

**EFFECT OF WATERSHED SUBDIVISION AND
ANTECEDENT MOISTURE CONDITION
ON HEC-HMS MODEL PERFORMANCE IN THE
MAHA OYA BASIN, SRI LANKA**

Muhammad Kamran

(15579 F)

Degree of Master of Science in
Water Resources Engineering and Management

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

February 2017

**EFFECT OF WATERSHED SUBDIVISION AND
ANTECEDENT MOISTURE CONDITION
ON HEC-HMS MODEL PERFORMANCE IN THE
MAHA OYA BASIN, SRI LANKA**

Muhammad Kamran

(15579 F)

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science in
Water Resources Engineering and Management

Supervised by

Dr. R. L. H. L. Rajapakse

UNESCO Madanjeet Singh Center for South Asia Water Management
(UMCSAWM)

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

February 2017

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/dissertation, 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).

.....

Muhammad Kamran

.....

Date

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

.....

Dr. R. L. H. L. Rajapakse

.....

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and above all, I praise Allah, the almighty for providing me this opportunity and granting me the capability to proceed successfully.

Furthermore, I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my research supervisor Dr. R. L. H. Lalith Rajapakse for his research guidance and for his warm and constant encouragement during my research tenure. Without his dedicated supervision and continued guidance, this thesis would not have been a success. I am deeply grateful to him for his valuable time and support, encouragement and professional advice that I received through out in the research and writing of this thesis.

I will never hesitate to convey my thanks to the Center Chairman Professor N. T. S. Wijesekera who always helped me by extending all necessary help to carry out my research. He was kind enough to provide guidance and support even with his tight schedules. His sincere and consistent encouragement is greatly appreciated.

I would like to extend my utmost appreciation to Dr. T. M. N Wijayaratna, Head/Hydraulic and Water Resources Engineering Group of the Department of Civil Engineering for extending help and support and professional advice for my research.

I would also like to thank Mr. H. W. Kumarasinghe and all staff at UMCSAWM, who encouraged, inspired, supported, assisted, and sacrificed their time and efforts to help my pursuit of a Master's degree.

I am indebted to many of my colleagues with whom I worked together and who supported me despite their own work and those who helped me in achieving the success in research and writing of the thesis and all the other persons that supported me, directly or indirectly in many ways during my stay here.

I would especially like to thank Late Shri Madanjeet Singh, SAF (India) and the University of Moratuwa for giving me this opportunity to study towards a Master's Degree in Water Resource Engineering and Management, at the UNESCO Madanjeet Singh Centre for South Asia Water Management (UMCSAWM), Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Last and most importantly, I would like to thank my family, and friends for giving me the strength to finish this thesis.

ABSTRACT

Effect of Watershed Subdivision and Antecedent Moisture Condition on HEC-HMS Model Performance in the Maha Oya Basin, Sri Lanka

Rainfall-Runoff models such as Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS) are used for predicting the hydrologic response of watersheds. Due to the effect of discretization, the model accuracy increases with number and watershed sub-divisions and the inferred level of soil saturation in the model. Therefore, an important issue that must be addressed by all users of these models is the determining of an appropriate level of watershed subdivision and Antecedent Moisture Condition (AMC) for runoff simulation.

The present research study was conducted in an attempt to find appropriate answers for the above two modelling issues. As a case study, the Badalgama watershed is selected as study area in the Maha Oya Basin in Sri Lanka. Spatial extent of Badalgama watershed is 1272 km² with an upstream river length of 96 km. Four rainfall stations and one river gauge station are selected in Badalgama watershed. Daily rainfall and streamflow data were used for calibration period from 2005 ~ 2008 and for validation period from 2010 ~ 2013.

River basin was divided into 3, 6, 9, and 16 number of subdivisions based on critical threshold area method using ArcGIS 10.5. Nash–Sutcliffe (NASH) and Mean Ratio of Absolute Error (MRAE) objective functions were selected as the evaluation criteria of the model. HEC-HMS modeling was carried out for different subdivisions and varying AMC conditions.

The result shows that with MRAE objective function, the accuracy of the model increased by 4.5% up to six subdivisions and with NASH, the accuracy increased by 4.2% with respect to the same lumped model. The accuracy of the model found to decrease for the model with six subdivisions to sixteen sub-divisions. The accuracy of the model with Antecedent Moisture Condition with AMC-III was found to increase by 12.04% as compared to AMC-II.

