

Modelling of nutrient emission in river systems (MONERIS): Presenting new perspectives and current developments of a widely used emission model

Oprei, Anna; Huk, Victoria & Venohr, Markus Wednesday, June 5, 2024, 09:00 AM

















Example for data collection

Landuse

| Year | Europe | EU27 | GER | |
|------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|--|
| 2010 | GLOBE- CORINE 2012 | | | |
| 2011 | | CORINE 2012 | LBM 2012 | |
| 2012 | | | | |
| 2013 | | | | |
| 2014 | | | | |
| 2015 | | | LBM 2015 | |
| 2016 | | CORINE 2018 | | |
| 2017 | | | I BM 2018 | |
| 2018 | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | |
| 2020 | | | | |

Connection to sewer and WWTP

| Year | Europe | GER | Berlin |
|------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 2010 | | | |
| 2011 | | | |
| 2012 | | | |
| 2013 | | | |
| 2014 | annual data | | annual data, |
| 2015 | | municipality | house block |
| 2016 | country level | level | level |
| 2017 | | | |
| 2018 | | | |
| 2019 | | | |
| 2020 | | | |







• Heterogeneous input data cause inconsistencies in spatial overlapping





- Heterogeneous input data cause inconsistencies in spatial overlapping
- Spatial resolution of input data ranges between:
 - Polygons: 1:25.000 1:1.000.000
 - Raster: 10 m 10 km
- MONERIS calculates on the basis of hydrological sub catchments (polygons can be better integrated in data and programming structure of the model)
- Modelling of retention and nutrient loads is still done on level of hydrological sub catchments







- Heterogeneous input data cause inconsistencies in spatial overlapping
- Spatial resolution of input data ranges between:
 - Polygons: 1:25.000 1:1.000.000
 - Raster: 10 m 10 km
- MONERIS calculates on the basis of hydrological sub catchments (polygons can be better integrated in data and programming structure of the model)
- Modelling of retention and nutrient loads is still done on level of hydrological sub catchments







- Heterogeneous input data cause inconsistencies in spatial overlapping
- Spatial resolution of input data ranges between:
 - Polygons: 1:25.000 1:1.000.000
 - Raster: 10 m 10 km
- MONERIS calculates on the basis of hydrological sub catchments (polygons can be better integrated in data and programming structure of the model)
- Modelling of retention and nutrient loads is still done on level of hydrological sub catchments

Model Extent -> Fractal Grids 100 km





- Heterogeneous input data cause inconsistencies in spatial overlapping
- Spatial resolution of input data ranges between:
 - Polygons: 1:25.000 1:1.000.000
 - Raster: 10 m 10 km
- MONERIS calculates on the basis of hydrological sub catchments (polygons can be better integrated in data and programming structure of the model)
- Modelling of retention and nutrient loads is still done on level of hydrological sub catchments









































Basic concept of P-R-Model

Snow coverage, snow melt = $f(max(T_{mean}))$

Evapotranspiration (ET) according to MODIS

Surface runoff: CN values according to Jafaar et al. (2019), slope correction, soil moisture based on soil water volume balance

-> selection of CN values based on antecedent runoff conditions (ARC)

Interflow = f(usable field capacity, slope, tile drainage
coverage, soil water content of deeper layers)
-> Capillary rise is limited by water content of deeper

Groundwater

soil layers

Permeability and water storage capacity according to geohydrological classes



Case Study: Odra River Basin (total area 119,000 km²)





Runoff model validation – Model efficiency for each station

Observed data:

- separate measured direct runoff and baseflow via hydropgraph separation (WMO) (R-package: lftstat)
- allocate 1 km grid cells to catchment area of gauge (criterion: area share > 50 %)
- calibrate against observed runoff data from 11 independent upstream gauges:
 - Direct runoff (modelled vs observed)
 - Tile drainage interflow (modelled vs observed)
 - Baseflow (modelled vs observed)
- validate by runoff data from 36 additional gauges
 (2010-2020)

| Total runoff | MAD (mm) | PBIAS (%) | NSE (mm) |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Monthly | 176.9 | 2.70 | 0.89 |
| Yearly | 96.5 | -10.9 | 0.22 |
| All-time | 40.6 | -11.0 | 0.60 |



Runoff model validation – Model efficiency for each station

Observed data:

