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Basic Question

How well we can predict sediment toxicity using sediment contaminant data?

Impetus

When we decide to manage sediment contamination, we should understand how well we can predict the biological change?

Probability is appropriate way to express predictions
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Definition and Terminology

*Probability* – quantification of the likelihood that something will occur

*Conditional probability*: probability of something occurring when it is known that something else has occurred

\[
P(Y) = \text{probability of } Y \text{ (unconditional probability)}
\]

\[
P(Y | X) = \text{probability of } Y \text{ if } X \text{ occurs (conditional probability)}
\]
ERLs and ERMs

ERL and ERM are, respectively, the 10\textsuperscript{th} and 50\textsuperscript{th} percentiles among ranked concentrations associated with effects.

They are percentiles, they have no inherent predictive ability.
Cumulative Distribution Function for Data Used to Derive Original ERL/ERM for Cu (Long and Morgan 1990)

Critical Values:
- ERL = 70 ppm
- ERM = 390 ppm
**ERL Concentrations**  
*(Long et al. 1995)*

Empirically based as 10\textsuperscript{th} percentile among concentrations found to co-occur with a biological effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>1.0 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>0.15 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDE</td>
<td>2.2 ppb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tDDT</td>
<td>1.6 ppb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tPCB</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tPAH</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAH</td>
<td>16 to 700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conditional Probability Analysis

Formulation as probability of aquatic impact if specific level of sediment contamination is exceeded

Incorporates uncertainty and natural variability into analysis
Conditional Probability Analysis

Given –

$Y = 1$ : impacted aquatic condition

$X$ : sediment contamination

Two-step approach to calculate $P(Y = 1 \mid X > X_C)$ –

1. Identify subset of resource for $X > X_C$
2. Determine fraction of subset with impact

Calculate $P(Y = 1 \mid X > X_C)$ for all observed values of $X_C$
Conditional Probability Analysis on Data Used to Derive Original ERL/ERM for Cu

- Probability of Bentic Impact for Exceeding X-Value
- Cu in Estuarine Sediments (ppm)
- 95% CI
- 16 ppm current ERL
- 70 ppm ERL original data
- 220 ppm non-overlapping CIs
- 390 ppm ERM original data
- 95% CI

ERL original data
- 70 ppm
- 220 ppm non-overlapping CIs

ERM original data
- 390 ppm
Quantified Predictability

1508 samples (NS&T and EMAP)
<ERL  5% toxic   >ERL<ERM 13%   >ERM 38%

2475 samples (NS&T and EMAP)
<ERL  5% toxic   >ERL<ERM 13%   >ERM 41%

2760 samples (NS&T, EMAP, and others)*
<ERL  8% toxic   >ERL<ERM 20%   >ERM 48%

*(16% of 2160 *Ampelisca abdita* tests showed toxicity,
51% of 600 *Rhepoxnius abronius* tests showed toxicity)
Redefine ERLs and ERMs

ERL ~ concentration at which about toxicity is found about 10% of the time

ERM ~ concentration at which about toxicity is found about 50% of the time

Just coincidence that ERL and ERM are the 10th and 50th percentiles of concentrations co-occurring with effects

It does not follow that
5 ERL exceedances = 1 ERM exceedance
Logistic Regression (Field et al., 2002) yields a continuous relationship between probability (p) of toxicity and concentration of (x)

\[
\exp(B_0 + B_1(\log_{10}(x)))
\]

\[
p = \frac{1}{1+ \exp(B_0 + B_1(\log_{10}(x)))}
\]

\[
\ln(p/(1-p)) = B_0 + B_1(\log_{10}(x))
\]
Logistic equation

\[ B_0 = -5.79 \quad B_1 = 2.93 \]

\[ p = 0.11 + 0.33P_{\text{max}} + 0.4P^2_{\text{max}} \]
Cumulative areal distribution of Cu concentrations VA and LA Provinces

$p = 0.11 + 0.33P_{max} + 0.4P_{max}^2$
Simulations with Cu Levels (EMAP-VP 1990-93 Data) Using Logistic Regression with Uncertainty in Regression Parameters

Uncertainty Standard Deviation is 1% of Parameter value
Simulations with Probability of Toxicity Using Logistic Regression with Uncertainty in Regression Parameters

Uncertainty Standard Deviation is 1% of Parameter Value
$P(Y = 1 \mid X > X_c)$

$p = \frac{e^{(B_0 + B_1 \log_{10}(X))}}{1 + e^{(B_0 + B_1 \log_{10}(X))}}$
1990-93 Virginian Province

- CPA observed toxicity (80%)
- reverse CDF Cu
- logistic regression function
- CPA modeled toxicity (90%)
1990-93 Virginian Province

- CPA observed toxicity (90%)
- reverse CDF Cu
- logistic regression function
- CPA modeled toxicity (90%)
1990-93 Virginian Province, small systems

- CPA observed toxicity (80%)
- reverse CDF Cu
- logistic regression function
- CPA modeled toxicity (90%)
1990-93 Virginian Province, small systems

- CPA observed toxicity (90%)
- reverse CDF Cu
- logistic regression function
- CPA modeled toxicity (90%)
Conclusions

Only approximate comparison of logistic regression predictions with observations because of differing definitions of toxic sediments

Small estuarine systems in Virginian Province observed to have most overall extensive sediment toxicity

Overall best comparison of predictions with observations for small systems

Predictions over or underestimate observations depending upon Cu levels in sediments and estuarine geomorphology

Conditional Probabiility Analysis appears to be a robust approach for comparing predictions with observations
Messages We Want to Leave With You

ERLs/ERMs are not criteria and have no intrinsic predictive value

Incorporation of additional analyses with data can provide some predictive capability

May need to incorporate, at a minimum, estuarine geomorphology into predictions

Advantages of probability-based designs with consistently collected suite of indicators

Conditional Probability Analysis provides different analysis perspective
Approaches for Identifying Changepoint (Thresholds)

- non-overlapping confidence intervals
- nonparametric deviance reduction
- change in curvature of fitted curve

\[ P(y = 1|x > x_C) = \begin{cases} 
1 + \frac{(D_0 - 1)}{1 + \exp(B_0 (x_C - x_0))}, \text{ for } x_C > x_0 \\
1 + \frac{(D_0 - 1)}{1 + \exp(B_1 (x_C - x_0))}, \text{ for } x_C \leq x_0 
\end{cases} \]