With the above findings, it is concluded that subdivision of watershed for modeling results in no more than modest improvements in prediction of low flow and medium flow simulation. As the result shows in the AMC analysis AMC-III produced improved accuracy of 12.04% in calibration period and 6.60% for validation period as compared to AMC-II. The event-wise estimation of AMC led to further increase in model accuracy.

In this research, the recession method was considered for the base flow simulation which led to a mass balance error exceeding 20%. Therefore, it is recommended apply linear reservoir method as base flow simulation method to further improve the modelling accuracy by conserving the water balance.

Keywords: Antecedent Moisture Condition, Hydrological modeling, Sensitivity analysis, Watershed subdivision

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF APPENDIX	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Hydrological modeling in Sri Lanka.....	3
1.3 Why hydrological models are needed?	4
1.4 Challenges of water situation in Sri Lanka	4
1.4.1 Impact of climate change	4
1.4.2 Water demand for agriculture sector.....	4
1.4.3 Water demand for water supply sector.....	5
1.5 Problem statement	5
1.6 Objectives.....	5
1.6.1 Overall objective	5
1.6.2 Specific objectives	6
1.7 Limitations and scope of the research.....	6
2.0 LITERATURE REVEIW	7
2.1 General detail of hydrological model.....	7
2.2 Types of hydrological modeling	7
2.2.1 Stochastic models.....	7
2.2.2 Process-based models.....	8
2.2.3 Lumped hydrologic models.....	8
2.2.4 Semi-distributed hydrologic models	8
2.2.5 Distributed hydrologic models.....	8
2.3 Classification of hydrological modeling	9
2.4 HEC-HMS Background	9
2.4.1 Continues and event base simulation	10

2.5	Antecedent moisture condition	11
2.5.1	Importance of soil moisture on runoff	11
2.5.2	CN variability with antecedent moisture condition	12
2.5.3	Major weaknesses in AMC	13
2.6	Scale effect in modeling.....	14
2.6.1	Issue of scale in hydrologic modeling.....	15
2.7	Objective function.....	15
2.7.1	Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency	16
2.7.2	Coefficient of determination (R^2).....	17
2.7.3	Mean absolute error (MAE).....	17
2.7.4	Mean squared error (MSE)	17
2.7.5	Ratio of Absolute Error to Mean.....	18
2.7.6	Mean Ratio of Absolute Error (MRAE)	18
2.8	Characteristics of objective functions	18
2.9	Identification of hydrological model.....	19
2.9.1	Calibration of hydrological model	19
2.9.2	Manual calibration	19
2.9.3	Automatic calibration.....	20
2.9.4	Verification of hydrological model.....	20
2.10	Sensitivity analysis.....	20
3.0	MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGIES	22
3.1	General	22
3.2	Study area.....	22
3.3	Data and data source	23
3.4	Data checking.....	25
3.4.1	Details of missing data.....	25
3.4.2	Thiessen rainfall.....	25
3.4.3	Visual data checking	26
3.5	Filling in of missing data.....	32
3.5.1	Annual water balance.....	34
3.5.2	Variation of annual runoff coefficients.....	35
3.5.3	Variation of annual rainfall and streamflow	36

3.5.4	Comparison of annual rainfall.....	36
3.5.5	Double mass curve	37
3.6	Research methodology	38
3.6.1	Development of the basin model	41
3.6.2	Development of the precipitation loss model.....	41
3.6.3	Development of transform model	41
3.6.4	Development of baseflow model	42
3.6.5	Development of precipitation model.....	43
3.6.6	Control specification	43
3.6.7	Model calibration	43
3.7	Development of model considering antecedent moisture condition	44
3.7.1	Calculation of model parameters	44
3.7.2	Development of HEC-HMS model for AMC	47
4.0	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	48
4.1	General detail	48
4.2	Calibration for Badalgama lumped model	48
4.2.1	Statistical goodness of fit measures for initial parameters.....	48
4.3	Parameters sensitivity analysis.....	52
4.4	Optimization of parameters	53
4.5	Lumped model result for optimum parameters in calibration period.....	59
4.5.1	Annual water balance	59
4.5.2	Flow duration curve in calibration period.....	60
4.5.3	Outflow hydrograph	63
4.6	Lumped model result for optimum parameters in validation period.....	65
4.6.1	Annual water balance	65
4.6.2	Flow duration curve for validation period	66
4.6.3	Outflow hydrograph	67
4.7	Distributed model	70
4.7.1	Three subdivision model result in calibration period.....	70
4.7.2	of three subdivisions model result in validation period	76
4.7.3	Six subdivisions model result in calibration period	80
4.7.4	Six subdivisions model result in validation period	86

