

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

Division of Spill Prevention and Response Contaminated Sites Program



Fate and Transport Modeling Guidance
March 2026

Signature Page

Supersedes: *Fate and Transport Modeling Guidance*, January 2017.

Issued by:

Stephanie Buss

Stephanie Buss, Program Manager

Date:

March 11, 2026

Contents

Signature Page.....	i
Acronyms.....	iii
1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Selecting a Modeling Program in the Public Domain.....	1
2.1 EPA’s Vapor Intrusion Screening Level (VISL) Calculator.....	2
2.2 Integrated Groundwater Modeling Center, Colorado School of Mines (IGWMC) Research Web Page.....	2
2.3 USGS Water Resources Mission Area Software Catalog.....	2
2.4 EPA’s Hydrologic and Water Quality Assessment Modeling Web Page.....	2
2.5 EPA Science Models and Research Tools (SMaRT) Search.....	2
2.6 Army Corps of Engineers Groundwater Modeling System (GMS).....	2
3.0 Modeling Work Plan.....	3
3.1 Modeling Objectives.....	3
3.2 Conceptual Site Model (CSM) for Modeling.....	4
3.3 Technical Approach.....	4
3.4 Computer Model.....	4
3.5 Sensitivity Analysis.....	5
3.6 Model Calibration.....	5
3.7 Model Verification.....	6
3.8 Uncertainty Analysis.....	6
3.9 Prediction.....	6
3.10 Post Audit of the Modeling.....	7
4.0 Modeling Report.....	7
5.0 Model Review.....	7
References.....	8

Acronyms

AAC – Alaska Administrative Code
ASTM – American Society for Testing and Materials
CSM – Conceptual Site Model
CSP – Contaminated Sites Program
DEC – Department of Environmental Conservation
DEQ – Department of Environmental Quality
DoD - Department of Defense
EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
GMS – Groundwater Modeling System
IGWMC – Integrated Groundwater Modeling Center
OHEPA – Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
ORD – Office of Research and Development
RP – Responsible Person
SMaRT – Science Models and Research Tool
USGS – United States Geological Survey
VISL – Vapor Intrusion Screening Level Calculator

1.0 Introduction

Fate and transport models have become an integral tool for contaminated site investigation and remedial technique selection nationwide. In accordance with 18 Alaska Administrative Code (AAC) 75.340(e)(2), a responsible person (RP) may propose an alternative cleanup level for the migration to groundwater pathway using site-specific data and a fate and transport model. However, modeling for other pathways, such as contaminant migration to surface water, air pathway modeling, and other pathways and receptors may also be accepted and in some cases could be required. The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation's (DEC) Contaminated Sites Program (CSP) uses contaminant fate and transport models to help determine site specific aquifer characteristics; as tools for predicting contaminant concentrations at exposure points; and to assist in evaluating and selecting the most effective remedial alternative. CSP recognizes that the use of fate and transport models will continue to grow, and regulatory agencies will be relying on information obtained through modeling to assist with site management decisions. When adequately constructed, documented, and verified, fate and transport models can provide an acceptable line of evidence supporting risk management decisions.

Fate and transport modeling is most appropriately used in conjunction with other lines of evidence. CSP project managers must ensure that modeling results are protective of human health and the environment. The effective use of predictive fate and transport models as management decision tools requires the establishment of their functionality, performance characteristics, and applicability to the site being considered. Generally, models transform empirical values of input parameters into predictions of chemical concentrations in media which can then be utilized to estimate risk. The input parameters are equally as important as the mathematical components of the model and therefore results critically depend on model inputs.

The purpose of this guidance is to provide general guidelines and criteria for the selection and application of fate and transport models and to promote the appropriate use of models. This guidance is not a substitute for professional judgment that should be applied in the selection and application of modeling. CSP considers any predictive tool that attempts to describe either the past or future fate and transport of contaminants to be either qualitative or quantitative, analytical or numerical to be a model. This guidance outlines the criteria for selecting a model, and the elements to evaluate and document to ensure model calculations are appropriate for their intended use.

