FORECASTING DRY WEATHER FLOW TO ASSESS FUTURE WATER EXTRACTION CAPACITIES AT KOLEIMODARA INTAKE IN KUDA GANGA, KALU GANGA

Warushahennadige Rangika Sajeewani Fernando

(208351R)

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa Sri Lanka

February 2022

FORECASTING DRY WEATHER FLOW TO ASSESS FUTURE WATER EXTRACTION CAPACITIES AT KOLEIMODARA INTAKE IN KUDA GANGA, KALU GANGA

Warushahennadige Rangika Sajeewani Fernando

(208351R)

Supervised by

Mr A. H. R. Ratnasooriya

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Science in Civil Engineering

UNESCO Madanjeet Singh Centre for

South Asia Water Management (UMCSAWM)

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa Sri Lanka

February 2022

DECLARATION OF THE CANDIDATE AND SUPERVISOR

"I declare that this is my own work and this thesis/dissertation2 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).

UOM Verified Signature

UOM Verified Signature	03/02/2022
Warushahennadige Rangika Sajeewani Fernando	Date
The above candidate has carried out research for the Dissertation under my supervision	e Masters/ MPhil/PhD thesis/
UOM Verified Signature	03/02/2022
Mr A. H. R. Ratnasooriya	Date

ABSTRACT

Forecasting Dry Weather Flow to Assess Future Water Extraction Capacities at Koleimodara Intake in Kuda Ganga, Kalu Ganga

Kalu Ganga is the primary source of potable water supply in the greater Colombo area and total Kalutara District. Kethhena water treatment is supposed to cover the water demand in the middle and southern parts of the Kalutara district, which is estimated as 1.5 m³/s, including the subsequent explanation to covet 2030 to 2060 design horizon. The new intake at Koleimodara in Kuda Ganga is supposed to extract water during the dry weather period the as the old intake at Thebuwana is impacted by salinity intrusion. Therefore, this study was formulated to assess the possibility of extracting water from the Koleimodara intake during the subsequent design horizon.

A hydrological model was developed using Hydrologic Engineering Centre's Hydrologic Modelling System (HEC HMS) to estimate river discharge at Koleimodara with Deficit and Constant loss method, linear reservoir baseflow method, Snyder Unit Hydrograph transform method, and Muskingum routing method. The calibration and validation events were selected as the water cycle having prolonged dry spells i.e.,2006/2007 and 2011/2012 for calibration and 2008/2009, 2009/2010, 2013/2014 and, the continuous stimulation from 2005 to 2015 for validation. Kukule Ganga run-off-the-river plant operations were included for the model with elevation-capacity-discharge relationship considering environmental flow (0.5 m³/s) and maximum turbine discharge. The objective functions, Relative Nash-Sutcliff (NSE_{rel}), Mean Ratio of Absolute Error (MRAE), Root mean square error (RMSE), and Percent bias (PBIAS) were used to evaluate model performance. Future precipitation projections were derived from Regional Climate Model (RCM) ICTP-RegCM4-7 based on NCC-NORESM1-M Global Climate Model (GCM) under Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) project. Two future scenarios of Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) 2.6 and 8.5 were used to assess the future precipitation in the basin and streamflow at the intake location. The Standard Precipitation Index (SPI) and low flow indices i.e., Probability exceedance flow of 90th percent (Q₉₀) and 50th percent (Q₅₀), Mean 7-day annual minima (MAM7) and Mean 30-day annual minima (MAM30), Baseflow index (BFI), deficit duration, deficit volume, and intensity were applied to assess the future (2030-2060) climatic and low flow conditions of the project area relative to the observed data simulations of the 2005 to 2020 period.

The SPI indicated a possibility of the dry months becoming drier (June, July, and August under RCP 2.6 and July and August under RCP 8.5) or prevail the same dry conditions (January and February under both RCPs), and the wet month May receives more precipitation (under RCP 8.5). All indices indicated a possibility of low flows decreasing with deficit durations becoming more prolonged under both RCPs particularly during 2030-2040. Deficit analysis results and MAM7, MAM30 results indicated that the first inter-monsoon and Northwest monsoon periods continue to be the dry period. The intake is projected as facing a maximum deficit volume of 4.9 MCM for 47 days with the intensity of 105 thousand m³/day and with a deficit volume of 4.4 MCM for 42 days with the intensity of 105 thousand m³/day respectively, under RCP 2.6 and 8.5 during 2030 to 2040. Deficit events are projected as two during the base period (2005-2020) and nine and twelve respectively, under RCP 2.6 and 8.5 from 2030 to 2060. Based on the results of this study, it is recommended to select another water source for the next design horizon extractions or maintain storage of about 4.9 MCM to cater to the dry period water deficit to provide an uninterrupted water supply.