4.7.5	Nine subdivision model result in calibration period	91
4.7.6	Nine subdivisions model result in validation period.....	97
4.7.7	Sixteen subdivisions model result in calibration period	102
4.7.8	Sixteen subdivisions model result in validation period	108
4.8	Comparison of model calibration results	113
4.8.1	Flow comparisons	113
4.9	Comparison of model in validation period.....	117
4.9.1	Flow comparisons	117
4.10	Comparison of annual mass balance errors.....	120
4.10.1	Comparison of annual mass balance errors in calibration	120
4.10.2	Comparison of annual mass balance errors in validation.....	121
4.10.3	Statistical performance in calibration and validation period.....	122
4.10.4	Comparisons of model parameters for Badalgama watershed.....	128
4.11	Result for the model of Antecedent Moisture Condition	128
4.11.1	Result for calibration period	128
4.11.2	Result for validation period.....	129
4.12	Discussions.....	130
4.12.1	Data and data period	130
4.12.2	Existence of data error	131
4.12.3	Selection of model parameters and objective function	131
4.12.4	Model development and sensitivity analysis	131
4.12.5	Subdivisions of the watershed.....	131
4.12.6	Evaluation criteria of model in calibration period	132
4.12.7	Evaluation criteria of model in validation period	133
4.12.8	Matching flow duration curve.....	133
4.12.9	Comparison of flow residuals	134
4.12.10	Data and data period for Antecedent Moisture Conditions.....	136
4.12.11	Evaluation criteria for AMC calculations	136
4.12.12	Evaluation of AMC model.....	136
5.0	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	137
5.1	Conclusion.....	137
5.2	Recommendations	138

LIST OF REFERENCES	139
---------------------------------	------------

LIST OF APPENDIX

Appendix A: Visual checking of data without filling missing data in calibration and validation period	145
Appendix B: Single mass curve without filling missing data in calibration and validation period	161
Appendix C: Parameters of lumped and subdivision model and Thiessen weight ..	166
Appendix D: Statically T-test for lumped and six subdivisions	176
Appendix E: Watershed subdivisions approach.....	180
Appendix F: Evaluation criteria for AMC calculations	183

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: Variation of SCS CN with AMC	12
Figure 3-1: Study area of Badalgama watershed	22
Figure 3-2: Land use classification for Badalgama watershed	24
Figure 3-3: Thiessen polygons for Badalgama Watershed	26
Figure 3- 4: Streamflow response to rainfall without filling missing data in 2005 ...	28
Figure 3-5: Streamflow response to rainfall without filling missing data in 2011	29
Figure 3-6: Streamflow response to rainfall after filling missing data in 2005	30
Figure 3-7: Streamflow response to rainfall after filling missing data for 2011	31
Figure 3-8: Single mass curve without filling missing data.....	32
Figure 3-9: Single mass curves after filling in the missing data	33
Figure 3-10: Annual water balance for Badalgama watershed	34
Figure 3-11: Variation of annual runoff coefficient of Badalgama watershed	35
Figure 3-12: Variation of annual rainfall and streamflow for Badalgama watershed	36
Figure 3-13: Comparison of annual rainfall.....	37
Figure 3-14: Double mass curves for each rainfall gauging station.....	38
Figure 3-15: Methodology flow chart.....	40
Figure 3-16: Time of concentration	42
Figure 3-17: Soil classification	45
Figure 4-1: Flow duration curve for initial parameters.....	49
Figure 4-2: Flow duration curve of initial parameters in calibration period.....	50
Figure 4-3: Hydrograph result of initial parameters in calibration period.....	51
Figure 4-4: Parameters sensitivity analysis.....	52
Figure 4-5: Global optimization for soil percolation and soil storage	58
Figure 4-6: Global optimization for soil storage and ratio to peak parameter	59
Figure 4-7: Annual water balance of lumped model in calibration period	60
Figure 4-8: Flow duration curve in calibration period Badalgama watershed.....	61
Figure 4-9: Flow duration curve for each year in calibration period	62
Figure 4-10: Hydrograph for calibration period.....	63

