

**BASINWIDE ANALYSIS OF WATER RESOURCES AND
POLLUTE TRANSPORT USING A DISTRIBUTED
PARAMETER MODEL**

Amali Chathurika Dahanayake

158045C

Degree of Master of Philosophy

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

July 2019

**BASINWIDE ANALYSIS OF WATER RESOURCES AND
POLLUTE TRANSPORT USING A DISTRIBUTED
PARAMETER MODEL**

Amali Chathurika Dahanayake

158045C

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Philosophy

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

July 2019

Declaration of the Candidate and Supervisor

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).

Signature

Date

The above candidate has carried out research for the MPhil thesis dissertation under my supervision.

Signature of the supervisor

Date

Basinwide Analysis of Water Resources and Pollute Transport Using a Distributed Parameter Model

Abstract

The Nachchaduwa sub-catchment (598.74 km²) of the Malwathu Oya basin is seasonally stressed in the dry periods and its downstream parts undergo intermittent floods during monsoon seasons while the fate and behaviour of excess Nitrogen (N) and Phosphorus (P) added to the waterways due to agricultural fertilizers used in the upstream areas remain unresolved. This study incorporated the Water and Energy Transfer Processes (WEP) model to assess the water resources and pollutant transport of the catchment concerning the present status and six possible future scenarios. The required data for the model runs including meteorological, geographical, hydrological, and data related to water quality and anthropogenic activities, were collected and processed identifying the suitable model parameter values. The amounts of N and P in fertilizers applied in this catchment exceeded the actual plant requirement. In both wet and dry seasons, the differences between the measured water quality parameters in upstream and downstream were not statistically significant. The model results of the hydrological component showed that the catchment response to the rainfall was highly regulated due to reservoir storage effect. The model results of the material transport component showed that, on average, the wet season had about 5~7 times the dry season value of the Total Suspended Solids (TSS) in the streams, and in both seasons, the modelled TSS, NO₃⁻ and PO₄³⁻ were within the ranges of the previously published results. Scenario analysis found almost all water quality parameters reduced with the reduction of fertilizer input (maximum 30.64% reduction) and with the increase in temperature (maximum 2.27% reduction), but they increased with the increase in rainfall (maximum 13.49% increase). The findings will be useful in identifying best water resources management practices and coping with the residual N and P in streams and water bodies in a more pragmatic manner.

Keywords: Hydrological and material transport models, Nachchaduwa, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Process-based models

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude towards all the organisations and individuals who have contributed and supported to this research. This research was funded by University of Moratuwa Senate Research Council Grants; SRC/ST/2015/17, SRC/LT/2016/09 and SRC/ST/2017/33.

First, I would like to express my profound gratitude to the supervisor of this research, Dr. R. L. H. L. Rajapakse, Senior Lecturer, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for his immense support, continuous supervision, valuable guidance, and cordial mentoring given throughout the study period, as well as for sharing his extensive knowledge and precious time on this study.

Then I would like to extend my appreciation towards the staff of the Department of Irrigation, in both Colombo and Anuradhapura divisions, for providing the necessary streamflow and reservoir operation data for this study, as well as for the patronage given in field visits to the Nachchaduwa reservoir. Then I would like to acknowledge the support given by the staff of the Fertilizer Division, Divisional Secretariat Division of Anuradhapura District, in collecting fertilizer issuing data. Thereafter, the staff of the Meteorological Department is acknowledged for their support given in collecting meteorological data for this study.

Further, my sincere acknowledgements are conveyed to Professor J. M. A. Manatunga, and to the staff of the laboratory of the division of Environmental Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for their support and advices given during the water quality testing conducted in that laboratory.

The research would not have been possible without the support given by all the academic staff members of the Department of Civil Engineering, including Senior Professors, Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers. All the non-academic and academic support staff of University of Moratuwa are greatly appreciated for their heterogeneous supports given throughout the study period.

Finally, I am greatly indebted to my family, colleagues, and friends who gave me an immense support to successfully complete this research study.