Keywords: Climate change, HEC HMS, Kukule Ganga, low flow, RCM, water intake

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this study to my parents for all the efforts and dedications they made, and the encouragement and support given which no words can express to make me and my sister who we are today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to offer my sincere gratitude to the late Sri Madanjeet Singh for founding South Asia Foundation (SAF) and offering scholarships through UNESCO Madanjeet Singh Center for South Asia Water Management (UMCSAWM). The efforts by SAF chapter of Sri Lanka are highly appreciated which paved the way for obtaining the scholarship and processing of the documents.

I take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to my research supervisor, Mr. Harsha Rathnasooriya, for continuous guidance, valuable advice, and support and for guiding me to get support from relevant expertise. I must convey my heartfelt appreciation to the research coordinator, Dr. Janaka Bamunawala for the valuable advice, encouragement, fullest support given throughout this study, and coordination for even arranging other expertise to get advice.

Further, I wish to express my deep appreciation to Prof. R. L. H. Lalith Rajapakse, Director/center Chairman of UMCSAWM for his valuable advice, and for being always responsive and supportive to complete this study successfully. I must convey my sincere gratefulness to all the research panel members as their valuable comments had always helped me to direct this study on the correct path and to continuously improve it. Moreover, I must show my sincere appreciation to Dr. Nimal Wijayaratna for his valuable support, advice given especially in hydrological modeling. I am very much grateful to Dr. Jeewanthi Sirisena for her valuable advice and heartfelt encouragement to move forward during the hard times.

Further, I wish to acknowledge the help provided by the technical and support staff in the UMCSAWM center of the University of Moratuwa.

I am grateful to the Director of Irrigation (Hydrology), Irrigation Department for providing me with streamflow data as well as the Deputy General Manager (Samanala Complex) and Civil Engineer of DGM (Samanala Complex) office, Ceylon Electricity Board for providing me with Elevation-Area-Capacity details and other relevant data of the Kukule Ganga weir which were very important data for this study.

Further, I must acknowledge Ms. Kumari Alahapperuma, the immediate superior of my workplace, Chief Engineer (Planning and Design), and also Deputy General Manager (Western-South) and the General Manager of the National Water Supply and Drainage Board for granting me to apply for this scholarship and acquire this valuable knowledge.

I must sincerely acknowledge my heartiest fellow batch mates for their support and encouragement. Even though we had to manage with distance learning their support was always there when needed.

Finally, I must gratefully remind my husband and my son for all the support and encouragement given and for baring me being fully engaged with studies in times and also my mother and parents in-law who supported me in every possible way to complete this study successfully.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declar	ation (of the candidate and supervisor	V
Abstra	nct		VII
Dedica	ation		IX
Ackno	wledg	ement	XI
Table	of con	tents	XIII
List of	figure	es	XIX
List of	tables	S	XXIII
List of	abbre	viations	XXVII
Chapt	er 1		1
1	Intr	oduction	1
1.1	Gen	eral	1
1.2	Clin	nate Change Effects Related to the Wet Zone of Sri Lanka	2
1.3	Bacl	ground and Context	3
1.4	Prob	olem Statement	5
1.5	Rese	earch Objectives	6
1	.5.1	Main objective	6
1	.5.2	Specific objectives	7
Chapt	er 2		9
2	Lite	rature Review	9
2.1	Low	Flow Hydrology	9
2	2.1.1	Low flow estimation	10
2	2.1.2	Low flow deficit analysis	10
2	2.1.3	Baseflow index (BFI)	12
2.2	Envi	ironmental Flow Assessment	12
2.3	Hyd	rological Modelling	16

