

**SPATIALLY DISTRIBUTED WATERSHED
MODELLING FOR RIVER BASIN PLANNING
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ATTANAGALU OYA**

W.M.D.Wijesinghe

09/8083



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.
Electronic Theses & Dissertations
www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

May 2011

**SPATIALLY DISTRIBUTED WATERSHED
MODELLING FOR RIVER BASIN PLANNING
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ATTANAGALU OYA**

W.M.D.Wijesinghe

09/8083



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.
Electronic Theses & Dissertations
www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master
of Science

Supervised by
Professor N.T.S.Wijesekera

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

April 2011

Abstract

Information on streamflow is a central component for water resource and water quality engineering and management. A majority of stream reaches which require discharge information are ungauged. Therefore a comparative study using the catchment characteristics and observed streamflows of Attanagalu Oya watershed at Karasnagala gauging station was carried out.

In the described work two Spatially Distributed Models using two sub catchments and four sub catchments were developed. Results from the spatially distributed approaches were compared with the results from a Lumped Watershed approach. In the lumped catchment approach the main watershed of Attanagalu Oya at Karasnagala was considered as single lumped unit. In the Spatially Distributed Approaches Karasnagala Watershed was divided into two and four sub catchments respectively. In each of the models a Unit Hydrograph was developed using the watershed characteristics. A Direct Runoff Hydrograph was then developed incorporating the rainfall for the selected event. In this model it was assumed that effective rainfall fraction contributes to the Direct Runoff while the rest infiltrates to the ground and contributes to storage in the catchment sub surface. Baseflow component was incorporated to the model and checks for mass balance were conducted. Baseflow was assumed as proportional to the storage in the catchment. In the model a coefficient was taken to represent the fraction of water released as baseflow. Mean Ratio of Absolute Error (MRAE) and the Relative Error in Peak Discharge were used as the objective function of comparing the streamflows. For each of the approaches the model was calibrated using 28 events and verification was done using 30 events. The model consists of five parameters. The Baseflow coefficient, α was one calibration coefficient. Two separate runoff coefficients C_L and C_H were used for the rainfall values less than and greater than a particular threshold value, R_0 respectively. In addition, an initial moisture level, m_I of the catchment sub surface was assumed. Average values of the parameters for the 28 calibration events were obtained. Calibration and Verification were carried out for High and Low Rainfall Events separately and also as a single set of events.

The variation of Baseflow coefficient and the two runoff coefficients were kept in a minimum levels during calibration, since their variation within a one particular catchment was identified as very low from event to event. When the average calibration parameters were used for the model verification, the model indicated a reasonable accuracy when the MRAE and Relative Error in Peak Discharge values were very low.

The Spatially Distributed Approach with four sub catchments can be used for Karasnagala when high accuracy of peak flows is required while the lumped catchment approach can be used for quick estimations where less accuracy is required. The average error in peak discharge for lumped catchment approach is 2.4% and the same for Spatially Distributed Approach is 2.2%. The average MRAE for the lumped catchment approach and the spatially distributed approach are 0.3140 and 0.3132 respectively. Results showed a good match of the calculated flows with the observed, when the average baseflow coefficient, α is 0.033 for Four Watershed Approach. Average R_0 value was 68 mm. Average C_L and C_H values were 0.375 and 0.384 while average m_I is 68.03mm.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, the author would forward his heartiest gratitude to Professor. N.T.S. Wijesekera, for his continuous supervision, encouragement and valuable advices throughout the study. The author expresses his special appreciation to Professor J.M.S.J. Bandara, Research Co-ordinator, Department of Civil Engineering, Professor S.P. Samarawickrama, Department of Civil Engineering and Dr. K.M.P.S. Bandara, Director, Engineering Service Board for serving as the members of the Progress Review Committee and the Thesis Evaluation Panel.

The author is grateful to Eng. U.S. Wijesekara, Deputy Director, Hydrology Division, Department of Irrigation for the provision of Streamflow Data related to Atanagalu Oya. The author would like to acknowledge Mr. C. Kumarasinghe, Senior Superintendent of Air Surveys, Survey Department of Sri Lanka for providing Digital Survey Data at a concessionary price. The author would like to express his sincere thanks to the staff of the Computer Laboratory and Hydraulic Laboratory of the Department of Civil Engineering for their support in providing facilities and services during the research.

