EVALUATING LAMPRICIDE TRANSPORT IN LAKE CHAMPLAIN

1

prepared for

Inland Fisheries Section New York State Department of Environmental Conservation 50 Wolf Road Albany, New York 12233

by

Jeffrey P. Laible, P.E., Ph.D. Civil Engineer Holmes Road Charlotte, Vermont 05445

and

William W. Walker, Jr., Ph.D. Environmental Engineer 1127 Lowell Road Concord, Massachusetts 01742

FINAL REPORT

APRIL 1987

EVALUATING LAMPRICIDE TRANSPORT IN LAKE CHAMPLAIN

prepared for

Inland Fisheries Section New York State Department of Environmental Conservation 50 Wolf Road Albany, New York 12233

by

Jeffrey P. Laible, P.E., Ph.D. Civil Engineer Holmes Road Charlotte, Vermont 05445

and

William W. Walker, Jr., Ph.D. Environmental Engineer 1127 Lowell Road Concord, Massachusetts 01742

FINAL REPORT

APRIL 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. TECHNICAL APPROACH	2
3. HYDRODYNAMIC ANALYSIS	. 3
4. MASS TRANSPORT ANALYSIS	. 4
5. WIND VELOCITY DATA	5
6. MODEL TESTING	6
7. SIMULATION OF TFM APPLICATIONS	. 8
8. SIMULATION OF BAYER-73 APPLICATIONS	10
9. SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	11
10. DENSITY CURRENTS	12
11. EMPIRICAL PLUME PROJECTIONS	13
12. RESULTS	15
13. SITE 1 - GREAT CHAZY RIVER	15
14. SITE 2 - SARANAC RIVER	17
15. SITE 3 - AUSABLE RIVER	19
16. SITE 4 - LEWIS CREEK	21
17. SITE 5 - PUTNAM CREEK	23
18. CONCLUSION	25
REFERENCES	. 28
FIGURES (1-74)	
TARIES (1-3)	

1. INTRODUCTION

This report provides technical assistance to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYDEC) in projecting the transport of lampricides applied to Lake Champlain tributaries and bays. This information will be used by NYDEC to evaluate impacts on water supplies and on sensitive ecological areas and to design procedures for monitoring and mitigating impacts associated with the proposed lamprey control program.

Mathematical models are used to project the spatial and temporal histories of lampricide plumes resulting from specified treatment conditions (defined by applied concentration, duration, location, streamflow, wind regime, and season). Evaluations have been conducted at five sites and seven proposed treatments:

		Lampricide	Treatment
Site No.	River/Creek	TFM	Bayer-73
. 1	Great Chazy River	x	
2	Saranac River	x	x
3	Ausable River	x	x
4	Lewis Creek	x	
5	Putnam Creek	Χ.	

Site locations are shown in Figure 1. For each site and treatment, the size and duration of the lampricide plume have been projected down to 50 and 20 ppb concentration levels.

2. TECHNICAL APPROACH

The projections are based upon mathematical models representing hydrodynamics and mass transport in the embayment and open lake waters associated with each application site. Two types of models are involved:

- hydrodynamic model, which predicts current speeds and directions in the lake surface layer as a function of wind speeds, wind directions, and topography (Laible, 1985a,1985b,1986); and
- (2) transport model, which predicts concentration patterns as a function of current velocities, flows, applied concentrations, and topography (Walker, 1985).

The models are tested against field data from Rhodamine dye studies conducted by the NYDEC between May and August, 1986 (Meyers, 1986). The field data consist of river discharge rates, local wind conditions, dye concentrations and temperature recordings.

The tasks required for projecting the transport at each site are as follows:

- Based upon review of dye study results, define model regions.
- (2) Develop finite element grid for hydrodynamic model.
- (3) Run hydrodynamic model to generate lake circulation patterns for various wind conditions.
- (4) Develop transport model grid.
- (5) Using circulation patterns generated by the hydrodynamic model, simulate dye release experiments and test models by comparing observed and predicted dye concentrations.
- (6) Use linked hydrodynamic and transport models to simulate lampricide plume under proposed treatment conditions (streamflow, applied concentration, duration) over a range of ambient wind conditions.

Results of preliminary simulations and sensitivity analyses are described in a previous report (Laible and Walker, 1986). Initial sections of this report discuss basic concepts involved in the hydrodynamic analysis, mass transport analysis, and simulation of treatment conditions. Detailed results for each site are subsequently presented. A final section summarizes results and compares plume projections with those developed by Meyers (1986) based upon dye study results.

3. HYDRODYNAMIC ANALYSIS

Circulation patterns in the vicinities of the river mouths have been simulated using a steady-state finite element hydrodynamic model (FEM) which has been developed and applied elsewhere on Lake Champlain (Laible,1985a,1985b,1986). Lake circulation is driven by wind. The model first computes vertically averaged horizontal velocities of the fluid at discrete points (nodes) in the model region. Subsequently, the vertical distribution of the flow at each node is computed.

Wind-driven flows vary over depth owing to development of two types of currents: drift currents and slope currents. Drift currents are directly attributed to wind shear on the water surface. As water piles up or is drawn away from the shoreline, a surface elevation gradient develops. This gradient causes a pressure in the opposite direction of rising slope. This pressure drives fluid at the lower depths in a direction generally opposite to the direction of the wind (slope current).

The distribution of flow over depth generally starts with surface currents aligned with the wind, except in deeper regions, where they may deviate significantly due to Ekman frictional effects. With increased depth, the currents diminish and then reverse, pointing into the wind. In shallow regions, horizontal patterns are further complicated by

2

effects of topography. Topographic flows interact with classical slope and drift currents to form relatively complex velocity distributions which can only be described by numerical models of the type employed in this study. For a detailed discussion of the finite element model, the reader is referred to Laible (1985a,1985b,1986).

From the complex flow distribution, it is possible to evaluate total flows in the mixed layer at each node in each of the orthogonal directions. This is done by integrating the vertical flow distribution over the mixed layer depth and keeping track of the total flow in each of four directions (north, south, east, and west). The vertically integrated flows are used in the two-dimensional mass transport model described below.

Circulation patterns have been generated at each site for eight different wind directions (N,NE,E,SE,S,SW,W,NW) under a standard wind speed (8.7 miles per hour). Flow patterns for other wind speeds have been generated by scaling (flow rates are roughly proportional to the square of the effective wind speed). These current fields have been used in modeling transport of dye and lampricide under appropriate wind conditions, as described below.

The hydrodynamic flow fields are presented as vector plots of vertically averaged flow at each node and total flux (velocity times depth) at each node. A total of 80 flow fields and their associated exchange and advective fields have been generated under this study. Examples for N and NE winds are presented for each site (e.g., Figures 17 and 18). Reversing the direction of the arrows on these figures yields circulation patterns under S and SW winds, respectively.

4. MASS TRANSPORT ANALYSIS

Mass transport simulations have been performed using S2D, a finitedifference model developed in previous studies on Lake Champlain (Walker,1985; Walker et al.,1986). As compared with the triangular, link/node grid used by the FEM, S2D simulations are performed on a grid of square cells. The model is two dimensional (latitude and longitude) and has been designed for application to the lake surface layer. Each cell is assumed to be completely mixed. Two basic modes of transport are considered:

- (1) advection (based upon current velocities supplied by the hydrodynamic model), and
- (2) diffusion (calculated from cell morphometry and an assumed diffusion or dispersion coefficient).

The advective circulation patterns supplied by the FEM reflect winddriven currents in both directions across each cell interface. Exchange between adjacent cells can occur, for example, because of surface drift currents in one direction and bottom slope currents in the opposite direction. Currents supplied by the hydrodynamic model generally dominate flow and mass transport between cells; the diffusive component is relatively unimportant.

In a steady-state mode, S2D solves for concentration fields resulting from a fixed loading regime and flow field. In a dynamic mode, S2D solves for time-varying concentration fields resulting from transient loading regimes (e.g., 12-hour lampricide application). Flow fields are fixed for a given run, however. To simulate transient flow fields (e.g., resulting from shifting wind directions or varying tributary flows), a series of linked model runs must be performed; final concentrations for one run or time increment provide initial values for the next. Boundary conditions can be specified as fixed concentration or zero-gradient. The latter, more conservative boundary condition has been used in the simulations discussed below.

Consistent with previous model applications, a uniform cell size of 400 meters has been employed. Mean cell depths have been derived from Lake Champlain navigation charts, which refer to minimum lake elevations (28.4 meters msl). Under 1986 spring-summer conditions, lake elevations were near normal (1 to 1.2 meters above minimum). Accordingly, mean depths used in simulations have been increased by one meter relative to those displayed in cell grid maps (e.g., Figure 19). A maximum mixedlayer depth of 10 meters has been assumed in the hydrodynamic and transport simulations; accordingly, depths are truncated at 10 meters. As described below, shallower mixed layers are assumed in most simulations.

To permit use in transport simulations, flow fields generated by the hydrodynamic model must be interpolated and integrated along cell interfaces in the S2D grid. The resulting flows across each interface must also satisfy a water balance constraint on each cell. Considerable effort has been expended in refining the methodology used for these calculations, in order to minimize errors involved in linking the hydrodynamic and transport models. The resulting procedure consists of the following steps:

- (1) read coordinates at FEM elements and nodes (x,y), corresponding velocities in each direction (+vx,-vx,+vy,vy) and depths (z);
- (2) translate FEM coordinates (x,y) to S2D grid coordinates (column,row);
- (3) for each cell interface (excluding those bordering land masses):
 - (a) divide interface into 3 segments of equal length;
 - (b) interpolate products +vx*z, -vx*z, +vy*z, -vy*z at center of each segment, using weighted sum of values at nearest node or element in each quadrant (NE,SE,SW,NW); weight - squared inverse distance; maximum distance - 1 row/column width;

- (c) sum interpolated values over 3 segments and multiply by cell width to get flows (m³/day), positive and negative, across each segment;
- (4) formulate water balance equations and calculate water balance error (total flow in - total flow out) for each cell;
- (5) divide the grid into regions of approximately 30 cells;
- (6) number regions in increasing order, so that highest numbered regions border on boundary conditions;
- (7) for each region, in increasing order, correct water balance errors by adding a correction term for the net flow across each interface; exclude interfaces bordering cells in lower-numbered regions; select correction terms to minimize sum of squares of corrections, subject to water balance constraints; formulate problem using LaGrange Method of Undetermined Multipliers; solve resulting system of linear equations (containing roughly 3 x #cells unknowns) via Gauss Elimination;
- (8) store resultant flow matrix for use in subsequent runs.

Prior to flow balance correction, median water balance errors for flow fields are on the order of 5%.

5. WIND VELOCITY DATA

Wind speed and direction partially determine circulation patterns predicted by the hydrodynamic model and the path of dye or lampricide released into the lake at a particular location and time. Wind velocity measurements taken during the dye release study at each site have been described previously (Laible and Walker, 1986). The locations of wind measurements made in the field are critical; because of the sheltering effects of land masses, land-based measurements tend to under-predict effective wind speeds driving lake circulation. Wind speeds measured at the study sites were generally lower than speeds measured simultaneously at Burlington Airport. The latter provides a long term, quality wind record which has been shown to be more useful than onsite measurements for modeling purposes because of the factors discussed above (Laible and Walker, 1987).

To provide perspectives on wind conditions, statistical analyses of the Burlington Airport wind record have been conducted for May through September of 1986 (3-hour observations). A cross-tabulation of wind speed and direction (Table 1) shows that there are two dominant wind events: South or Southeast (42.7% frequency) and North or Northwest (33.1% frequency). The frequency distribution for September only (the month proposed for lampricide application) is similar to that for May-

5

September. The distribution of total wind load (driving force for lake circulation, roughly proportional to square of wind speed) is also dominated by southerly and southeasterly winds (Table 2). Similar results have also been obtained for the May-September 1984 wind record from Burlington Airport (Laible and Walker, 1987).

The wind load factor (calculated as shown in Table 2) is defined as the ratio of lake circulation rate at a given wind speed to the circulation rate at a standard wind speed of 8.7 mph. Flow fields have been generated by the FEM for each site and wind direction under a standard wind speed of 8.7 mph (load factor = 1.0). Figure 2 displays the three-day moving-average load factor vs. time for the May-September 1986 period. A three-day averaging period has been used because it is a reasonable time scale for evaluating lampricide plume duration (from TFM application to dilution below 50 or 20 ppb concentration levels). Moving average load factors range from .5 to 4. Figure 2 provides indications of the probabilities of encountering lake circulation rates which are higher or lower than those simulated. As discussed below, sensitivity analyses indicate that lampricide plume durations are strongly dependent upon circulation rates (wind load factors). Maximum plume areas and locations, however, are dependent primarily upon wind directions and mixed depths and are relatively insensitive to circulation rates.

6. MODEL TESTING

Table 3 summarizes dye study and lampricide treatment conditions at each site. The models are tested by simulating dye study conditions (flow, applied concentration, duration, wind) and comparing observed and estimated maximum dye concentrations in each model cell over the duration of the dye measurements. In these simulations, dye concentrations are rescaled to an applied concentration of 1000 ppb. Observed and predicted plumes are compared at 100 and 10 ppb, which 10-fold and 100-fold dilutions of correspond to the applied concentration, respectively. These comparisons are complicated by the following factors:

- (1) variations in background fluorescence;
- (2) potential errors in measurement coordinates;
- (3) spatial data-reduction procedures;
- (4) estimation of effective wind speeds and directions driving lake circulation during the study period.

These factors are discussed below.

Variations in background (natural) fluorescence limit the resolution of the dye studies, especially for detecting high dilution ratios. As indicated in Table 3, maximum detectable dilution ratios range from 93 to 470 for the various sites, based upon background fluorescence values ranging from .02-.03 assumed by Meyers(1986). The latter values are very conservative, however. Based upon review of dye measurements taken at locations distant from the application point and/or prior to the dye application, background fluorescence was highly variable and occasionally exceeded .1 units. A median value of .05 seems more representative; this reduces the resolution range to 56-236. Variations in background fluorescence likely account for some of the differences between observed and predicted concentration contours, particularly at the 100-fold dilution level.

As described by Meyers(1986), dye measurement locations were tracked using Loran-C units. Instrument drift and possible errors in the transformation to orthogonal coordinates (latitude and longitude) are additional potential sources of error in the dye data.

The model predicts the mean concentration in each cell and time step. The dye sampling strategy tended to exclude null samples (i.e., samples were more likely to be taken for laboratory analysis if the onboard fluorimeter indicated values which were significantly above background levels.). Because of this strategy, limited number of samples, and the complexities involved in spatial weighting, it is infeasible to calculate a mean dye concentration for each grid cell and time period for comparison with model simulations. Accordingly, the comparisons based upon the maximum dye concentration detected in each cell over the duration of the study. Both random and deterministic factors contribute to variability within model cells and partially explain differences between observed (maximum) and predicted (mean) dye concentrations.

For reasons discussed in Section 5, the selection of the appropriate wind regime (direction, speed) to drive the hydrodynamic model under dye study conditions is not straightforward. Each dye study has been simulated under three alternative sets of wind conditions:

- Burlington Airport directions and speeds (updated at 3hour increments);
- (2) Burlington Airport resultant direction and observed mean load factor, as defined in Table 2 (constant over entire simulation period); and
- (3) Site directions and Burlington Airport speeds (updated at 3-hour increments).

Possibly because of sheltering effects, site measurements of wind speed are unrealistically low and have not been used in the simulations. The above wind cases provide a range of simulations for comparison with the observed dye plumes.

Based upon review of lake temperature profiles, the vertical distribution of dye with depth, and comparison of observed and predicted dye plumes, the maximum depth of the mixed layer is adjusted to

represent dye study conditions. To reflect thermal buoyancy of the inflowing streams, shallower depths (1.5-2 meters) have been used in simulating spring dye studies at the Great Chazy and Saranac Rivers. Greater depths (5-10 meters) have been used in simulating the dye studies conducted during August at the remaining sites. Simulations of TFM and Bayer-73 applications (scheduled for September) assume maximum mixed layer depths of 5 meters. Subject to potential effects of inflow density currents (Section 10), the 5-meter mixed depth is conservative (likely causing over-estimation of plume areas) because the lake thermocline is likely to be found in the 15-20 meter range during September.

7. SIMULATION OF TFM APPLICATIONS

Once the hydrodynamic and mass transport models have been set up and tested for a given lake region, simulation of TFM applications to inflow streams is relatively straightforward. The application is represented as a square wave in stream concentration (12 or 16 hours in duration, depending upon site) at the prescribed treatment level. Hydrodynamic conditions (streamflow and lake circulation) are held fixed for a given run. Lake concentration levels respond to the transient input: concentrations near the river mouth increase during the application period and decrease thereafter, as the material is transported away from the mouth. The simulation is continued until all cell concentrations drop below 10 ppb.

To illustrate the methodology employed in simulations of river TFM applications, a "movie" of one treatment (Saranac River, North Wind) is shown in Figure 3. In this example, the simulation proceeds until all cell concentrations drop below 50 ppb (i.e., 90 hours). Results are summarized in the form of a plot of maximum TFM concentration in each model cell (last plot). Comparing this plot with the 50 ppb standard defines the spatial extent of the lampricide plume. Plume duration is defined as the time required (from start of lampricide loading to lake) for all cell concentrations to drop below the 50 ppb standard.

Simulations such as that shown in Figure 3 are conducted separately for each of eight wind directions and standard wind load. The resulting plume maps (cell-maximum concentrations for each wind direction) are subsequently overlayed and compared to produce a single, composite grid of cell-maximum concentrations. An example is shown in Figure 4. The grid is subsequently overlayed on a lake chart and contours are plotted for the 10, 20, and 50 ppb concentration levels. Derived in the way, the contours should surround the plume, regardless of wind speeds and directions which are present at the time of application. If the wind were from the south, for example, the plume would tend to fill the northern portions of the contours.

TFM simulations assume treatment conditions (streamflow, applied concentration, duration) specified in Table 3. Because the transport model is linear, simulation results can be rescaled to estimate maximum

TFM concentration contours for other sets of treatment conditions. This rescaling is performed based upon the total mass of lampricide applied:

$$C_o = C_t F$$

 $F = \langle Q_o Y_o T_o \rangle / \langle Q_t Y_t T_t \rangle$

where,

F = scale factor

under proposed treatment conditions:

 C_t = lake lampricide concentration (ppb) Q_t = streamflow (cfs) Y_t = applied lampricide concentration (ppb) T_t = duration of application (hrs)

under simulated conditions (as defined in Table 3):

 C_o = lake lampricide concentration (ppb) Q_o = streamflow (cfs) Y_o = applied lampricide concentration (ppb) T_o = duration of application (hrs)

This rescaling is inaccurate for locations in the immediate vicinity of the river inflow, but is accurate for defining plume boundaries at 50 and 20 ppb concentration levels.

For example, the maximum concentration grid shown in Figure 4 is based upon a simulated streamflow of 600 cfs, applied TFM concentration of 1.5 ppm, and treatment duration of 12 hours. Since concentrations are displayed with a scale factor of 5, grid values greater then 10 would represent the 50 ppb plume under the simulated treatment conditions. Suppose that one wanted to use these results to predict the 50 ppb contours for treatment conducted at a streamflow of 800 cfs, applied TFM concentration of 2 ppm, and treatment duration of 12 hours. The first step is to calculate the scale factor:

F = (600 cfs x 1.5 ppm x 12 hrs) / (800 cfs x 2 ppm x 12 hrs)

= .56

The grid cell value corresponding to 50 ppb would be 50 x .56 / 5 = 5.6. Thus, all cells in Figure 4 with scaled concentrations equal to or exceeding 5.6 would be inside the 50 ppb contour under the modified treatment conditions. Similar calculations can be performed to estimate other contour levels based upon the standard grid.

8. SIMULATION OF BAYER-73 APPLICATIONS

Simulation of Bayer-73 applications to delta areas is based upon the same principles, but is more complicated because the effective release period of the material must be considered. Bayer-73 is applied in a granular form (5% active ingredient bound to sand particles with a water-soluble adhesive). When the material hits the water, the some portion of the active ingredient is released immediately into the surface water. The sand particles sink and the remainder of the active ingredient is subject to slower release.

One laboratory study (Seeyle,1987) has shown that less than 35% of the active ingredient is released into the water, based upon a single overnight extraction in Lake Huron water (87 ppm alkalinity). Because of adsorption equilibria, however, multiple extractions may yield higher release percentages. Higher percentages may also be released into Lake Champlain waters because of differences in alkalinity.

Ho and Gloss (1987) describe results of a study of Bayer-73 levels following treatment in Seneca Lake, New York. A 101-acre plot in the vicinity of a lake inflow was treated at the prescribed rate of 100 lbs Bayer-73/acre (5% active ingredient). Concentrations of Bayer-73 were followed as a function of depth at nine stations over a 96-hour period and ranged from <10 to 573 ppb. All concentrations were below 50 ppb within 48 hours of treatment and below 10 ppb within 96 hours. Direct transfer of these results to other sites is impossible because concentration history is partially related to site-specific hydrodynamic factors (ambient lake currents, tributary inflow), as well as to water and sediment chemistry.

Of the nine stations monitored by Ho and Gloss, the shallow nearshore station (F) in the center of the treated region would be the least subject to hydrodynamic factors. Time series data from this station are plotted in Figure 5. Surface concentrations peaked at about 400 ppb between 4 and 6 hours after treatment. Mid-depth and nearbottom concentrations peaked at about 300 ppb between 2.5 and 5 hours after treatment. If the water in the vicinity of this station were completely isolated (no hydrodynamic exchange with surrounding regions) and if all of the applied active ingredient were dissolved in the water, a mass-balance calculation indicates that average Bayer-73 concentration in the region would peak at 550 ppb. Differences between the observed 300-400 ppb peak and the theoretical maximum value of 550 ppb are attributed to transport by lake currents flowing through the region, permanent binding of the active ingredient to the sand particles (lack of release), adsorption to lake bottom sediments, and decay in the water column.

Because effects of transport are potentially significant but were not quantitatively determined at the Seneca Lake site, the Ho and Gloss study does not show that less than 100% of the applied active ingredient was actually released into the water column. The difference between the observed and theoretical maximum concentrations is small enough to be explainable based upon hydrodynamic factors alone. Accordingly, 100% release is assumed in simulations of Lake Champlain Bayer-73 applications. Based upon the time series behavior observed by Ho and Gloss (Figure 5), an effective release period of 6 hours is assumed.

Sensitivity of Bayer-73 plume behavior to assumed release period is illustrated in Figure 6. In this simulation, Bayer-73 is applied at 100 lbs/acre to 175 acres near the mouth of the Saranac River under a north wind. Effects of alternative release periods (24, 12, 6, and 3 hours) on the simulated maximum concentrations and plume duration are shown. Plume duration is defined as the total length of time during which cell concentration exceeds the 50 ppb criterion. A longer release period increases dilution in ambient currents and decreases plume size and As distance from the application area increases, duration. the sensitivity of the simulated maximum concentrations to the assumed release period decreases. This reflects the fact that, over reasonable time scales for the release and under a given set of ambient conditions, the basic driving force for the creation of the lampricide plume in the surrounding lake waters is the total mass of active material applied (i.e., 5 lbs/acre), not its rate of application or rate of release (lbs/acre-hour).

Figure 6 indicates little difference between the 6-hour and 3-hour simulations. Accordingly, the 6-hour release period supported by the Ho and Gloss study is used in simulating Bayer-73 applications to Lake Champlain. Projections are conservative (i.e., under-predict cell-mean concentrations) because less than 100% of the active ingredient will be released into the water column and the dissolved material will be subject to various decay mechanisms (photolysis, adsorption, hydrolysis, uptake) as it is transported away from the application site.

9. SENSITIVITY ANALYSES

Sensitivity analyses indicate that, for a given site, applied concentration, and river flow, the most important factors determining the maximum area of the dye or lampricide plume are wind direction and the effective depth of the mixed layer. Figure 7 illustrates sensitivities of maximum plume area to wind load and mixed layer depth for the Saranac River TFM application under a north wind. Mixed depth and shoreline topography determine the availability of volume for dilution of the applied loading. Generally, plume areas will be greatest for wind directions which generate along-shore currents and hinder transport into deeper offshore regions. Wind speeds (which determine transport rates) generally have a strong influence on plume duration, but a weak influence on plume size and location, for a given wind direction.

Mechanisms responsible for decreasing lampricide or dye concentrations following application include:

(1) dilution in the lake volume contained within the simulation grid;

- (2) transport out of the simulation grid via wind-driven currents;
- (3) transport out of the simulation grid via river flow, as it moves through the lake towards the outlet;
- (4) transport out of the simulation grid in the main lake flows to the north (driven by whole-lake water balance);
- (5) decay due to various physical, chemical, biological mechanisms.

Generally, mechanism (1) is dominant for all simulations. Mass-balance calculations indicate that mechanisms (2) and (3) are relatively unimportant for the cases studied. Mechanisms (4) and (5) are potentially important over long time scales, but have not been considered in the simulations.

All simulations assume that lampricide behaves conservatively in the environment. Many studies have shown that TFM and, especially, Bayer-73 are subject to a number of physical, chemical, and biological processes which cause removal from the water column. Sediment adsorption and photolysis are considered to be important decay mechanisms; half-lives in the range of 2.5-10 days have been reported (NRCC,1985; Ho and Gloss,1987). Because these mechanisms are not accounted for, the simulations likely over-estimate the areas and durations of the lampricide plumes following treatment. Sensitivity analyses indicate that consideration of lampricide decay would generally have little effect on maximum plume areas (because these are generally achieved a within one or two days after treatment) but may have substantial effects on predicted plume duration.

10. DENSITY CURRENTS

The models assume that streams entering the lake are completely mixed into the lake epilimnion. Differences between inflowing stream temperature and lake surface temperature, as driven primarily by season, can create a potential for the inflowing stream to float or sink to lake layers of similar density. This phenomenon depends upon several factors, including temperature, flow velocities, stream and lake topographies (Fischer et al., 1979).