	2.3.1	Types of hydrological models	16
	2.4 Obje	ective Function	18
	2.4.1	Percent bias (PBIAS)	19
	2.4.2	Percent streamflow volume error (PVE)	19
	2.4.3	Mean Ratio of Absolute Error (MRAE)	19
	2.4.4	Coefficient of determination (R ²)	20
	2.4.5	Root mean square error (RMSE)	21
	2.4.6	Relative Nash-Sutcliff (NSE _{rel})	21
	2.4.7	Recommended performance ratings for the study	21
	2.5 HEC	HMS Model	22
	2.5.1	Precipitation loss model	
	2.5.2	Initial Parameter Estimation	
	2.5.3	Transform model	29
	2.5.4	Baseflow model	29
	2.5.5	Routing Model	30
	2.5.6	HEC HMS Model calibration	
	2.6 Clim	nate Change Data for Future Projections	31
	2.7 Bias	Correction	33
	2.8 Bias	Corrected RCM Precipitation Data Evaluation (Using Drought Analysis)	34
	2.9 Past	Climate Projected Studies of the Kalu River Basin	35
	2.10 Anal	lysis of Future Projections with Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI)	36
C	Chapter 3		39
3	Met	hodology	30
J	Met	llouology	
C	Chapter 4		43
4	Data	Checking and Analysis	43
	4.1 Stud	y Area	43
	4.2 Data	and Data Checking	43
	4.2.1	Land use and soil data	
	4.2.2	Hydrological and meteorological data	
	4.2.3	RCM data for future projections	
	4.2.4	Visual data checking	
	4.2.5	Thiessen average rainfall	

	4.	2.6	Annual and monthly rainfall variations	. 54
	4.	2.7	Single mass curve	. 56
	4.	2.8	Double mass curve	. 56
	4.	2.9	Filling of missing rainfall data	. 56
	4.3	Dete	rmination of Flow Threshold for Low Flow Deficit Analysis	. 57
	4.4	Seaso	onal Distribution of Streamflow in Kuda Ganga	. 58
	4.5	Bias	Correction of RCM Data and Model Selection	. 59
	4.6	Evalu	nation of Bias-Corrected RCM Precipitation Data	. 62
	4.	6.1	Evaluate bias-corrected precipitation with drought analysis	. 63
	4.7	Varia	ation of Projected Precipitation Relative to the Base Period (1976 to 2005)	. 66
C	hapte	r 5		. 69
5		Mod	el Development and Applications	. 69
	5.1	Mode	el Selection	. 69
	5.2	HEC	HMS Model Development	. 69
	5.	2.1	Development of the basin model	
	5.	2.2	Development of the transform model	. 73
	5.	2.3	Development of the baseflow model	. 74
	5.	2.4	Development of the routing model	. 75
	5.	2.5	Reservoir routing method	. 76
	5.	2.6	Precipitation model and time-series data	. 78
	5.	2.7	Control specification	. 79
	5.	2.8	Model simulation	. 80
	5.3	HEC	HMS Model Calibration	. 80
	5.	3.1	Event selection for model calibration and validation	. 80
	5.	3.2	Finalized objective functions for the study	. 82
Cl	hapte	r 6		. 83
6		Resu	lts Analysis	. 83
	6.1	Mode	el Calibration and Validation Results	. 83
	6.	1.1	Outflow hydrographs	. 83
	6.	1.2	Flow duration curves	. 88
	6.	1.3	Model performance	. 92
	6.2	Asses	ssment Future Projections of Precipitation of Kuda Ganga Basin	. 93