Figure 4-11: Hydrograph of lumped model in calibration period.....	64
Figure 4-12: Annual water balance for validation period of lumped model.....	65
Figure 4-13: Flow duration curve of lumped model in validation period.....	66
Figure 4-14: Hydrograph of lumped model in validation period.....	67
Figure 4-15: Flow duration curve at each year of lumped model in validation period	68
Figure 4-16: Hydrograph of lumped model in validation period.....	69
Figure 4-17: Three subdivisions of Badalgama watershed.....	70
Figure 4-18: Annual water balance for three subdivisions in calibration period.....	72
Figure 4-19: Flow duration curve for three subdivisions model in calibration period	73
Figure 4-20: Hydrograph for three subdivisions model in calibration period	73
Figure 4-21: Flow duration curve for three sub divisions model in calibration period	74
Figure 4-22: Hydrograph for three subdivisions model in calibration period	75
Figure 4-23: Annual water balance for three subdivisions model in validation period	76
Figure 4-24: Flow duration curve for three sub divisions model in validation period	77
Figure 4-25: Hydrograph for three subdivisions model in validation period.....	77
Figure 4-26: Flow duration curve for three subdivisions model in validation period	78
Figure 4-27: Hydrograph for three subdivisions model in validation period.....	79
Figure 4-28: Six sub division of Badalgama watershed	80
Figure 4-29: Schematic diagram for six sub divisions model in HEC-HMS.....	81
Figure 4-30: Annual water balance for six subdivisions model in calibration period	82
Figure 4-31: Flow duration curve for six sub divisions model in calibration period	82
Figure 4-32: Hydrograph for six sub divisions model in calibration period.....	83
Figure 4-33: Flow duration curve for six subdivisions model in calibration period..	84
Figure 4-34: Hydrograph for six subdivisions model in calibration period.....	85
Figure 4-35: Annual water balance for six subdivisions model in validation period	86
Figure 4-36: Flow duration curve for six subdivisions model in validation period...	87
Figure 4-37: Hydrograph for the model of six subdivisions in validation period.....	88

Figure 4-38: Flow duration curve for six subdivisions model in validation period...	89
Figure 4-39: Hydrograph for six subdivisions model in validation period.....	90
Figure 4-40: Delineation of nine subdivisions for Badalgama watershed.....	91
Figure 4-41: Schematic diagram of nine subdivisions in HEC HMS	92
Figure 4-42: Annual water balance for nine subdivisions model in calibration period	93
Figure 4-43: Flow duration curve for nine sub divisions model in calibration period	93
Figure 4-44: Hydrograph for nine sub divisions model in calibration period.....	94
Figure 4-45: Flow duration curve for nine sub divisions model in calibration period	95
Figure 4-46: Hydrograph for nine sub divisions model in calibration period.....	96
Figure 4-47: Annual water balance for nine sub divisions model in validation period	97
Figure 4-48: Flow duration curve for nine sub divisions model in validation period	98
Figure 4-49: Hydrograph for the model of nine subdivisions in validation period ...	99
Figure 4-50: Flow duration curve for nine sub divisions model in validation period	100
Figure 4-51: Hydrograph for nine sub divisions model in validation period.....	101
Figure 4-52: Sixteen subdivisions in Badalgama watershed	102
Figure 4-53: HEC-HMS schematic diagram of sixteen subdivisions model in Badalgama watershed.....	102
Figure 4-54: Annual water balance for sixteen sub divisions model in calibration period	103
Figure 4-55: Flow duration curve for sixteen sub divisions model in calibration period	104
Figure 4-56: Hydrograph of sixteen sub divisions model in calibration period	105
Figure 4-57: Flow duration curve for sixteen sub divisions model in calibration period	106
Figure 4-58: Hydrograph for sixteen sub divisions model in calibration period	107
Figure 4-59: Annual water balance for sixteen sub divisions model in validation period	108

