

**EVALUATION OF MODELS FOR YIELD
COMPUTATION IN UNGAUGED WATERSHEDS FOR
IRRIGATION INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN**

Sasiri Tharasara Siriwardana

(158567D)

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

June, 2018

**EVALUATION OF MODELS FOR
YIELD COMPUTATION IN UNGAUGED
WATERSHEDS FOR IRRIGATION INFRASTRUCTURE
DESIGN**

Sasiri Tharasara Siriwardana

(158567D)

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science in Water Resources Engineering and Management

Supervised by

Professor N.T.S. Wijsekera

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

June, 2018

DECLARATION

“I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis, in whole or in part in print electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books)

.....

Date:

Sasiri Tharasara Siriwardana

The above candidate has carried out research for the Master’s thesis under my supervision.

.....

Date:

Professor N.T.S. Wijsekera

ABSTRACT

In any country water management and water infrastructure development activities are mostly associated with ungauged watersheds. Yield computation method recommended by Irrigation Guideline of Sri Lanka does not provide sufficient evidence to ascertain the accuracy of the estimations. Unavailability of a reliable yield calculation method for a practicing engineer to plan, design, construct and manage water infrastructure in ungauged catchments, affects planning, and design of infrastructure and carrying out efficient water management. Therefore a comparison of available yield models and a verification of model outputs with observed values is required to fill a much needed gap in reliable yield estimations for water resources engineering and management. Moreover, the seasonal yield limitations in the Irrigation Department guideline (1984) should be verified to assess the need of changes to the thresholds. IGM is empirical. HEC-HMS, UH are two other catchment yield models commonly used for water engineering applications. These three models were selected and evaluated with observed daily streamflow data of two watersheds from Attanagalu Oya and Kalu River basins.

The present work at first attempted to evaluate the capability of an ungauged catchment modeler to accurately estimate the yield for water infrastructure planning and design. Subsequently these results were evaluated with the actual observations in order to make suitable recommendations. The period of comparisons in the Attanagalu Oya and Kalu river basins were from 2005-2015 and 2006-2014 respectively.

Three spreadsheet models were developed by using the parameters reported in the literature. Lack of recommended methods were overcome by evaluating literature recommendations and incorporating the best engineering judgement. Model parameters were identified by making best estimations from available literature. Seasonal yield thresholds of IGM were checked with observed yield values. Comparison of model estimations with the observations was done using annual water balance and flow duration curves while using Mean Ratio of Absolute Error as the indicator.

According to the state of art review, Irrigation department yield estimation model (IGM) is the best available watershed yield estimation model. Comparison of three models revealed that IGM is the closest monthly yield estimation model with 12.5% and 22.5% annual difference in estimation for Dunamale and Ellagawa watersheds respectively. HEC model over estimates streamflows by 53.2% and 25.7% in Dunamale and Ellagawa watersheds respectively while the UH model overestimates the streamflow of Ellagawa by 101% and underestimates the streamflow by 16.7% in Dunamale watershed. IGM underestimates the streamflow in rainy months and overestimates during relatively dry months and the threshold time of exceedance is 60% for both Dunamale and Ellagawa watersheds. The use of HEC and UH model results create significant ambiguities when compared with the IGM because of the unreliability associated with the process and parameters in the guidance material. Yield model estimates when compared with the observations show that in all three models the antecedent rainfall acts as a key factor influencing model overestimation and underestimations. IGM, HEC-HMS and UH model development and parameter estimations need better reference material to arrive at accurate watershed yield values. It is therefore important to systematically determine design safety factors to account modelling uncertainties.

Key words: Yield computation, ungauged watersheds, Infrastructure design, hydrological models

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere, heartfelt gratitude to my research supervisor, professor N.T.S, Wijesekera for the continuous guidance, supervision, encouragement and support through the study. The assistance provided in studying the background of the research, continuous steering to the right direction and the guidance is appreciated.

I wish to express my deep appreciation to Dr. R.L. H. Lalith Rajapakse for providing all necessary help and support for the research as well as the consistence encouragement is greatly appreciated.

I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. H.P.O.G. Ratnayaka, Mr. Vidura Deshapriya, Mrs. P. M. Jayadheera and my colleges for sharing their valuable knowledge. The extended gratitude goes to Mr. Vajira Kumarasinghe for the support and assistance given for study comfortably.

I would also like to thank Late. Shri Madanjeet Singh and the University of Moratuwa for giving me this opportunity to study towards a Master Degree of Water Resource Engineering and Management, at UNESCO Madanjeet Singh Centre for South Asia Water Management, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.

I am grateful to my parents, my brother and my husband for their encouragement and wisdom guidance. All family members and friends that motivated me for successful completion of the thesis are appreciated.