	6.3 Ass	essment of Future Projections of Streamflow at Koleimodara Intake	96
	6.3.1	Probability exceedance flow of 90 th percent (Q ₉₀) and 50 th percent (Q ₅₀)	96
	6.3.2	Mean n-day annual minima (MAMn)	98
	6.3.3	Baseflow index (BFI)	98
	6.3.4	Continuous low flow and deficit volume	100
Cl	hapter 7		105
7	Dis	cussion	105
	7.1 Sele	ection of Data Period for Analysis	105
	7.2 HE	C HMS Model Performance	105
	7.2.1	Model performance in calibration	105
	7.2.2	Model performance during validations	107
	7.3 Fut	ure Projections of Precipitation	110
	7.3.1	Evaluation of bias-corrected precipitation	110
	7.3.2	Evaluation of future climate projections of precipitation	111
	7.3.3	Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI)	111
	7.4 Fut	ure Projections of Streamflow	112
	7.4.1	Probability exceedance flow of 90 th percent (Q ₉₀) and 50 th percent (Q ₅₀)	113
	7.4.2	Mean 7-day annual minima (MAM7) and Mean 30-day annual minima (M	AM30)113
	7.4.3	Baseflow index (BFI)	114
	7.4.4	Continuous low flow and deficit volume	114
Cl	hapter 8		117
8	Coi	nclusions and Recommendations	117
	8.1 Cor	iclusions	117
	8.2 Rec	ommendations	118
Bi	bliograph	V	119
	0 1	•	
Aı	nnexure I		137
I.	Str	eamflow Response with Rainfall	137
Aı	nnexure I	[157
II	. Sin	gle Mass Curve and Double Mass Curve	157

Anne	xure III	161
	Dry Spell Characteristics of Historical Period (Comparing Observed and Bias-	
corre	cted RCM Data)	161
Anne	xure IV	169
IV.	Analysis of Monthly and Seasonal Means of Observed, RCM, and Bias-corrected l	RCM
Rainf	fall	169
Anne	xure V	177
V.	HEC HMS Model Development	177
Anne	xure VI	185
VI.	Model Simulations for the Design Period using Bias-corrected RCM Data under R	CP
2.6 an	nd 8.5	185

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: The Location map of intakes and river gauging stations	4
Figure 1-2: Annual minimum of seven-day moving average daily discharge at Millakanda gaugin	g
station for total data period before (1991-2001) and after (2003 -2017) the Kukule Ganga ru	ın-
off-the-river powerplant establishment	6
Figure 2-1: Commonly used deficit characteristics defined by the threshold level method	11
Figure 2-2: Screenshots from the Sri Lanka Environmental Flow Calculator (SLEFC) FDCs of	
Millakanda data for default EMCs	15
Figure 2-3: Screenshots from the Sri Lanka Environmental Flow Calculator (SLEFC) Reference	time
series and Environmental time series for EMC - class E for Millakanda	15
Figure 2-4: Schematic of DC model	27
Figure 3-1: Methodology Flowchart of the study	39
Figure 4-1: Land use map of Koleimodara catchment	45
Figure 4-2: Soil map of Koleimodara catchment	45
Figure 4-3: Kalu Ganga with Koleimodara basin map and gauging stations	47
Figure 4-4: RegCM4-7 RCM grid points in the study area (resolution 25 x 25 km²)	49
Figure 4-5: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2009/2010	51
Figure 4-6: Variation of daily rainfall of all stations with Millakanda streamflow; comparing thre	e
5year water cycles (Oct/2005 to Sep/2020)	52
Figure 4-7: Thiessen polygons of Millakanda watershed	53
Figure 4-8: Variation of the annual rainfall of Millakanda watershed	54
Figure 4-9: Variation of average monthly rainfall of Millakanda watershed (2000-2020)	55
Figure 4-10: Seasonal variation of streamflow at Millakanda gauging station (2005 to 2020)	59
Figure 4-11: Variation of monthly observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bias-corrected RCM rainfall	fall
over 30 years (1976 to 2005)	61
Figure 4-12: Variation of Monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bi	as-
corrected RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)	63
Figure 4-13: Comparison of the monthly variation of the dry spell characteristics of RCM	
precipitation data with the observed precipitation data over 30 years (1976 to 2005)	65
Figure 4-14: Average monthly and seasonal variation of precipitation compared to the historical b	oase
period (1976 to 2005) under RCP 2.6 and 8.5 scenarios	66
Figure 4-15: Average monthly variation of precipitation in three decades over the design period	
comparatively to the historical base period (1976 to 2005) under RCP 2.6	67
Figure 4-16: Average monthly variation of precipitation in three decades over the design period	
comparatively to the historical base period (1976 to 2005) under RCP 8.5	67
Figure 5-1: Six sub-basins and reach elements delineated by the GIS tools and terrain data and of	her
basin elements of HEC HMS hydrological model	70