Author's special gratitude goes to the International Centre for Geoinformatics Applications and Training (ICGAT), University of Moratuwa for providing him space to work and for using its resources to make his research a success. He also likes to thank all the staff of ICGAT who supported him in completing his research.

Finally the author dedicates his gratitude to his parents for their continuous support and encouragement to make his higher study aspirations a success.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| DECLARATION | ii |
| Abstract | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | iv |
| Table of Contents | v |
| List of Figures | viii |
| List of Tables | x |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 General | 1 |
| 1.2 Definition of Research Problem | 2 |
| 1.3 Objectives | 4 |
| 1.3.1 Overall Objective | 4 |
| 1.3.2 Specific Objectives | 4 |
| 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | 5 |
| 2.1 Spatially Distributed Watershed Modelling Techniques | 5 |
| 2.2 Unit Hydrograph Theory | 6 |
| 2.2.1 Background of UH | 6 |
| 2.2.2 Synthetic UH | 8 |
| 2.2.3 SCS Dimensionless Hydrograph | 8 |
| 2.3 Application of UH Theory for River Basin Planning | 8 |
| 2.4 Rainfall Loss Computation Techniques | 9 |
| 2.5 Baseflow Separation | 9 |
| 2.6 Model Calibration and Verifications | 10 |
| 2.7 Use of Spreadsheets in Engineering Computations | 10 |
| 3 METHODOLOGY | 12 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 12 |
| 3.2 Watershed Demarcation | 13 |
| 3.3 Theissen Average of Rainfall | 13 |
| 3.4 Spreadsheet Model for Computations | 14 |
| 3.4.1 UH Computations | 14 |
| 3.4.2 DRH Computations | 15 |
| 3.4.3 Total Runoff Hydrograph Development | 15 |
| 3.5 Discharge and Rainfall Event Selection | 16 |
| 3.6 Model Calibration and Verification | 16 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 3.7 | Comparison of the Models | 16 |
| 4 | DATA | 18 |
| 4.1 | Data Summary | 18 |
| 4.1.1 | Data Types | 18 |
| 4.1.2 | Data Resolutions | 18 |
| 4.1.3 | Stream Network | 18 |
| 4.1.4 | Land Use Data..... | 20 |
| 4.2 | Data | 23 |
| 4.2.1 | Streamflow Data | 23 |
| 4.2.2 | Rainfall Data | 24 |
| 5 | ANALYSIS AND RESULTS..... | 27 |
| 5.1 | Watershed Demarcation | 27 |
| 5.1.1 | Main Watershed Demarcation | 27 |
| 5.1.2 | Stream Network Finalisation | 27 |
| 5.1.3 | Sub Watershed Demarcation..... | 28 |
| 5.1.4 | Determination of Catchment and Sub Catchment Parameters..... | 29 |
| 5.2 | Theissen Polygon Analysis of Rainfall..... | 34 |
| 5.2.1 | Distribution of Rain Gauging Stations..... | 34 |
| 5.2.2 | Computation of Theissen Average Rainfall..... | 39 |
| 5.3 | Spreadsheet Model for Computations | 40 |
| 5.3.1 | Outline of the Model..... | 40 |
| 5.3.2 | UH Computations | 41 |
| 5.3.3 | DRH Computations..... | 49 |
| 5.3.4 | Total Runoff Hydrograph Computations | 50 |
| 5.4 | Model Calibration..... | 50 |
| 5.4.1 | Event Selection for Calibration..... | 50 |
| 5.4.2 | Calibration Results for Lumped Watershed Approach..... | 51 |
| 5.4.3 | Calibration Results for Spatially Distributed Watershed Approach (Case A)..... | 54 |
| 5.4.4 | Calibration Results for Spatially Distributed Watershed Approach (Case A)..... | 57 |
| 5.5 | Model Verification | 60 |
| 5.5.1 | Events Selected for Verification | 60 |
| 5.5.2 | Verification Results for Lumped Watershed Approach..... | 61 |
| 5.5.3 | Verification Results for Spatially Distributed Watershed Approach (Case A)..... | 64 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 5.5.4 | Verification Results for Spatially Distributed Watershed Approach (Case A) | 66 |
| 5.6 | Summary Results | 69 |
| 5.6.1 | Summary Results for Lumped and Spatially Distributed Watershed Models | 69 |
| 5.6.2 | Summary of Optimum Model Parameters | 70 |
| 6 | DISCUSSION | 72 |
| 6.1 | General | 72 |
| 6.2 | Accuracy of Watershed Demarcation | 72 |
| 6.3 | Theissen Average Rainfall | 73 |
| 6.4 | Behavior of Unit Hydrographs | 73 |
| 6.4.1 | Behavior of Standard UH | 73 |
| 6.4.2 | Conversion to the Required UH | 73 |
| 6.4.3 | Superposition of the UHs from the Sub Catchments | 74 |
| 6.4.4 | UHs from Spatially Distributed Approach and Lumped Watershed Approach | 75 |
| 6.5 | Computational Resolutions | 75 |
| 6.5.1 | Interpolation of Co-ordinates | 75 |
| 6.6 | Model Accuracy for High Flows | 75 |
| 6.7 | Model Accuracy for Low Flows | 76 |
| 6.8 | Model Accuracy for Medium Flows | 76 |
| 6.9 | Model Accuracy Levels for the Spatially Distributed and Lumped Parameter Approaches | 77 |
| 6.10 | Model Accuracy for High Rainfall Events | 78 |
| 6.11 | Model Accuracy for Low Rainfall Events | 78 |
| 6.12 | Overall Model Accuracy | 79 |
| 6.13 | Behavior of Baseflow | 79 |
| 6.14 | Effects of Runoff Coefficients | 79 |
| 6.15 | Effect of Initial Moisture Level | 80 |
| 6.16 | Rising and Recession Limbs of the Hydrograph | 80 |
| 7 | CONCLUSIONS | 81 |
| 8 | REFERENCES | 82 |