- separate measured direct runoff and baseflow via hydropgraph separation (WMO) (R-package: Iftstat)
- allocate 1 km grid cells to catchment area of gauge (criterion: area share > 50 %)
- calibrate against observed runoff data from 11 independent upstream gauges:
 - Direct runoff (modelled vs observed)
 - Tile drainage interflow (modelled vs observed)
 - Baseflow (modelled vs observed)
- validate by runoff data from 36 additional gauges (2010-2020)

| Total runoff | MAD (mm) | PBIAS (%) | NSE (mm) | NSE (m ³ s ⁻¹) |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|---------------------------------------|
| Monthly | 176.9 | 2.70 | 0.89 | 0.79 |
| Yearly | 96.5 | -10.9 | 0.22 | 0.97 |
| All-time | 40.6 | -11.0 | 0.60 | 0.97 |





Case study: Odra River Basin, annual means 2010-2020





Case study: Odra River Basin, annual means 2010-2020





Case study: Odra River Basin, means 2010-2020, total runoff [mm]







Case Study: River basins in Germany (total area 743,646 km²)

Case study: Germany, total runoff [mm]





June 2015

Case study: Germany, TN emissions from atmospheric deposition [kg ha⁻¹]

November 2015

April 2015



30 31.05.2024 Oprei, A., Huk, V. & Venohr, M.: Modelling of nutrient emission in river systems (MONERIS): Presenting new perspectives and current developments of a widely used emission model

Case study: Germany, TN emissions from surface runoff [kg ha⁻¹]

March 2015



August 2015

31 01.06.2024 Oprei, A., Huk, V. & Venohr, M.: Modelling of nutrient emission in river systems (MONERIS): Presenting new perspectives and current developments of a widely used emission model

Case Study Ukraine: Modelling denitrification in inundated soils

 $D = pD \cdot fpH \cdot fT \cdot fCS \cdot fNO3 \cdot Fd$

- D = modelled denitrification of riverine NO3, in kg/ha/yr
- pD = potential Denitrification
- fpH = reduction function for top soil pH
- fT = temperature
- fCS = clay and silt content
- fNO_3 = mean NO_3 concentration in water
- Fd = mean annual flooding duration

Tschikof et al. (2022): <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.156879</u>



Potential Denitrifaction in Soils

33





Reduktionfactor for pH due to increased pH values

 $fpH = e^{-(pH-7.25)^{\frac{2}{3}}}$

fpH: pH dependent reduction factor [-] pH: pH value in soil water



(Heinen, 2006)

^{34 01.06.2024} Oprei, A., Huk, V. & Venohr, M.: Modelling of nutrient emission in river systems (MONERIS): Presenting new perspectives and current developments of a widely used emission model



Reduction function due to low mean annual temperatures



(Heinen, 2006)

 $fT = 2^{\frac{T-16}{10}}$



Reduction function due to coarser soil structure





Adaption function according to changing riverine NO₃ concentrations and local elevation

 $fNO_3 = \frac{N}{K+N}$

 $Fd = -70.559 \ln(z + 0.50) + 88.711$

fNO₃: riverine concentration adaption factor, without unit

N: NO₃ concentration in mgL⁻¹

K: constant reference concentration (7.2 mgL⁻¹)

 $fNO_3 = 0.33$ (for N = 3.5 mgL⁻¹) $fNO_3 = 0.49$ (for N = 7 mgL⁻¹) Fd: adaption factor due to flooding frequency, without unitz: elevation relative to mean water level in m

Needs to be calibrated for local conditions.

In case of Kakhovka dam breach flooding frequency does not have to be derived.

(Schleuter, 2016)



(Heinen, 2006; Ghane, Fausey and Brown, 2015)

Modelled denitrification of riverine NO₃ in inundated areas





Variable denitrification rates

•Warsaw "Warsaw 3.5 mgL⁻¹ Riverine NO₃ concentration MOLDOV MOLDOV ROMANIA ROMANIA Bucharest= Bucharest= *Warsaw .Warsaw mgL⁻¹ MOLDOV MOLDOV ROMANIA ROMANIA Bucharest* Bucharest*

Mean annual air temperature in 2019



Mean air temperature in June 2019

0.00 - 0.05 0.05 - 0.10 0.10 - 0.20 0.20 - 0.30 0.30 - 0.40 0.40 - 0.50 0.50 - 0.60 0.60 - 0.70 0.70 - 0.80 0.80 - 1.50 1.50 - 2.50 $2.50 - \ln f$





Comparison with globally monitored denitrification rates



Pan et al. (2022), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107850



Showcase examples...





What next?

Odra river

German river basins

Ukraine

- Incorporate phytoplankton, floodplain and groyne field retention •
- Allow modelling of other substances (e.g. salinity, heavy metals or priority • substances) **TN emissions from** Monthly total runoff
- **Develop an open modelling platform**

surface runoff

Denitrification rates







Thank you for your attention!

Contact: anna.oprei@igb-berlin.de, markus.venohr@igb-berlin.de