2.0 Selecting a Modeling Program in the Public Domain

CSP limits modeling programs to those which are available in the public domain unless otherwise approved. For the purposes of this guidance, public domain modeling programs are defined as readily available, without access fees, widely distributed, and generally accepted models. The majority of the public domain models have received extensive peer-review, and case histories describing their limitations and drawbacks have been published in scientific literature. Many of the public domain modeling programs were developed by government agencies, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), and U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). When a public domain program has been modified, it is no longer considered a public domain program. A modified public domain model can still be proposed for use if it is peer reviewed, widely distributed, and generally accepted. Compared to public domain modeling programs, proprietary modeling programs without proper review and general acceptance may provide a lower level of confidence in making site cleanup decisions.

Choosing the appropriate model requires site-specific evaluation that considers the heterogeneous nature of the transport media, contaminant types and mixtures, and contaminant distribution.

Although CSP does not maintain a list of approved fate and transport models, many sources provide downloadable software and manuals, some of which are listed below. Consultants are encouraged to work with the CSP project manager prior to proposing use of a model or submitting model data.

2.1 EPA's Vapor Intrusion Screening Level (VISL) Calculator

<https://www.epa.gov/vaporintrusion/vapor-intrusion-screening-level-calculator>

The EPA constructed this calculator to support vapor intrusion evaluation. The excel spreadsheet calculator lists volatile chemicals, provides recommended screening level concentrations for indoor air, soil gas, and groundwater, and allows calculation of site-specific screening levels based on user-defined target risk levels and exposure scenarios.

2.2 Integrated Groundwater Modeling Center, Colorado School of Mines (IGWMC) Research Web Page

<https://igwmc.princeton.edu/research/>

The IGWMC is an internationally oriented information, education, and research center for groundwater modeling. IGWMC provides downloads of several different free modeling software programs in the public domain.

2.3 USGS Water Resources Mission Area Software Catalog

<https://water.usgs.gov/water-resources/water-resources-software-catalog/>

The various software programs and related documentation on these web pages were developed by the USGS for use in fulfilling its mission. The software can be used, copied, modified, and distributed without any fee or cost. Use of appropriate credit is requested. The software is provided as a minimum in source code form as used on USGS computers.

2.4 EPA's Hydrologic and Water Quality Assessment Modeling Web Page

<https://www.epa.gov/hydrowq>

This website provides predictive exposure assessment techniques for aquatic, terrestrial, and multimedia pathways for organic chemicals and metals. A wide range of analysis techniques is provided, ranging from simple desk-top techniques suitable for screening analysis, to sophisticated, state-of-the-art continuous simulation models.

2.5 EPA Science Models and Research Tools (SMaRT) Search

<https://www.epa.gov/research/epa-science-models-and-research-tools-smart-search>

SMaRT Search is a searchable inventory of freely available models, tools, and databases from EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD).

2.6 Army Corps of Engineers Groundwater Modeling System (GMS)

<https://www.erdc.usace.army.mil/Media/Fact-Sheets/Fact-Sheet-Article-View/Article/476776/groundwater-modeling-system/>

The DoD, in partnership with the Department of Energy, the EPA, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and 20 academic partners, developed the GMS. The GMS provides an integrated and

comprehensive computational environment for simulating subsurface flow, contaminant fate and transport, and design of remediation systems.

3.0 Modeling Work Plan

Figure 1 outlines the steps involved in contaminated sites model application. A thorough site characterization effort should precede any modeling at a contaminated site. If an RP will use modeling, it is recommended that a modeling work plan be submitted to CSP for approval prior to use. The modeling work plan may be a subsection of a comprehensive work plan that describes all proposed work at a contaminated site. The proposed modeling work plan should include the components in the following subsections.




Figure 1: Steps in Contaminated Sites Model Application

3.1 Modeling Objectives

The objectives and reasons for the modeling should be specific and measurable. For example, modeling might be conducted in order to predict benzene concentrations in groundwater at a certain distance from a source of specified concentration, or the predict vapor concentrations arising from a well-defined source in an enclosed space of specific dimensions. Having a specific objective helps determine, at a later time, if the modeling exercise has been successful.