Figure 5-2: Canopy storage map of the Koleimodara watershed	72
Figure 5-3: Surface storage map of the Koleimodara watershed	73
Figure 5-4: Elevation – capacity – discharge chart of Kukule Ganga weir	77
Figure 5-5: Number of dry spells and lengths relative to the probability exceedance flow of 90^{th}	
percent (Q ₉₀)	81
Figure 6-1: Hydrographs for the calibration events 2006/2007 and 2011/2012 water cycles	84
Figure 6-2: Hydrographs for the calibration events2006/2007 and 2011/2012 water cycles (semi-scale)	_
Figure 6-3: Hydrographs for the validation events 2008/2009, 2009/2010 and 2013/2014	85
Figure 6-4: Hydrographs for the validation events 2008/2009, 2009/2010, and 2013/2014 water (semi-log scale)	-
Figure 6-5: Hydrographs for the continuous model validation simulation 2005-2015 in normal assemi-log scale	
Figure 6-6: Flow duration curve for the calibration event water cycles; 2006/2007(a, b), 2011/20	012 (c,
Figure 6-7: Flow duration curve for the validation event water cycles; 2008/2009 (a, b), 2009/20	010 (c,
Figure 6-8: Flow duration curve for the validation event water cycle; 2013/2014 (a, b), continuo model run 2005 to 2015 (c, d)	us
Figure 6-9: Monthly variation of SPI-1 until 2060 comparatively to the historical base period (19	
2020) under RCP 2.6 scenario	
Figure 6-10: Monthly variation of SPI-1 until 2060 comparatively to the historical base period (1992
to 2020) under RCP 8.5 scenario	95
Figure 6-11: Variation of probability exceedance of flow indices Q ₉₀ and Q ₅₀ relative to the histobase period (2005 to 2020) under RCP 2.6 and 8.5 scenarios	
Figure 6-12: Percentage difference of MAM7 under RCP 2.6 and RCP 8.5 (a, b) and the MAM3	
under RCP 2.6 and RCP 8.5 (c, d) relative to the base period 2005-2020	
Figure 6-13: Average annual and seasonal baseflow index (BFI) variation and percentage chang	
relative to the base period 2005-2015 under RCP 2.6 and 8.5	
Figure 6-14: Variation of deficit characteristics; daily deficit (a), the cumulative deficit (b) over	
historical and projected time scales, and the deficit intensity of the events (c) for water	
extraction of 1.5 m ³ /s during the base period 2005-2020 and the design period 2030-2060	under
RCP 2.6 and 8.5 scenarios	
Figure 6-15: Deficit volume and the number of days of the events for water extraction of 1.5 m ³ /	
during the base period (2005-2020) and the design period 2030-2060 under RCP 2.6 (a) ar	
RCP 8.5 (b) scenarios	
Figure 7-1: Flow duration curves for the calibration period	
Figure 7-2: Flow duration curves for the validation period	109

Figure I-1: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2004/2005	138
Figure I-2: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2005/2006	139
Figure I-3: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2006/2007	140
Figure I-4: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2007/2008	141
Figure I-5: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2008/2009	142
Figure I-6: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2010/2011	143
Figure I-7: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2011/2012	144
Figure I-8: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2012/2013	145
Figure I-9: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2013/2014	146
Figure I-10: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2014/2015	147
Figure I-11: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2015/2016	148
Figure I-12: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2016/2017	
Figure I-13: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2017/2018	150
Figure I-14: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2018/2019	151
Figure I-15: Streamflow response to rainfall in Millakanda watershed in 2019/2020	152
Figure I-16: Streamflow response to Thiessen Average rainfall in Millakanda watershed in Oct/2	2004 –
Sep/2008	153
Figure I-17: Streamflow response to Thiessen Average rainfall in Millakanda watershed in Oct/2	2008 –
Sep/2012	154
Figure I-18: Streamflow response to Thiessen Average rainfall in Millakanda watershed in Oct/2	2012 –
Sep/2016	155
Figure I-19: Streamflow response to Thiessen Average rainfall in Millakanda watershed in Oct/2	2016 –
Sep/2020	156
Figure II-1: Single mass curves	158
Figure II-2: Double mass curves	159
Figure IV-1: S1 - Variation of monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, a	ınd
bias-corrected RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)	170
Figure IV-2: S2- Variation of monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, a	nd
bias-corrected RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)	171
Figure IV-3: S3-Variation of monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, ar	ıd
bias-corrected RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)	172
Figure IV-4: S4-Variation of monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, ar	ıd
bias-corrected RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)	173
Figure IV-5: S5-Variation of monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, are	ıd
bias-corrected RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)	174
Figure IV-6: S6-Variation of monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, ar	ıd
bias-corrected RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)	175