To provide regional perspectives on the driving forces for inflow density currents, stream and lake temperature records from the St. Albans Bay area of Lake Champlain have been analyzed. The data consist of weekly temperature measurements at two locations between 1982 and 1986, as derived from studies of St. Albans Bay being conducted by Water Resources Research Center of the University of Vermont. Figure 8 compares monthly-average stream and lake surface temperatures. Average stream temperatures exceed the lake surface temperatures only during May. This creates a tendency for inflowing rivers to float on the lake surface for some distance, until the density gradient is dissipated by wind, other sources of turbulence, and thermal diffusion.

Stream temperatures average less than 1 deg-C below lake surface temperatures during June. As the season progresses from June through October, the stream becomes increasingly cool relative to the lake surface and a driving force for inflow plunging develops. During September, the month proposed for lampricide treatment, the average stream temperature (14 deg-C) is 5 degrees cooler than the lake surface (19 deg-C). Review of vertical temperature profiles from the Kingsland Bay area of Lake Champlain (Figure 9, from Smeltzer, 1985) indicates that the 14-degree contour is found in a depth range of 15 to 25 meters during September. Thus, if no entrance mixing is involved, September streamflow would tend to plunge to the 15.25 meter level, spread laterally at that level and eventually dissipate. In reality, depending upon stream velocity and topography, some entrance mixing would tend to occur and cause entrainment of warm lake surface waters, until the "plunge point" is encountered (Fischer et al., 1979). With entrance mixing, the plunging inflow stream would seek a shallower depth range and be incorporated sooner into the mixed layer.

Effects of density currents are apparent in some of the dye study results. Mean and maximum dye concentrations are displayed by site and depth interval in Figure 10. Concentrations have been rescaled to an applied concentration of 1000, so that a value of 100 represents a 10fold dilution of inflowing river water. As described by Meyers (1986), dye concentrated at the lake surface during May 1986 plume studies at the Great Chazy and Saranac Rivers (1 and 6 in Figure 10). This is attributed to stream temperatures which were 6-10 deg F warmer than lake surface temperatures (Table 3). During the August surveys, streams were slightly cooler than lake surface (1-3 deg F) and the dye was mixed to greater depths.

Seasonal variations may influence projections of lampricide behavior based either upon the dye studies (Meyers, 1986) or upon the two-dimensional models discussed below. The dye studies were conducted during May and August, as compared with the proposed mid-to-late September lampricide treatment period. Because of differences in inflow plunging potential and mixed layer depths, the dye studies are limited analogues for plume behavior during the proposed treatment period. Additional interpretations of model results, given the potential for density currents, are presented in the Sections 13-18.

11. EMPIRICAL PLUME PROJECTIONS

To supplement TFM plume projections based upon the models and upon contour plotting (Meyers, 1986), an alternative projection technique employing dye measurements has been developed and applied to each site. The technique is based upon two fundamental concepts which result from the linearity of mass transport:

- Under a given set of hydrodynamic conditions, plume response is related to the total mass of applied material (streamflow x applied concentration x duration).
- (2) Once the material has been applied, maximum lake concentrations decay exponentially as a function of time and distance from the river inflow, at rates which reflect ambient hydrodynamics.

The first concept permits rescaling of dye concentrations measured in the lake to TFM concentrations under prescribed treatment conditions, based upon the ratio of TFM load to dye load. This rescaling is inaccurate at low travel distances and times (low dilution ratios for the inflowing river). The second concept permits approximate extrapolation of maximum plume concentration as a function of time and space on a semi-log scale. The exponential decay rate reflects the net influences of all transport processes operating during the study period. This is an approximation because effective dilution rates may vary with distance from the inflow.

The method is illustrated in Figure 11 using data from the May/June dye study at the Saranac site. Measured dye concentrations are rescaled to TFM concentrations based upon the TFM/dye load ratio. The logarithms of projected TFM concentrations are plotted as a function of time and distance from the river inflow. Time is measured relative to the start of plume entry to the lake. Distance is calculated from the latitude and longitude coordinates of the dye measurements relative to the river mouth. To illustrate vertical aspects of plume behavior, different symbols are used to represent surface (x) and subsurface samples (o).

Projections of time and distance required to reach 50 and 20 ppb maximum concentration levels are based upon extrapolations of straight lines defining the upper portions of the scatter plots. These are illustrated by the dashed lines in Figure 11. The linearity of these lines is consistent with the exponential decay discussed above ((2) above).

One advantage of this technique is that it is simple and easily implemented, given a data file containing dye measurements as a function of latitude, longitude, depth, and time. It avoids the complex spatial averaging and interpolation procedures required to generate contour diagrams. Spatial analysis is still required, however, to project directional aspects of the plume.

The major limitation of the technique is that the projections are valid only for the hydrodynamic conditions under which the dye study occurred. Projections may differ for wind speeds, wind directions, or lake mixed depths which are significantly different from those encountered during the dye study. Such variations can only be considered by conducting multiple dye studies or by using simulation models of the type described below. At long distances and times (high dilution factors and low concentrations), the dye measurements are increasingly sensitive to variations in background fluorescence. As discussed above, very conservative (low) values for background fluorescence have been used; this may lead to underestimation of decay rates and overestimation of the plume durations and distances using this technique.

Despite limitations, this technique is useful for projecting and summarizing dye plume behavior as a function of time, distance, and depth. Based upon comparison of surface (x) and subsurface (o) samples, Figure 30 shows that the dye plume was initially concentrated at the surface (high concentrations at short times and distances from the river inflow). As time and distance increased, however, the dye became more evenly distributed with depth.

12. RESULTS

Table 3 summarizes treatment conditions for each site, as prescribed by NYDEC. The upper limit of the specified flow range has been used in the simulation of TFM and Bayer-73 treatments. Methodology for rescaling simulation results to project plumes resulting from other streamflows, concentrations, or durations is discussed above. Projected plume areas (maximum TFM or Bayer-73 concentration > 50 ppb), distances, and durations are displayed for each treatment and wind direction in Figures 12,13, and 14, respectively.

The following summary of figure numbers will assist readers in locating key results for each site:

	Chazy	Saranac	Ausable	Lewis	Putnam
Model Region	15	25	40	53	63
Finite Element Mesh	16	26	41	54	64
Circulation Patterns	17-18	27-28	42-43	55-56	65-66
Transport Model Grid	19	29	44	57	67
Empirical Projections	20	30-31	45	58	68
Dye Simulations	21	32-33	46	59	69
Plume Projections	22-24	34-39	47-52	60-62	70-72

Detailed results are discussed below.

13. SITE 1 - GREAT CHAZY RIVER

Model results for Site 1, Great Chazy River, are summarized in the following Figures:

- 15 Model Region
- 16 Finite Element Mesh
- 17 Circulation Patterns North Wind
- 18 Circulation Patterns Northeast Wind
- 19 Transport Model Grid
- 20 Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Meas.

15

- 21 Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
- 22 Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
- 23 Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
- 24 Maximum TFM Concentration Contours

The hydrodynamic and mass transport models have been developed, tested, and applied to the Great Chazy site using methods described in the above sections. Results and unique features of this site are discussed below.

Plume areas and durations projected for the Great Chazy TFM treatment generally exceed those projected for other sites because of two primary factors: the relatively high quantity of TFM applied (1885 lbs, Table 3) and the shallow nature of this lake region. Depths range from <1 to 4 meters in King Bay and shoreline areas to the south within the projected plume area (Figures 15, 19, 24). Because of shallow depths, dye or lampricide applied to the river is potentially transported over relatively long distances before being diluted to 50 and 20 ppb concentration levels. Shallow depths would also increase exposure of TFM to bottom sediments and light, however; this would tend to increase losses due to adsorption and photolysis mechanisms and thereby reduce the spatial and temporal extent of the plume.

The Great Chazy dye study was conducted in late May of 1986. Because the dye was applied 5.5 miles above the river mouth, there was considerable delay (29 hrs) and dispersion of the plume in the river before it reached the lake. To account for this, the effective loading period used in the dye simulation has been increased from 12 to 36 hrs and the effective inflow concentration has been reduced by a factor of 3, based upon observed dispersion of the dye at the river mouth. In simulating TFM applications, the effective loading period has been increased from 16 to 48 hours and the concentration at the mouth of the river has been reduced from 3.5 to 1.16 ppb. This assumes that dispersion in the river during the TFM application will be similar to that observed during the dye study. Because they depend primarily upon the total mass of TFM applied, projections of maximum TFM plume areas are insensitive to a reasonable degree of dispersion in the river above the lake.

Because the inflowing river averaged about 10 degrees F warmer than the lake surface temperature, the plume was initially concentrated at the lake surface. Figure 20 shows that at short distances from the inflow, maximum surface dye concentrations (x) were much higher than maximum subsurface concentrations (o). Field observations indicate that the dye was initially mixed only to the 1-2 meter level (Meyers, 1986). At long distances (> 3000 meters), however, maximum dye concentrations were similar in surface and subsurface samples. This indicates that vertical mixing increased as the plume proceeded south, driven by the northern winds which were dominant after the dye entered the lake. Northern winds generated high flow velocities along the lake shore (Figure 17). Dye plume simulations under three wind conditions are compared with observed surface and subsurface concentrations in Figure 21. Based upon the observed dye distribution, simulations assume a maximum mixed layer depth of 1.5 meters. The simulation using the resultant wind (North, Load Factor = 1.16) agrees best with the observations and successfully predicts the southern extent of the plume.

The proposed Great Chazy TFM treatment will occur at a streamflow of 150 cfs, applied concentration of 3.5 ppm, and duration of 16 hours. Projected cell maximum TFM concentrations are displayed as a function of wind direction in Figure 22. Generally, N, NW, or NE winds would be most conducive to transport of the applied TFM. Based upon simulation of northern winds, the projected 50 ppb contour would extent south to the mouth of the Little Chazy and the 20 ppb contour would extend to Trembleau Point (Figure 24).

Under other wind conditions (including dominant southern winds), the Great Chazy TFM plume would tend to remain within the King Bay region. The long plume durations (200-300 hours) predicted for SE, S, and SW winds (Figure 14) reflect "trapping" of material in extreme northern portions of the King Bay. Actual plume durations would be lower because of decay mechanisms which are not considered in the simulations.

14. SITE 2 - SARANAC RIVER

Model results for Site 2, Saranac River, are summarized in the following Figures:

- 25 Model Region
- 26 Finite Element Mesh
- 27 Circulation Patterns North Wind
- 28 Circulation Patterns Northeast Wind
- 29 Transport Model Grid
- 30 Empirical Projection of TFM Plume (June)
- 31 Empirical Projection of TFM Plume (August)
- 32 Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations (June)
- 33 Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations (August)
- 34 Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
- 35 Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
- 36 Maximum TFM Concentration Contours
- 37 Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
- 38 Cell Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations

39 Maximum Bayer-73 Concentration Contours

The hydrodynamic and mass transport models have been developed, tested, and applied to the Saranac River site using methods described in the above sections. Results and unique features of this site are discussed below.

During the May 31-June 1 dye study, the inflowing river averaged 7-11 degrees F warmer than the lake surface temperature, the plume was initially concentrated at the lake surface. Figure 30 shows that at short distances from the inflow, maximum surface dye concentrations (x) were much higher than maximum subsurface concentrations (o). At long distances (> 3000 meters), however, maximum dye concentrations were similar in surface and subsurface samples. This indicates that vertical mixing increased as the plume traveled out into the lake. Generally, the pattern is similar to that observed at the Great Chazy, except transport distances were somewhat shorter at Saranac because of greater depths and different wind conditions.

During the August dye study, inflow and lake surface temperatures were similar and the appeared in subsurface samples at shorter times and distances from the inflow (Figure 31). A tendency for subsurface dye concentrations to exceed surface values developed as the plume progressed (e.g., times 15-20 hours, distances 500-1000 meters). This may have been caused by plunging of the river inflow; based upon surface temperature measurements at the mouth of the river, however, the river was only 0-2 degrees F cooler than the lake surface temperature and thus there was little driving force for development of density currents. Temperature measurements in the river above the lake would provide an improved basis for evaluating the potential for density currents.

Another possible explanation for the dye distributions observed during the August survey involves extraneous sources of fluorescence in the region, which would tend to interfere with the dye measurements. Surveys of the Cumberland Bay region conducted prior to dye applications indicated occasional "hot spots" of high fluorescence which could not be readily explained (Meyers, J.A., NYDEC, Pers. Comm., 1987).

As discussed above (Section 3), transport directions often vary vertically within the mixed layer owing to drift and slope currents. A third explanation for the observed vertical behavior of the dye during the August study involves initial mixing, followed by shearing and transport in different directions within the upper and lower portions of the mixed layer. Under the southern winds which were dominant during the dye study, predicted net flow velocities in the vicinity of the river mouth are towards the north and east (Figure 27). The surface plume would tend to follow this path. Reverse currents on the bottom of the mixed layer, may have transported dye towards the south, however. Contour plots of maximum surface and subsurface dye concentrations (Figure 33) suggest that maximum dye concentrations were greater in regions south of the river mouth.

Figure 31 reveals two outliers in the log(TFM) vs. distance plot. These were derived from a vertical profile taken south and east of the river inflow (Column 6, Row 16 of the transport grid, Figure 29) approximately 30 hours after the dye plume reached the lake and 2500 meters from the river mouth. Dye concentrations varied with depth as follows (samples SB108, SB109, SB110):

Depth (m)	0	1.5	3
Dye (ppb)	.07	.44	1.3

Other samples in the same general vicinity showed less variation with depth and maximum concentrations less than .5 ppb. The field log indicates that the maximum depth at this location was 3 meters. If this is true, entrainment of organic bottom sediments may explain the elevated fluorescence of the bottom sample. The recorded maximum depth is inconsistent with the lake navigational chart (Figure 25), which indicates maximum depths in the range of 8.5-11 meters in this region.

Dye plume simulations under three wind conditions are compared with observed surface and subsurface concentrations in Figures 32 and 33 for the June and August surveys, respectively. During the June survey, the dye apparently tracked further to the east (reaching Cumberland Head) than predicted by any of the simulations (Figure 32). It is possible that actual winds were more from the west or southwest than indicated by the airport or site measurements. Agreement between observed and predicted peak dye concentrations is generally good for all simulations of the August release (Figure 33). The exception to this is the anomalous profile discussed above.

The proposed Saranac River TFM treatment will occur at a streamflow of 600 cfs, applied concentration of 1.5 ppm, and duration of 12 hours. Projected cell maximum TFM concentrations are displayed as a function of wind direction in Figure 34. Generally, N or NW winds would be most conducive to transport of the applied TFM. Based upon simulation of northern winds, the projected 50 ppb contour would extent south to the oil terminals and the 20 ppb contour would extend to Bluff Point (Figure 36).

Under other wind conditions, the Saranac TFM plume would tend to remain within the Cumberland Bay region. The long plume durations (120-140 hours) predicted for SE, S, SW, and W winds (Figure 14) reflect "trapping" of material in extreme northern portions of the Cumberland Bay. Actual plume durations would be lower because of decay mechanisms which are not considered in the simulations.

The proposed Bayer-73 treatment of the Saranac River mouth will involve application of 100 lbs/acre of granular Bayer-73 to 175 acres. Plume projections are displayed in Figures 37-39. Because the total mass of active ingredient applied (875 lbs, Table 3) is less than the mass of TFM applied (2424 lbs), Bayer-73 plume projections fall within the TFM applications. Sensitivity to wind direction is qualitatively similar to that discussed above for TFM. Because Bayer-73 is less stable (more subject to adsorption and photolysis) than TFM, projected plume areas and durations are also more conservative.

15. SITE 3 - AUSABLE RIVER

Model results for Site 3, Ausable River, are summarized in the following Figures:

40 Model Region

- 41 Finite Element Mesh
- 42 Circulation Patterns North Wind
- 43 Circulation Patterns Northeast Wind
- 44 Transport Model Grid
- 45 Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Meas.
- 46 Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
- 47 Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
- 48 Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
- 49 Maximum TFM Concentration Contours
- 50 Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
- 51 Cell Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations
- 52 Maximum Bayer-73 Concentration Contours

The hydrodynamic and mass transport models have been developed, tested, and applied to the Ausable River site using methods described in the above sections. Results and unique features of this site are discussed below.

In contrast to the other treatment sites, which discharge into sheltered bays, the Ausable River discharges into a region which is directly exposed to the open lake (Figure 40). Lake depths drop off rapidly about 600 meters east of Ausable Point. Material transported east from the mouth should be dispersed rapidly. Potential transport distances are greater, however, in the shallow shoreline regions extending from Prey's Marina on the north to Port Kent on the south. In simulating dye and TFM applications, flow is assumed to be split equally between the upper and lower mouths. Projections of 20 and 50 ppb plume contours are insensitive to this assumption.

The Ausable dye study was conducted in early August 1986 under south winds. A vertical profile taken near the river mouth 4 hours after the plume reached the lake indicated good initial mixing with depth, with dye concentrations ranging from 1.2 to 1.6 ppb over a 12 meters of depth. Stream temperatures were only about 1 degree F cooler than the lake surface, so there was little driving force for development of density currents.

Because of the exposed nature of Ausable Point and good initial mixing, dye concentrations dropped off rapidly as a function of time and distance (Figure 45). The dye data are limited, however, by the lack of observations during the initial loading period (0-10 hours). One outlier is evident at 24 hours after dye plume entry and distance of 1500 meters from the Upper Mouth. This observation was taken in shallow waters (Depth = 1 meter) northwest of Ausable Point. It is possible that this measurement reflected dye loadings from the Little Ausable River, which was studied simultaneously. The timing of the measurement coincided with the arrival of the trailing edge of the Little Ausable dye plume (Meyers, 1986) and the measurement was taken approximately 500 meters from the river mouth. Agreement between observed and predicted 10-fold and 100-fold dilution plumes is reasonable for all simulated wind conditions (Figure 46).

Because the offshore open lake waters are deep at this site relative to the assumed 5-meter mixed depth, the projections of offshore transport, particularly the 20 and 10 ppb contours, are likely to be very conservative. While a potential for inflow plunging exists at this site under fall treatment conditions, this potential would be reduced by mixing which would occur as the plume travels across shallow shoreline regions with relatively high ambient current velocities (Figures 42,43) before reaching thermally stratified regions.

The proposed Ausable River TFM treatment will occur at a streamflow of 400 cfs, applied concentration of 1.6 ppm, and duration of 12 hours. Projected cell maximum TFM concentrations are displayed as a function of wind direction in Figure 47. The plume is driven south in shallow shoreline regions under N, NW, or W winds and is driven north under E, SE, or S winds. Other wind conditions are more conducive to transport east into the open lake. Over a range of wind conditions, the simulated 50 ppb TFM plume extends from Port Kent on the south to the mouth of the Little Ausable River on the north. Because of open lake exposure, projected plume durations are relatively short (less than 40 hours for all wind directions, Figure 14).

The proposed Bayer-73 treatment of the Ausable River mouth will involve application of 100 lbs/acre of granular Bayer-73 to 250 acres. Plume projections are displayed in Figures 37-39. Because the total mass of active ingredient applied (1250 lbs, Table 3) is less than the mass of TFM applied (1725 lbs), Bayer-73 plume projections fall within the TFM applications. Sensitivity to wind direction is qualitatively similar to that discussed above for TFM. Because Bayer-73 is less stable (more subject to adsorption and photolysis) than TFM, projected plume areas and durations are also more conservative.

16. SITE 4 - LEWIS CREEK

Model results for Site 4, Lewis Creek, are summarized in the following Figures:

- 53 Model Region
- 54 Finite Element Mesh
- 55 Circulation Patterns North Wind
- 56 Circulation Patterns Northeast Wind
- 57 Transport Model Grid
- 58 Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Meas.
- 59 Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
- 60 Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
- 61 Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
- 62 Maximum TFM Concentration Contours

The hydrodynamic and mass transport models have been developed, tested, and applied to the Lewis Creek site using methods described in the above sections. Results and unique features of this site are discussed below. Lewis Creek empties into Hawkins Bay, a shallow lake region inside McDonough Point and Long Point (Figure 53). Under dominant south or southeast winds, the hydrodynamic model predicts a counter-clockwise circulation pattern in Hawkins and Town Farm Bay region (east of Thompson's and McDonough Points, Figures 55-56).

Direct measurements of current velocities were taken on several occasions during August and September of 1986 in offshore regions of Hawkins Bay (west of Gardiner Island) (Laible and Walker, 1987). Comparison of measured and modeled current velocities indicate that the hydrodynamic model captures the general structure of circulation patterns in the region, but under-predicts current magnitudes, typically by a factor of two or more. Under-estimation of effective wind speeds driving lake circulation and/or the effective wind shear coefficient may contribute to differences between observed and predicted current speeds. The above field study results suggest that actual transport rates would be higher and plume durations would be shorter than those predicted at this site. Since the same methodology and wind shear coefficient have been used in all hydrodynamic simulations, this conclusion may hold for other sites as well.

Dense stands of aquatic weeds (water milfoil) are present in shallow regions of Hawkins Bay during the summer. These likely impede mixing of the creek inflows and alter the predicted circulation patterns shown in Figures 55 and 56. Because the hydrodynamic model does not account for the presence of these weeds, initial mixing of creek inflows is probably overestimated. This has minimal influence on simulation of 50 and 20 ppb plumes, however, because they generally extend beyond the weed-infested regions. Weed beds would have less influence under fall treatment conditions compared with summer dye study conditions.

The Lewis Creek dye study was conducted in mid August of 1986 under variable winds with a resultant direction from the west. Interpretation of dye study results at this site is complicated by the high storm flows which were present during the study and by variations in background fluorescence in the Hawkins and Town Farm Bays owing to turbid inflows from Lewis and Little Otter Creeks. Another limitation is lack of data from shallow regions of Hawkins Bay near the creek mouths.

The vertical distribution of fluorescence at this site was complex. At some locations and times, peak concentrations were found at depths of 7.6 meters. At others, the dye was well-mixed to depths of 15 meters. Still at others, the dye was concentrated at the surface (0-3 meters). Density currents attributed to cold storm inflows, variations in background fluorescence, entrainment of organic material in bottom samples, and shearing into surface and bottom currents likely contributed to the complex vertical distribution observed at this site. The stormy conditions provided a less than ideal data set for model testing and plume projection.

Decay of peak dye concentration as a function of time and distance was reasonably exponential (Figure 58). Concentration projections at long times and distances are probably over-estimated because actual background fluorescence levels were higher than the assumed value (.02 ppb). Model predictions for various wind conditions show the 10-fold and 100-fold dilution contours further to the east and south than the measurements indicate (Figure 59). This may be attributed to the presence of weed beds and other limitations in the dye data discussed above. The measured and predicted plume areas are in good agreement.

The proposed Lewis Creek TFM treatment will occur at a streamflow of 50 cfs, applied concentration of 6.5 ppm, and duration of 12 hours. Projected cell maximum TFM concentrations are displayed as a function of wind direction in Figure 60. Under dominant SE, S, or SW winds, the plume is transported north and east on counter-clockwise currents towards Town Farm Bay. North winds cause transport west towards McDonough Point. The projected maximum 50 ppb contour for all wind conditions (Figure 62) fills Hawkins Bay (inside McDonough and Long Points). The 20 ppb contour extends from the mouth of Kingsland Bay into Town Farm Bay at a point east of Point Bay Marina.

Under typical wind loads, projected plume duration for the Lewis Creek treatment ranges from 20 to 80 hours (Figure 60). Actual plume durations would be lower because of decay mechanisms which are not considered in the simulations and because observed current speeds are under-predicted by the hydrodynamic model.

17. SITE 5 - PUTNAM CREEK

Model results for Site 5, Putnam Creek, are summarized in the following Figures:

- 63 Model Region
- 64 Finite Element Mesh
- 65 Circulation Patterns North Wind
- 66 Circulation Patterns Northeast Wind
- 67 Transport Model Grid
- 68 Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Meas.
- 69 Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
- 70 Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
- 71 Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
- 72 Maximum TFM Concentration Contours

The hydrodynamic and transport models have been developed, tested, and applied to the Putnam Creek site using methods described in the above sections. Results and unique features of this site are discussed below.

Putnam Creek discharges into a narrow portion of South Lake Champlain (Figure 63). The potential for transport of lampricide over long distances is limited by the relatively small quantity of TFM applied (686 lbs vs. 876-2424 lbs for other sites, Table 3) and by dilution in lake currents and advective flows. Moving east from the mouth, lake contours follow a shallow shelf and subsequently drop of sharply into the main channel (11-14 meters). Because of lake advection and dominant southern winds, plume transport would most likely occur towards the north. Moving north in the main channel, maximum depths decrease from 11-14 meters to 7-9 meters in the region north to Crown and Chimney Points. The likelihood that this region will be thermally stratified under fall treatment conditions is low.

Advection from south to north, as driven by inflows from the southern watersheds, is a potentially important source of dilution which has not been considered in the simulations discussed below. Based upon drainage area ratio (158 vs. 2900 km²), lake advection would provide an initial dilution ratio of 18 for the applied TFM. This would reduce the applied TFM concentration from 8.5 to .47 ppm, once the streamflow is mixed with the lake advective flows. Further decreases would occur as a result of wind-driven currents and volume dilution considered in the simulations.

The Putnam Creek dye study was conducted in mid August of 1986 under light southern winds. Interpretation of dye study results at this site is complicated by the high storm flows which were present during the study and by variations in background fluorescence owing to the turbid character of the South Lake. Because of the cold storm flows, the river was roughly 3 degrees F cooler than the lake surface. Near the river inflow, the dye was sharply concentrated at a depth of 3 meters. As time and distance from the dye loading increased, a more uniform distribution with depth was achieved (Figure 68).

The observed 100-fold dilution contour was located near Yellow House Point, about 2000 meters north of the creek inflow (Figure 69). Variations in background fluorescence may cause over-statement of the observed dye plume. Model projections for a maximum mixed-layer depth of 5 meters put this contour about 1200 meters north of the inflow. Lack of complete mixing in the lake cross-section near the river inflow likely contributes to the under-estimation of the plume. Additional simulations assuming a maximum mixed-layer depth of 2 meters show better agreement with the observations. This does not physically describe the situation, however, because the dye was well mixed to depths up to 6 meters at the northern edge of the plume; i.e., lack of mixing occurred only near the river inflow.