3.2 Conceptual Site Model (CSM) for Modeling

Based on available data, regional inferences, and professional judgment, a geologic and hydrogeologic CSM should be prepared and included in the modeling work plan. The CSM should be graphical (maps, cross-sections, block diagrams) with associated descriptions. If the CSM simulates groundwater flow, it should indicate whether the subsurface is a porous or a fractured medium. It should consider chemical and physical properties of the contaminants that may affect their movement. The CSM should quantify the presence of permafrost and corresponding influence on fluid flow, if applicable. It should describe the temperature and pressure conditions of the transport media.

For modeling of the vapor intrusion pathway, a CSM can be developed by conducting thorough building surveys. The building surveys should document building foundations, ventilation systems, preferential pathways, sensitive receptors, existence of background contaminant sources, and building occupancy. Finally, the CSM should discuss data gaps, assumptions, and uncertainties, and be continually refined as more data is obtained.

3.3 Technical Approach

A narrative should be included which describes technical considerations necessary to achieve the stated goal, such as numerical or analytical, modeling dimensions (1-D, 2-D or 3-D), saturated or unsaturated flow, multiphase or single phase, reactive or non-reactive, dispersion, retardation, and/or degradation.

3.4 Computer Model

The work plan should identify the selected computer model. The capacities and limitations of the model should be discussed, including how specifically it applies to the site-specific conceptual site model. Site-specific input parameters are preferred. The work plan should reference the specific reports where the data has previously been presented in addition to presenting the site-specific data, sample numbers, dates collected, and specific sample locations. Non-site-specific input parameters should have good justifications. The source of these parameters should be identified, for example, EPA's *Soil Screening Guidance* documents, CSP's *Draft Cleanup Levels Guidance for Methods Two and Three*, or scientific literature. The work plan should specify if input parameters have been assigned, any assumed values, and justification for the assumptions. The fate and transport parameters should be for the temperature and pressure conditions described in the conceptual site model versus standard temperature and pressure conditions. Submit computations to derive the parameter values at site-specific temperature and pressure conditions from the standard temperature and pressure conditions. Boundary and initial conditions should be described.

3.5 Sensitivity Analysis

The use of extreme or non-representative assumptions or parameter values is a common weakness of mathematical models. Therefore, it is important to identify the critical parameters and conduct a sensitivity analysis for the most critical parameters. A sensitivity analysis is the process of varying inputs over a reasonable range (range of uncertainty in the value of the parameter) and observing the relative change in model response. The sensitivity of one parameter versus others is also evaluated. The purpose of the sensitivity analysis is to demonstrate the sensitivity of the simulations by varying input values. Sensitivity analyses are also beneficial in determining the direction of future data collection activities. Data for which a model is relatively sensitive would require future characterization, as opposed to data for which the model is relatively insensitive, which would not require further field characterization. See also *Applied Ground Water Modeling: Simulation of Flow and Advective Transport* by Anderson and Woessner and *Applied Contaminant Transport Modeling Theory and Practice* by Zheng and Bennett.

When the input parameters vary widely and the model is designed to ultimately predict contaminant concentration, an upper or lower 95% confidence limit of the mean should be used depending on the influence of the predictive contaminant concentration for an exposure assessment. If the range of parameter values is known with confidence, then parameters should be chosen to represent the bounding case of maximum risk to human health and the environment (i.e., worst case scenario).

3.6 Model Calibration

The work plan should include a plan to calibrate the model to reproduce appropriate field-measured parameters. The field-measured parameters will be different for different models and for different transport media. Calibration establishes that the model can reproduce field conditions. Models have no predictive value if they cannot reproduce observed concentrations.

Calibration consists of changing values of input parameters in an attempt to match field conditions within acceptable criteria. Calibration requires that field conditions be properly characterized. Lack of proper characterization may result in a calibration to a set of conditions that do not represent actual field conditions.

Since some inputs are highly variable and the data is limited, these values are typically adjusted and extrapolated through an iterative process until an acceptable match is made. As calibration proceeds, data gaps often become evident. The modeler may have to redefine the CSM and collect more data. When the best calibrated match is achieved, a final input data set should be established and demonstrated to be reasonable and realistic. The degree of accuracy and how precise the match should be is governed by the defined purpose of the modeling. Each modeler and reviewer will need to use professional judgment in evaluating the results. There are no universally accepted goodness-of-fit criteria that apply in all cases. However, it is important that the modeler make every attempt to minimize the difference between model-simulated and field conditions. Additional information for calibrating a groundwater model can be found in American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D5981M-18 *Standard Guide for Calibrating a Groundwater Flow Model Application*.