List of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1.1 Study Area Map..... | 3 |
| Figure 3.1 Overall Methodology Flow Chart | 12 |
| Figure 4.1 Stream Network of Karasnagala Basin used for the Present Study..... | 19 |
| Figure 4.2 Land use Map of Karasnagala Catchment..... | 21 |
| Figure 4.3 Satellite Image for Karasnagala..... | 22 |
| Figure 4.4 Annual Average Streamflow for Karasnagala..... | 23 |
| Figure 4.5 Monthly Average Streamflow for Year 1971 for Karasnagala | 23 |
| Figure 4.6 Daily Average Streamflow for Karasnagala for 1971 | 24 |
| Figure 4.7 Annual Rainfall Plot for Karasnagala..... | 24 |
| Figure 4.8 Annual Rainfall Plot for Vincit | 24 |
| Figure 4.9 Monthly Rainfall Plot for Karasnagala for 1971 | 25 |
| Figure 4.10 Monthly Rainfall Plot for Vincit for 1971..... | 25 |
| Figure 4.11 Daily Rainfall Plot for Karasnagala for 1971..... | 25 |
| Figure 4.12 Daily Rainfall Plot for Vincit for 1971..... | 26 |
| Figure 5.1 Stream Orders of Karasnagala Stream Network as per Shreve System ... | 28 |
| Figure 5.2 Stream Orders of Karasnagala Stream Network as per Strahler System.. | 28 |
| Figure 5.3 Demarcated Sub Catchments of Karasnagala Basin for Case A in 1:10,000 Scale..... | 31 |
| Figure 5.4 Demarcated Sub Catchments of Karasnagala Basin for Case B in 1:10,000 Scale..... | 32 |
| Figure 5.5 Sub Catchment Boundaries in Case A Demarcated using 1:10,000 and 1:50,000 Scale Topographic Data..... | 33 |
| Figure 5.6 Rain Gauges Associated with Karasnagala..... | 36 |
| Figure 5.7 Watershed Boundary of Karasnagala Overlaid on the Thiessen Polygons | 37 |
| Figure 5.8 Thiessen Polygons of Karasnagala Cropped with Karasnagala Watershed Boundary..... | 38 |
| Figure 5.9 Rainfall Records on 3rd January 1971 | 39 |
| Figure 5.10 Schematic Diagram of the Baseflow Separation Model..... | 40 |
| Figure 5.11 Standard UH for Karasnagala Main Watershed | 43 |
| Figure 5.12 Standard UH for Sub catchment 1A | 43 |
| Figure 5.13 Standard UH for Sub Catchment 2A | 44 |
| Figure 5.14 Conversion of Standard UH to Required UH..... | 45 |
| Figure 5.15 Required UH and the Standard UH for Karasnagala..... | 46 |
| Figure 5.16 Required UH for Sub Catchment | 47 |
| Figure 5.17 Required UH for Sub Catchment 2 | 47 |
| Figure 5.18 Spatially Distributed UH for Karasnagala Watershed with the UH Components from the Individual Sub Watersheds | 48 |
| Figure 5.19 DRH for Event with ID C01 | 49 |
| Figure 5.20 Total Runoff Hydrograph for Karasnagala for the Event C01 | 50 |
| Figure 5.21 Calculated and Observed Hydrographs for Calibration Event C01 in Logarithmic Scale | 54 |
| Figure 5.22 Calculated and Observed Hydrographs for Calibration Event C01 in Normal Scale..... | 54 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 5.23 Flow Duration Curves of Calculated and Observed Streamflows for Calibration Event C01..... | 55 |
| Figure 5.24 Calculated and Observed Hydrographs for Calibration Event C01 in Semi Logarithmic Plot | 57 |
| Figure 5.25 Calculated and Observed Hydrographs for Calibration Event C01 | 57 |
| Figure 5.26 Flow Duration Curves of Calculated and Observed Streamflows for Calibration Event C01..... | 58 |
| Figure 5.27 Calculated and Observed Hydrographs for Verification Event V01 in Semi Logarithmic Plot | 61 |
| Figure 5.28 Calculated and Observed Hydrographs for Verification Event V01 | 61 |
| Figure 5.29 Flow Duration Curves of Calculated and Observed Streamflows for Verification Event V01 | 62 |