The proposed Putnam Creek TFM treatment will occur at a streamflow of 30 cfs, applied concentration of 8.5 ppm, and duration of 12 hours. Projected cell maximum TFM concentrations are displayed as a function of wind direction in Figure 70. Consideration of lake advection would shift the plume directions towards the north and provide additional dilution. The predicted maximum 50 ppb contour extends from the town of Crown Point on the south to below Yellow House Point on the north (Figure 72). These simulations assume a maximum mixed layer depth of 5 meters under proposed treatment conditions. Assuming a more conservative maximum mixed-layer depth of 2 meters places the 50 ppb and 20 ppb contours at the 20 and 10 ppb contours, respectively, shown for the 5-meter mixed depth simulations in Figure 72. Under typical wind loads, projected 50-ppb plume duration for the Putnam Creek treatment ranges from 50 to 120 hours (Figure 60). Actual plume durations would be lower because TFM decay mechanisms and dilution in lake advective flow are not considered in the simulations.

18. CONCLUSION

The plume projections described above are conservative estimates of transport resulting from lampricide applications under the prescribed treatment conditions. This section reviews important concepts that should be considered in interpreting the results. Plume projections are also compared with those developed by Meyers (1986) based directly upon dye measurements.

Assuming that significant density currents do not develop, plume area projections are conservative because a maximum mixed layer depth of 5 meters has been assumed, whereas actual mixed layer depths exceeding 12 meters are anticipated for September conditions. The assumed mixed layer depth has a greater influence on simulations of deeper lake areas (e.g., Ausable) than on simulations of shallower lake areas (e.g., Great Chazy).

Predicted contours refer to the mean concentration in the mixed layer at a given latitude and longitude. Individual samples taken within the mixed layer at given location will be higher or lower than the predicted mean value. Testing of the predicted mean dye concentrations against the observed maximum concentrations in each model cell considers this source of variability. Such comparisons are hindered by variations in background fluorescence, which influence the observed maximum concentrations, particularly at high dilution ratios (low dye concentrations).

Additional factors contributing to conservatism in the projections include:

- (1) Lampricide decay mechanisms are not considered.
- (2) Field studies have shown that current speeds predicted by the hydrodynamic model are lower than measured values, at least at the Lewis Creek site (Laible and Walker, 1987).
- (3) Transport and dilution attributed to lake advective flow (as driven by the whole-lake water balance) are ignored.

Consideration of these factors would have more influence on predicted plume durations than on plume locations and maximum areas.

Figure 73 provides additional information on plume duration. For each treatment, the logarithm of the maximum TFM or Bayer-73 concentration (maximum of eight wind directions) is plotted against time in 50-hr increments. As discussed above, the long tails on the Great Chazy and Saranac decay curves reflect trapping of material in the extreme northern portions of King and Cumberland Bays, respectively, under south winds. The relatively slow decay of the Putnam TFM curve reflects lake morphometry; because dilution in the lake advective flow has been ignored, however, the Putnam decay curve over-estimates lake concentrations, particularly at long times which would facilitate mixing of the plume with the lake cross-section. Potential effects of lampricide decay are represented in Figure 73 by super-imposing decay rates of .07 and .23 day⁻¹ on the simulated dilution curve for each treatment. These rates correspond to half-lives of 10 and 3 days, respectively, a reasonable range for decay of TFM or Bayer-73 attributed to photolysis and sediment adsorption (NRCC, 1985; Ho and Gloss, 1987).

One limitation of the maximum concentration grids (e.g., Figure 23) is that they may under-estimate maximum concentrations in the immediate vicinities of the river inflows because of possible incomplete mixing. This limitation should not influence peak concentrations in the vicinities of the projected 50 and 20 ppb contours, however.

Another, potentially more severe limitation is the possibility that density currents will develop under fall treatment conditions because of temperature differences between the inflowing river and lake surface. Such conditions would tend to increase the time and distance required for the plume to mix with the water column and reach 50 and 20 ppb concentration levels. To a degree, the shallow (5 meter) mixed depth assumption compensates for errors due to lack of complete mixing. Assuming a (very conservative) maximum 2-meter mixed depth shifts the maximum concentration contours for each treatment outward, but in each case the 20 ppb contour for a 2-meter mixed depth falls inside of the 10 ppb contour shown for a 5-meter mixed depth.

The significance of inflow plunging would depend upon site characteristics (in particular, stream velocity, shoreline and bottom topography) and upon the presence of deep water intakes in the lake region. Additional modeling studies could be done to evaluate potential dilution above and below the inflow plunge point. Because of extensive data requirements and limitations in the state-of-the-art, however, a full three-dimensional modeling effort would not necessarily yield results which are more accurate or reliable than those derived from the two-dimensional models. A fall dye study is recommended to provide a basis for testing model projections under conditions which are more representative of the proposed treatment conditions.

Model projections of maximum plume area are compared with results derived directly from the dye studies (Meyers, 1986) in Figure 73. The sketched contours of dye concentration were developed by Meyers using a contour plotting program. The shaded areas represent the maximum 50 ppb TFM contour based upon simulation of eight wind directions.

To compare the projections, the dye or TFM concentrations have to be rescaled based upon the ratio of dye load to TFM load (see Table 3). Based upon the loading ratio, the dye concentration contour corresponding to the 50 ppb TFM contour can be calculated for each site. As shown in Figure 73, these dye concentrations are .09 ppb for Great Chazy, .12 ppb for Saranac (August), .14 ppb for Ausable, .20 ppb for Lewis, and .15 ppb for Putnam.

Note that the dye projections reflect lake conditions (wind, mixed depth) which were present during the field study, whereas the model projections reflect maximum values for eight wind directions and a maximum mixed layer depth of 5 meters. When these differences are considered, the projections are generally consistent. Results for each site are described below.

For the Great Chazy, the 50 ppb TFM contour should correspond to the .09 ppb dye contour. As shown in Figure 73, however, the model projection more closely follows the .15 ppb contour. This difference is explained based upon differences in mixed layer depth between the dye study and the simulated fall treatment. As discussed above, the dye floated on the surface (< 2 meters) and did not mix vertically, except at long distances and times from the inflow. The model simulations are based upon a maximum 5 meter mixed depth. Thus, the simulated plume (shaded area) falls well inside the .09 ppb dye contour for the Great Chazy.

At the Saranac River site (August), the 50 ppb TFM contour should correspond to the .12 ppb dye contour. Results for the June survey are similar (not shown). Because of the effects of different wind directions, the model projections span a range of contours. The southern portion of the model plume reflects simulation of northern For south winds representative of the dye study, model winds. projections correspond roughly to the 0.20 ppb dye contour. Some of this inconsistency may be attributed to effects of variations in background fluorescence and the relatively low resolution of the Saranac dye study for detecting high dilutions of the river inflow. Because of the inconsistency between the projections, the Saranac site is a likely candidate for the fall dye study recommended above.

Agreement between the simulated Ausable TFM plume and the .14 ppb dye contour is good. The southern area of the model plume extends well beyond the .05 ppb dye contour because of effects of northern winds which were not present during the dye study.

Agreement between the simulated Lewis Creek TFM plume and the .20 ppb contour is also good. The dye study was conducted under shifting westerly winds. Simulation of southern and northern winds causes the plume to extend beyond .20 ppb contour to areas further west and north, but generally within Hawkins Bay.

The Putnam Creek results are also consistent. The shaded model plume coincides with the predicted .15 ppb dye contour. The dye study was conducted under prevailing southerly winds.

REFERENCES

Fischer, J.B., E.J. List, R.C.Y. Ho, J. Imberger, and N.H. Brooks, <u>Mixing in Inland and Coastal Waters</u>, Academic Press, New York, 1979.

Ho, K.T.Y. and S.P. Gloss, "Distribution and Persistence of the Lampricide Bayer 73 Following a Control Application", <u>Canadian Journal</u> of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 112-119, 1987.

Laible, J.P., "Phosphorus and Transport in Stevens Brook Wetland in SAB", Completion Report to University of Vermont Water Resources Research Center, June 1985a.

Laible, J.P., "Hydrodynamic Component of the Lake Champlain Offshore Hatchery Discharge Study", prepared for Vermont Department of Buildings, December 1985b.

Laible, J.P., "Coupled Finite Element and Boundary Model for Flow and Transport in Lakes", Draft Manuscript Submitted to <u>Advances in Water</u> <u>Resources</u>, 1986.

Laible, J.P. and W.W. Walker, "Evaluating Lampricide Transport in Lake Champlain", prepared for New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Progress Report, December 1986.

Laible, J.P. and W.W. Walker, "Transport Studies in Hawkins and Town Farm Bays", prepared for Vermont Department of Buildings, January 1987.

Meyers, J.A., "Analysis of Rhodamine WT Dye Plume Studies on Lake Champlain, New York", Bureau of Monitoring and Assessment, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, November 1986.

National Research Council Canada, "TFM and Bayer 73: Lampricides in the Aquatic Environment", NRCC Publication No. 22488, Associate Committee on Scientific Criteria for Environmental Quality, ISSN 0316-0114, 1985.

Seeley, J., Hammond Bay Laboratory, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Unpublished Research on Bayer-73, Personal Communication, March 1987.

Smeltzer, E., "Lake Champlain Fish Hatchery Discharge Study", Vermont Department of Water Resources and Environmental Engineering, 1985.

Walker, W.W., "Documentation for P2D and S2D: Software for Analysis and Prediction of Water Quality Variations in Two Dimensions", prepared for Vermont Department of Buildings and Vermont Department of Water Resources and Environmental Engineering, April 1985.

Walker, W.W., J.P. Laible, E.M. Owens, and S.W. Effler, "Impact of an Offshore Hatchery Discharge on Phosphorus Concentrations in and Around Hawkins Bay, Lake Champlain", prepared for State of Vermont, Department of Fish and Wildlife, March 1986.

LIST OF FIGURES

1	Lake Champlain Study Sites
2	3-Day Moving-Average Wind Load Factor Burlington Airport, 3-Hr Observations, May-September 1986
3	Simulated Response to Saranac TFM Treatment
4	Site: Saranac River (Example) Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
5	Observed Water Column Responses to Bayer-73 Treatment
6	Sensitivity of Simulated Lake Response to Bayer-73 Release Period
7	Sensitivity of Plume Area and Duration to Wind Load and Mixed Depth
8	Seasonal Variations in Stream and Lake Surface Temperatures St. Albans Bay, Lake Champlain, 1982-1986 Monthly Means
9	Lake Champlain Temperature vs. Depth and Season
10	Mean and Maximum Scaled Dye Concentrations vs. Site and Depth Range
11	Site: Saranac-June (Example) Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements
12	Simulation Summary - Maximum Plume Areas
13	Simulation Summary - Maximum Plume Distance from Inflow
14	Simulation Summary - Plume Duration
15	Site: Great Chazy River, Model Region
16	Site 1: Great Chazy River, Finite Element Mesh
17	Site 1: Great Chazy River Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - North Wind
18	Site 1: Great Chazy River Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns • Northeast Wind
19	Site 1: Great Chazy River, Transport Model Grid
20	Site 1: Great Chazy River Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements
21	Site 1: Great Chazy River Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
22	Site 1: Great Chazy River Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction

LIST OF FIGURES (CT)

.

23	Site 1: Great Chazy River, Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
24	Site 1: Great Chazy River, Maximum TFM Concentration Contours
25	Site 2: Saranac River, Model Region
26	Site 2: Saranac River, Finite Element Mesh
27	Site 2: Saranac River Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - North Wind
28	Site 2: Saranac River Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - Northeast Wind
29	Site 2: Saranac River, Transport Model Grid
30	Site 2: Saranac River (June) Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements
31	Site 2: Saranac River (August) Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements
32	Site 2: Saranac River (June) Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
33	Site 2: Saranac River (August) Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
34	Site 2: Saranac River Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
35	Site 2: Saranac River, Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
36	Site 2: Saranac River, Maximum TFM Concentration Contours
37	Site 2: Saranac River Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
38	Site 2: Saranac River, Cell Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations
39	Site 2: Saranac River, Maximum Bayer-73 Concentration Contours
40	Site 3: Ausable River, Model Region
41	Site 3: Ausable River, Finite Element Mesh
42	Site 3: Ausable River Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - North Wind
43	Site 3: Ausable River Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - Northeast Wind

LIST OF FIGURES (CT)

44	Site 3: Ausable River, Transport Model Grid
45	Site 3: Ausable River Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements
46	Site 3: Ausable River Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
47	Site 3: Ausable River Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
48	Site 3: Ausable River, Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
49	Site 3: Ausable River, Maximum TFM Concentration Contours
50	Site 3: Ausable River Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
51	Site 3: Ausable River, Cell Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations
52	Site 3: Ausable River, Maximum Bayer-73 Concentration Contours
53	Site 4: Lewis Creek, Model Region
54	Site 4: Lewis Creek, Finite Element Mesh
55	Site 4: Lewis Creek Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - North Wind
56	Site 4: Lewis Creek Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - Northeast Wind
57	Site 4: Lewis Creek, Transport Model Grid
58	Site 4: Lewis Creek Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements
59	Site 4: Lewis Creek Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
60	Site 4: Lewis Creek, Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
61	Site 4: Lewis Creek, Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
62	Site 4: Lewis Creek, Maximum TFM Concentration Contours
63	Site 5: Putnam Creek, Model Region
64	Site 5: Putnam Creek, Finite Element Mesh
65	Site 5: Putnam Creek Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - North Wind

LIST OF FIGURES (CT)

2

66	Site 5: Putnam Creek Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - Northeast Wind
67	Site 5: Putnam Creek, Transport Model Grid
68	Site 5: Putnam Creek Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements
69	Site 5: Putnam Creek Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations
70) Site 5: Putnam Creek Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
71	Site 5: Putnam Creek, Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations
72	Site 5: Putnam Creek, Maximum TFM Concentration Contours
73	Simulated Maximum Concentrations vs. Time TFM and Bayer-73 Applications - All Sites
74	Comparison of Plume Projections

Figure 1 Lake Champlain Study Sites






WIND LOAD FACTOR

T = 0 HR\$

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

-,	
5]200000000000	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
6[200000000	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
7)xxxxxx ·	10000000000000
6)xxxxxxx	10000000000000
9]:00000000	200000000
10 202000	37600000000
11 200000	200000000
12 00000000	3000000
13 200000000	1
14]x0000000x	1
15].co.co.co.t	1
16 xxxxxxxxx	1
17 100000000	1
18 200220202	1
19 200000000	1
20 20000000	1
21 20000000	
22 333300330033	XXX
23 000000000	i
24 20000000000	i
25 0000000000	Ì

T = 10 HAS

123430	7 0 7 10 11 12 13 16 13
******************	***************************************
4)2000000000000000000000000000000000000	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
\$],xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
6 2022000028	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
7 200000	20020000000000
8[20000	XUXUQQQQQQQQQQ
9 20000000	MARCOCKER .
10 200000 33 2	ACCORDENCES IN THE REAL PROPERTY AND A DECIDENCES INTERNAL PROPERTY AND A DECIDENCES
11 200000228 94 24 4	XXXXXXXXXXX
12 300000 27 9 1	200000
13)2000000 6 3	
14 0000000 1 1	
15 00000000x	
16 00000000	
17 20000000	
18 20000000	
19/2000000	-
20 20000000	
21 20000000	
22/2000000000	жх
23 0000000000	
24 00000000000	
25 000000000000000000000000000000000000	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

T = 20 MRS

T = 30 MRS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
+-	•••			** •					• • •	• • •		•		• • • •
4]x	хж	200	ucio	XXL	1 12)	000	000	3003	ĸю	000	000	966	000	UU.
E in		~~~												

T = 40 #RS

212000000000000				100000000000000000000000000000000000000
6[200000000				200022220000000000000000000000000000000
7 300000				***************
8[200000				XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
9 200000000				000000000000000000000000000000000000000
10 200000 13 1				Kickickock
11 200000 3 4 3	1			100000000
12[200000000 15 5	1			100000
13 20000000 22 7	1			
14 2000000 23 8	2			
15 200000000 20 10	3	1	1	
16 200000000 13 10	4	2	1	1
17 20000000 7 9	4	2	2	1
18 200002000 4 7	4	3	2	1
19 20000000 1 5	4	2	1	1
20 00000000 3	2	2	1	
21 00000000 1	1	1		
22 353533333333333		я	DOC	
23 10000000000				
24 200000000000000000000000000000000000				
25 2000000000				

8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

T = 60 MRS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

\$ xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	UXX.			200000000000000000000000000000000000000							
6[20000000				000000000000000000000000000000000000000							
71000000						ж					
S XXXXXX						×	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX				
9 202222222							*****				
10[2000000 4							XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX				
11 1000000 1 1							JOCKLOCK COL				
1200000000 4							200000				
13 0000000 7	1										
14 200000000 11	2										
15 XXXXXXXXX 15	3	1		1	1	1					
16 000000000 15	4	1	1	1	1	1					
17 XXXXXXXXXXX 13	5	2	t	1	1	1					
18 xxxxxxxxx 11	6	3	z	2	2	1					
19 x000000 7	6	4	3	3	2	1					
20 00000000 4	6	4	3	3	2	1					
21 000000000 1	4	4	3	3	2	1					
	3	3	Зx	xx	1	1					
23 200000000000	1	2	2	1	1						
24 00000000000000		1	1								
251000000000000000000000000000000000000		1	1								

T = 90 HRS

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

410000000000000	oub	000	000	хю	хυ	3000	1 300000000
S 2000020000000	хх				ж	XXXX	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
6[2000000000					я	xxx	1xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
7(xxxxxx						×	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
8 XXXXXX						×	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
9 200000000							XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
10 000000							100000000000
11000000							XXXXXXXXXXX
12 300000000							XXXXXXX
13 20000000 1							í
14120000000 2							i
15 000000000 3							i
16 0000000 5	1				1		i
1710000000 8	1				1	1	i
18100000000 9	2	1	1	1	1	1	i
193333330077 10	3	1		1	1		. i
201 xxxx x x 9	4	2	2	2	2	÷.	1
21100000000 7	5	3	3	2	2	÷.	а í
221222222222222222	-	۵.	3	х <u>т</u>	2	1	i
231 x 7 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	÷.	ž	3	2	2	÷	· ·
241 22 241 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	ŝ	3	3	2	-	i.	
25 1 121000000000000	ž	ŝ	3	5	÷	÷	

MAXIMUM CONCENTRATIONS (ALL TIMES)

1234	5	6	7	a	9	ю	11 12	15	14 15
**********	•••	•••		***	• • •	•••	••••		
4]x00000000000000	000	XXX	000	boo	UCID	()()()	200000	XXXX	or
5,0000000000000000000000000000000000000	ĊK.				×		20000	7)()(X	00000
6 XXXXXXXXX					х) O CI	30000	XXXX	00000
7 20000X						ж	200000	XXXX	aaaa
8 X00000						́х	10000	XXXXX	0000
9 000000000							XXX	0000	00000
10 XXXXXX 44 5	1						XXX	10000	
11 xxxxxx235105 3	65	9	z					0000	
12 80000000 51 2	4	6	1					х	00000
13 13000000 32 1	17	4							
14 0000000 25 1	14	4	1						- 1
15 xxxxxxxx 20 1		ż	1	1	1	1			
1617777777777 16 1		5	2	÷		÷			- 1
171 ***********************************		ŝ	5	;	÷	÷			
18 19 19	ĥ	ž	ĩ	;	÷	÷			
101 Water and 10	÷	2	-	;	•	4			
201200000000000000000000000000000000000	2	2	1	-	-	4			
	2	2	:	2	-	1			
21100000000 7	2	1	2	3	2	1	1		
	•	4	- 10	xx	2	1	1		
23 100000000	4	3	3	2	2	1			. !
24 200000000000	3	3	3	z	1	1			ļ
2517497777777777	_	-	_	_					

ω

Model Region Shown in Figure 25 igure ĝ Saranac TFM Treatment Units

l

ppb/5

North Wind, Grid Cell

Simulated

Res

ponse

Figure 4

Site: Saranac River (Example) Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb/5Flow = 600 cfs, Applied TFM Conc. = 1.5 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

·																
3[xxxx		xxx		coo	000	000	200			200		xx			MAX	: 1
41xxxx	00000	xxxx	xxxx	000	000	000	000		0000	2000		xx				"
5 xxxx	xxxxx	xxx	xxx	9	8	7	6)	200	2000	2000	xxx	xxx	000	xx		Ì
6 xxxx	xxxx	16	14	11	9	7	6х	xxx	xxx	xxx	∞	2000	xxx	xx		Ì
7 000	xx 13	20	16	12	9	6	5	5x	xxx	xxx	2000	xxx	xxx	xx		Ì
8 xxxx	x 15	33	21	13	9	6	5	4x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx			i
9 0000	00000	46	23	14	9	7	4	4	3x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx			i
10 xxxxx	xx107	66	28	15	9	7	4	3	3x	xxx	2000	xxx	xx			- í
	xx261	138	62	28	15	5	3	3	2	2x	∞	$\infty \alpha$	xx			i
12 1 x x x x x	XXXXX	51	28	12	9	5	3	3	2	2	2x	xxx	xx			i
13 1 x x x x	XXXXX	32	19	10	5	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	1			i
14 10000	xxxx	25	14	10	6	5	4	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	i
15 10000	0000	20	.11	7	6	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
1610000	XXXXX	16	10	6	ž	4	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
171xxxx	XXXXX	13		6	4	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
Rixxxx	*****	12	8	· 4	ż	2	2	1	1	1	Ť	1	•	·	1	11
101 7 7 7 7	*****	10	7	4	ž	रू. र	2	4	•	÷	÷	-	•		•	
201 v v v v	~~~~	0	ż	1		7	5	÷		÷	4	÷				
50 AAAA 54 WWWW	~~~~~	7		1	2	7	5	4		4	-	4				
		•	2	7	3		2	4	+	•	-	4				
~	LXXXX	XXX	4	4	- 38	XX	4		1							- !
သူသသ	XXXXX	XXX	4	4	3	2	2	1	1		1					- !
24 XXXX	XXXXX	XXX	4	3	3	2	1	1								ļ
25 [XXXX	00000	XXX	4	-3	3	S	1	1					,			
+																



Observed Water Column Responses Ho and Gloss (1987) Figure Ģ to Bayer-73 Treatment Station F

Figure 6

Sensitivity of Simulated Lake Response to Bayer-73 Release Period Saranac River Treatment, North Wind, Conc. Units - ppb/5

MAXIMUM BAYER-73 CONCENTRATION (PPB / 5)

RELEASE PERIOD = 24 HOURS

PLUME DURATION (CONC. BAYER-73 > 50 PPB), HOURS

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

12345	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	
+		
4]2000000000000000000000000000000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	
5 xxxxxxxxxxxxx	10000000000000000000000000000000000000	
6[200000000	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	
7\$200000	AND CONCERNENCES	
8 100000	X0000000000000	
9()00000000x	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	
10 200000 5 12 7	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	
11 xxxxxx 1 12 11	3 xxxxxxxx	
1200000000 8 8	2 xxxxxx	
13 xxxxxxx 5 6	1	
14 xxxxxxxx 3 4	1 [
15 2000000000 1 3	1 1	
16 200000000 2	1	
17[200000000 1	1	
18 200000000	l l	

RELEASE PERIOD =	12 HOUR\$	
RELEASE PERIOD =	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	
RELEASE PERIOD =	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 000000000000000000000000000000000000	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 000000000000000000000000000000000000	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 000000000000000000000000000000000000	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 5 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 6 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 7 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 7 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 7 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 7 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 7 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 7 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 7 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 7 INCOMPANIESCONDENCE 1 INCOMPANIESCO	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 000000000000000000000000000000000000	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 000000000000000000000000000000000000	
RELEASE PERIOD 1 2 3 4 5 4 3000000000000000000000000000000000000	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 x0xx0xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 + 4 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 COCODUCKNONCEREMENDING XICCIDION XICIDION XICIDION XICCIDION XICCIDION XICCIDI	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 2000/00000000000 5 2000/00000000000 6 2000/00000 8 2000/00000 9 200000000 9 200000000 10 2000000 6 20 12 11 200000 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 COCIDOUDROCASSICIOUSDICASSICION XICKINGOORKISSICIONOCK XICKINGOORKISSICION XICKINGOORKISSICION XICKINGOORKIS XICKI	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 XCREWOODCOCCORDOC 5 XCREWOODCOCCOCCO 5 XCREWOODCOCCOCC 6 XCREWOO 8 XCREWO 9 XCREWOO 9 XCREWOO 9 XCREWOO 10 XCREWO 11 XCREWO 12 XCREWO 13 XCREWO 13 XCREWO 14 XCREWO 15 XCREWO 15 XCREWO 15 XCREWO 16 XCREWO 16	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 COCIDOURCHOUCHOUCHOUCHOUCHOUCH X000000000000000000000000000000000000	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 DEREDOCOUDECOURS 5 DEREDOCOUDECOURS 6 DEREDOCOUDECOURS 6 DEREDOCOURS 6 DEREDOCOURS 7 DEREDOCOU	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 000000000000000 5 000000000000000 6 00000000 7 000000 9 00000000 9 000000000 9 00000000 10 000000 10 000000 10 000000 11 000000 11 000000 11 000000 11 000000 11 000000 11 000000 11 000000 11 000000 11 000000 12 000000 12 000000 13 000000 13 000000 14 0000000 15 000000 15 000000 16 000000 16 000000 16 000000 10 00000 10 000000 10 000000 10 0000000 10 0000000 10 0000000 10 0000000 10 0000000 10 0000000000 10 0000000000 10 000000000000 10 000000000000 10 000000000000000 10 0000000000000000 10 000000000000000000000000000 10 0000000000000000000000000000000000	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 COORDELIGENCE/SECTION (SECTION (SECTIO	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 XORENDODGOUDDODG 5 XORENDODGOUDDODG 5 XORENDODGOUDDODG 5 XORENDO 7 XORENDO 9 XODGOUDC 9 XODGOUCK 9 XODGOUCK 9 XODGOUCK 10 XOZGOUDGOC 11 XOCGOUDGOC 11 XOZGOUDGOC 13 XOZGOUDGOC 14 XOZGUUDGOC 15 XOZGUUDGOC 15 XOZGUUDGOC 15 XOZGUUDGOC 15 XOZGUUDGOC 15 XOZGUUDGOC 15 XOZGUUDGOC 15 XOZGUUDGOC 15 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC 16 XOZGUUDGOC 17 XOZGUUDGOC	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 COCIDOLIDORICALISECTIONICOLUCIALION XICOLUCIONICALISECTIONICOLUCIAL XICOLUCIONICALISECTIONICAL XICOLUCIONICALISE XICOLUCIONI	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 XCORRODOCCORONOC 5 XCORRODOCCORONOC 5 XCORRODOCCORONOC 5 XCORRODOCCOR 6 XCORRODOCCOR 9 XCORRODOC 10 XCORRODOCCOR 10 XCORRODOCCOR 10 XCORRODOCCOR 11 XCORRODOCCOR 12 XCORRODOCCOR 13 XCORRODOCCOR 15 XCORRODOCCOR 15 XCORRODOCCOR 15 XCORRODOCCOR 16 XCORRODOCCOR 17 XCORRODOCCOR 17 XCORRODOCCOR 18 XCORRODOCCOR 18 XCORRODOCCOR 18 XCORRODOCCOR 18 XCORRODOCCOR 10 XCORRODOCCOR	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 COCOUNDROCKERSDOCKERSDOCK XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	
RELEASE PERIOD = 1 2 3 4 5 4 XCKXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	12 HOURS 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	

