



Thermal Mitigation: Model Prediction Application

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION, SEF

Presented to an advisory committee of the DRBC on February 19, 2019. Contents should not be published or re-posted in whole or in part without permission of DRBC.

Multiple Linear Regression

- ▶ Approach:
 - ▶ Understand relationship between Cannonsville releases and Lordville Maximum Water Temperature (75°F / 77°F) for SEF's given charge.
 - ▶ NJDFW
 - ▶ Dataset – May 15 – Sept 15, 2008-2018
 - ▶ CFS – 0 – 2,000
 - ▶ Multiple Linear Regression: R Studio
- ▶ Application of MLR:
 - ▶ Apply appropriate cfs based on Peter's model (~195 cfs/°C), to days exceeding thresholds under phased and non phased approach

Multiple Linear Regression

	LordTmax
LordTmax	1
LordTavg	0.99
HarvDisch	-0.01
HarvTmax	0.84
HarvTmin	0.79
HarvTavg	0.86
BingTavg	0.71
BingTavglag	0.73
HaleEddyTmax	0.55
HaleEddyTmin	0.07
HaleEdduTavg	0.38
HaleEddyDisch	-0.28
BeaverKTMax	0.85
BeaverKTavg	0.85
BeaverkDisch	-0.08
StilesDisc	-0.23
StilesMaxT	-0.09
StilesAvgT	-0.2
FEddyDisc	-0.09
FEddyMaxT	0.85
FEddyMinT	0.82
FEddyAvgT	0.85
PercSTil	-0.01
StilesDiscL	-0.28

► Rudimentary step-wise regression

► Adding and subtracting variables based on Pearson correlations and scatterplots to find best model

	0.84	0.92	0.8	0.8	0.4	-0.14	0.16	0.14	1														
	0.89	0.92	0.82	0.84	0.38	-0.08	0.18	0.14	0.99	1													
	-0.07	-0.1	-0.1	-0.04	0.01	0.14	0.08	0.01	-0.16	-0.15	1												
	0.08	0.04	0.11	0.11	-0.34	-0.22	-0.37	0.85	0.26	0.25	-0.2	1											
	-0.07	-0.08	-0.03	-0.1	0.44	0.53	0.53	0.21	-0.02	-0.02	-0.16	0.24	1										
	-0.08	-0.18	-0.09	-0.1	0.26	0.53	0.42	0.34	-0.12	-0.1	-0.14	0.36	0.94	1									
	-0.11	-0.12	-0.1	-0.04	0.01	0.12	0.08	0.02	-0.19	-0.18	0.91	-0.22	-0.18	-0.16	1								
	0.85	0.94	0.8	0.79	0.37	-0.14	0.14	0.05	0.97	0.96	-0.21	0.18	-0.02	-0.12	-0.25	1							
	0.93	0.9	0.8	0.86	0.24	-0.04	0.12	0.07	0.92	0.96	-0.16	0.17	-0.06	-0.07	-0.2	0.93	1						
	0.9	0.94	0.81	0.84	0.31	-0.1	0.13	0.06	0.96	0.97	-0.19	0.18	-0.05	-0.1	-0.23	0.98	0.98	1					
	0.2	0.18	0.19	0.16	-0.23	-0.24	-0.29	0.56	0.43	0.41	-0.5	0.81	0.33	0.41	-0.56	0.37	0.35	0.36	1				
	0.07	0.03	0.1	0.11	-0.32	-0.21	-0.35	0.78	0.28	0.28	-0.2	0.9	0.26	0.38	-0.22	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.76	1			

Model:

```
Call:
lm(formula = Lowest$LordTmax ~ Lowest$HaleEddyDisch + Lowest$FEddyMaxT + Lowest$BingTavglag, data = Lowest)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-3.9798	-0.6028	0.0847	0.6870	9.2523

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	7.3554961	0.2986481	24.63	<2e-16	***
Lowest\$HaleEddyDisch	-0.0044207	0.0001701	-25.99	<2e-16	***
Lowest\$FEddyMaxT	0.5794512	0.0200101	28.96	<2e-16	***
Lowest\$BingTavglag	0.1732817	0.0156687	11.06	<2e-16	***

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 1.11 on 884 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.8111, Adjusted R-squared: 0.8105

F-statistic: 1265 on 3 and 884 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

$$\text{LordTmax} = b_0 - (0.0044207 * \text{HaleEddyDisch}) + (0.5794512 * \text{FEddyMaxT}) + (0.1732817 * \text{BingTavglag})$$

226 cfs/°C with 95% confidence interval of 218 to 235

Application of model

- ▶ Kolesar Model 1:

- ▶ $\text{LordTmax} = 4.612 - 0.005118 \text{ StilDiscL} + 0.8650 \text{ FishTavg} + 0.02211 \text{ BingTavgL}$

- ▶ 195 cfs/°C with 95% confidence interval of 187 to 205

Application Assumptions

- ▶ Perfect prediction:
 - ▶ We know the conditions: avg. water temperature, avg. air temperature, etc.
- ▶ Simulated releases:
 - ▶ We know exactly how much water to release: given 1 cfs released from the reservoir decreases Lordville water temperature by - 0.005118 °C
- ▶ The only additional releases for thermal mitigation were the ones supplied:
 - ▶ 6/9/2008, 7/6/2010, 7/22/2011, 6/20/2012, 7/17/2013, 7/23/2016
- ▶ No releases when CFS at Lordville > 2000 CFS assuming diminishing effects

No phase approach < 75 °F

	Simulated Releases	Actual Releases	Total Release needed to mitigate >75°F	Difference between used and bank
2008	3771	592	4363	-1863
2009	899	0	899	1601
2010	3771	543	4314	-1814
2011	430	817	1246	1254
2012	1583	365	1947	553
2013	20	671	690	1810
2014	0	0	0	2500
2015	137	0	137	2363
2016	117	510	628	1872
2017	0	0	0	2500
2018	332	0	332	2168

Phased approach <75°F <77°F

	Simulated Releases	Actual Releases	Total Release needed for phases	Difference between used and bank
2008	1876	592	2468	32
2009	899	0	899	1601
2010	2130	543	2673	-173
2011	156	817	973	1527
2012	567	365	931	1569
2013	0	671	671	1829
2014	0	0	0	2500
2015	137	0	137	2363
2016	0	510	510	1990
2017	0	0	0	2500
2018	117	0	117	2383

* If we dropped phases to <73°F & <75°F it would take more than 2x the water

No phase approach < 73°F

	Simulated Releases	Actual Releases	Total Release needed for phases	Difference between used and bank
2008	9086	592	9678	-7178
2009	2130	0	2130	370
2010	10004	543	10547	-8047
2011	1192	817	2009	491
2012	6292	365	6657	-4157
2013	723	671	1394	1106
2014	274	0	274	2226
2015	1485	0	1485	1015
2016	1837	510	2347	153
2017	176	0	176	2324
2018	2989	0	2989	-489

No phase approach < 68°F

	Simulated Releases	Actual Releases	Total Release needed for phases	Difference between used and bank
2008	36,225	592	36,817	-34,317
2009	10,375	0	10,375	-7,875
2010	36,538	543	37,081	-34,581
2011	10,082	817	10,899	-8,399
2012	40,485	365	40,850	-38,350
2013	7,874	671	8,545	-6,045
2014	5,881	0	5,881	-3,381
2015	10,922	0	10,922	-8,422
2016	27,042	510	27,552	-25,052
2017	12,388	0	12,388	-9,888
2018	18,601	0	18,601	-16,101