Documenting the degree of model calibration is important since it helps demonstrate how well the model estimates reality. Documentation can be in two forms: qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative is the simpler of the two, and involves using words, maps, tables, and graphs to demonstrate that the model-derived predictions are consistent with the behavior that is expected based on field data.

Quantitative analysis involves a statistical comparison of modeled results to values measured in the field. Many model post-processors include statistical packages that can provide an efficient tool for quantifying the model's accuracy.

For initial assessments, it is possible to obtain useful results from models that are not calibrated. Potential applications include screening and guiding data collection activities. Risk calculations should not be made from uncalibrated model results unless a sensitivity analysis is conducted and critical input values represent worst case scenarios.

3.7 Model Verification

A second set of field data using the set of calibrated parameter values and stresses should be reproduced. Because of uncertainties in the calibration, parameter values of a calibrated model may not represent the contaminated site conditions. If the parameter values established during calibration are changed during verification, the model should be calibrated again with the changed parameter values. By reproducing a second set of field data, model verification establishes greater confidence in the model. With only one set of field data, it may not be possible to verify a model. Collection of a second set of field data is often possible at sites with multiple observation wells. CSP may accept a calibrated but unverified model for predictions as long as careful sensitivity analysis of both the calibrated and the predictive models are performed and evaluated.

3.8 Uncertainty Analysis

The uncertainty associated with the modeling of a given problem should be evaluated. The uncertainty in modeling exists because of uncertainties in transport mechanism, sink/source within the transport media, temporal and spatial variation of model parameters, initial and boundary conditions, and matrix heterogeneity.

3.9 Prediction

Upon completing calibration, sensitivity analysis, and field-verification, the model can be used to predict future scenarios. Predictive simulations should be viewed as estimates and not as a certainty. There is always some uncertainty in predictive models. The simulations are based on the CSM, the input parameters, and the model algorithms. The model's limitations and assumptions, as well as the differences between field conditions and the conceptual site model will result in errors in simulations. In an attempt to minimize these errors, models are calibrated by adjusting inputs until the model closely reproduces field conditions within some acceptable criteria. However, the time period over which a model is calibrated is typically small compared to the length of time used for predictive simulations.

Relatively small errors observed during the time period over the model calibration or history matching may be greatly magnified during predictive simulations because of the larger time period typically used in predictive simulations. The growth in errors resulting from projecting model simulation into the future should be evaluated by monitoring field conditions over the time period of the simulation or until appropriate cleanup criteria have been achieved.

Predictive simulations are often conservative. That is, given the uncertainty in model input parameters and the corresponding uncertainty, model input values are selected that result in a "worst-case" simulation. Site-specific data may be used to support a more reasonable worst-case scenario (i.e. site-specific data should be collected to limit the range of uncertainty in predictive

models). If long-term action is necessary, it may be necessary to refine and update the model as additional data is collected and future stresses are observed.

3.10 Post Audit of the Modeling

Plan to conduct a post audit analysis several years after the modeling study is completed. Collect new field data to determine whether the prediction was correct. Analyze what went wrong with the modeling and means to improve it. If site remediation work reduces risks posed by the contaminated site to acceptable levels, and monitoring proves that the risks are acceptable, a post audit analysis may not be necessary.

A sufficiently calibrated and field-validated model uses historical data to predict the future; however, it is difficult to predict the magnitude, location, and duration of future stresses. As a result, performance monitoring (validation) of predictive simulations often show the flow system did not behave as predicted. Post audits analyses utilize the additional field data collected after the model study is completed to evaluate the accuracy of the prediction. The new data should be used to recalibrate the model to update and improve the simulation. These periodic updates allow appropriate "corrective actions" to be made (e.g., modifications to an extraction well system). Anderson and Woessner's *Applied Ground Water Modeling: Simulation of Flow and Advective Transport* and Konikow's *Predictive accuracy of a groundwater model – Lessons from a postaudit* provide discussions on post audit analysis methods that can be utilized to re-calibrate a model. Many investigators have suggested not extending transient predictive simulations for more than twice the number of years for which there is transient calibration and verification data.