RELEASE PERIOD = 6 HOURS

1	2	3	4	-5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
*	•••		•••		•••						• • •				
4]x00	000		xx	000	000	000	000	000	000	ĊU,	xxx	QQQ	œ	L	
5 200	000	200	UX)	σcx				;	000	QC.	XXX.	000	000	xxx[
6 2000	000	ж						1	000	ĊС,	xxx	000	000	xxx	
7[2000	DOC.								3	000	000	000	000	000	
8}2000	жж.								3	000	000	οœ	000	ood	
9[2000	000	хх								1	000	000	400	oorj	
10 2000	DOI:	6	26	17						1	000	000	000	oox)	
t1[xxxx	io:	1	ð	22	4	1					1	000	000	000	
12 3330	DUXX	xx	10	12	3							,	000	ox)	
13 xxxx	DOCK	XX.	6	8	2									- İ	
14 [1000	000	XX	3	-6	2									- İ	
15 2000	2000	ж	1	3	1									- İ	
16 2000	COD	KX.		5	1									Ì	
17(2000	UKX.X	хx		1										- İ	
181,000	000	XX												- i	

4----

ż

RELEASE PERIOD = 3 HOURS

12345	674	5 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
*****	******	******
4 202200000000000	000000000	1 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
5 3000000000000000000000000000000000000		200000000000000000000000000000000000000
6]20003222003		200000000000000000000000000000000000000
7{xxxxxxx		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
6[3000000		TODOXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
9[200020000		10000000000
10 XXXXXX 6 30 21		200000000000000000000000000000000000000
11 200000 1 29 24	5 1	200000000
12 00000000 10 12	3 :	1000000
13 XXXXXXXX 6 8	z	i
14 xxxxxxx 3 6	2	i
15 xxxxxxx 1 4	1	i
16 20000000 2	1	i
17 200220000 1		i
18[20000000		i
		•

**************	******************************
4[2000000000000000000000000000000000000	
5 0000000000000000000000000000000000000	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
6[x000x0000	XX000000000000000
7 2002000	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
5 x0000x	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
	20000000000
0 xxxxxxx 15	XX20000000X
11 xxxxxx 12 12	1000000000
2000000000	XXXXXXX
3 20000000	1
14 20000000	
15 00000000	
161200000000	
17 300000000	
18 00000000	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

	· · ·
+	
4()3000000000000000000000000000000000000	3000000000000000000000000
5]xxxxxxxxxx	X00000000000000000
6 XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
7 XXXXXX	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
8 xxxxxxx 8	1000000000000000
9[30033000X	100000000000
10 x000xxx 14 6	200000000000
11 xxxxxx 13 13	20000000
12 20000000 8	ADDODOCK
13100000000	1
14 000000000	1
15 100000000	I
16 00000000	1
17[J0000000X	1
18 20000000	1
·	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

* ***********************************	·····
4 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	1 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
\$ xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	x0000000000000000000000000000000000000
6 2000000000	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
7[xxxxxx	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
6[xxxxxxx	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
9]200200000	20000000000
10 00000 13 7	ACCORDING AND AC
11[x0000x 13 13	200000000
12 20000000 5 9	200000
13 (1000000000	i i
14 Jacobaaaaa	1
15 200000000	i
16(200000000	I
17(200000000	i
18 0000000000	i
4	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

•	****************************
4 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	1000000000000000000000000000000000000
\$ x00000000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000
6[xxxxxxxxxx]	x0000000000000000000000000000000000000
7 1000000	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
8 200000	10000000000000000
9[300000000	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
10 000000 13 7	10000000000
11 100000 12 12	xxxxxxxxxxx
12 200000000 5 10	xxxxxxx [
131,000,00000	i i
14 200000000	1
15 00000000	1
16 20000000	ĺ
17).0000000x	i
18 200003388	i

Sensitivity of Plume Area and Duration to Wind Load and Mixed Depth Saranac River TFM Treatment

Figure 7









Figure 9 Lake Champlain Temperature vs. Depth and Season



ļ

1

Figure 10 Mean and Maximum Scaled Dye Concentrations vs. Site and Depth Range Concentration Units Scaled to River Application of 1000

Sites: 1-Great Chazy, 2-Saranac (August), 3-Ausable, 4-Lewis, 5-Putnam, 6-Saranac (June)



MEAN DYE CONCENTRATION

MAXIMUM DYE CONCENTRATION



SCALED DYE

SCALED

D Y E

			Ė	igure	11			
	Site	: Sa	arana	ac-June	e (Exar	nple)		
Empírical	Projection	of	TFM	Plume	Based	upon	Dye	Measurements

TIME = Hours from Entry of Lampricide Plume to Lake
DISTANCE = Distance from River Inflow (Meters)
LOG TFM = Log₁₀ (Projected TFM Conc., ppb), Rescaled from Dye Data
TFM CONC = Measured Dye Conc. x TFM Load / Dye Load
LOAD = Streamflow x Applied Conc. x Treatment Duration

Symbols: x = surface samples, o = subsurface samples



SARANAC - JUNE

L Ö G

T F

Ŏ

T F



SARANAC - JUNE



DISTANCE



Figure 12 Simulation Summary - Maximum Plume Areas



PLUME AREA (ACRES)



Figure 13 Simulation Summary - Maximum Plume Distance from Inflow



MAXIMUM DISTANCE FROM INFLOW (MILES)

TEW 28

Figure 14 Simulation Summary - Plume Duration



(SAH) NOITAAUG EMUL9

Figure 15 Site: Great Chazy River Model Region

Map Scale = 1:88816, 1 Inch = 1.4 Miles

Í



Figure 16 Site 1: Great Chazy River Finite Element Mesh



ļ

Finite Element

Mesh

Site 1

Chazy

223 Nodes

367 Elements

77 Bnd Nodes





Figure 17 Site 1: Great Chazy River Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - North Wind (Directions Reversed for South Wind)







Figure 19 Site 1: Great Chazy River Transport Model Grid

Cell Depths (Meters) at Minimum Lake Elevation (92.9 ft,msl) xxx = Land Mass, Cell Dimension = 400 meters

		1		2		3		4	!	5	6		7	8		9	10	9	11	1	12	13	6 1	4	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	· · ·		••	•••							•••		• • •		•	••	•			•	••				•••	•••		•••		• • • •	• • • •
						× -	к	**			× × 3	(X)	X X)	(X X	x	XX	xı	(X)	× ×	(X) •	XX:	***		XX	× × × ×	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)		(XX)	xxxJ
2		С.				ж. 									ж.	X X	x 2		-		2	2		**	X X 0	7	7	7			KXX J
4		0	22	20		<u>,</u>	20	~~ ~~			~~ ~						× ,		-		-			2 7		,	7		2		
5		0	20	23		2.	Ĉ	<u></u>			~~`		~~ (0	<u>.</u> .					5			7	-	Ť		1	7		^^^I
		0	20	2,		<u>.</u>	ĉĈ	~~	0.		~~ `				0	~~					5			۰ ۲	-	-	2		7		21
7		Ç,	2°	* *		<u>,</u>	ŝ	22		***	~~`		~~ ~		0	~~					1	- 3		ž	Å	5	7	÷	ž	2	21
R S		2		2.			~~	~~			~~ ~				<u>.</u>	••	~ `		2.		-	-		ž	ž	5	ž	ž	ž	ž	
0	^ ^	*	**	* *		x :	~ ~	ŶŸ	2	***			***		Ŷ.	ŝ	~ í		2	2	÷	3		2	ž	5	ž	-	ž	ž	- 11
10	хx	x	хx	xx		x	хx	**	x	x x :	***		***	сж ж	x	**	x 3	e x 1		. x :		3		4	5	3	3	2	2	2	- 11
11	xx		K X	x)	(x)	x :	x x	x x		**:	***	ex:	***		x	**	x 1	(x)		(x)		3		4	5	4	4	2	2	2	
12	x x	x :		x 3	(x :	x :	x x	x x		**:	x x 3	(1)	***	t x x		* *	* 3	(X)			**	1		3	6	4	5	2	2	2	- 11
13	xx	x	x x	xx	(x)	x	xx	xx		xx	x x)	(x)	x	0-		۵.	ĩ) x :		(X)	**	1	l	3	6	6	5	3	2	2:	ex x l
14	xx	x	x x	x >	(x)	x	xx	xx		**	xx		0	1		2) x :		(x)	**	1		3	6	6	5	3	3	2:	xxx I
15	xx	x	x x	x)	CX.	x	xx	xx		xx	xx		Ō	1		2		l x i		(X)	xx	2	2	3	6	6	5	3	3	2:	cxx1
16	xx	x	x x	x)	CX.	x	xx	xx	x	x x	xx		0	0		1		t x i		c	0	2		4	6	5	5	3	3	2:	(xx)
17	xx	x	x x	x 2	CX.	x	xx	xx		x x	xx		- 0-	1		1		1	ť	,	1	2		4	7	1	5	4	3	2:	xxx I
18	xx	x	ĸx	x,	C X	x	××	xx	x	xx	x x		0	1		2	1	5	1	5	3	1		4	7	3	3	5	3	2	01
19	xx	x	xx	x)	(x	x	хx	хх	x	xx	хx		Ċ.	2		3	4	6	4		3	0)	3	7	6	3	4	3	Z	oi
20	xx	x.	xx	x	< x	X)	ĸх	хх	ix:	x x	хx	1	0	2		3	3	5	4	4	3	0	•	3	7	6	2	4	3	2	01
21	xx	x	xx	x)	(X	x	хx	xx	x	x x	x x)	cx.	x	1		3		4	5	5	3	1	1	3	6	6	2	4	2	1:	xxxİ
22	xx	x	xx	x	cx	x	хx	хx	L RC	xx	xx	ĸ x	x	0		3		6	5	5	3	3	5	3	7	3	2	3	3	2:	xxx
23	xx	x	хx	x	(x	X:	хx	хх	tx.	x x	x x :	cx.	x	0		2	1	5	é	5	4	4		8	4	1	1	3	2	1:	xxx
24	Į××	x	xx	x>	cx	x	x x	хх	ix:	xx	**)	CX.	x	0		2	4	4	7	7	7	9	•	4	0	Q	1	2	2	1:	x x x
25	t x x	x	хx	x,	(X	x	ĸх	хх	x	xx	x x)	CX.	x	0		2	1	7	\$	•	8	6	•	1 x	xxx	хх	0	0	1	12	x x x
26	[x x	x	хx	x >	(X	K)	хx	хx	x	x x	xx	CX.	×	1		4	i	7	10)	7	1	1	0 x	xxx	xx	(XX)	(XX	1	12	x x x
27	xx	X	ĸx	x)	c x	X	XX	хх	LX:	XX	xx	CX.	x	1		4	1	•	10)	10	1	xx	XX	xxx	:xx)	(X X)	(xx)	(XX)	(XX)	KXX
28	x x	x	XX	*	(X	X	XX	хх	x	XX	XXI	¢X.	x	1		4	9	2	10)	6	1	xx	XX	XXX	***	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	K X X	x x x
29	x x	x	хx	x	٢X	X	хx	ХX	CX.	XX	x x)	(X	x	1		4	1	5	t¢)	6	0) x x	XX	XXX	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	x x x
30	xx	x	хx	x	x	X	хx	хx	x	XX	XXJ	¢ X	×	1		\$	1	•	10)	4	XXX	LX X	XX	XXX	***	(XX)	(**)	(XX)	x x x 3	x x x
31	XX	X	×х	×	cx	X	ĸх	хx	: x :	X X	XXI	CX.	x	1		6	11	0	8	3	1.	***		XX	XXX		(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	XXX
32	XX	Χ.	XX	X 7	¢X	X	XX	XX	X	XX	X X)	(X)	×	1		7	10	נ	1	7 X :	XX	XXX		XX	XXX	XX	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(* * * *	XXX]
33	XX	x	××	×>	(X	X	K X	××	: X :	XX	ĸх	1	0	1	_	7	1		1	6 X.	хx	XXX	(XX	XX	XXX	XXX	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	KXX
34	XX	X	XX	x	(X	X	xx	XX	(X)	X X I	××	1	6	8	1	0	11		-	5 X :	XX	XXX	(XX	XX	XXX	XX	(XX)		(XX)	(XX)	XXX
35	XX	X	××	× >	(X	X	XX	x		3	7	i	8		1	0	10	1	1	X	XX	XXX	. * *	XX	XXX	XXX	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX
30	XX	X :	××	x)	CX.	X :	×х	x		-	2		9 1		1	v		5	1	I X 3	XX	ххх		XX	XXX	XXX	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	xxx [
31	X X	x	K X	x >	сх.	X 3	× ×	X		5	-		9 1		1	U 4	1	r •	1	X	XX.	XXX		XX	***	***	(XX)	(XX)	(* *)	CXX3	xxx [
38		х.	××	X)	(X.	X :	XX	X X	х.	X	\$		y 1			,	1) X I	()	(X)	XX.	XXX		XX	XXX	XXX	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	CXX)	KXX
39	X X	.х:	к X	x)	сх.	x :	××	X X		X	1	1	0	\$		•	2	>X)	()	(X)	XX	***		XX	X X X	:XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	KXX [
40	XX	.×.	×х	X 2	(Х.	X :	x	× ×		ĸ		1	•	×.		y o		IX.	K X	(X)	XX	***		XX	X X X	XXX	(XX)	XXX	(XX)	(XX)	KXX
41		X:	KX.	× ×	(X .	x :	× ×	×	1	-	10		0 1 A 4			y	2) X 3 •	K X	(X)	<u>кх</u> :	***		**	***					(* *)	(XX)
42	XX	×:	K X	x 2 0	сх .	X : -	XX	×.		~				u a	2	v			с X	(X)	× × :			**							
43	X X 	×		0 5		د ،		4 E		r z	• •	1	0 1		1	0	••	7X) \	к X А	EX.)				**	***						
44	X X 	×		٤ ٨		4 7		2		9 6	IV ∡	1	0 1 0 1	1 UF -	1	v A	10		у 1 С	* X 1 1	K X .	***		**	***				(XX)		
44		Ĵ.		÷		2		2 2		5	5		9 1 9 1	10	4	0	**		10	· • ·	10	***		~~	~~~						
47		Ĵ.	~ ~	Ĵ		•		4			1		7	7	1	ń	**		• •	5	10	~~~		22	***	***					
1.2	^ A x ¥	÷.	* *	^ x >	(x	ž		3		3	2		2	ŝ	1	5	1	ί.	10	5	10	* * *		**	***	***	****			****	
49	x x		 	x 7		x		1		2	3	ł	3ו	. x ×	x	x	1		 1 C	5	10	***		X ¥	***	***		XX1	(XX)	(X X)	KXX L
50	xx	X	ĸх	x>	CX.	x	хx	, x x	x	xx:	- x x >	cx:	xxx	(XX	x	x		5	1 0		10	xxx	XX	XX	XXX	xx)	(XX)	XXX	(XX)	(XX)	x x x
																-											-				· •

Figure 20

Site 1: Great Chazy River Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements

TIME - Hours from Entry of Lampricide Plume to Lake DISTANCE - Distance from River Inflow (Meters) LOG TFM - Log₁₀ (Projected TFM Conc., ppb), Rescaled from Dye Data TFM CONC - Measured Dye Conc. x TFM Load / Dye Load LOAD - Streamflow x Applied Conc. x Treatment Duration

Symbols: _x = surface samples, o = subsurface samples



GREAT CHAZY

GREAT CHAZY





LOG TEM

L Q Q

F

Figure 21 Site 1: Great Chazy River Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations Rescaled to Applied Conc. of 1000, Contours = 100-Fold Dilution

Observed Great Chazy ; scale factor = 182 6 7 8 9 19 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 11;xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx depth = 8 121333333333333333333333333333 max observed 13 xxxxxx I IXXXXXI I XXX XXXXXX 15ixxx 🕈 1 XXXXXX XXX XXX 8 xxx36 18!xxx369 xxx4871 28 xxx 78138 21 xxxxxx128 9 1Ç 14 22 XXXXXX 231xxxxx121.36 24:xxxxx 07 41 25:xxxxxx 76 25 XXXXXX 261xxxxxx 271xxxxxx 38 XXXXXXXXXXXXX 18 281xxxxxx 23 291xxxxxx ****** *********************** 6 7 8 9 19 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 111xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx depth > 0 12 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx max observed 13:xxxxxx 1222222 14 xxx 15 xxx XXXXXX XXXXXX 16:xxx 17:xxx 14 25 XXX 5 181xxx 191xxx 281xxx 9 27 14 20 XXX 14 8 21 XXXXXX 9 22 XXXXXX 20 21 23 XXXXX 20 21 25 XXXXX 20 21 26 XXXXX 25 27 XXXXX 25 28 XXXXX 25 29 XXXXX 25 ş 3 XXXXXX IXIXIXIXXXXXXXX **************************** ******* 291xxxxx **********************

Predicted

airport speeds - site directions



resultant wind, direction = n, load factor = 1.16



airport speeds - airport directions



Figure 22 Site 1: Great Chazy River Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction Maximum Mixed Layer Depth = 5 Meters, Units = ppb/5

3 4

.

12 15 16 15 14 17 14

3 4 5 4 7 8 9 18 11 12 13 14 15 14 17 18

1 2000000000000000000000000000000000000
2 0000000000000000000000000000000000000
13 NOVING CONTRACTOR 26 18 16 CONTRACT 2 1 1
M 30000000000 43 33 20 1500000 3 2 1 1 1
IS NOTICE AT 34 20 1610000 4 2 1 1 1 1
Missococcoccocc 78 42 22 1700x 9 5 2 1 1 1 1
17 annana anna 105 61 34 25 22 16 9 3 2 1 1 11
10 manuar and 72 37 12 10 10 10 4 4 2 2 1 11
19 hanannouceura 53 29 14 7 6 4 5 6 3 1 1 1
Mineren and 10 16 9 5 3 2 3 3 7 1 1
21 200000000000000000000000000000000000
221200000000000000000000000000000000000
Zinnenenterstationer 21 40 6 6 3 3 2 2 2 1 1
24 transmission mar 17 7 4 3 3 3 5 2 2 1 11
Singersegurger II S & S S Survey 1 11
Management 11 4 3 3 3 3 Superstant
Zimperment A 1 2 2 2 Processmannel
Simulation 4 1 2 2 Province and
Sticoportograf 6 3 2 2 2magragement
Querences 5 3 2 20000000000
Simonom 3 3 2 2 incompany
Blazers 1 1 2 2 1 1 transmortement

3	4	5	4	7	ŧ	19	11	12	13	14	15	14	17	18	

18),100000000000000000000000000000000000	0000000x Ø]
11 Jacou constant concernance	
12 100000000000000000000000000000000000	000000R I
15 juouaadaaaaaaaa 1 1	troupone j
14 2000000000000 1 1 1	100004
15 2000000000 1 1 2	1idoudui I
16 AMARAMANA 2 3 2	1404
17 1000000000 59 19 3	1 1
LA 21 22 YOURSELEVER ST. 15	
19 00000000000 50 20 B	
20 200000000000000000000000000000000000	21
21 320000000000000000 27 11	211 1
221-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00	
23 600000000000000000000000000000000000	221111
25 January Construction 17 7	222111
Zikowana 13 5	2 2 2 1 1303300
261stantastantasta	2 2 2 1 10000000
Ziennerwinnen A 1	2 2 2 1177777777777777
Zalonomona 6 3	2 2 2 Internet and a second
2910000000000007 7 1	2 2 2 100000000000000000000000000000000
301 and an and a second second second	2 2 2 deterministration
Million and A 3	2 2 2xxeexeexeexeexeexee
12 In contraction of 5 1	2 2urosuprovouror
Strengthener 4 4 2	2 2000000000000000000000000000000000000
Minimum 3 3 2	2 12020000000000000
35 manage 1 1 2 2 1	1 1 mm m m m m m m m m
36 avanuar 1 1 1 1 1 1	
371000008 1 1 1 1 1	

	,	٠	,	•	7			19	n	12	13	н	ъ	10	1 r	18	
--	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	----	---	----	----	---	---	----	------------	----	--

		-

101000000000000000000000000000000000000	00000303	*4
11 20000000000000000000000000000000000	200000000	I
12 280000000000000000000000000000000000		- I
13 10000000000000000000000000000000000	1ideucus	J:
14 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	Tracucus	l. I
15jicologuenau 1 1 1	100000	i
14 10000000000 1 2 1	1000	i
17 AND DODDOD \$9 17 2	• •	• i
18[.coursessan 50 13 3	2 11	11 1
19/2000000000 45 19 8	42111	
201000000000000000000000000000000000000		
21/10/10/10/10/10/10/201		
371		11 1
		11 1
		11 1
	52222	21
23 1000000000000 9 5	2225	
24]KW000000000 8 4	32222	nonemetresi
27)1000000000000000000000000000000000000	5 2 2 2000	0000000000000
20)00420000000000 5 3	2 2 2 2000) nizziorazan
294x000000000000 \$ 3	5 5 5 5 2000	Contra la contra
Micococococano 4 2	2 2 200000	1000000000000
31 (100000000000000000000000000000000000	2 2 2000000	0000000000000
32/2000000000 3 2	1 100000000	
Binnonen 2 2 1	1 120000000	່ມແບບອຸບອຸບອຸບອຸ
Sectore and the sectore se	1 1000000000	jooddaacuaaci
35100000111111	1 12/28/2000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000
Séjacana	00000000	STREET, DUCK
37	ICCU PARA	THE REPORT OF TH

0\$100000000000000000000000000000000000	
1 ματατικα το το το το το το το το το το το το το	1000000000
5[3000000000000000000000000000000000000	and an an an an an an an an an an an an an
Sjemmennen	20000 E
t).courseson	Jonanat j
Sjouandantaan	2000000
1 \$ \$ xxxxxxxxxxxx \$	1.004 1 1
7 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	
\$ xxxxxxxxxxxx 71 26 4	
* annument SJ 29 14	: 7 4 2 2 1 3 3 1 j
* susaninassan 38 27 16	, 9 4 2 2 2 1 1 1 1
1 10000000000000000000000000000000000	
2/2000000000000000000000000000000000000	17432221]
8 * xuoooxiixiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	* * * 3 3 2 2 1 1
X MORECOURSER # #	: 4 3 3 3 3 2 1
S NOODDOODDOODD & S	i 4 3 3 3 3xxxxxxx i
6 xmanuscoccourt 5 4	3 3 3 3 3 30000000000
7/2000000000000000000000000000000000000	3 2 2 2mmmoocoocood
\$(1000000000 3 3	2 2 2 2 toucourseouch
9(100000000000 2 Z	2 2 2 2 2000000000000000000000000000000
0[1000000000000000000000000000000000000	t t tuccouccessee
i t avourooovales i t	* 1 1.0000000000000000000000000000000000
t supersonalises t	; t tapacourrenerations
3(2000000000	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
4(20000000000	2000000000000000000
5 paulax	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
6 Şirayan Ka	Providence and an arrival
7 (nanaz	300000000000000000000000000000000000000
****************	********************************

1 4 5 A 7 E 9 10 11 12 18 14 15 16 17 18

10 januar concentration at 1
11 200000000000000000000000000000000000
12(200000000000000000000000000000000000
13 100000000000 16 16 16 16000000
14 Jacobiasasas 38 26 36 14acobia 1
15 Junior and a 13 18 Manual
14 secolosiation 78 39 14 12:0ct 1
17(solaacequaruqua #0 52 19 5 1 1)
10 (FOLGOLGOLGOLGOL 9 25 10 4 2 1
19 20000000000 5 11 6 5 3 1 1
20[samusama 3 3 5 4 3 f 1
21 000000000000 2 3 3 2 1 1 1
22 (2012/2012/2010/00/00/00/00/00/00/00/00/00/00/00/00/
23 (
24
25 percentration and 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 because
26[meansaccesses: 1 1 1 1 1 1 toucessecond)
27(200000000000000000000000000000000000
20[summerican 1 1 1 1 1 Summericans]
29 announcement 1 1 1 1 1 tourseconcered
30 possessessesses 1 1 1 1 toosessessessesses
31(2000000000000000000000000000000000000
32[300000000000 1 1 1 10000000000000000000
33 accordance 1 1 faccordanceacoused
34 100000000000000000000000000000000000
35]1000000 1 1000000000000000000000000000
36]exector factoresconcereres
37)cocco introductional and a second

3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

***************************************	•
10 [1,
11 francesson and a constant and a	IJ
15(100100000000000000000000000000000000	r
13(000000000000000000000000000000000000	١
14(10000000000 43 33 29 1400000 3 1 1	1
15 Jacamanaaaaa 44 34 29 14 maaa 3 2 1	i.
16(00000000000 53 33 19 13cout 4 3 2 1 1	Ĺ
17 DOUDDOUDOUL \$7 33 17 12 7 4 3 2 1 1	ì
10 Junio 10 Junio 2 11 12 36 7 4 2 1 1 1	i.
19 2000000002 1 3 4 7 6 4 2 1 1 1	ř.
201300000000000000000000000000000000000	i.
21 1 22 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	i.
221cmmmmmmm 1 1 3 4 2 1 1 1 1	i.
Zincongerman 1 1 2.2 1 1 1 1 1 1	ï
	1
	Ŀ
	1.
	h
	!
	!
	Į.
33 (NOUGO CONCOLO 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Į.
34 jusudadadas däätääääääääääääääääääääääääääääääääää	Ļ
35 400000 1000000000000000000000000000000	L
36 2000 B 1000 B 1000 B 100	L
37 example in the second sec	