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: General performance ratings for watershed models	22
Table 2-2: HEC HMS hydrological model studies in Sri Lanka	24
Table 2-3: Canopy storage values	27
Table 2-4: Surface depression storage values	28
Table 2-5: Soil data to calculate maximum deficit	28
Table 2-6: Categorising drought events based on SPI values	37
Table 4-1: Data sources and resolution	44
Table 4-2: Land use distribution of Koleimodara catchment	46
Table 4-3: Soil types of Koleimodara catchment	47
Table 4-4: Coordinates of gauging stations	48
Table 4-5: Details of the RCM and related GCM from the CMIP5 ensemble	49
Table 4-6: Thiessen weights of rain gauging stations – Millakanda watershed	53
Table 4-7: Monthly average rainfall comparison Oct/2000 to Sep/2020	55
Table 4-8: Percentage of missing rainfall and streamflow data of total model simulation period	
(September/2005 to October/2020)	57
Table 4-9: Thiessen weights of RCM grid points over Millakanda watershed	59
Table 4-10: Statistics of bias correction result over the evaluation period (2001-2005)	60
Table 4-11: Monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bias-corrected	RCM
rainfall for Millakanda watershed over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)	62
Table 4-12: The reference evapotranspiration (ET _o) for each month	64
Table 4-13: Average annual rainfall variation	66
Table 5-1: Basin model components, parameters, and methods of estimation	71
Table 5-2: Calculation of lag time and the peaking coefficient for sub-basins	74
Table 5-3: Calculation of parameters of each sub basin for linear reservoir baseflow	75
Table 5-4: Calculation of parameters for Muskingum routing model for each reach element	76
Table 5-5: Kukule Ganga run-off-the river powerplant data for the study	77
Table 5-6: Elevation - storage - discharge relationship data of Kukule Ganga run-off-the river	
powerplant	78
Table 5-7: Thissen weights calculated for each sub-basin for rainfall stations	79
Table 5-8: Thissen weights calculated for each sub-basin for RCM grid points	79
Table 5-9: Details of the events selected for calibration and validation	81
Table 6-1: Model performance of calibration and validation	92
Table 6-2: Summary of deficit durations of drought events during the period 2005-2015	92
Table 6-3: Probability exceedance of flow indices Q_{90} and Q_{50} and variation relative to the base	period
2005-2020 under RCP 2.6 and 8.5	97

Table 6-4: Calculation results of deficit duration, deficit volume, and intensity for water extraction of
1.5 m³/s of the base period 2005-2020 and during the design period 2030-2060 under RCP 2.6
and 8.5 scenarios
Table III-1: Comparison of the response of the average dry spell length between the bias coerced
RCM precipitation data and the observed precipitation data (1976 to 2005)162
Table III-2: Comparison of the response of the maximum dry spell length between the bias coerced
RCM precipitation data and the observed precipitation data (1976 to 2005)
Table III-3: Comparison of the response of the standard deviation of dry spell length between the bias
coerced RCM precipitation data and the observed precipitation data (1976 to 2005)164
Table III-4: Comparison of the response of the 90 th percentile dry spell length between the bias
coerced RCM precipitation data and the observed precipitation data (1976 to 2005)165
Table III-5: Comparison of the response of the 95th percentile dry spell length between the bias
coerced RCM precipitation data and the observed precipitation data (1976 to 2005)166
Table III-6: Comparison of the response of the 99th percentile dry spell length between the bias
coerced RCM precipitation data and the observed precipitation data (1976 to 2005)167
Table IV-1: S1 - Monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bias-corrected
RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)
Table IV-2: S2 - Monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bias-corrected
RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)
Table IV-3: S3 - Monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bias-corrected
RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)
Table IV-4: S4 - Monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bias-corrected
RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)
Table IV-5: S5 - Monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bias-corrected
RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)
Table IV-6: S6 - Monthly and seasonal means of observed rainfall, RCM rainfall, and bias-corrected
RCM rainfall over evaluation period (2001 to 2005)
Table V-1: Sample calculation of canopy storage for Kukule Ganga sub-basin S1178
Table V-2: Estimated canopy storage value for each sub-basin
Table V-3: Calculation of basin average surface storage for sub-basins
Table V-4: Calculation of constant rate or saturated hydraulic conductivity, and maximum deficit for
Kukule Ganga sub-basin (S1)
Table V-5: Calculation of percentage impervious for Kukule Ganga sub-basin (S1)183
Table V-6: Estimated basin average deficit and constant parameters for each sub-basin183
Table V-7: Calibrated parameters of the HEC HMS model
Table VI-1: Variation of MAM7 with projected streamflow under RCP 2.6 scenario relative to the
hase period 2005 to 2020 186

