, 1999-2010.

| Year | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | Average |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|
| Constituent % Difference | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hardness | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Dissolved Solids | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total Suspended Solids | 23% | 28% | 25% | 27% | 32% | 39% | 42% | 17% | 46% | 24% | 35% | 48% | 32% |
| Calcium | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | -1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Sodium | -7% | -8% | -10% | -5% | -9% | -10% | -9% | 2% | -12% | -5% | -8% | -11% | -8% |
| Alkalinity | 10% | 11% | 7% | 2% | 6% | 3% | 5% | -7% | 4% | 9% | 10% | 5% | 5% |
| Bicarbonate | 14% | 15% | 5% | -1% | 3% | -4% | 3% | -7% | 2% | 13% | 15% | 2% | 5% |
| Chloride | -16% | -20% | -15% | -3% | -14% | -11% | -12% | 8% | -15% | -13% | -21% | -17% | -12% |
| Sulfate | -5% | -4% | -7% | -6% | -6% | -7% | -9% | 3% | -11% | -3% | -5% | -7% | -6% |
| Total Organic Nitrogen | 9% | 17% | -3% | 6% | 6% | 11% | 22% | 10% | 25% | 16% | 22% | 24% | 14% |
| Total Phosphorus | 13% | 11% | 14% | 13% | 13% | 12% | 10% | 8% | 10% | 11% | 10% | 9% | 11% |
| Escherichia Coli Bacteria | 55% | 54% | 56% | 55% | 55% | 55% | 53% | 53% | 53% | 54% | 53% | 52% | 54% |
| Fecal Coliform Bacteria | 70% | 70% | 69% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Arsenic | 3% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 3% | 3% | 4% | -13% | 5% | 1% | 3% | 4% | 2% |
| Atrazine | 0% | 17% | 4% | -2% | 11% | 7% | -1% | -1% | 2% | 3% | 4% | -6% | 3% |
| Suspended-Sediment | -10% | -20% | -12% | -8% | -18% | -26% | -27% | 17% | -31% | -14% | -26% | -38% | -18% |

Sedgwick models for sediment not as robust– -WHY?



-Original model contained a Q term MLR suggests that relation of turb and q has changed

Advantages of turbidity/SSC

- Time series of turbidity is easily measured and maintained in ADAPS
- Rarely hysteresis in turb/SSC
- Relations are defined by a single slope
- Results are reproducible
- Uncertainty is easily defined



Advantages of turbidity/SSC

- Comparisons indicate turb/SSC estimates have less uncertainty than Q/SSC estimates
- SSC and SSL are computed in real time
- Can be used for TSS data
 Largest issue with TSS is the subsampling for analysis



Limitations

- Turbidity truncation use backscatter
- Turbidity values from different sensors are not equivalent
- Each regression model is site specific
- Statistical significance of Turb/SSC relation decreases if
 - the Δ sand/silt is disproportional to Δ SSC
 - SSC sources vary in grain-size distributions or color
 - Samples do not evenly span the observed range





Figure 1. Location of selected sediment-sampling stations in the lower Missouri River Basin for which data are presented (see table 1 for station names corresponding to station identifiers).



http://pubs.usgs.gov/ds/530/pdf/ds530.pdf

Heimann and others 2010

Missouri River



USGS 06934500 Missouri River at Hermann, MO



Suspended sediment (sieve diameter % < 0.0625 mm)

■USGS Turbidity-SSC with a varying proportion of sand and silt

Turbidity-SSC with a varying proportion of sand and silt





http://nrtwq.usgs.gov/



USGS Home Contact USGS Search USGS

US Geological Survey Real-Time Water Quality Data For the Nation

NATIONAL REAL-TIME WATER QUALITY

Real-Time Water Temperature, in °C March 28, 2011 00:35ET ΗI ≊USGS State has continuous computed water-quality data Explanation ∇ ∇ ∇^* ∇ ∇ 5-9.9 10-19.9 20-29.9 30-35 <1 1-4.9 >35 No Data Disch Cond D.O. Turb Temp

Continuous real-time water-quality data are used for decisions regarding drinking water, water treatment, regulatory programs, recreation, and public safety. Sensors in streams typically measure streamflow, water temperature, specific conductance, pH, dissolved oxygen and turbidity. Additionally, these measurements can be used as surrogates to compute real-time concentrations and loads of other water-quality constituents.

Click the Map for Real-Time Water-Quality Data. This Will Either Show:

1. This National Real-Time Water Quality (NRTWQ) website (currently lowa, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin) provides hourly computed concentrations and loads for sediment, nutrients, bacteria, and many additional constituents; uncertainty values and probabilities for exceeding drinking water or recreational criteria; frequency distribution curves; and all historical hourly in-stream sensor measurements.

2. WaterQualityWatch presents colorful maps of recent hourly measurements of streamflow, water temperature, specific conductance, pH, dissolved oxygen, and turbidity. The most recent 120 days of real-time data also are available for download. Similar to NRTWQ, its data are obtained from the USGS National Water Information System.

Accessibility FOIA Privacy Policies and Notices

U.S. Department of the Interior | U.S. Geological Survey

URL: http://nrtwq.usgs.gov/nrtwq/

Page Contact Information: National Real-Time Water Quality Information Page Last Modified: Wed 06 October 2010



Questions?

Patrick Rasmussen USGS, Kansas pras@usgs.gov 785-832-3542

http://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/tm3c4/ http://water.usgs.gov/osw/suspended_ sediment/time_series.html http://waterwatch.usgs.gov/wqwatch/ http://nrtwq.usgs.gov