\$ 4	5	4	7	1	10	11	12	13	16	15	16	17	18	

******			•
10 10-10-10-10-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-0		\$ ¥	Т
11]300000000000000000000000000000000000			L
12]100000000000000000000000000000000000			ŧ.
13 June 0000000000 22 18 1600000 2 1 1			1
14 and 00000000 34 29 17 15 and 01 2 1	1.1		۱Ł.
15 (SOCODORADOR 41 29 16 16:00000 4 2 1	1.1	t :	ų
16(20000000000 54 35 16 Those 7 5 2 1	1.1	t :	ų
17 page gauge gauge states 57 32 19 16 11 8 5 3 3	1 1	1	ų
18 JOUGERARDANEER 2 & 10 10 8 4 4 2 3	£ 4.	1	IJ,
19[annoonnoon 2 3 5 5 4 3 2 3	: 1	٦.,	ų
20 (1 \$	1	1
21 000000000000000000000000000000000000	: 1	1	1
22 course 000000000 1 1 1 1 1 1	1	1	1
23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 2	1.1	1	1
25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 2	1 1	1	1
25 (2000) 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 20	COCK.	1	11
25 000000000000000000000000000000000000		-	2
27 MARANA TIL MARAN	0000	0000	×
25 25 25 25 25 20 25 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20			×
29 200000000000000000000000000000000000	0000	2010	*
36(2000000000000000000000000000000000000			=ţ
\$1 (200000000 0000000 0000000000000000000	0000	0000	ux į
25 x000000000000000000000000000000000000			
22 (xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx			٩ļ
34 (memoranous) 2000000000			ų
35 (KOURA 100000000	0000	0000	믹
36\$0000X 1000000			۳ļ
32 NOVACE 1000000000	00000	0000	UK
		****	••

3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

***********	•••					***	•••	***	•••	***	***	+
io (kanananananana		000	900		UR	÷.					¥	1
1 [200	900		÷.	υοψ	ф0i						1
121212000000000000000000000000000000000	900	ume	001	ų.	UQU							1
13 3000000000000	101	9	- 8		UCU	OD4	٦					
14 2200000000000	u	11	a		000	OÜL	1	1				1
15 3000000000000	19	14		8	000	004	2	1	1			1
16 100000000000000000000000000000000000	44	42	z	17		9	5	2	1	1	1	1
17 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	77	61	34	8	z	16	9	3	2	1	1	ų
10 3 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	6	17	10	19	10	ι¢		4	2	2	1	11
19(2000000000000000000000000000000000000	\$	3	1	2	3	4	\$	4	3	2	1	11
20 20033030000	1	1	1	\$	- L	1	2	3	3	2	1	ч
21 (10003003008600		1	1	1	t	1	1	\$	2	5	1	11
22 300300400000	жk	1	1	1	1	t	1	2	2	z	1	ų
23/200000000000	iπ.	t	1	1	1	1	1	z	z	z	1	Æ
24 [100.000.00000	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	Ş	z	z	1	11
25 124 26 40 (25 (26)	.	ŧ	1	1	3	1	1	12		DUK	1	ų
26 000000000000000000000000000000000000	ola,		-1	- 1	1	1	1	ta			000	an)
27 100.000000000				1	1	3	ta			000		찌
20 (wj.
27	uq.								-		, and	
302,000,000,000,000	dibil										600	bux)
31 (100000000000000000000000000000000000	100							, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	JOO	000		oux)
32(00000000000000	100				1	000	000	000	000	900	600	xx)
33 (normalization)												na f
Minuneuruitat					;	000	obo	oluci	book	000	000	жį
Stores								obe		nue		zzt
36 (1000000					;	9.4	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				N, P	ant i
37 248 198					;	000		, se	, and a		oyp	as)
												- · ·

3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 14

				<u></u> .							
10 texes and a second				-							Ē.
111000000000000000000000000000000000000											÷
121					<u> </u>						2
131-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1											1
16 Jacobson Street St	1	÷	2								1
	1	1			<u></u>						1
islamanana i			-								ł
winneren +		XQ	2								1
17[200000000000000	25	*	1		ς.						1
19[00000000000 72	57	"	2	2	5	1	1				1
Manazara 4	25	9		3	3	2	1	1	1		1
20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	25	7	3	2	2	2	1	1	1		1
\$1)32000000000000000000000000000000000000	17	á	\$	t	2	Ż	1	1	1		1
22(100000000000000000000000000000000000	13	6	s		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25 100000000000000000000000000000000000	12	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	L
×(manufactures)	9	3	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	Т
S[maxmana	4	z	1	1	1	1	13		XX.	٩.	L
26 200000000000000000000000000000000000	3	1	1	1	1	1	14				H)
27 20000000000000000000000000000000000	2		1	t	1	13	7.7K	to la	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	00000	A)
26 200000000000000000000000000000000000	2	1	1	1	1	1x		19 08			мÌ.
29 200000000000000000000000000000000000	t	1	1	1	1	14	***	N)			4
30 200000000000000000000000000000000000	1	1		1	18			1001		1000	મં
31 2000000000000000	1	1			13	100	***	iQU1		0000	٨İ.
20000000000000	1	1		x	200			iou:		jouat	лİ
33 (x0000000000 1	1			*	-	ICI.				00000	×
34 300 00 00 00 00						-					эÝ.
35 1000002											аĹ
Manner						200	X.UC		TH		
371220203						100	-	to la	-	outer.	ai.
											· •

Figure 23 Site 1: Great Chazy River Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb/5Flow = 150 cfs, Applied TFM Conc.= 3.5 ppm, Duration = 16 hrs

3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

+											+
10 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	xxx	000	000	000	oox						1
11 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	xxx	000	∞	000	xx	1					1
12 200000000000000000000000000000000000	xxx	000	∞	000	XX	1	1				1
13 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	24	18	16)	000	схх	2	1	1			
14 j xxxxxxxxxxxxx 43	33	20	15)	000	хx	3	2	1	1		1]
15 xxxxxxxxx 47	34	20	14;	000	xx	4	2	1	1	1	1
16 000000000000000000000000000000000000	42	22	17)	œ	9	5	2	1	1	1	1
17 000000000000000000000000000000000000	61	34	25	22	16	9	3	2	1	1	1]
18 000000000 72	37	12	10	10	10	8	4	2	2	1	1
19 000000000000000000000000000000000000	29	14	7	6	4	5	4	3	2.	1	1
20 000000000000000000000000000000000000	30	16	9	5	3	2	3	3	2	1	٦İ
21 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	27	14	8	5	2	2	2	2	2	1	ŧÈ
22 000000000000000000000000000000000000	24	11	7	4	3	2	2	2	2	1	1
23 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	23	10	6	⁻ 4	3	3	2	2	2	1	1j
24 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	17	7	4	3	3	3	3	z	z	1	1
25 000000000000000000000000000000000000	13	5	4	3	3	3	3x	xxx	xx	t	1j
26 00000000000000000000000000000000000	11	-4	3	3	3	3	3x	ххх	xxx	xxx	xx[
27 000000000000000000000000000000000000	8	4	3	2	2	2x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx
28 000000000000000000000000000000000000	8	3	2	2	2	2x	xxxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx
29 200000000000000000000000000000000000	7	3	2	2	2	2x	xxx	2000	xxx	xxx	xx
30 000000000000000000000000000000000000	6	3	2	2	2x	2000	000	xxx	xxx	xxxx	xx
31 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	6	3	2	2	2x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx
32 000000000000000000000000000000000000	5	3	2	2)	000		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx
33 xxxxxxxxx 4	4	2	2	2)	000	200	∞	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx
34 000000000000000000000000000000000000	3	2	2	1)	000	000	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx[
35 XXXXXX 1 1 2	2	1	1	1)	000	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx
36]xxxxxx 1 1 1	1	1	1	12	000	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx
37 xxxxxx 1 1 1	1	1	1	1)	000	000	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx

Figure 24 Site 1: Great Chazy River Maximum TFM Concentration Contours

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units - ppb Flow - 150 cfs, Applied TFM Conc.- 3.5 ppm, Duration - 16 hrs Map Scale 1:59507, 1 Inch - .939 Miles



Figure 25 Site 2: Saranac River Model Region

Map Scale = 1:88816, 1 Inch = 1.4 Miles







ſ

Finite Element

Mesh

Site 2

Sananac

207 Nodes

340 Elements

72 Bnd Nodes











Figure 29 Site 2: Saranac River Transport Model Grid

Cell Depths (Meters) at Minimum Lake Elevation (92.9 ft,msl) xxx = Land Mass, Cell Dimension = 400 meters

			1		Z	!	3	;	4		5		6	7	•	8	9	1	0	1	1	12	13	1	4	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	
1	• - [x	 . x	×	* • * •	 . x	x	* *	(x)	• • × ×	* * X X		• • x x	* * x x	**	**		 		 x>	. .	• - x	 2		••	 4	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	31	•
2		. x	x	x	e x	x	**		××	xx		* *	xx	xx	x		. x x				 x x				3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	6.	αx.	
3	1		x		e x		**		* *	**		* *	**	**	**			**			**	**)		××	¥	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	61	xx	
4			-	x :			**		* *	**		**	* *	**						r u	**	**1	***	**		3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	ō	3.		
ŝ	1.		÷	* 1			* 1		••			~ ^	1	3		3	1	**			**	~~`	***	~~ ~~	~~			10	10	10	10	10	10	7			
	1.		2	÷.			2.	,	7		7		÷	7		7	ż	25			22	201		22	22			10	10	10	10	10	10	4			
7	12		Ç	~ .	20	, ^	Ŷ	ì			;		ž	ŝ		7	7		÷.		~~	~~/ ~~/		÷.	22	~~		10	10	10	10	10	10				
	1.4		2	~ ·	20		-	í	5		5		4	5		7			4.5		<u>.</u> .	~~/ ~~/		20	~~	20		10	10	40	10	10					
ŏ	1 ^ F 5		0	2	~ ~				,		÷		2						ž		î,			20	22	<u>.</u>		10	10	10	10	10	7.				
1 0	1.4		0	÷.	22		~		5		÷		-			á	10	•	ŏ		3 A 4 U			22				30	10	40	10	10	2.				l I
44	1.			2			2	Ś	2		2		÷.				10		7		0 A 2					<u>.</u>		10	10	10	10	10.					
1.7	14		0	<u>م</u>					-		-		7 6	10		10	10				۵ ۸		***	00			4	10	10	10	10	10,					i t
47	12	•••							2		2		7	10			1.0				v 		2	~~	**	**	1.		10	10	10	101					1
	г» 1.			×.			. X I		2		-		ž	10						1	~	10			<u>د</u>	-	10	10		10							í.
	22								-		2	1		10			10			2		10	10		Š		10	10	10	10	10	10					1
12	12		X	X:	ж ж		х 3		2		2		Y.	10		10				1	U A	10	10		U A	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	21	(XX)			1
10	12	C X	х	X	XY		X	ĸ	4		1		ž	2		10	19			1	U A	10	19		U A	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	- 23	(X X :			
17	5	CX	• X	×:	××	(X)	X)	•			1		2	2		10	10		U.	1	U A	10	10		v	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	27	(XX)		• * * *	
15	2	CX	x	X	XX	(*	x)	κ.	2		•		2			Y	10			1	0	10	10	1	U D	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	27		(XX)		
19	5	C X	L X	X	X>	()	x)	ĸ	3		4		<u>r</u>	8		2	10		0	1	u	10	10	1	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	23	(* * :	KXX.	XXX	
20	b	CX	X	X	XX	(X	x)	ĸ	4		5		7	9	2	8	10		0	1	0	10	10	1	0	10	70	10	10	10	10	10	23	(XX)	XXX:	XXX	!
21		C X	X	X	X)	C X	x	t.	4		6	1	0	9	•	6	2		0	1	0	10	10	1	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Z :	(X X)	(XX)	KXX	
Z 2	þ	()	LX.	X	x >	()	X)	ĸх	XX		6		9	9) X I	(X	ć	1	0	1	Q	10	10	1	Ç	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	Z	(XX)	X X X	K X X	1
23	b	¢X	X	X	X	()	(X)	ĸΧ	хx		4	1	0	10	•	4	10	1	0	1	0	10	10	1	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	2:	(XX)	K X X	(XX	ļ
24	þ	C X	X	X	X	()	30	K X	XX		6	1	0	10	1	0	10		0	1	Q	10	10	1	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	2)	(XX)	(XX)	(XX)	l
25	þ	()(CX	X	x >	C)(х	K X	XX		6	1	0	10	1	10	10	1	0	1	Q	10	10	1	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	2	1:	(XX)	(XX	l
	۰.				• •			• •	• •		• •	• •									۰.				••												۶

Figure 30

Site 2: Saranac River (June) Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements

TIME	-	Hours from Entry of Lampricide Plume to Lake
DISTANCE	=	Distance from River Inflow (Meters)
LOG TFM	=	Log10 (Projected TFM Conc., ppb), Rescaled from Dye Data
TFM CONC	-	Measured Dye Conc. x TFM Load / Dye Load
LOAD		Streamflow x Applied Conc. x Treatment Duration

Symbols: x = surface samples, o = subsurface samples

L Ø G

T F B

L G G

I

F

SARANAC - JUNE



[] NE





Figure 31

Site 2: Saranac River (August) Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements

TIME	Ŧ	Hours from Entry of Lampricide Plume to Lake
DISTANCE	-	Distance from River Inflow (Meters)
LOG TFM	-	Log_{10} (Projected TFM Conc., ppb), Rescaled from Dye Data
TFM CONC	***	Measured Dye Conc. x TFM Load / Dye Load
LOAD	-	Streamflow x Applied Conc. x Treatment Duration

Symbols: x = surface samples, o = subsurface samples

3.3 3.1 2.9 2.7 2.5 TFM(PPB) e.3 2.1 1.9 50 1.7 1.5 - 20 1.3 1.1 0.9 0.7 0.5 4 ۰ ٥ ٥ 0.3 | 35 45 5 15 4Q 10 30 20 гò ຂ່ຮ

SARANAC - AUGUST

L Ö G

Ť F N

1 0 6

T F

N



T i he





Figure 32 Site 2: Saranac River (June) Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations Rescaled to Applied Conc. of 1000, Contours = 100-Fold Dilution

Observed

Saranac June, scale factor = 333.3



Predicted

airport speeds, site directions





Figure 33 Site 2: Saranac River (August) Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations Rescaled to Applied Conc. of 1000, Contours = 100-Fold Dilution

Observed

Predicted

Saranac August, scale factor = 333.3





81xxxxxx

XXXXXXXXXXX

1*******

xxxxx91659

13: xxxxxxxxx 14: xxxxxxxxxx 15: xxxxxxxxxx 16: xxxxxxxxxx 16: xxxxxxxxxx 17: xxxxxxxxxx

181xxxxxxxx

2 xxxxxxx12823

3

XXXXXX

Figure 34 Site 2: Saranac River Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction Maximum Mixed Layer Depth - 5 Meters, Units - ppb/5

1 2 3 4 3 4 7 8 9 19 19 12 13 14 15 14 17 18	
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	r r
Placent 13 29 16 12 9 6 5 Second contraction	
Nacucus 15 33 21 13 9 6 5 Generations	
P)nannanan (4.23 16 9 7 6 6 Boundarian S)annan 107 66 28 15 9 7 6 3 Barnonannan	
1 access261138 42 28 15 5 3 3 2 2accessor	
2 NGCOURCEL \$1 28 12 9 5 3 3 2 2 2005300	
<pre>spacecocccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc</pre>	
5 NCC000000 20 11 7 6 4 3 3 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1	
k]avangungan 1610 6 4 4 3 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 Pinuangunga 15 0 4 4 7 3 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Passuences to 7 4 3 3 8 1 1 1 1	
Fixed controls a 5 4 3 3 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Z[xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	i
Skouccouccouc 4 4 3 2 2 1 1 1	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 14	
•	•
	1
7 (xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx	
T Arcaninaga Kootaakakak	i
2 jacozowa 51 26 6 1 Alusion	
3 sourcestone 32 17 4	i i
4 JOURDUCUCUCI 25 14 4 1 Sizauranama 20.11 4 1 1 1	
6 xuuuuuuuuu 16 10 5 2 1 5 5	i –
7 122000000 13 + 5 2 2 1 1	ł
9 alonatation 10 7 4 3 3 2 1	
Bacucauco + 6 4 3 3 2 1	ł
1)20200020202020202020202020202020202020	1 1
3 anananananan 4 4 3 2 2 1 1	í
* (xexemance 4 3 3 2 1 1	!
**************************************	•
1 2 3 4 5 4 7 2 0 10 11 12 12 12 12 12 12	
***************************************	•
	!
	1
4 00000000 1 1 1 1 1 1 1000000000000000	i
7 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Į
Placebook 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1
ID[Autobat 44 5 1 1 1 1 2 1 Tanapasau	1
2)200000000000000000000000000000000000	1
3 ANCONCUSK 30 17 5 1 1 2 2 2 1 1 1	i
4 jaucoucuu 22 14 6 2 1 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 5 jaucoucuu 17 11 4 1 1 3 9 2 3 2 4 4 4 4 4	1
бјалодавија: 964432221111	
7[10000000 974432291111511	
o (2000-000,00, f é é 5 2 1 1 1 9]2000-000,00, f é 6 3 2 1 1	
0 20000000 6 3 1 1	i
Streetweet 3 1	1
3/2007000000	
	Í

	1	J	2	3	•		5	4	7		•	10	17	Ľ	15	14	15	14	17	18	
3	()000			-																	ľ
i	100			-	00	×.	N.	-				عتند		تنحد	000					1	
5	jaan			-						1	to			000						i	
ŝ	3.00		u.						1	1	12			000				1 00		1	
7	jxuo	Ö5	UL.					I.	1	1	2	2		تتيج						i	
ų	ļwu		u					1	1	\$	2	24	شبت	تتجلب	900	100	20			i	
,	hoo	Ud	0u	-			I.	1	z	2	3	3	28	a u bi		a de la com	ues:			i	
¢	200	-	u.	ø	1		1	t	2	2	2	z	2	oue	-		99			i	
1	700	æ	ođ	59	11	4	\$	13	۰3	s	2	2	2	⊅	-	000	001				
ł	100	8	00	MX.	42	2	8	11	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	000	LUIC			1	
5	X	-			24		¢.	10	4	3	3	3	3	z	2	1	1			1	
ţ) na	-	ų	-	H		5	10	4	5	4	3	3	2	z	2	1	1	1	- 1	
S,	ļwa				11		,	7	4	4	3	3	2	z	2	2	1	t	1		
¢,	(w	-			3		5	4	3	2	3		1	1	\$	ŧ	1	1	1	ા	
ľ	ļaa	un		i.	1		1	1	1							1	1	1	1	- 14	
١) na	-	UQ.																1	ц	
ļ	ļaa	dq.	-	-																- 1	
0	100	υb	οú																	F	
1	100	80	00	200															·	- 1	
ł	100		••		. 1					ш,										- 1	
3	(xw	8	00		ü															- 1	
Ļ	390					£														1	
J	į		•	-																	
																				-	

1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 9 18 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

\$[************************************	
4 (2000000000000000000000000000000000000	
S REAL PRODUCTION 2 2 2 REAL PRODUCTION OF THE	
6[
7 TANKAR & 5 5 5 3 3 2 2000000000000000	
\$(x0000x 711 10 7 5 3 2 200000000000000	
7 AUDOLUDUX 20 16 9 6 3 2 2 Ingen Augusta	
16 mman 57 43 25 15 9 4 2 2 1mm200000000	
11 00000261133 58 28 15 5 2 1 1 100000261	
12 ADDRESS \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ 3 2 1 1 100000	
13 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 5 1 3 5 3 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1	
14 200000000 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
15 100000000 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
16 20200000	
17 JACOutebox	
18 10000000	
19120000000	
2012000000	
21 (000000000	
22/1987323002303 393	
23 (3000000000	
* 1	

25 | 1100

RUK 14 13 11 0 ANNA 15 20 16 12 Anna 15 35 21 15 \$þ 7 120000000 46 25 12 7 5 a 107 1311 14 1000000 15 1.00000000 16(3 -17120000000 18 2000000000 19 3 2) Junior 21 [# 벖고 23 | 200302000000 24 j×

	1	,	2	3	4			7			10	19	12	13	14	15	16	17 1.	8
	****	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	••••	***										****	••
3	جدا	UK;	w	00	xixx			uoc	-				W.0		يتلو			56	Т
4	İω		69	out	NPUC	000	000	JOO	000	000					100				Í.
\$	100	w	•••	UCK		uų.			7	61	999			090		-	7 7		1
6	Luu		20	10	14	14	11	•	7	40	800	390	000	000					Т
7	ļνυ			13	20	16	n		6	3	Sa				,000	200	жκ		Ť.
6	100	(R)	8	15	33	19	12	8	6	4	4	000	000	600					1
Ŷ	, wo	úa			46	22	t1	7	\$	4	3	3,				100			ŧ
Ó		uų,	o, 1	107	45	22	•	5	4	3	3	34			, in the	AR.			i
1	[JUO	bυ	шâ	×1	89	21	٠	3	z	z	ż	z	æ		-	NK.			Í.
z	200	80	u y	-	-1	1	t	1	1			2	2	ъ					÷.
3	202	UC.	vo	00		٩.	1	1	1	1	1	2	z	2	1	1			ŧ
4	NO	00	w	uct.	- 1	1	1	1	1	1		2	2	1	1				ł
5		۰.	00	œ	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1					Ĺ
6		80			- 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	t						Ĺ
7	100	80	u p	URT.	. 1	1	1	1	1	1	3								Ť.
ð			1.	ц.	1	1	1	1	1	1									i.
ŧ	100			t.	1	1	1	1	1										Ĺ
٥j	bum			70	1	1	1	4	1										í.
ij			uur	-	t	1	1	1	1										í
2	-				00	4	÷.	Ť.											í.
3	ļ.	ų	00	000	000	Ť	1	1	1	1									i.
q	100		w	-		1	1	1	1	÷.									Ĺ
si	100				-	1		1	1	1									Ť
ł									•										•

1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 9 18 11 12 13 14 15 18 17 16

312000203000000000000000000000000000000		341)
420000000000000000000000000000000000000	COLOUGIO COLORA	Í
Sjanuaroonaari 🕻 🔪	TANKING CONTRACTOR	i
61000000000	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	i
7(200000	CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER	- i
\$ juocoox	Management (COK	i
9 1000000 1 2 2 2 1	AKADODODDAX	i
10 junious 27 51 12 10 5 2		i
11 former 257138 42 28 14 3	1000 OUX	- 1
12 100000000 34 22 12 4 1	30000000	i
13/200200000 16 12 7 4		i
14 348300000 11 9 4 2		i
15 Januar 9 6 3 1		i
16 NODOCIERA 7 5 5 1		i
1710000000 6 5 2 1		í
18 anna 19 5 4 2 1		i
19 200000 5 4 2 1		i
20 20000000 5 4 2 1		i i
21 00000000 4 3 2 1		- i
22 10000000000 3 2 1000		i
23 1		i
24 30000000003 3 2 1 1		i
25 00000000000 3 2 1 1		i

Figure 35 Site 2: Saranac River Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb/5 Flow = 600 cfs, Applied TFM Conc.= 1.5 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

																	+
3 xxx	00000	œ	000	ooc	000	∞		xxx	xxx		xxx		xx			MAX	1
4[xxx	20000	oa	000	000	000	∞	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	000	xx				1
5 200	00000	œ	000	ox	9	8	7	6х	xxx	xxx		xxx	xxx		xx		Ì
6 xxx	00000	x	16	14	11	9	7	6х	∞	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx		xx		Ì
7 7 1 xxx	xxx 1	13	20	16	12	9	6	5	5x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx		i
8 xxx	xxx 1	15	33	21	13	9	6	5	4x	xxx	∞	xxx	xxx	xx			i
9 9 1 xxx	20000	ot	46	23	14	9	7	4	4	3x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx			i
10 İxxx	200010	07	66	28	15	9	7	4	3	3x	∞	xxx	xxx	xx			ાં
111xxx	xxx2(51	138	62	28	15	5	3	3	2	2x	2000	xxx	xx			i
121xxx	XXXX	ox	5t	28	12	9	5	3	3	2	2	2x	xxx	xx			i
13 1 x x x	XXXXI	oc.	32	19	10	5	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	1			i
14 xxx	XXXXI	x	25	14	10	6	5	4	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	f
15 v v v	XXXXX	Y	20	11	7	~	2	2	ž	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	11
161222	~~~~	~~	16	10	, ,	~	4	ž	2	2	2	1	1	÷		4	11
171000		~	17	ä	~	7	7	2	2	-	4	4	÷	÷	4	4	41
17 [XXX 10 [VVV			12	,	~	7	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	-	•	4	- 1 j - 4 j
101777			12		7	2	2	2	4	'	-	-	-	•			- 1
191222	20200	К.Я.	10		-	2	2	~	-		1		1				
20 į XXX	20200	x	<u> </u>	0	4	<u>د</u>	3	2	1		1	1	1				. !
21 [XXX	20000	x	8	5	4	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1				ļ
22 į x x x	20000	00	xxx	4	4	3x	xx	2	1	1		1	1				ļ
23 XXX	30000	00	юx	4	4	3	2	2	1	1		1					1
24 XXX	200200	œ	юx	4	, 3	3	2	1	1								1
25 xxx	$\infty \infty \infty$	XX)	xxx	- 4	,3	3	2	1	1			•					1
																	4

Figure 36 Site 2: Saranac River Maximum TFM Concentration Contours

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb Flow = 600 cfs, Applied TFM Conc. = 1.5 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs Map Scale 1:59507, 1 Inch = .939 Miles