4.0 Modeling Report

A final modeling report should describe model predictions, technical analysis, input parameters, and results of parameter sensitivity and model uncertainty analysis. Critical input and output files should be included in the report's appendices. The report should provide sufficient information for an independent reviewer to duplicate model runs.

5.0 Model Review

CSP may hire an external environmental consultant to review the modeling work plan and modeling results. In accordance with state law, all expenses incurred for project oversight, including review of fate and transport models, must be reimbursed by the RP. Model acceptance may require contaminant levels monitoring and institutional controls.

References

- Anderson, M.D. and W. W. Woessner (1992). *Applied Ground Water Modeling: Simulation of Flow and Advective Transport*. San Diego, CA, Academic Press.
- ASTM (2018). *Standard Guide for Calibrating a Groundwater Flow Model Application*. (ASTM D5981M-18).
- ASTM (2019). *Standard guide for Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Systems*. (ASTM D5979-96(2019)e1).
- Bear, J., M. S. Beljin, and R. R. Ross (1992). *Fundamentals of Ground-Water Modeling* (EPA Groundwater Issue Paper). Environmental Protection Agency, Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory.
- Cramer, R., Parker, B. L., & Stapleton, J.M. (2025). Remediation Geology and Process-Based Conceptual Site Models to Optimize Groundwater Remediation. *Sustainability*, 17(5), Article 2027. doi:10.3390/su17052027.
- DEC (2017). *Draft Cleanup Levels Guidance for Methods Two and Three*.
- Dougherty, D. E. and A. C. Bagtzoglou (1993). A Caution on the Regulatory Use of Numerical Solute Transport Models. *Ground Water* 31(6), 1007-1010.
- EPA (1994a). *Assessment Framework for Ground-water Model Applications*.
- EPA (1994b). *Ground-water Modeling Compendium - Second Edition, Model Factsheets, Descriptions, Applications and Cost Guidelines*.
- EPA (1996a). *Soil Screening Guidance: Technical Background Document*, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, D.C.
- EPA (1996b). *Soil Screening Guidance: User's Guide*. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, D.C.
- EPA (2009). *Guidance on the Development, Evaluation, and Application of Environmental Models*. (EPA/100/K-09/003). Council for Regulatory Environmental Modeling, Office of the Science Advisor, Washington, D.C
- Konikow, L.F. (1986). Predictive accuracy of a groundwater model – Lessons from a postaudit. *Ground Water*, 24(2),173:184.
- Kresic, N. (1997). *Quantitative Solutions in Hydrogeology and Groundwater Modeling*, Boca Raton, FL: Lewis Publishers.

Lukas, I. (1997). A Tiered Approach to Regulators' Evaluation of Groundwater Model Applications. *Remediation Management*, First Quarter: 22-29.

Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) 2014. *Groundwater Modeling, Remediation and Redevelopment Division Resource Materials*. (52 pp).

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OHEPA) 2007. *Ground Water Flow and Fate and Transport Modeling. Technical Guidance Manual for Ground Water Investigations*. (Rev.1, 37 pp).

Ritchey JD, Rumbaugh JO. 1996. *Subsurface Fluid-Flow (Ground-Water and Vadose Zone) Modeling*. (ASTM STP1288. 423 pp).

Schmelling, S. G. and R. R. Ross (1989). *Contaminant Transport in Fractured Media: Models for Decision Makers*, (EPA Superfund Ground Water Issue).

Spitz, K. and J. Moreno (1996). *A Practical Guide to Groundwater and Solute Transport Modeling*, New York, NY: Wiley-Interscience.

van der Heijde, P. K. M., A. I. El-Kadi, et al. (1989). *Groundwater Modeling: An Overview and Status Report*.

van der Heijde, P. K. M. and O. A. Elnawawy (1992). *Quality Assurance and Quality Control in the Development and Application of Ground-water Models*.

Zheng, C. and G. D. Bennett (1995). *Applied Contaminant Transport Modeling-Theory and Practice*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand Rein.