Table VI-2: Variation of MAM30 with projected streamflow under RCP 2.6 scenario relative to the	
base period 2005 to 2020	86
Table VI-3: Variation of MAM7 with projected streamflow under RCP 8.5 scenario relative to the	
base period 2005 to 2020	86
Table VI-4: Variation of MAM30 with projected streamflow under RCP 8.5 scenario relative to the	
base period 2005 to 2020	87
Table VI-5: Average annual and seasonal baseflow index (BFI) variation and percentage change in	
relative to the base period 2005-2015 under RCP 2.6	87
Table VI-6: Average annual and seasonal baseflow index (BFI) variation and percentage change	
relative to the base period 2005-2015 under RCP 8.5	87

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADB: Asian Development Bank,	1
AED: Atmospheric Evaporative Demand,	36
AMAIWSP: Aluthgama Mathugama Agalawatta Integrated Water Supply Project	t, .4
AMF: Absolute Minimum Flow,	10
AOGCM: Atmosphere-Ocean coupled General Circulation Model,	34
AR 5: Fifth Assessment Report,	32
CCCR-IITM: Centre for Climate Change Research - Indian Institute of Tropical	
Meteorology,	33
CE: Coefficient of Efficiency,	19
CEA: Central Environmental Authority,	14
CGCM: Coupled General Circulation Models,	32
CMIP 5: Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5,	32
CORDEX: Coordinated Regional Downscaling Experiment,	6
C _p : Peaking Coefficient,	30
Ct: basin coefficient,	30
DC: Deficit and Constant,	27
DSD: District Secretariate Division,	3
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment,	4
EMC: Environmental Management Classes,	14
ESGF: Earth System Grid Federation,	34
ET _o : Reference Evapotranspiration,	36
FDC: Flow Duration Curve,	10
FSL: Full Supply Level,	76
GCM: Global Climate Models,	33
HEC HMS: Hydrologic Engineering Centre's Hydrologic Modelling System,	23
IEE: Initial Environmental Examination,	13
IPCC: Inter-governmental Panel for Climate Change,	6
IWMI: International Water Management Institute,	14
JICA: Japan International Cooperation Agency,	1

LFFC: Low Flow Frequency Curve,
LHI: Lanka Hydraulic Institute,
LR: Linear Reservoir,
MA: Moving Average,
MAP: Mean Annual Precipitation,
MGD: Million Gallons per Day,
MOU: Memorandum of understanding,14
MRAE: Mean Ratio of Absolute Error,
NEA: National Environmental Act,
NSE: Nash-Sutcliff,
NSE _{rel} : Relative Nash-Sutcliff,
NWSDB: National Water Supply and Drainage Board,
PBIAS: Percent bias,
PEP: Percent Error in Peak,
PEV: Percent Error in Volume,
PVE: Percent Streamflow Volume Error,
R ² : Coefficient of Determination,
RCM: Regional Climate Model,
RCP: Representative Concentration Pathways,
RCP: Representative Concentration Pathways,
SAR: Sum of Absolute Residuals,
SLEFC: Sri Lanka Environmental Flow Calculator,
SMA: Soil Moisture Accounting,
SSR: Sum of Squared Residuals,
UH: Unit Hydrograph,
UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme,
USACE: United States Army Corps of Engineers,
WCRP: World Climate Research Programme,
WMO: World Meteorological Organization,
WTP: Water Treatment Plant.