Figure 37 Site 2: Saranac River Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations vs. Wind Direction Maximum Mixed Layer Depth = 5 Meters, Units = ppb/5

	1	2	3	*	5		7		*	10	Ħ	12	13	14	15 1	16 1	7 1
3	1.00		000	OUE		000		000	000	000	000	000	000				
6	hou	alita	Landa C	nte	iuio	deno		000									
s	****					3	2	2	2				ł	-	min		
6	1000			4		-	ŝ		2	-			nan				
7	1000		3	4	÷.	ŝ	ī	5	5	2							
R	10,000		4	10	m	Ā	ĩ	5	5								
õ				15	11	7	2	4	3			_		~	2		
2			7	÷	ž	7	Ξ.	5		:							
1		_			ž	ž	1	-	1	:					<u> </u>		
1					2	7	1	4	1	2				3000			
-		4.10		19		2	•	1	1		1	2	**	2004	**		
	1000	000		1		1	1	1	1		1	1					
2	1KIOU	000	001	•		3	-		1	1	1	1					
	, and			- 7	- 5	z	2	1	1	1	1						
6			÷	•	4	2	2	1	1	1							
7	(1000	000	UÜL	3	3	2	1	1	1								
	tione	0,8	-	3	3	2	1	t									
9	þaxi	C QU	÷	2	- 2	2	1	t	1								
0	jeau	000	UQ2	2	\$	t	1	t	1								
r	xaax	ņ, s	994	2	1	٠,	1	1	1		÷						
2	2000	900	000	KOCK.	- 1	1	13	001	t								
5	[77 84	nia	URC	2001	. 1	1	1	1									
н	1.000	a ya ya		30UI	1	1	1										
		-	~~~	~~~		1											

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

\$(xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	-	a nati	ilinin (aira	100	000000000000	ĸ
4[xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	2000	NUCK	ж	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	100	00000000000000	
\$(1003034134934	-					000000000000000000	
6[mmuuq					1		
7(10000x							
\$(xanayar						2000000000000	
7\$10000000						Discourse saint.	
10 10000x 6 26	17						
11,000008 125	Ż	٠	1			ACCOUNTS AND	
12]101000000000000000000000000000000000	12	3				300000	
13)100030007 7	٠	5					
14.jicocococ 6	6	z					
S hoodcaced S	5	2					
16)x00000000 4	4	2	1				
17 100000000 3	2	2	1	1			
18 xxxxxxxxx 3	3	2	1	1			
\$ spannack 5	2	2	1	1	۱		
s sources (a	z	1	1	1	1		
21 2000000000 2	1	1	۰t	1	1		
22 1000000000000	1	1	12		1		
25 1200000000000000000000000000000000000	1	Ŧ	1	1			
X 10000000001	1	t	t				
3(200000000000	1	t	t				

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 19 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

*		***************	
31/2020/00/2020/00/2020/00/2020/00/2020/20000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/20000/20000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000/2000	000000000	jedice concern	HE .
4)000000000000000000000000000000000000		A KORKKKOK	
\$\$kuouocooodaaaa	-		
6 jauabaalar	324	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	
7 javane		200000000000000000000000000000000000000	
<pre>#lmmmum</pre>		ADDRESS OF ADDRES	
780000000		X01003000000	
10(x0000x 6 25 15		THE OCCUPATION OF THE OCCUPATI	
11 00000 1 26 20 4		KULKARARIYA	
12 11 11 12 AUGULAU AUGULAU		KURKUR	
13(azastata 7-7-3			
Н(жилиники: 6 5 2 :	1 1	1	
S[xcuccucx 4 4 2 1	1 1 1		
16 разлажных 3 3 2 2	2 1 1 '	1	
\$7)xxxxxxxxxx 2 2 2 1	111		
16 S S 2000,000	н н.		
19 xxxxxxxxxxx 1 1 1			
20 000000000000000000000000000000000000			
t management			
2).0000.000.000	XXX		
23 (xilelioubbbooxt			
24 [207000000000			
Z jucaciaaaaz			

123	•			•			0	42	12 LA L2 L4	
**		****	****			***				*****
3 2000000000			NO.	-00	100		100		100003	1
4[300000000	0000	000	1040	000		÷		200		
§ [10300000000	0000	*			1	197	1000	2000		
6 x000000000								200	انادانان تسعدهم	
7 2000000									000000000000000000000000000000000000000	
\$ Jacobs							-	7.10 0		
9 200000000								200	10000000	
10 2003042 7	28 1							2000	100000.0000	
tijsuoss 1	25 2	2 3			1	1		z	JUCCOLLEGE	
12[300000000	-81	4 4		1		1			1000000	
13	6	74	1	1	1	1	1	1		
1431000000000	4	43	: 2	1	1	1	1	1		
15 200000000	3	3 1	2	1	1	1				
16 1.00000	t	1 1	1	1						
17 1000000000										
18 10000000										
19 300000000										
20										
21 000000000										
22 30000000000	1001		1							
23 1000000000	XXX									
24 1000000000	XIX.									
Simme										

 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 4
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 15
 16
 17
 16

 3
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10