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.
 Electronic Theses & Dissertations
www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 4.1 Data Resolutions and Availability | 18 |
| Table 4.2 Land Use in Karasnagala Watershed | 20 |
| Table 5.1 Watershed Parameters Determined under Case A | 30 |
| Table 5.2 Watershed Parameters Determined under Case B | 30 |
| Table 5.3 Rain Gauging Station Details | 35 |
| Table 5.4 Theissen Areas and Theissen Weights for the Two Rain Gauging Stations | 39 |
| Table 5.5 Events Selected for Calibration | 51 |
| Table 5.6 Minima and Maxima of the Calibration Parameters and Error Indicators. | 52 |
| Table 5.7 Calibration Parameters for Selected Trials | 53 |
| Table 5.8 Minima and Maxima of the Calibration Parameters and Error Indicators. | 55 |
| Table 5.9 Calibration Parameters for Selected Trials | 56 |
| Table 5.10 Minima and Maxima of the Calibration Parameters and Error Indicators | 58 |
| Table 5.11 Calibration Parameters for Selected Trials | 59 |
| Table 5.12 Events Selected for Verification | 60 |
| Table 5.13 Minima and Maxima of the Verification Parameters and Error Indicators | 62 |
| Table 5.14 Verification Parameters for Selected Trials | 63 |
| Table 5.15 Minima and Maxima of the Verification Parameters and Error Indicators | 64 |
| Table 5.16 Verification Parameters for Selected Trials | 65 |
| Table 5.17 Minima and Maxima of the Verification Parameters and Error Indicators | 66 |
| Table 5.18 Verification Parameters for Selected Trials | 67 |
| Table 5.19 Average Parameters Used in Calibration and Verification the Single Catchment Approach | 68 |
| Table 5.20 Minima and Maxima of the Calibration Parameters and Error Indicators | 68 |
| Table 5.21 Model Accuracy for High Rainfall Events | 69 |
| Table 5.22 Model Accuracy for Low Rainfall Events | 69 |
| Table 5.23 Overall Model Accuracy Levels | 70 |
| Table 5.24 Minimum Maximum and Average Model Parameters for Lumped Wa- tershed Approach | 70 |
| Table 5.25 Minimum Maximum and Average Model Parameters for Spatially Dis- tributed Watershed Approach with Two Sub Catchments | 71 |
| Table 5.26 Minimum Maximum and Average Model Parameters for Spatially Dis- tributed Watershed Approach with Four Sub Catchments | 71 |