Figure 4-60: Flow duration curve for sixteen sub divisions model in validation period	109
Figure 4-61: Hydrograph for the model of sixteen sub divisions in validation period	110
Figure 4-62: Flow duration curve for sixteen sub division model in validation period	111
Figure 4-63: Hydrograph for sixteen sub divisions model in validation period	112
Figure 4-64: Performance comparison for high flow in calibration period	114
Figure 4-65: Performance comparison for medium flow in calibration period	115
Figure 4-66: Performance for low flow in calibration period	116
Figure 4-67: Performance comparison for high flow in validation period	118
Figure 4-68: Performance comparison for medium flow in validation period	119
Figure 4-69: Performance comparison for low flow in validation period	120
Figure 4-70: Comparison of annual mass balance error (%) in for calibration period	121
Figure 4-71: Comparison of annual mass balance error (%) in validation period	122
Figure 4-72: Performance comparisons of statically in calibration period	124
Figure 4-73: Overall comparison of statically performance in calibration period	125
Figure 4-74: Statically performance comparison in validation	126
Figure 4-75: Overall comparisons of statically performance in Validation	127
Figure 4-76: Performance for the model of different AMC condition in calibration period	129
Figure 4-77: Performance for the model for different AMC condition in validation period	130
Figure 4-78: Variation of streamflow residuals of lumped model in calibration period	135
Figure 4-79: Variation of streamflow residuals of six subdivisions model in calibration period	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Variation of SCS CN with AMC.....	13
Table 3-1: Location of gauging stations in Badalgama watershed	23
Table 3-2: Data sources and resolutions	23
Table 3-3: Land use classification for Badalgama watershed.....	24
Table 3-4: Details of missing data	25
Table 3-5: Thiessen weight of rain gauging stations for Badalgama watershed	26
Table 3-6: Slope factor estimated for rainfall stations in 2005.....	33
Table 3-7: Annual water balance in Badalgama watershed.....	34
Table 3-8: Variation of annual runoff coefficient of Badalgama watershed	35
Table 3-9: Comparison of annual rainfall	37
Table 3-10: Parameters for loss model.....	41
Table 3-11: Time of concentration and lag time calculation	42
Table 3-12: Thiessen weight of rainfall stations	43
Table 3-13: CN value for land use classes	45
Table 3-14: Curve number for Badalgama watershed	46
Table 3-15: Limitation of AMC value SCS	46
Table 3-16: Calculations of Antecedent moisture conditions value	47
Table 3-17: Summary of AMC lumped model	47
Table 4-1: Calibration result for initial parameters	49
Table 4-2: Manual calibrated parameters values	53
Table 4-3: Initial parameters values.....	54
Table 4-4: Result by changing overall flow parameters	55
Table 4-5: Result by changing loss parameters.....	55
Table 4-6: Result by changing base flow parameters	55
Table 4-7: Result by changing surface flow parameters.....	56
Table 4-8: Optimized parameters value	57
Table 4-9: Global optimization for soil storage and ratio to peak parameters.....	58
Table 4-10: Global optimization for soil storage and ratio to peak parameter	59

Table 4-11: Annual water balance of lumped model in calibration period.....	60
Table 4-12: Model performance for calibration for different flow condition	61
Table 4-13: Model performance for lumped model in calibration period	63
Table 4-14: Annual water balance of lumped model in validation period.....	65
Table 4-15: Performance for lumped model for validation period	67
Table 4-16: Rainfall gauge weight for three subdivisions	71
Table 4-17: Annual water balance for three subdivisions in calibration period	71
Table 4-18: Three sub divisions result in calibration period.....	72
Table 4-19: Annual water balance for three subdivisions model in validation period	76
Table 4-20: Thiessen weight for six sub divisions.....	80
Table 4-21: Annual water balance for six subdivisions model in calibration period.	81
Table 4-22: Flow duration curve result for different flow condition.....	82
Table 4-23: Model performance for six sub divisions model in calibration period...	83
Table 4-24: Annual water balance for six subdivisions model in validation period..	86
Table 4-25: Performance for the model of six subdivisions in validation period.....	87
Table 4-26: Annual water balance for nine subdivisions model in calibration period	92
Table 4-27: Performance of nine sub divisions model at different flow condition in calibration period.....	94
Table 4-28: Annual water balance for nine sub divisions model in validation period	97
Table 4-29: Performance of nine sub divisions model in validation period	98
Table 4-30: Annual water balance for sixteen sub divisions model in calibration period	103
Table 4-31: Performance of sixteen sub divisions model in calibration period.....	104
Table 4-32: Annual water balance for sixteen sub divisions model in validation period	108
Table 4-33: Performance of sixteen sub divisions model at different flow condition in validation period	109
Table 4-34: Performance comparison for high flow in calibration period.....	113
Table 4-35: Performance comparison for medium flow in calibration period.....	114

Table 4-36: Performance comparison for low flow in calibration period.....	115
Table 4-37: Performance comparison for high flow in validation period.....	117
Table 4-38: Performance comparison for medium flow in validation period.....	118
Table 4-39: Performance comparison for low flow in validation period.....	119
Table 4-40: Comparison of annual mass balance error (%) in calibration period ...	121
Table 4-41: Comparison of annual mass balance error (%) in validation period ...	122
Table 4-42: Statistical performance comparison in calibration period	123
Table 4-43: Overall comparison of statically performance in validation period	125
Table 4-44: Summary of AMC for six subdivisions and lumped model	128
Table 4-45: Performance of the model for different AMC condition in calibration period	129
Table 4-46: Models performance for calibration period	132
Table 4-47: Models performance in validation period.....	133
Table 4-48: Performance for different flow region in calibration period of six subdivisions model	134