```
        Alian & E & E & F 
        1
        Decomposition and the second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second
```

1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 9 30 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

zi

3 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	
4 ADD COLORODO COLOCO COLO COLOCO COLOCO COLO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCO COLOCOLO	
5 (anti-construction 2 2 2 thereasternooned	1000
6[00000000 6 4 3 3 2 toucooccourse	
7 000000 3 5 6 5 3 2 2 Tapageogoage	10000
5 JOURNAL 4 10 19 4 4 3 2 1000000000000	
Plantmax 15 13 4 3 2 2 1 Internet	
Winners 131 24 4 5 1 1 1 Instruction	
11 January 1 20 14 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
	<u> </u>
	XX .
12 juniorites	
32 arcaneologi	
tāļomonara.	
19[20000000	
20 (xxxxxxxxx) 05	
\$1 Construction	
22(300000000000000000000000000000000000	
23 20000000022	
24 120020200000	
2	

1	2	3	4	5	4	2	9 10	11	12	13	16	75	15	17	16

11										E LI	ī
	~			_		_		_			ï
Showernersterst	3	2	2	2							i
élesessa é é	÷	ī	ž	2	-	00	-		-		i
7tunna 3 6 6	5	3	2	2	2c				-		í
atummer 4 10 9	6	4	3	z	tx	, and a	3000	i anci	00000		i
*[announce 15 13	6	4	2	z	1	ħ	adaa		0000		j
40 possour 3 30 22	\$	1	2	1	1	u					Ì
11 000000 1 19 14	3	1			١.	1	ta	-	NOR		I
15 The Contraction of the Contra						1	1	10	UCICIK		I
13] 13 00000000											1
14 20009000000											ļ
15 2000000											
36[3305060000											1
17 [200000000											
#[1760c00c											ł
~[1
											1
21		.,	-								i
Streeman											ł
26 0-1-100000055											i
Zitracouracean											i

*****	***		•••	•••	***			
5§ເດດອອີກອອອກອອສະຫະ	1.50				1000	1000	00120000	U.
\$ [000		1000	10.4	10	-		
5	5	2	2	2.			000000000000000000000000000000000000000	
6 anomene 4 4	3	2	2	2.		100	0000000000000	
7	4	3	2	1	74	1004	100000000000000000	
6(xuasee: 4 4 8	s	3	z	3	18	2006		
9/00000000 13 12		4	3	1	1	16	10000000000	
0 200000 5 32 24		3	2	1	١.	1ĸ	1000000000	
1 22 14	4	3	1	1	1	1	12000000000	
2 house and						1	1 202322	
\$ jenus contex								
i housean								
\$10000000								
6].00.000								
7) saaqaaaaa								
\$]x10000000								
* xouououxt								
500000000 (#								
) <u>and a state of the state</u>								
2/200000000			002					
annonana a								
A DOCODOCODER								
S I MONTRADING								

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 16 15 16 17 18

3 nonconcernationer	
400000000000000000000000000000000000000	toecodocococococococ
S[Haddaducadadada	101000200000000000000000
4)000000R	
7 3454642	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O
\$)000000	2000000000000000
9 Junior 1 2 1	
10 xxxxxxx 8 32 23 5 2	200000000000
11 000001 25 23 9 4	1 200000000
12 00000000 5 6 3 2	ADDOLOGI,
13 Junuouodot 3 3 2 1	
14 30000000 2 2 1	
15 3404000 2 1 1	
16 RIGHARDARE 2 1	
17 200000000 1 1	
181-000000000 1 4	
15 300000000 1 1	
28 100000000 1 1	
2thuonuccur 1 1	
22	AU.
23/100000000 1	
26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 2	
Simmer 1	
Figure 38 Site 2: Saranac River Cell Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb/5 Application Area = 175 Acres, Dose = 100 lbs/acre (5% Active Ingred.)

24 20000000000 1 1 1 25 xxxxxxxxxxx 1 1 1

23 xxxxxxxx 1 1 1 1

Figure 39 Site 2: Saranac River Maximum Bayer-73 Concentration Contours

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb Application Area = 175 Acres, Dose = 100 lbs/acre (5% Active Ingred.) Map Scale 1:59507, 1 Inch = .939 miles





Ì

ľ













.

Figure 44 Site 3: Ausable River Transport Model Grid

Cell Depths (Meters) at Minimum Lake Elevation (92.9 ft,ms1) xxx = Land Mass, Cell Dimension = 400 meters

		1	I	2		3		4		5	4	6	7	,	8	9	10) '	11	12	13	3	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	+- x	 x)	· -		- ,	 10	1	0	1	 0	11	 0	10	 -	10	10	10	,	10	•••• 10	10		••• 1 በ	10	10	10	10	10	101
2	1 ~	23	è	2		10	1	ñ	1	ň	10	n	10		10	10	10		10	10	11	'n	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
3	^ ¥	* 1	è	2		10	1	ň	1	ò	1	Ň	10		10	10	10		10	10	11	'n	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
4	l n l x	x 5		1		10	1	ñ	1	- 0	1	0	10		10	10	10		10	10	11	n	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
5		x 3		4		10	1	ň	1	ň	11	n	10	•	10	10	10	, ,	10	10	11	ň	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
6	l n l x	¥)		1		6	1	0	1	0	1	6	10		10	10	10		10	10	10	5	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
7	1 X	* 1	e e	1		ž	1	ñ	1	ñ	11	n	10		10	10	10		10	10	11	Ň	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
8	1 A 1 V	× 1		1		2	•	ž	1	ñ	1	ň	10		1.0	10	10		10	10	11	'n	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
0	1 2	~ `				ñ		1	•	Å	1	n i	10		10	10	10	, E 4	10	10	11	'n	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
10	4 ** 1 x	21 21	. x	¥ ¥		ň		'n		5	1	n	10		10	10	10		10	10	10	'n	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
11	1 2	x 3	(x	× ×		ŏ		ñ		1	•	1	10		10	10	10		10	10	10	5	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
12	1 ** 1 x	x)	. x	xx	×	ĸ x	xx	ž	xx	ż	1	0	3		10	10	10		10	10	10	,	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
13	1 x	* 1		* *	¥ S	**	x x	×	x x	Ŷ		1	6		10	10	10		10	10	10	3	10	10	10	10	10	10	101.
14	l x	x 1		xx	x	x x	x x			Ô	ļ	5	10		10	10	10		10	10	10	5	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
15	l x	x)	(x	xx	x	x x	xx	x		Ô		7	10		10	10	10		ŧ 0	10	10	3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
16	1 x	x)	(x	××	x	. x	xx	×	хx	x	-	3	10		10	10	10		10	10	10	, I	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
17	 x	x 3	(x	х x	x	c x	xx	×		1		3	8		10	10	10		10	10	- 14	, I	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
18	l x	x >	CX.	xx	x>	x x	xx	x		ò		1	2		3	3	10	1	10	10	10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
19	i x	x>	cx.	xx	x>	(x	xx	x	хx	x	1	0	1		2	3	6	. 1	10	10	10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
20	l x	x>	cx.	xx	x	сx	xx	x	xx	x		0	0		3	3	5		9	10	10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
21	İх	x>	(x	хх	x	x x	xx	x	xx	xx	(x)	x	0	I	2	3	9	• •	10	10	10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
22	l x	x>	(X	xx	x	(X	хx	x	хx	xx		кх	xx		0	6	10	• •	10	10	10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
23	İx	x>	cx.	хx	x	x x	хx	x	хx	хx	(x)	кx	хx	x	cx	9	10	1	10	10	10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	101
24	İx	x>	CX.	xx	x	κx	хx	x	хx	хх	x	xx	xx	x	(x	9	10	1	10	10	10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
25	l x	x	cx.	xx	x	кx	xx	x	хx	xx	(x)	xx	xx	x	(X)	(xx	9	• •	10	10	10)	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
26	x	x>	cx.	хx	x	(X	xx	x	xx	xx	x	xx	xx	x	(X)	(xx)	xxx	(x)	(X)	xxx	Ş	,	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
27	x	x>	CX.	хx	x	(X	xx	x	xx	xx	x	хx	xx	x	(x)	(XX)	xxx	x	(X)	xxx	ç	>	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
28	l x	x>	(X	xx	x	< x	хx	x	хx	xx	x	ĸх	хx	x	(x)	(xx)	xxx	:x)	(X)	xxx	ç	,	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
<u>-</u>								_																					

Î

Figure 45

Site 3: Ausable River

Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements

TIME	-	Hours from Entry of Lampricide Plume to Lake
DISTANCE	-	Distance from River Inflow (Meters)
LOG TFM	=	Log ₁₀ (Projected TFM Conc., ppb), Rescaled from Dye Data
TFM CONC	=	Measured Dye Conc. x TFM Load / Dye Load
LOAD	-	Streamflow x Applied Conc. x Treatment Duration

Symbols: x = surface samples, o = subsurface samples

э.з 3.1 e.s a.7 æ ×? \$.5 2.3 TFM(PPB) 2.1 1.9 1.7 50 ١ 1.5 ŝ 1.3 - 20 1.1 0.9 0.7 \mathbf{a} 0.5 0.3 5 ιò 15 sp эό 35 40 45 \$ 25 so 11 HE



L 0 5

1 F H

L 0 6

T F N

I





DISTANCE

Figure 46 Site 3: Ausable River Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations Rescaled to Applied Conc. of 1000, Contours = 100-Fold Dilution

Observed

auxable scale factor = 363.4 depth = 0, max observed



depth > 0, max observed



Predicted

airport speeds - site directions

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9	10	11	12 :	13
+	•••	••••			+
5 xxx 2 2 1					1
6 ==== <u>5</u> 2 1					1
7 xxx 13 21 13 6 3 1					1
8 22 34 23 14 7 3 1					1
9 mm 28 41 28 21 13 7 3	1				1
10 x 25 13 6	2	1			1
11 84 24 9	4	2			1
12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	5	2			1
13 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	5	2			1
14 20000000000 44 53 17 /8	з	1			ł
15 xxxxxxxx 49 78 15 / 5	1				I.
16 xxxxxxxxxxxxx199] 23/ 3	1				1
17 - 3 1					1
18					I.
19/2000000000000					1
20 300000000000000000000000000000000000					1

resultant wind, direction = s, load factor = .85

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 13

airport speeds - sirport directions

1 7 3 6 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

1234367043	~			· ·
+				+
5 mm 2 1 1				I
6 xxx £ 6 3 1				
7 8 12 15 8 4 2				I
a xxx 21 29 18 10 5 2				- 1
9 xxx 27 40 22 16 10 5 2 1				1
10	2	1		1
11 1000000 33 36 51 86 30 15 9	5	2		- 1
12	в	2		l
13 (2010 2010 2010 2017 53 17 29	5	2	1	- 1
14 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	3	1		1
15 20000000000 49 22 15 6 3	1			
16 20 3 1				1
17 100 000 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1				1
18 300000000000				1
19 200000000000000				
20 200000000000000000000000000000000000				
+				

Figure 47 Site 3: Ausable River Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction Maximum Mixed Layer Depth - 5 Meters, Units - ppb/5

- ---

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4 9 10 11 12 13 15 16 17 18	1 2 3 6 5 6 7 B 4 10 11 12 13 16 15 16 17 18	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 14 17 18
······································	Zinar tv i	21==== Ĕ [
	3)004	3 jant 1
4100 3 3 3 3 2 2 2 1 1 1	4 jaun j	4 jan 111111
Simu 4443323111	Sijoux J	5 (xxx 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
4 jun 5 5 5 4 3 2 2 1 1 1 j	6(ND). [6[anx 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1
7jau 665322111	7]668	7 μμμ 5 3 3 3 2 2 1 1 1
apan 6 8 7 6 4 2 1 1 1 1	4)xm	d houl 6 4 4 3 3 2 1 1 1 1
9 100 7 20 9 7 5 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
	11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
	12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	
16 autorestations 14 28 10 8 6 5 6 3 2 1 1 1 1	14 annual 9 9 7 6 4 2 1 1	14 (2007000000 + 11 8 5 3 2 1 1 4 7 1
15 2000000000000000000000000000000000000	15 μασασσασα 19 12 5 4 5 2 1 1 1 1 1 1	15 (#100000000000 10 15 10 5 3 1 1 1 1
16 1 A TO TO THE	16 2 2 2 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	16 (ACCESSION 20 9 3 1
17 3000000000000000000000000000000000000	17 000000000 6 9 5 3 3 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1	17]2000000000
18 parameters 16 23 13 7 3 2 2 2 1 1 t 1 1 1	₩6 xxxxxxxxxxxxx \$ \$ 4 3 3 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1	18 jacakooneen
19 Jagane 000000 10 16 16 9 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1	39[0000000000000 4 4 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	19 JACOCCESCOUCHE
20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2		
	Risesser	7 ing page a page and
	* www.	Minetetacocococococococ
25 Jacob 000000000000000000000000000000000000	2512922009000000000000000000000000000000	31,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,0
26 1	26 (1000-000-000-000-000-000-000-00-00-00-00	3 Martin Contractor Co
27 200000000000000000000000000000000000	Z harman and a subsection of the subsection of t	27(mai/0060000000000000000000000000000000000
26 DOCTOR CONTRACTOR DECIDENCE CONTRACTOR DECIDOR DEC	25 procession and a strange 000000000000000000000000000000000000	28 4 00000000000000000000000000000000000
**************************************	\$2+1+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2+2	* ***********************************
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 15 16 15 16 17 18	E 2 3 6 5 8 7 6 9 10 11 12 13 16 13 18 17 10
	Mana (2)	21 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Strar	31mm	3 Jan 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1
span, j	4100	4 jan 1333222111
Shaar I	Sjauot	5 201 4 4 4 3 3 2 2 3 3 1
6jzm	6/344	4 1 1 1 1 5 5 5 4 3 2 2 1 1 1 5 5 5 4 3 2 2 3 4 1 1 5 5 5 4 3 2 2 3 4 1 1 5 5 5 4 3 2 2 3 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
7 facula	7(100	2 mm 4 4 4 5 3 2 2 1 1 1 (
ðjunn	6 (Xur	ajan 6 8 7 6 4 2 1 5 1 5
(max)	Φ[xag	9 juar 7 40 + 7 5 2 1 3 3 1
10 2002005	10 Xu0xx	10 (x saugas 11 11 10 9 3 1 1 1 1
\$1 30000E	1t 2000dst	11 fizument 12 14 16 17 5 2 t t 1
		12 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
		13 2000000000000000000000000000000000000
	17 100000000000000000000000000000000000	17/2000000000000000000000000000000000000
	16 100000000 12 15 10 4 3 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1810000000000
19100000000000000000000000000000000000	19 333333333333333333 13 10 7 5 3 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1	19 2000000000000000000000000000000000000
201000000000000000000000000000000000000	20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	20 Jaurobastaterenan
21 000000000000000000000000000000000000	23 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24	21 januar markan j
22(HOLDOGRAM AND HOLDOGRAM 7 6 4 3 3 2 2 1 1	22 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	ZZ 40000000000000000000000000000000000
23[1000000000000000000000000000000000000		23 (2010) 0000000000000000000000000000000000
28 000000000000000000000000000000000000	28 100000000000000000000000000000000000	28 3.00000000000000000000000000000000000
***************************************	**************************************	***************************************
1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 9 19 13 12 13 14 15 14 17 18	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 14 17 18	- 1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 9 10 13 12 13 14 19 14 17 18
7/mm	2 june	** **********************************
Sinta M. C	Siam I	21,006 1 1 5 1 1 5 2
- j 4)atot	4 101	
Sjean I	S Inter	• p2204 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
8 juon 1	و بسد ک	
7(ann	7]1001	7ixxx 3 3 2 2 5 1
@(suor	44ma	Sjaat 4 3 2 2 1
9 1001 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 5 5 1 3 1 4	91x12 \$	9 Jucc 5 5 5 5 5 3 2 1 1 1
10 [#2043034 3 3 3 3 3 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 4 4		W 344,000x 6 6 7 7 4 2 2 1 1 1
11 aaaaa 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1	11 J KARAMA	11 Juculau 7 9 12 16 9 5 4 2 2 1 1 j
	13 Internet and 14	12(HOLMANDERAUGURE 25 13 7 4 3 2 1 1 1
тералиски наличная се на е э э е е з 2 2 1 1 1 1 [16]насторикация 16 17 е в А С 4 С 5 е 1 6 е 1	13 20 4 1 1 i	13 (controloculous 27 11 4 4 3 2 1 1 1 1
15 Internet terrer 12 12 12 10 7 4 4 5 6 1 1 1 1	Nieturenene 12 16 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	** passes and a to the total and the total and the total and the total and the total and total a
16 accounterations 37 18 11 6 3 2 1 1 1		
17[courselence 3 0 4 2 1	17 JURINA 17 20 11 S 1 9 1 1 1 1	Theory and the second s
16/2000000000 1	18 4000000000 16 21 13 7 2 1 1 1 1 1	Winsersonn (
tP(socoustances (19	19]6504900000
20(ancountermound (20 of transmission and the 10 6 3 2 2 2 2 2 1	() (manufactures
21 2345542000000000000000000000000000000000	21 Jack Company and Company 14 18 5 4 3 3 2 2 1 1	21 juny 5000000000000000000000000000000000000
	22 Automatication (1) + 6 5 4 3 5 2 1	22(100000000000000000000000000000000000
	23 RECEDENTION CONTRACTOR 6 5 6 6 3 3 2 1	23/200000000000000000000000000000000000
		24 00000000000000000000000000000000000
26 AND CONCERNING CONCERNING AND ADDRESS OF		
27]k		
28 (2000) 200 (2000) 200 (2000) 200 (2000) 200		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Figure 48 Site 3: Ausable River Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb/5 Flow = 400 cfs, Applied TFM Conc.=1.6 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs

	1	Z	3	5 4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
z	[XXX	: 2	2	2 2	2	2	2	1	1	1						•	łAX	••	ľ
3	[xxx	(2	2	2 2	2	2	2	Z	1	1								Ì	ĺ
4	xxx	: 3	3	; 3	3	2	S	Z	1	1	1							Ī	ĺ
5	XXX	4	4	4	3	3	г	2	1	1	1							i	
6	xxx	: 5	. 5	5	- 4	3	Z	2	1	1	1							i	
7	xxx	6	. 6	5 6	5	3	2	2	1	1	1							İ	
8	xxx	6	. 8	3 7	6	4	2	1	1	1	1							Ì	
9	xxx	. 7	10	9	7	5	2	1	1	1	1	1	1					ĺ	
10	xxx	xxx	11	11	10	9	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		Ì	
11	xxx	xxx	12	14	16	17	9	5	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	İ	
12	xxx	ixxx	xxx	∞	xxx	30	-17	10	5	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	
13	xxx	xxx	xxx	0000	xxx	44	16	9	5	4	4	3	2	2	1	t	1	1	
14	xx	DOXX	xxx	xxx	14	20	10	8	6	5	4	3	2	1	1	1	1	Ì	1
15	[xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	13	20	12	10	7	5	3	2	2	1	1	1		Ì	Ē
16	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	37	18	11	6	3	2	1	1	t	1	1	1	1	
17	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	17	28	14	8	4	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	
18	xxx	xxx	xxx		16	21	13	7	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
19	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	18	14	9	5	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	t	1	
20	xxx	0000	xxx	∞c	xxx	17	14	10	6	4	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	
21	200	oox	xxx	0000	xxx	xxx	14	11	8	5	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	
22	xx	xxx	xxx	∞	xxx	000	oox	11	8	6	5	-4	3	3	2	t		ĺ	
23	xxx	XXX	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	000	xx	6	5	4	4	3	3	2	1		Ì	ĺ
24	xx	oox	xxx		xxx	xxx	œ	кхх	3	4	4	4	3	3	2	1		Ì	
25	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx		∞	000	ox	3	3	3	3	3	2	t		ĺ	
26	[xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	∞	000	000	000	000	αx	3	2	2	t		ĺ	
27	XXX		xxx	∞	xxx		000	000	000	000	000	αх	3	2	1	t		Ì	
28	xxx		xxx	xxx	xxx	000	∞	000	000	$\infty \infty$	000	οx	3	2	1	1		İ	
																			•

Figure 49 Site 3: Ausable River Maximum TFM Concentration Contours

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb Flow = 400 cfs, Applied TFM Conc.=1.6 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs Map Scale 1:59507, 1 Inch = .939 Miles



Figure 50 Site 3: Ausable River Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations vs. Wind Direction Maximum Mixed Layer Depth = 5 Meters, Units = ppb/5

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 7 8 7 8 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	1 2 3 4 3 6 7 8 7 10 11 12 13 14 13 16 17 10
•		1 thurse
2 100 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Spou E Thusu	
3 jaca, 1, 1, 2, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,		
4 јаца 22221111		4 Jan
5 juni 3 3 3 2 2 1 1 1		5 Jan 1
6 jana 3 3 3 3 2 1 1 1		• XI
7] มอน 4 4 3 2 1 1 1		
8 aua: 4 4 5 4 3 1 1 1		elanz.
9 104 5 7 4 5 4 2 1 1	9[xxx 2 3 3 2 2 1 1 1	7 3.07
10 automat 7 7 7 6 3 2 1 1 1 1	10 [10 2002XXX 1 1
Tilaman & @ 10 11 7 4 3 7 1 5 1 1	31 [202003 3 4 4 4 2 1 1 1 1 1	11[2222 1
12 meter and a second and a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a s	12	12 and a construction of the state of the st
	13 Incompany 25 8 4 3 2 1 1 1	13 (x00000000000 24 10 7 4 2 1 1
	Mary reversion 44.27 9 4 7 1 1 1	Who up at a constant of 24,10,6,3,2,1
		15 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
		Minute and 13 3 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1
16 Jucucucucucucucucucucucucucucucucucucuc		
17 2006 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20	t/ (autocontention	
10 (2000 Council along 11 14 9 5 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	18 (19 January 19 Janu	
17 (x.0x.0x.0x.0x.0x.13 10 6 3 2 1 1 1 1 1 1	19 (2000)0000000000	
20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	0\$	20 subiziorialeucotz 2 1
21 23 23 2 2 2 1 1	21 (000000000000000000000000000000000000	21 Jacob and a state of the sta
	22 (20000000000000000000000000000000000	22 10000000000000000000000000000000000
		22 ##################################
	24 Testamenta and an and a state of the	* X NARODON CONTRACTOR INC.
	Xiverana and a second second	23 (1000000000000000000000000000000000000
2 2 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		27 323 32 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33
Tring and the second se		
25 journour augustation and an an an an an an an an an an an an an	44 berroecconcenserenceserenceneren	
* • . • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	***************************************	***************************************
1 2 3 4 3 6 7 8 9 30 11 12 33 14 15 16 17 18	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 9 10 15 12 15 14 15 16 17 18	· 1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8 9 19 11 12 13 14 15 14 17 18
**************************************	***************************************	***************************************
¥ xxx[3	21,000,13113131 * 54	v xxx)\$
31000	3 [alac: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 3	· 3 (xex
61978	4 100 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
* jaon	5 Jacet 3 3 3 2 2 1 1 1	Slaar
2 itat	c)	4 ture
6(10K		
7(202		7 14K
6[1001		6100
P[sax	1/100,5785621	P 200
(\$) ananaz	10 20,000,0 7 7 7 4 2 1	10 januar -
1 CIERCIAN	11 Jugudu 6 7 18 11 4 1 1 1	41 jacanana
	1213000000000000225 5 2 1 1	126000000000000000000000000000000000000
	Nivermenteren 20 5 1 t	13 hours and 19 5 1
		tälenmenna ät 73 7 2
	16 Junioration 17 27 4 1	Minuterent at M 4 3
ISJACAMINIKANIKAN 26 11 7 6 1		
17 200 200 00 0 7 16 10 6 3 1	17 10000000	
la]concourag 7 9 \$ 3 2 1 1 1	15 00000000000	10 FLOOD DOD 2 7 7 6 6 2 1 1 1 1 1 1
19)maanaaaaaaaaaa 8 7 5 2 1 1 1 1 1 t	19 -UGD0000000000000	19 (20010000000000000000000000000000000000
20 (20 (20 (20 (20 (20 (20 (20 (20 (20 (20 manuscriptore (05	20 [
210000000000000000000000000000000000000	21 Intercontractification	21 (200000000000000000000000000000000000
22 100000000000000000000000000000000000		22 x x x x y y x x x x x x x x x x x x x
	23 (xarabaran managana managana managana managana managana managana managana managana managana managana managa	23(200000000000000000000000000000000000
	24 1 2020202020202020202020202020	20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2
Stramana and and a state of the	25 1.000000000000000000000000000000000000	25 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
Minner the second		26(200000000000000000000000000000000000
	771	271
	21	
***************************************	***************************************	
·		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 4 7 9 7 7 7 7 7 10 11 12 13 16 13 16 13 16 17 18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		44
	. Z[NR 1	
stron	spana i i i	242.02
-{IXXX	4 janz 1 1 1 1	
Sjaux	Sjue: 2 1 1 1 1	ի հիտա ի
4 jaux	éļama: 2, 2, 3, 1, 1	6 junz
7 203	7 100 2 2 2 1 1	71000
\$ am	ájana: 5 3 2 2 1	\$jum
9]383	9 mm 3 6 3 3 2 1 1	t jan
10)	1011020000 6 5 5 3 3 2 1 1 1	10 (2000)
1000000 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	15 august 6 6 8 11 7 4 5 9 4 4	111.000.001
	17) was an an an 30 30 5 7 9 9 4 4	121-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1
	14 processes and 23 7 3 2 1 1 1 1	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1
	13 [1000000000000 34 16 3 2 1 1 1	
18 jour and a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a set a s	16 000000000000000000000000000000000000	16 Junior 25 6 2 1 1
172000000000 \$ 4 2 1	17 20000000000	17]34030340344034 12 19 8 3 1 1 1
18(ANRHARAMAK	18 XARAAAAAAAAA	156 2000 00 00 00 11 14 9 \$ 2 1 1 1 1
19(400-4400-000000	19 MARTINE TRANSPORT	19 and 000000 13 10 6 3 1 1 1 1 1
383000000000000	29 1 20100000000000	201x00000000000000000000000000000000000
211000000000000000000000000000000000000	211111111111111111111111	211mmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmm
21. TARAFARTARAFARTARAFARTA		
23 ZARACUCKARDENDOGKERENE	22 (#00000000000000000000000000000000000	23 (************************************
25 RARAFUCKARALAKONSULANAKA 24 ALEXANDRAKARAKAKANSULOK	. 72 (SACATERONALADARIANA 23 (Sacateronaladaria) 24 (Sacateronaladaria)	25 (CARCINGUE) (CONTROL CONTROL & 3 3 3 2 2 1 36 (CARCINGUE) (CONTROL & 2 2 2 2 2 1
23 248-40-400 23 248-40 24 25 24 25 24 25 24 25 25	22 AUCCURRENTINGUNGUNGUNGUNGUNGUNGUNGUNGUNGUNGUNGUNGUN	25 (2010) 22 (2010) 23 (2010) 24 (2010) 25 (20
23 халаасыскаялаанынынынын 24 алалаандасыскаялаасынык 26 аламындасысыныкынык 26 халамындасысыныкынык 26 халамындасысыныкыныкы	. 22 (340000000000000000000 23 (20000000000000000000000 24 (200000000000000000000000 25 (2000000000000000000000000 25 (200000000000000000000000000000000000	25 (социальности со 3 3 3 2 2 1 34 (социальности со 2 2 2 2 2 1 35 (социальности со 2 2 2 2 2 1 35 (социальности со 2 2 2 2 2 1 36 (со со со со со со со со со со со со со с
23 лаланандаландар (1996) 24 лаланандар пареонородо 25 лаландар (пареонородоосососососососососососососососососо	. 22 (жилосороссионаниосонан 23 (соороссоороссионанороссионана 24 (соороссоороссионанороссионана 25 (соороссоороссионанороссионана) 26 (соороссоороссионания на работа соороссионания 27 (соороссоороссионания на работа соороссионания на 27 (соороссоороссионания на работа соороссионания на работа	25 (сицентикански состанования 4 3 3 3 2 2 1 26 (сицентикански состанова 2 2 2 2 2 1 27 (сицентикански состанова 2 2 2 2 1 28 (состанования состанова 2 2 2 2 1 28 (состанования состанова 2 2 2 2 1 28 (состанования состанова 2 2 2 2 1 28 (состанования состанования состанования 2 1 1
23 XARAFACIONALINA (UNIVERSIA) 24 ANALANA (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) 35 ANALANA (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) 36 XARAFACIAN (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) 27 INALANA (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) 38 XARAFACIAN (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) 38 XARAFACIAN (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) 39 XARAFACIAN (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) 39 XARAFACIAN (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSIA) (UNIVERSia) (U	. 22 (законскорски оридонали 23 (соросски оридонали оридонали 34 (соросски оридонали оросски орид 35 (соросски оридонали оридонали оридонали 36 (соросски оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали 37 (соросски оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали 38 (соросски оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали оридонали 39 (соросски оридонали оридона Оридонали орид	25)спредната на полосоди со 4 3 3 3 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 1 26)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 1 27)апради со 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 1 28)спредната на полосоди со 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 <

Figure 51 Site 3: Ausable River Cell Maximum Bayer-73 Concentrations

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb/5 Application Area = 250 Acres, Dose = 100 lbs/acre (5% Active Ingred.)

	+					••••							•••			
2	[xxx]	: 1	Ŧ	1	1	1	1	1								MAX
3	xxx	: 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1							
4	xxx	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1							
5	xxx	: 3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1							
6	xxx	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	1							
7	xxx	4	- 4	4	3	2	1	1	1							
8	xxx	4	6	5	4	3	1	1	1							
9	(xxx	: 5	7	6	5	4	2	1	1							
10	[XXX	xxx	7	7	7	6	3	2	1	1	1	1				
11	xxx	xxx	8	9	10	11	7	4	3	2	1	1	1	1		
12	xxx	xxx	xxx	000	кхх	22	10	6	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	
13	xxx	0000	xxx	000	кхх	28	10	7	4	3	3	2	1	1	.1	1
14	xxx	xxx		σx	79	25	10	7	5	4	3	2	1	1	1	
15	xxx	2000	000	αx	79	26	14	9	6	4	2	2	1	1		
16	xxx	xxx	000	000	cxx	25	11	7	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	
17	xxx	xxx	000	oox	12	19	10	6	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx	11	14	9	5	2	1	1	1	- 1	1	1	1
19	xxx	xxx	000	∞	cxx	13	10	6	3	2	t	1	1	1	1	1
20	[xxx	xxx		000	cxx	12	10	7	4	3	2	2	1	1	1	1
21]xxx	xxx		000	∞	xx	10	8	6	4	3	Ż	2	2	1	1
22	xxx	xxx		000	000	000	òx	7	6	4	3	3	2	2	t	
23	xxx	xxx	∞	000	000	000	000	por	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	
24	xxx	xxx	∞	œ	000	∞	000	xx	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	
25	xxx	2000	000	000	∞	000	œ	xxx	xx	2	2	2	2	2	1	
26	xxx	xxxx	∞	000	000	000	œ	xxx	xxx		xxx	xx	2	2	1	
27	xxx	xxx	000	œ	000	∞	oox	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx	2	1	1	
28	xxx	xxx	000	000	000	∞	000	2000	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx	2	1	1	
	•															