Last but not least, all individuals who helped so far regarding the research project are kindly acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION-----	i
ABSTRACT -----	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT -----	iii
LIST OF FIGURES -----	viii
LIST OF TABLES -----	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS -----	xviii
1 INTRODUCTION -----	1
1.1 General -----	1
1.2 Significance of the Study -----	2
1.3 Problem Statement -----	3
1.4 Objective of the Study -----	3
1.4.1 Overall objective -----	3
1.4.2 Specific objectives-----	3
1.5 Study Area -----	4
1.5.1 Dunamale watershed in Attanagalu oya river basin -----	4
1.5.2 Ellagawa watershed in Kalu river basin -----	4
2 LITERATURE REVIEW -----	6
2.1 General -----	6
2.2 Watershed Yield and Uncertainties-----	7
2.3 Yield Computation Options -----	8
2.3.1 General-----	8
2.3.2 Guideline recommendations -----	10
2.4 Modern Hydrological Models -----	13
2.4.1 Setting-----	13
2.4.2 HEC-HMS modelling -----	15
2.4.3 Unit hydrograph model (UH) -----	16
2.4.4 Effective rainfall-----	21
2.4.5 Baseflow estimation -----	23

2.4.6	Model application studies -----	26
2.5	Design Yield/ Yield Thresholds -----	27
2.5.1	Guideline recommendations -----	28
2.5.2	Modern hydrological models -----	30
2.5.3	Safety factors -----	30
2.6	Data Checking -----	31
3	METHODOLOGY -----	32
3.1	Methodology Flowchart -----	33
4	DATA AND DATA CHECKING -----	34
4.1	Data -----	34
4.1.1	Rainfall data -----	34
4.1.2	Streamflow data -----	35
4.1.3	Evaporation data -----	35
4.1.4	Topographic data -----	36
4.2	Data checking -----	38
4.2.1	Station density -----	38
4.2.2	Visual checking -----	38
4.2.3	Missing data -----	44
4.2.4	Thiessen average rainfall -----	46
4.2.5	Annual water balance -----	49
4.2.6	Double mass curve -----	51
4.2.7	Data checking summary -----	51
5	ANALYSIS AND RESULTS -----	53
5.1	General -----	53
5.2	Qualitative Analysis of Literature -----	53
5.3	Design Yield Option Comparison – Analysis part 1 -----	56
5.3.1	General -----	56
5.3.2	Irrigation Guideline Model (IGM) -----	57
5.3.3	HEC-HMS Model -----	63
5.3.4	Unit hydrograph model -----	70
5.3.5	Evaluation of yield estimations -----	78

5.4	Yield Comparison – Analysis Part 2 -----	94
5.4.1	General-----	94
5.4.2	Data availability -----	94
5.4.3	Irrigation guideline model (IGM) - Dunamale watershed-----	97
5.4.4	Irrigation Guideline Model (IGM) - Ellagawa Watershed -----	113
5.4.5	HEC-HMS Model (HEC)- Dunamale Watershed -----	128
5.4.6	HEC- HMS Model (HEC) - Ellagawa Watershed -----	136
5.4.7	Unit Hydrograph Model (UH)- Dunamale Watershed -----	146
5.4.8	Unit Hydrograph Model (UH) - Ellagawa Watershed-----	155
6	RESULTS SUMMARY -----	164
6.1	Comparison of Design Yield -----	164
6.2	Computation of watershed yield-----	166
6.2.1	Monthly, seasonal and annual yield-----	166
6.2.2	Monthly flow duration curves-----	170
6.2.3	Numerical indicators -----	170
6.3	Estimations – Magnitude and Percentage of Deviation-----	171
6.4	Effect of Antecedent Rain -----	172
6.5	Comparison of Yield Thresholds -----	173
6.6	Yield Comparison-----	174
7	DISCUSSION -----	177
7.1	Design and Observed Data -----	177
7.2	Model Parameters -----	177
7.3	Model Components -----	178
7.4	Design Options -----	179
7.5	Model Estimations Comparison -----	179
7.6	Model Verification -----	182
8	CONCLUSIONS -----	185
9	RECOMMENDATIONS -----	186
	REFERENCES -----	187
	APPENDIX A: Streamflow variation corresponding to rainfall – Dunamale watershed-----	198

APPENDIX B: Streamflow Variation Corresponding to Rainfall – Ellagawa watershed-----	209
APPENDIX C: Double mass curve results for Dunamale and Ellagawa watersheds -----	218
APPENDIX D: HEC-HMS daily model results for observed rainfall input for Dunamale and Ellagawa watersheds -----	221
APPENDIX E: UH model effective rainfall variation for Dunamale and Ellagawa watersheds -----	231
APPENDIX F: UH model derivation and results -----	237
APPENDIX G: Yield model comparison results -----	240
APPENDIX H: Specimen calculations -----	243