

Using numerical modelling to regulate a growing aquaculture sector

2

Rebecca Seal Air & Ocean Modelling Unit SEPA



Scottish aquaculture

Dominated by Atlantic Salmon

463 licenced marine farms

235 operational in last 3 years

179,755 tonnes produced in 2015





Farm Scale Models





Aquaculture has historically treated sites in isolation

Each has own "footprint"

Compliance tested by **local** sampling

Implicit assumption that local conditions are attributable to local site







Remote impacts

Sensitive features

Cumulative impacts

Farm discharges affecting other farms compliance

Treatments of Farms in isolation







Waterbody scale models

Case study Colgrave Sound

Northern Shetland Yell, Unst and Fetlar

Large concentration of marine cage fish farms

> Wide range of hydrographic conditions







Model build

Flexible, triangular mesh

~ 48,000 elements

3 open boundaries

Forced by tide and wind

Depth averaged flow





Flow characteristics

Large pressure gradients caused by water level differences across area

Extremely fast flows in many parts

Flow accelerated through tidal straits and around headlands

Lochs/voes and sheltered embayments resist faster flows





Flow characteristics

Large pressure gradients caused by water level differences across area

Extremely fast flows in many parts

Flow accelerated through tidal straits and around headlands

Lochs/voes and sheltered embayments resist faster flows



Discharge context

20 marine cage fish farms

1 fish processing plant (omitted – insufficient data)

Several small sewage treatment plants (omitted - negligible)

Discharge scenarios

- Organic solids
- Dissolved nitrogen
- Azamethiphos





Particle Tracking Calibration





Suspended solids

Deposited solids





Areas touched by particulate solids in any timestep



	All	Bluemu II & Fetlar	Basta Voe	Mid Yell Voe
Area (km ²)	132.8	80.1	4.7	1.9
N farms	20	15	3	2
Biomass (t)	29,08 6	25,326	2,550	1,210
% exposed	83	89	35	15
% impacted	2	2	8	4
% impacted by >1 source	78	84	31	11
% impacted by >5 sources	66	69	21	9
% impacted by >10 sources	50	49	5	0
% local sources		98	73	90



Mean particulate solids impact source count



	All	Bluemu II & Fetlar	Basta Voe	Mid Yell Voe
Area (km²)	132.8	80.1	4.7	1.9
N farms	20	15	3	2
Biomass (t)	29,08 6	25,326	2,550	1,210
% exposed	83	89	35	15
% impacted	2	2	8	4
% impacted by >1 source	78	84	31	11
% impacted by >5 sources	66	69	21	9
% impacted by >10 sources	50	49	5	0
% local sources		98	73	90



Mean particulate solids impact (g m⁻² yr⁻¹)



10



Percentage local impact due to each source



	Deveent less limmest
Site	attributable to itself
'BMS3'	49.39%
'BUN1'	99.45%
'UYIS1'	34.85%
'BNES1'	49.58%
'WOB1'	40.00%
'BVN1'	99.86%
'FLAE1'	97.92%
'NWW1'	40.84%
'BMS5'	19.07%
'WOG1'	25.13%
'BASS1'	21.90%
'HAC1'	87.61%
'BURK1'	5.28%
'VAT1'	96.49%
'MYV1'	100.00%
'NSAN1'	79.60%
'BAS1'	69.32%
'VEE1'	43.62%
'TUR1'	48.43%
'HAS1'	54.10%



Screening tools





Screening tools







Screening tools







Conclusions



Numerical hydrodynamic

modelling required to understand the nature of dispersion over large scales

Such modelling is helping to drive debate and policy design in SEPA with respect to defining environmental standards that address water-body scale, cumulative impacts



Crucial that such modelling is employed routinely within the context of aquaculture discharges, going forward





Thanks.