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

Figure 52 Site 3: Ausable River Maximum Bayer-73 Concentration Contours

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units - ppb Application Area - 250 Acres, Dose - 100 lbs/acre (5% Active Ingred.) Map Scale 1:59507, 1 Inch - .939 miles



Y



Figure 53 Site 4: Lewis Creek Model Region Map Scale = 1:88816, 1 Inch = 1.4 Miles



Figure 54 Site 4: Lewis Creek Finite Element Mesh





Figure 56 Site 4: Lewis Creek Vertically Averaged Circulation Patterns - Northeast Wind (Directions Reversed for Southwest Wind)

Figure 57 Site 4: Lewis Creek Transport Model Grid

Cell Depths (Meters) at Minimum Lake Elevation (92.9 ft,msl) xxx = Land Mass, Cell Dimension = 400 meters

				1			2			3	\$		4	ł			5			ć	5		7	7		8	:		9	1	0 1		11	1	12		13	5	1	4		1 !	5	1	6		17	•	11	8	1	9	i	2 0)	2	1		22	2	
•	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		• •	•	•	•	٠	•	•	-	•	• •	• •	• •	•	-	-	-		•	• • •	•		• •	• •	•	• •	• •	-	-	•		• •	• •	-		• •	•	-		• •	-		• •		-	-	•		• +	•
1	1	X	X	X	x	x	x	X	X	CX	0	0	o	C	x	x	x	X	0	0	C	1	1 ()	1	0 1	1	1	0	1	0	•	10	1	t O		10)	1	0		11	0	1	0	•	10)	4	4		2	X	K X	(X	X	x	X.	x	K	
2	1	X	x	X	x	x	x	X	X	C)	0	0	¢	¢ ;	x	x	x	x	0	0	¢	1	1 ()	1	0	1	1	0	1	0		10	1	10		1 ()	1	0		1 (0 ;	o	x		3	x	x	x)	(x	x	x	K 7	cx	x	х	X	x	ĸĮ	
3	1	x	x	x.	x	x	x	x	X	. >	.,	o	c	c	x	x	x			7	7	•	te)	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	•	10	1	0		1 ()	1	0		1 (Q	1	0	x	x >	(X)	X	x)	cx	x	x)	x x	cx	x	x	X	x)	ĸ j	1
4	Ì	x	x	x:	x	x	x	x		2	0	0	o	0	×	x	x		1	1)		1 ()	1	1 0	1	1	0	1	0		10	1	01		1 ()	1	0		10	0,	0	x	x	x)	C C	I	Q		0		Q) x	x	x	x	x	κÌ	ł
5	È	x.	X)	x :	x	x	x	x	X	C)	0	0	o	k 3	x	x	x	x	0	0	ø	o	¢,	¢	1	0	1	1	0	1	0		10	1	01		1 ()	1	0		10	0,	o	x	x	\mathbf{x}	(į	2		3		2	2		1		ſ	o i	
6	i	x	x	x :	x	x	x	x			: >	\sim	0	k)	x	x	x	x	0	0	0	0	ĸ 3	0	0	cx	x)	(xx	0	(x)	ĸ.	хx	1	0		1 ()	1	0;	x	x	x	\mathbf{o}	x		2	2	6	6		5		3	5		1		(o i	1
7	i	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				0	0	c :	×	x	x	x		0	0	•	k 3	\mathbf{o}	0	c x	x	2	xx	0	(X		10	1	0		10	}	1	0		11	0	1	0		10)	,	7		6		3	s		1	x	x	ĸİ	1
8	i	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			C)		o		×	x	x	x	0	0	0	c	к.)	ō	0	. x	x		x x		(x		10	1	10		10)	1	Ó		1	0	1	0		1 0		,	7		7		5	5		2	x	x 1	κİ	
9	i	x	x	x :	×	×	x	×	×					0	×	×	×	x			0		0	Ö	0	<u>.</u>	x		. x	1	10	,	10	1	10		10	1	1	0		11	0	1	0		1 0			7		6		3	i y	x	ž	x	ж 1	- 4 2 1	1
10	Ľ	¥.	¥ :	¥ .	¥	¥	x						, , ,			x	¥	ÿ				• •			• •	e 14		,	. ¥	1	10		10	1	i n		11	5	4	ñ		11	n.	1	ĥ		11	ĺ		7		7	Y 3	- -			ç	¥.	x 1	- 1	1
11	1.	.	~ ·		~	Ç	ç	Ç					· ·		ç	Ç	ç	Ç										1	0	4	10		10	4	10		1 1	Ś		ň			ň	1	0		 1 A					5	ς,				Ĵ	0	2,	21	1
17	14	<u>.</u>			2	2	ç	Ĵ	0						2	0	Ĵ	Ĵ			,			ì	1	10		1	0				10	4	10			Ś	ì	Ň		• •		1	2		7			z		4	2.			. 0	Ĵ	0	~ ^	21	1
47	1	<u>~</u>			<u> </u>	<u>.</u>	2	<u></u>								<u>~</u>	<u>^</u>	2					.,					4	0		10		4.0		10		4 7		4	ž										-		1					2			·	
13	P	Χ.	X	ж.	×	×	×	X					0	C	×	X	X	×	2		(0				E U .		10				1	v				•	X		4			•		1.	X)	()	: X	. х	x	х.	XJ	4	
14	Ŀ	х.	X	X	X	x	X	X	X	C X		()	0	0	X	X	X		1						1	U		1	U	1	10		10	1	I U		11	лX	X	x		-	5)	C	X	X)	K)	(X)	X	×>	٤X	Χ.	X)	()	(X	X	x	X	x>	٩	
15		X.	X	X	x	X	X	X	X	C X		0	C	K		1	0		1	()		10)	1	0	1	1	0	1	0		10		6	X	x)	()(X	X	X	X)	x)	C	X	XJ	K X	(X)	X)	XX	٢X	х	X)	< X	(X	X	х	X :	X	C	
16		X.	X	X	x	X	x	X	X	X	5	1	10)		1	Q		1)	1	10)	1	0)	1	0	1	0		10		6	X	X)	(X	X	X	X	K I	K)	C	X	X	ĸX	X	XJ	XX	(X	X	X)	(X	C X	X	x	X	x	۱ ۷	
17	Ľ	X	X	X	x	X	X	X	X	2	L	1	1 ()		1	0		1	()	1	1 ()	1	0)	1	0		7)	κ.	хх		2	X	X	(X	X	X	X	X	x)	O	X	X)	()	(X)	X	XX	cx	X	X)	K X	٤X	X	x	X	X7	٢	
18	Ľ	X.	X	X	x	X	X	X	2	C)	[1	1 ()		1	Û		1	1)	1	1 ()		3			3		12	C	x x)	K)	(X	X	X)	(X	X	X	X	X	x)	0	X	x	K X	(X)	X	xx	٤X	x	X)	C X	(X	X	x	X	x)	٢Į	÷
19		X.	x	x:	x	x	x	x	х	C X	t	1	1 ()		1	Q		1	()	•	1 ()		0)		0		0		0;	o	(X)	x	x)	(x	x	X	X	x 3	x)	C	x	x	c)	(X)	x	x>	cx	x	x	c x	(X	x	x	X:	x>	c	1
20	1	X.	x	x:	x	x	x		1	0	•	1	10)		1	Ô		1	Ç)	•	1 ()		3	x	X	x		0;	k 3	xx	Ó	CX.	x	x)	(x	x	x	x	x)	K)	C)	x	x	ĸ,	(X)	x ;	хx	cx	x	x)	¢,	(X	x	x	X.	x>	٢Ì	
	+	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		-			•	•	-	-	-				• •	• •		• •	• •	-	-			• • •	•	•••		• •	-			•	٠	-	•			•			-			• •	-				-	-	•		• •	•

Figure 58

Site 4: Lewis Creek

Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements

TIME= Hours from Entry of Lampricide Plume to LakeDISTANCEDistance from River Inflow (Meters)LOG TFM= Log10 (Projected TFM Conc., ppb), Rescaled from Dye DataTFM CONC= Measured Dye Conc. x TFM Load / Dye LoadLOAD= Streamflow x Applied Conc. x Treatment Duration

Symbols: x = surface samples, o = subsurface samples



LEWIS

L C G

I

ĸ

0 6

Ī

Ē

M





DISTANCE

Figure 59 Site 4: Lewis Creek Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations Rescaled to Applied Conc. of 1000, Contours - 100-Fold Dilution

Observed

Predicted

XXXXXXI

11

2

5 21

14xxxxxx

XXXXXXXXX

XXXXXX

1 [xxx]

6xxxxxx

XXXXXX

XXX

ĺxxx

**** 7xxxxxx

21xxxxxxxxx

35xxxxxxxx

98**1**xxxxxxxx

5 16xxxxxxxx

12

Ī Ż

XXX

4

2

XXX

2

XXX

7xxx

7xxx

5

Lewis, scale factor = 186.38 airport speeds - site directions 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 28 21 22 9 18 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 11 depth = 031 ****************** ******** 21 max observed 3xxx ******* 41 XXXXXX 31 51 XXXXXX ***************** 61xxxxxxxx 1 2 3 XXXXXX XXXXXX 51 8xxxxxx 71xxxxxx 1 3 81xxxxxx t Ĵ. 7 6 XXXXXXXXX XXXXXX 71xxxxxx 4xxx1 91xxx ż 81xxxxxx 101xxx 504 29xxxxxxxx 1 XXX 91xxx 1 ž 6 3****** 111 XXXXXX 101xxx 121 XXXXXXXXX 111 131 XXX 1 2\TBxxxxxxxx XXXXXXXXX 121 141 XXX 4xxxxxxxxx { -11 151 131 ĝ 5xxx XXXXXXXXX 141 2xxx 3xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx 4 15! 3 resultant wind, direction = w, load factor = 1.23 161 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 28 21 22 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 31 ****** 41 11 depth > 8 XXXXXX xxxxxxxxi 21 51 max observed ********************** XXXXXX XXX 61xxxxxxxxx xxxxxx 2 23 4 71xxxxxx XXXXXX XXXXXX 1 2 51 81xxxxxx XXXXXX ġ. 61xxxxxxxxx XXXXXX 91xxx - 4 šФ 7**{**xxxxxx 101xxx Ŝ. 5xxx1 34xxxxxxxx 6 t 81xxxxxx 111 121 2 8<u>]56</u>xxxxxxxxx xxx! 1 4 5 91xxx xxxxxx 2 1 18¦xxx 202xxxxxxxx ******* 131 1 XXX 111 XXXXXXXXX 141 XXX ********************** 121 2 XXXXXXXXX ****** 151 131 13 2 XXX XXXXXXXXXX 14) 15) XXX ************************ airport speeds - airport directions 161 9 18 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 29 21 22 3! ********************** 4 XXXXXX 51 ****** 6;xxxxxxxx XXXXXX 7!xxxxxx 2.3 81xxxxxx

91xxx

101xxx

111 121

141

151

Figure 60
Site 4: Lewis Creek
Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction
Maximum Mixed Layer Depth = 5 Meters, Units = ppb/5

TXXX TXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	14] 15]
1 1 2 3 6 19143××00×××	12 xxx
1 2 3 4 6 12eunuuuu	11 xxxxxxxxx
1 2 2 2 1 1xxxxxxxx	10 xxxxxxxxxxxxx
1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 Manuar	9 xxxxxxxxxxxxx
111111111	B XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
111111111	7]xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
. xxxxxx 1 1 1 1 1	6)400000000000000
XXXXXXX 1 1 1 1 1	2 suuux
NUNCER 1 1 TOURDER	
KARKINGOO KARKINGO KARAN	1 I I I

12 13 14 15 16 12 18 19 20 21 23	1 01 4 8 4 10 11

	Ţ
	161
	12/200
1 2 3 3 5 2800000	11 () UCUCKOCK
1 1 2 4 6 9 18uccource	10 x000000000
1 1 2 3 3 4 5 3400000	9 xxxxxxxxxxx
1121111 xxx	5 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
111111 xxx	
verses 1 1 1 1	
xxxxxx 1 1 xxxxxx	7
XURSONOUNING STORES	21 E
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	11 01 6 8 2 9
KXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	15
XIXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	14
KUK ŞKXXDGXUKK	13 2000
1 2 61000000	12]xxxx
1 1 1 1 2 25×000000	11 J.concocc
1 1 1 2 2 4 6 16xxxxxxxx	10 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
1 1 1 2 3 4 5 11 7xuuuu	9 xxxxxxxxxxx
1112233554000	6 xuuxuuuuuuu 1
1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 3 4xxx	712000000000000000000000000000000000000
XXXXXXX 2 1 1 2 2 2	6 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	5 xxxxxx
XUNDER 1 1 XUNDER	
NXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	2 2
12 13 14 14 14 12 18 10 30 21 22	2 T B G 10 11

27 12 02 61 81 <i>2</i> 1 99 51	•	KUKUCK KUKUK	XXXXXXXX		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 XUX	1 1 1 1 1 1 1000000	1 2 2 2 4x00000004	3 4 3 2 500000000	4 7 10 19 890000000	ZXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		*	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	XXXXXX 2 2 2XXXXXXX	XUCKICK 2 2 2 3 2	00000 2 2 2 3 3 3	2 2 2 2 3 3 3 XXX	1 2 2 1 3 4 3xxx	1 1 1 4 4100000	1 1 1 1 1000000000	1 1 1 3 29uuuuuu	20000000196/ 1 L		 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		AUXIOLOGICOUDINUX	xxxxxx 2 2 3 3 3	UCCOCK 3 3 3 4 4 3	2 2 3 3 5 5 5 5 XXX	2 2 2 3 7 7 5xxx4	1 2 2 3 11 8xxxxxx	1 1 1 2 17xxxx000000	1 1 1 260000004	1 2 72665555555	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	NEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14				C XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	000000	XXXXXXX	XXXX 1	xxxx 1 1	× 12		7 - 1 - 4 Xavi	COCOCIE		8 9 10 11 12 13 14				XXNDCCCCXX	XXXXXXXX 1	2000000	XXXX 1	XXXXX	×			 8 9 10 11 12 13 14					DUCKNOX 1 1	000000 1 1	DODX 1 1	UXXX 11	5			XXX	XXXXX	
4 1			5 KYOUOXK	6 10000000	7 00000000	\$ x000000	9 xxxxxx	10 XXXXXXX	11 xxxxxxxx	12 xxx	2011 171	<u>5</u>		6 7		;	5 licence	6 KECKERDER	7 XIONICO	6 ×××000000	9]xxxxxix	10 xxxxxxx	11 0000000		<u>e</u> é	67	•	• •	5 kronex	6000000	7 8000000	6)xxxxxxxx	5 xuonana	10 x00000	11 x00000	12 xxx	13 xxx	ž	151	

6 7 8 9 10		- <u>e</u> i	2	_ z i	12 i	2 2	_ ≥ i	2	2	<u>୍</u> ଷ :	5	នារី
31 1440							-8	- 20	8	- 8	200	5
. .					×	8	3	2	2	â	ð	ž
S xxxxxx					*	8	ž	~	14	m	м	ъ.
00000000000000000000000000000000000000	5			×	ŝ.	ă.	м	м	m	*	4	Ж
7]xxxxx00000000x		-	•	÷-	•	2	м	м	ŝ	ŝ	ň	ਰ
8)xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	-	-	-		•	••	м	E,	~	•	Ň	3
9 XKKKKKKKKK 1	-	-	••	-	••	÷	4	**	÷	æ	200	3
10 xxxxxxxxxxxxxx 10	-	-	-	Ċu.	ē,	-4	٠	o.	2	3	2000	8
11 hooococcu 1 1	-		N	ю	÷	4	4	÷	â	ŝ	200	3
12 xxx	-	Ň	m	÷.	~	2	₽	8	₫.	8	000	ਤ
15 144	~ ~	÷	N	•	Ã	¥.	5	ର	Â	8	8	¥
14		-	\$	¥.	Ă,	ξ.	8	ŝ	8	5	2000	¥
151		8	8	8	ð.	Ξ.	8	8	8	ð.	202	ਤ
****	1	1	1	1	1	;	÷ .			1	ļ	ŧ
6789101	-	~	5	ž	2	2	17	8	≏	8	2	S.
······	ł.	1	Į.	Į.	1	1	1	į.		÷		ŧ
= 19						~	8	8	3	ğ	B.	Ť
+					×	3	×			×	200	5
5 200000					×	8	×	**	-			
6 x00000000000	8			8	3	ğ		-		-		
7 8000000000000					-	-	÷	-	-	-	2	8
b) xudococcoccitat				-	-	-	-	-	-		R	8
9 xxxxxxxxxx			-		-	-	.=	-		×	g	ă
10 XXXXXXXXXXXXXX		-	-		2	N	٠	-	×	ğ.	3	Ŧ
11 200000000		-	-	•	м	*	4	-	Ä	Š.	8	5
12 xux		-	-	N		ь.	=	8	ž	ž	3	Ŧ
13 (xux		-	-	~	ň	ğ	Ξ	8	ñ	ğ	200	3
14		-	3	ъ	Ä	ğ	3	8	5	Ĕ.	3	Ŧ
1 5 1		8	3	8	ğ	ğ.	8	8	ş	ž.	ş	5
** ** ***	1	1	ł	1	1	÷	:	1		÷	ł	1
			į				1		:	;		
0 1 2 3 10 1	-	N		-	n	2	4	2	2	8	2	N
+•••••••••••••	1	÷.,		1	1	1	÷.	1		1	Į.	† 1
*						×	8	3	ĝ.	Ž.	2	в
,					×	ŝ.	₫			R	8	×
5 purchase					×	ð.	5					-
6 NUCCESCONOCICCUCK	¥			2	8	ž						-
7 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX											2	x
8 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx					-		-	-			8	8
9 xxxxxxxxxxx 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	÷		ж	8	x
10 xxxxxxxxxx 1	-	-	-	~	N	N	-	-	×	Đ.	3	8
11 xxxxxxxxx 1 1	-	-	~	•	-	m,	2	-	Ň	ž	8	5
12 XXX 1	-	~	n	ŝ		₽	2	2	Ř	ž	3	8
13 xxu	-	-	N	2	ñ.	ž	2	2	ã.	3	8	×
<u>14</u>			Ě.	5	¥.	Š.	5	Ş.	×.	ş.	8	x
15		ā.	8	8	Š.	8	ŝ.	8	ž.	2	3	8
*****	1	1	ŧ.	ł.		ł.	1	÷	÷	ł.	i	Ţ

Figure 61 Site 4: Lewis Creek Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations

·. .

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb/5 Flow = 50 cfs, Applied TFM Conc.= 6.5 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs

3 MAX							2	000	000	0000	XXX	2000	XX
4						X	000	cxx	2	2	2x	xxx	xx
5 000000						×	000	ox	2	2	3	3	3
6 0000000000000000000000000000000000000	xxx	xx			>		x	3	3	3	4	4	3
7 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	xx		1	1	1	2	2	3	3	5	5	5x	xx
8100000000000000	xx	1	t	1	1	2	2	3	3	7	7	5x	xx
9 0000000000000000	1	1	1	1	t	2	3	4	.5	11	8>	0000	xx
	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	6	9	18x	000	0000	xx
11 00000000 1	1	1	1	2	3	4	4	4	6	29x	000	0000	xx
12 xxx	1	1	S	3	5	7	10	12	201	143x	200		xx
13 xxx		1	1	2	2	.3x	xx	13	20	35x	000		xx
14			1	1x	xx:	2x	000	000	000	000	000	0000	xx
15]			×		000		000	000	ooc	000	000	oox	xx

6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

Figure 62 Site 4: Lewis Creek Maximum TFM Concentration Contours

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units - ppb Flow = 50 cfs, Applied TFM Conc. = 6.5 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs Map Scale 1:59507, 1 Inch = .939 Miles





i e

Figure 63 Site 5: Putnam Creek Model Region Map Scale = 1:88816, 1 Inch = 1.4 Miles Figure 64 Site 5: Putnam Creek Finite Element Mesh



(

Finite Element

Mesh

Site 5

Putnam

185 Nodes

288 Elements

80 Bnd Nodes











Circulation Patterns

Flux m²/s Wind Direction

Figure 67 Site 5: Putnam Creek Transport Model Grid

; 0 x x x | 2 X X X 2 X X X 0××× 2 X X X | 0 5 x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 1 × × × × × × × × × × × × × 0×××××××× 2×××××× 2 X X X X X X o 0 3×××××× 3×××××× 2 X X X X X X 5 X X X X X X X X X *××××× 2 X X X X X X 3××××× 0××××××0 3××××××××× 7××××××××× 7××××××××× 8××××××××× 9××××××××× **9××××××××**×× 9××××××××× **1 x x x x x x** 2××××× 3×××××× **1 × × × × × × 1 x x x x x x 6XXXXXXXXX 6**××××××××× 3×××××× ł ~ ĊV. м •0 N MMM Ś ŝ 9 in, 4 ð Ś ŝ iΩ. m V M 4 LO. ÷ ò ~ -4 m 0 0 0 0 ***** S I м ŝ c ***** 0 0 35 XXXXXXXXX **** XXXXXXXXXX **** 2 **** **** 21 XXXXXXXXXX **** ***** **** ***** ***** XXXXXXXXXX ***** XXXXXXXXX ***** **** N m XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX X X X X X X XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX 3 | x x x 10 15 4 18 201 22 25 29 22 Ξ 12 12 23 28 30] Ē 7 191 4 5 24 26 331 5 60 0 34 - N 27

Figure 68

Site 5: Putnam Creek

Empirical Projection of TFM Plume Based upon Dye Measurements

TIME - Hours from Entry of Lampricide Plume to Lake DISTANCE = Distance from River Inflow (Meters) LOG TFM = Log₁₀ (Projected TFM Conc., ppb), Rescaled from Dye Data TFM CONC = Measured Dye Conc. x TFM Load / Dye Load LOAD = Streamflow x Applied Conc. x Treatment Duration

Symbols: x - surface samples, o - subsurface samples

L Ö G

1 F H

Ŭ G

T F



PUTNAM

PUTNAM



DISTANCE

.

Figure 69 🕚

Site 5: Putnam Creek Observed and Predicted Maximum Dye Concentrations Rescaled to Applied Conc. of 1000, Contours = 100-Fold Dilution

Observed

depth = 0, max observed

Predicted

airport speeds - site directions



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12:xxx	xxx	XX	3		X	xxx	xx
13 xxxx	XX	8	8	X	XXX	xxx	xxl
14:xxxx	XX	•	E		X	XXX	XX
1212222	XX VV	7	J		Ţ	X X X	XXi
171xxxx	xx	7	ž		Ŷ	~~~ X	xx
18 xxxx	XX	4	1	X	XXX	xxx	xx
191xxxx 291xxxx	XXX	XX	20	X	XXX	XXX	XX
21 . x x x x	***	XX	20	43x)	* * *. ¥ ¥ ¥	X X X X X X	XX XX
221xxxx	XXX	XX.	-	44x	XXX	XXX	XX
231xxxx	XXX	XX	2	17	XXX	XXX	xx
243XXXX 2590000	XXX	XX		- X	XXX	XXX	XXi
261 x x x x	*** XXX	*** XX	**	i	X	*** ¥¥¥	XX XX
27! x x x x	XXX	XX		•	X	XXX	xxt
281 x x x x	XXX	XX			X	XXX	xx[
27 i XXXX	XXX	XX 			X.	XXX 	XX

Putnam, scale factor = 84.75



resultant wind, direction = s, load factor = 0.51

1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14¦xxx	XX	ĸ				X	xxx	xx
15¦xxx	XX	X				X	XXX	XX
161xxx	XX	X				X	XXX	XX
17¦xxx	XX	X				X	XXX	XX
18[xxx	XX	X			<u>्र</u> X	XXX	XXX	XX
191xxx	XX	XXX	x,	*	-2X	XXX	XXX	XX
ZUIXXX	XX	XXX	X	131	<u>مې</u>	XXX	XXX	XXi
21 1 X X X	XX	XXX	X	31	¥.	XXX	XXX	XX
221222	XX	XXX	X-	3.7	16X	XXX	XXX	XXI
231222	XX	XXX	<u></u>		X	***	***	XX I
241222		***			' JX 1	***	***	XX VV
211000		~~~		**	•	- 0	~~^	₩¥.
27!		~~~	14 14			Ŷ	***	\$ \$!
28. 999	~~~	ŶŶŶ				Ŷ	***	Çγ!
291 xxx	XX:		x.			Ŷ	XXX	xxi
+								+

airport speeds - airport directions

+	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13 x	xxx	хx			x	xxx	xxx	xx
-141x:	XXX	XX				X	XXX	xx
15 x	XXX	XX				X	XXX	XX
19iX	XXX	XX				X	XXX	XX
1/1/	XXX	XX				X	XXX	XXi
1017.	***	XX uvv		4	- 20	***	***	33 L
2012	*** ***	~~~ ~~~	^^ - YV	i n	5,	*** ***	*** ***	\$₿}
21 x	XXX	XXX	ŶŶ	24	¥.	***	222	22 I
22 x	XXX	XXX	XX -	57	1Îx	XXX	XXX	xxl
231x	XXX	XXX	xx1	24)	18x	XXX	XXX	XXI
241x:	XXX	XXX	XX 4	55	∕ <u>n</u> x	XXX	XXX	XX
251x	XXX	XXX	XXX	XX	2	X	XXX	XX
261×	XXX	XXX	XX			X	XXX	xx
271x	XXX	XXX	XX			X	XXX	XX
281X	XXX	XXX	XX			X	XXX	xx
271X	XXX	XXX 	XX			X	XXX	XXI

Figure 70 Site 5: Putnam Creek Maximum TFM Concentrations vs. Wind Direction Maximum Mixed Layer Depth = 5 Meters, Units = ppb/5

12345678	12345478
1 Will second and	
2	Similarian (S
3jam muneouj	Jan · manazari
4 jaacoot saduaad	4 januara xaurani
S(xoraxx monou)	\$[sauaz www.i
é[xuxuut xux]	9120000X 1004
	7[200402 204]
elanover port	eparameter and
With the second se	
1110000000 x000001	11 30000000 00000
12[20000000 2000022]	12 0000000 20022
13 pooloou 1 1 taaaaaaa	131,000,000 1 1 1,000,000,000
14 (1000001 1 1 1 10000002)	14. (1000000 1 1 1 1. 10000000)
15 NOCOL 1 1 1 1 NOCULU	15 2000001 1 1 1 12000001
Minner 2 2 2 Zoouge	téjumen 2 2 2 2000er
	• 17 Junio 2 2 2 200000
19 Incococcia & Succession	Hiterranger 4 Sacousies
20[0000000x 12 70000000x]	20120000000 6 6000000000
21 NODROKKA 27 PRODUCTION	21 JANARA 10 PARADOLAR
22[200960061 42 14309600003]	22[communi 29 16/02/02/02/
23[20000000a126 2&cuovaxox]	23(10000000128 2500000000
26 procession \$1 13 page or an a	24(hopponent 4 4/menories)
25 house a source of	25 Junious and 2 Junious
26 JOUGOUGUE Z 2 ZUGERE	26 (#100000000 1 1 12000000)
201 becautions 1 1 because	
29 strootse 1 1 testari	20
Minutering 1 Incompany	Microsoft Augusta
+	***********************
12345678	12365678
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	12365678
12345674 1 N zkolodovologa 2 zcolodovologanj 3 xxx zcolodovol	12365678
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 N zkładzaboscogowa 2 J złosowodowana 3 zwona w stranowa 4 joszana z zastał 1 z z 4 5 6 7 8 2 z 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 8 skask-takuucheeur 2 scosostooraal 3 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 8 жилининининин 21 жилинининин 31 жи 4 жилинин 51 жил	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 8 21200000000000 21 2000000000000 21 2000000000000 21 200000000000000000000000000000000000	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 8 2000000000000 21 2000000000000 3100000 2000000000 31000000 200000000 31000000 2000000 31000000 2000000 31000000 200000 31000000 200000 31000000 200000 31000000 20000 31000000 20000 31000000 20000 31000000 31000000 31000000 31000000000 31000000000 310000000000	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 4 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 8 2020000000000000000000000000000000000	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 8 2020000000000000000000000000000000000	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

1234	5476
*	
1 145 30004	CLOUD XLOUR
2 x	CORRECTOR OF T
3 jacon	100000000
4 januaria	ARADOLAL
S January Construction	A DECKER A
6 juneau ar	2002
7 januara a	10
8 xxxxxxx	174A
9 30000022	ans)
10 20000000	2000 j
11 200000000pt	radiot
12/200000000	-monorest
15 10000000 1 1	tioucidenes
14 2000031 1 1	1 honouri
15 2000001 1 1	1 1/200000()
16 XRUDCA 1 1	
17]ROUGUL 1. 1	1 Tatatanas [
16/100001 2 2	(xeucoucouct
19 200000002 3	hammond;
29 JU0000004X \$	5 KARGER BER
\$1 Jacouranos 6.	60000uuuu j
22]Ioauguatette 10 1	1 toooccurrent
23 NOLLING 12	Stationates
25 300000002 42	Transmoord
	5 3000000
25jxxxxxxxxx 1	
suffconconnet 1	1 THERE
ZE I COUGUOU (CL. 1	t Durors
27 2000000000 1	1 100004

4 300000	XXXXXXX	412
S (1999) CE	nonerti	e[x
7 (separat Afransist	javs best	7 ja Alv
9000000000	20102	9[x
10 (methododot 11) successed	xxxxxxx(10 (p. 11.1 s
1200000000	numit[121.0
153,000,000 1 1	1 1/2/00/00/00	ւր հեր
15 JOGURON 1 1	1 1cococi	15 ja 66/2
17 342402 2 2	2 2000001	1745
16 x0000x 3 3 19 10000x 4	Succession (18ja 19ja
20]	8000000000	405
55(200000000 58)	Kasaboutat	22(3
23(100000000128	25004003402) 44040000071	, 25p 24p
Showard	2 Zestetas	2p
26 (manufacture 1 27) nonconcer 1	1 13003004.] 1 13000300.]	26 ja 27 ja
284,000,000,000	ENDER!	20(2
30).0000000		27 (a 39 (a

1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8	
)[9] mm		 11
21		2
3 x00 4 x00000		3(x 4(x
5100000	XXXXXXXX	Sja
5)300000 7(200002	79K	• (). 7 ().
alpowers Alvertaine	jica.	¢[:
10(x)00000000		10[2
11 (3000000000 12 (3000000000	100000() 100000()	11 (L) 12 (L)
13 NOUGH 1 1	transmoor	10
13 January 1 1	1 TADUQUS	34 () 15 ()
16 RURDER 1 1 17 RURDER 1 1	1 1200000	16 : 17 :
18 Januara 2 2	JEANERS AND	18(
19 (HOUSERING 6 20 (HOUSERING 11	Sinananan Tinanananan	19): 20):
21 2020000 23	7execciones	81 j.
23/2000000 91	BUCKEULUU	27
25 ALE COLUMN 18	2 1000002	원 : 조()
26 20000000 1	1 toour	26
27 300000004 1		25(
Showware 1	1 1000000	29[
******	*****	
1234	5 4 7 6	
20		2
3 faux		34
\$[134444	maneod	51
6 (xuuna 7 (xuuna	ן) הבניון נוגונית	6): . 7(
\$ 1000000	50 08	4
10[20000002		10
11 Sananda Silian 12 Sananda Silian) and and a second	tt (12)
13 30,000 1 1	100000000	13]
15 22002 1 1	1 1000000	15(
16(1.00000 1 1 17(1.000001 1 1	1 1000000	14) (70
10 200302 1 2	Sacanana	10
20(posucoust 12	700000302	20)
21 (40 100 100 27	transversers)	21
23/100000000 42	Fictoriououx) 7iustestiooux	23
24(10000000 20 25(10000000 20	4000000000	비
34 10000000 f	f ixtered	24
27 100 000 t 20 100 000 000 t	1 1.090004) 1 1.090004	27
29 poticionaliza - 1	1 1880000	37
section with the	HAND DESCRIPTION OF A D	~

기차 000 (20000) (20000) (20000) (20000) NOCULE SUCCULE SUCCULE SUCCULE SUCCULE nini ane 33 92 19 2 .

12345478

1 2 3 4 3 6 7 8 La pop a 96 20000KA Interiore 1300300 1xxxxxxx 00000000 IOROXANDER [

: #1 4

112 3-4 5 4 7 8

Figure 71 Site 5: Putnam Creek Cell Maximum TFM Concentrations

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb/5 Flow = 30 cfs, Applied TFM Conc.= 8.5 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

*	••			•••••
1 HAX	X	XXX	20000	0000000
2		х	XXXX	
3 xxx			XXX	0000000
4 xxxxxx				xxxxxxx
5 xxxxxxx				XXXXXXX
6[XXXXXX]6				xxx
7 xxxxxxx				xxx
8[xxxxxx				XXX
9[xxxxxxxx	x			xxx
10 0000000	ĸ			XXXXXXX
11 xxxxxxxxxx	x			XXXXXXX
12 xxxxxxxx	х			XXXXXXX
13 xxxxxxx	1	1	100	
14 xxxxxx	1	1	1	1xxxxxxx
15 xxxxxxx	1	1	1	1xxxxxx[
16[xxxxxx 3	2	2	2.	2xxxxxx
17100000	2	2	2 3	2xxxxxx
18]xxxxxx 3	3	3	3xx	
19 00000000	x	6	5xx	
20 xxxxxxxx	x	12	7xx	
21 xxxxxxxxx	x	27	9xx	
22 00000000	x	42	14xx]xxxxxxx
23]xxxxxxxx	x1	28	26 xx	2000000
24 00000000	x	51	13xx;	0000000
25 XXXXXXXXXX	XX	хx	6	4xxxxxx
26 xxxxxxxxxx	x	2	2	2xxxxxx[
27 xxxxxxxx	x	2	2	2xxxxxx
28 xxxxxxxx	x	1	1	
29 xxxxxxxx	x	1	1	1xxxxxxI
30 xxxxxxxxx	x	1	1xx	
+	••			•••••

ł

Figure 72 Site 5: Putnam Creek Maximum TFM Concentration Contours

1.

Composite Projections for Eight Wind Directions, Units = ppb Flow = 30 cfs, Applied TFM Conc.= 8.5 ppm, Duration = 12 hrs Map Scale 1:59507, 1 Inch = .939 Miles






Figure 74 Comparison of Plume Projections $\tau(t) \geq t$

LIST OF TABLES

- 1 Wind Speed and Direction Frequencies
- 2 Distribution of Wind Load by Direction and Speed Interval
- 3 Dye Study and Treatment Conditions

Table 1 Wind Speed and Direction Frequencies Burlington Airport, 3-Hr Observations

May-: SPEE	Septem D	ber 1986	5		WIND DI	RECTION			
mph		NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW	ALL
0	4.25	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.33
2	1.63	1.80	2.37	1.39	1.39	0.25	0.25	0.82	9.89
4	3.43	2.70	4.33	3.51	2.86	1.23	1.31	2.37	21.73
6	0.74	0.25	0.25	1.31	2.12	0.33	0.74	1.80	7.52
8	1.96	0.08	0.74	2.29	3.43	1.31	1.47	2.61	13.89
10	1.63	0.00	0.16	2.21	5.72	0.49	0.98	2.86	14.05
12	0.98	0.00	0.00	1.63	4.58	0.41	0.82	2.78	11.19
14	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.57	1.31	0.08	0.33	0.98	3.43
16	0.49	0.00	0.08	1.55	3.27	0.08	0.82	2.04	8.33
18	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.74	1.63	0.00	0.41	1.14	4.00
20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.33	1.14
22	0.00	0,00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.33
24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08
26		0.00	0.00	0.08	0.00	0,00	0.00 	0.00	0.08
ALL (Mean	15.36	4.90	7.92	15.69	26.96	4.17	7.27	17.73	100.00
Spee mph	d 5.7	4.5	5.1	10.0	11.3	8.0	10.6	11.0	9.2
Sept	ember	1986							
SPEE	D				WIND DI	RECTION			
mph	N 	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W 	NW	ALL
0	0.00								0.00
2	1.08	0.32	1.51	0.65	0.49	0.16		0.16	4.38
4	1.89	2.16	1.78	1.89	1.51	0.70	0.27	0.76	10.98
6	0.65	. 0.32		1.30	1,95		0.65	1.95	6.81
8	3.19		0.81	0.81	2.00	1.57	2.54	2.81	13.74
10	1,46			3.73	5.57	1.08	1.57	6.27	19.69
12				3.79	4.43	0.65		0.59	9.46
14			A 44	2.11	4.92		0.74	2.81	9.84
10			0.81	7.03	6.98		0.76		15.58
10				3.52	2.05				0.1/
20				1.70					1,93
20				1,41					1.41
ALL	8.27	2.81	4.92	28.18	30,50	4.16	5.79	15.36	100.00
Speed	d 4.2	5.0	5.0	12.0	11.4	8.1	9.5	9.6	8.9

Table Entries: Percent of Observations Speed = minimum of interval

May-S	Septer	aber 1986	5						,
SPEEI	D				WIND DI	RECTION			
mph	N	NE	E 	SE	S	SW	W • • • • • •	NW	ALL
0	0.00	0.00							0.00
2	0.14	0.16	0.20	0.12	0.12	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.85
4	0.72	0.53	0.82	0.73	0.62	0.24	0.29	0.53	4.48
6	0.28	0.09	0.09	0.50	0.81	0.13	0.28	0,69	2.88
8	1.17	0.04	0.42	1.41	2.09	0.75	0.97	1.60	8.45
10	1.65		0.17	2.43	5.93	0.51	1.06	3.13	14.88
12	1.45			2.53	7.32	0.63	1.29	4.31	17.53
14	0.34			1.18	2.71	0.17	0.68	2.03	7.10
16	1.23		0.23	4.03	8.43	0.20	2.03	5.30	21.47
18	0.27			2.56	5.70		1.43	4.07	14.03
20				1.77	1.87			1.47	5.11
22					0.91		0.91		1.81
24					0,57				0.57
26				0.84					0.84
ALL Mean	7.26	0.83	1.94	18.11	37.07	2.65	8.96	23.19	100.00
Load	0.75	0.27	0.39	1.83	2.18	1.01	1.96	2.08	1.59
Sente	amher	1986		57	*≀•				
SPEED		1700	WIND DIRECTION						
mph	N	NE	Е	SE	S	SW	W	NW	ALL
0	0.00				******	*******			0.00
2	0.25	0.08	0.35	0.16	0.12	0.04		0.04	1.02
4	0.69	0.81	0.61	0,69	0.59	0.26	0.11	0.30	4.07
6	0.33	0.17		0.67	1.00		0.33	1.00	3,50
8	2.09		0.54	0.54	1.31	1.00	1.78	1.86	9.12
10	1.20			3,42	4.81	1.01	1.41	5.62	17.47
12				4.26	5.01	0.75		0.62	10.64
14				2.70	6.31			3.61	12.62
16			1.25	10.31	10,13		1.07		22.75
18				5.99	4.54				10.53
20				3.78					3.78
28				4.49					4.49
ALL Mean	4.56	1.05	2.74	37.01	33.83	3.06	4,70	13.04	100.00
Load	0.40	0.32	0.48	2.70	2.17	1.01	1.32	1.40	1,52
.									

Table 2Distribution of Wind Load by Direction and Speed Interval
Burlington Airport, 3-Hr Observations

Table Entries: Percent of Total Wind Load Over Period of Observations Load Factor - (.22 S² + .004775 S³)/19.8 S - Mean Wind Speed (miles/hr)

> 37 34 71%

Site Number		1	2	2	3	4	5	
River		Chazy	Sar	anac A	usable	Lewis	Putnam	
Dve Study Condition	ns (Mevers	2 1986)						
Date	1986	5/29	5/31	8/8	8/6	8/11	8/13	
Mean Flow	cfe	225	750	1050	625	145	65	
Applied Conc	nnh	5 5	3 0	3 0	2 9	Q /	11 8	
Applied Duration	hrs	12	12	12	12	12	12	
Background Fluor.	ррЬ	.02	.03	.03	.03	. 02	.03	
Resolution (a)		275	100	100	93	470	393	
Resolution (Back	.05)	110	60	60	56	188	236	
Resultant Wind		ท	NIJ	s	s	w	s	
Wind Load Factor		1.16	. 84	. 77	.85	1.23	. 51	
Stream Temp. (b)	deg-F	67-72	67-68	71-72	70-72		69-70	
Lake Surface Temp	deg.F	57-63	56-61	72-73	71.73	72.73	73-74	
Due /TEM Load Factor	r(c)	1 77	3 50	2 50	2 73	A 19	3 00	
May Miyed Dopth		1 5	2.20	5 0	10 0	10 0	5.00	
-								
Prescribed TFM Trea	atment Con	ndition	S					
Streamilow	~							
Low	cis	100	500		300	25	15	
High	cfs	150	600		400	50	. 30	
Assumed	cfs	150	600		400	50	30	
Treatment Duration	hrs	16	12		12	12	12	
Applied Conc.	ppm	3.5	1.5		1.6	6.5	8.5	
Total TFM Load	lbs	1885	2424		1725	876	686	
Spread Factor	-r	3(d) 1		_ 1	1	1	
Vilutia 70	ppn.	175	75		80	325	425	-!
Bayer-/3 Treatment	Condition	ns	176		250		(*	
Tetal Daga	acres		100		100			
	IDS/ACI6	5	700 100		100			
ACCIVE Fraction	-		.05		.05			
Duration of Kelease hrs			0		1050			
ACCIVE LOAD	TDS		8/5		1220			
a Resolution - 1	Maximum de applied co	etectab	le dilu ation /	tion fa backgr	ctor - ound fl	uoresce	ence	
b River inflow peak of dye estimated from	temperatu plume a m surface	ures es t rive measur	stimated er mout ments d	from h; lak istant	surface te surf from ri	e measu face te ver inf	rements emperatu flow.	in res

Table 3 Dye Study and Treatment Conditions

c Dye Load / Prescribed TFM Load (1b/1b) x 1000

d Spread Factor accounts for dispersion of TFM in river above lake; conc. entering lake is divided by 3 and duration of loading is multiplied by 3 (based upon dye study results).