Table of Contents

Declaration of the Candidate and Supervisor	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables	xiii
List of Appendices	xv
List of Abbreviations	xvi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Overview of the Study	1
1.2 Identified Research Gap	4
1.3 Problem Statement	5
1.4 Objectives	5
1.4.1 Overall objective	5
1.4.2 Specific objectives	6
1.5 Chapter Outline of the Thesis	7
2 Literature Review	8
2.1 Overview and Present Status of the Malwathu Oya Basin	8
2.2 Water Resources Management in Malwathu Oya	9
2.3 Water Quality in Malwathu Oya Basin	11
2.3.1 Water quality in streams in Malwathu Oya basin	11
2.3.2 Water quality in reservoirs in Malwathu Oya basin	13
2.3.3 Groundwater quality in Malwathu Oya basin	18
2.4 Review of the Current Status in Malwathu Oya Basin	20
2.5 Water Quality Monitoring for River Basin Management	21
2.6 Importance of Physics based Modelling for River Basin Management and Selection of the WEP (Water and Energy transfer Processes) Model for the Analysis	22
2.7 Fertilizer Over Usage in the Basin	28
2.8 Climate Change Impacts	32
3 Materials and Methods	36
3.1 Methodology	36
3.2 Data and Data Checking/Data Pre-Processing Procedures	38
3.2.1 Data Sources and Data Resolution	38

3.2.2	Study Area - Nachchaduwa Catchment Related Data	39
3.2.2.1	Nachchaduwa reservoir.....	39
3.2.2.2	Land use, soil types and delineation of sub catchments of the Nachchaduwa catchment.....	39
3.2.3	Rainfall Data	41
3.2.4	Streamflow Data	42
3.2.4.1	Initial data checking.....	42
3.2.4.2	Developing a streamflow data series for the WEP model using HEC HMS	43
3.2.5	Water Balance/Yield Analysis.....	43
3.2.6	Meteorological Data.....	46
3.2.7	Reservoir/Streamflow Water Quality Data.....	48
3.2.7.1	Reservoir/streamflow water quality - Yala season	49
3.2.7.2	Reservoir/streamflow water quality - Maha season.....	53
3.2.8	Fertilizer Related Data	59
3.3	WEP Model Analysis.....	69
3.3.1	Preparation of Input Files.....	69
3.3.2	WEP Model Analysis.....	70
3.3.3	Parameter Sensitivity Analysis	70
3.3.4	Scenario Analysis.....	71
4	Results and Discussion	72
4.1	WEP Model Results (for the Present Condition).....	72
4.1.1	Streamflow comparison with HEC-HMS model results.....	72
4.1.2	Temporal variation of results	74
4.1.2.1	TSS results	76
4.1.2.2	Results of Nitrogen components	78
4.1.2.3	Results of Phosphorus components	85
4.1.2.4	Results of other parameters.....	91
4.1.3	Spatial variation of results	92
4.1.3.1	Discharged DN from each layer (“fort.108” results file).....	93
4.1.3.2	DN in gravity drain/subsurface losses (“n-andrn1.asc” results file)..	94
4.1.3.3	DP in gravity drain/subsurface losses (“p-apdrn1.asc” results file)...	94
4.1.3.4	Mesh influx DN quantity (“n-fxce.asc” results file).....	95
4.1.3.5	Mesh influx PN quantity (“n-fxpnce.asc” results file).....	96
4.1.3.6	Mesh influx DP quantity (“p-fxdpce.asc” results file).....	97

4.1.3.7	Mesh influx PP quantity (“p-fxppce.asc” results file)	98
4.2	Sensitivity Analysis Results.....	99
4.2.1	Material movement for the overland flow (“surfaceC.csv” file)	99
4.2.2	Material transport in the river channel (“riverC.csv” file).....	102
4.2.3	Non-point source material transport in forest and urban area (“nonpointsource.csv” file)	104
4.3	Scenario Analysis Results.....	106
4.3.1	Comparison of fertilizer related scenarios (Scenario 1, 2 and 3).....	106
4.3.1.1	Comparison of temporal variation of results.....	106
a)	Results of Nitrogen components	106
b)	Results of Phosphorus components.....	109
c)	TSS variation.....	112
4.3.1.2	Comparison of nutrient concentrations with flow values	113
a)	Results of Nitrogen components	113
b)	Results of Phosphorus components.....	116
c)	Comparison of percentage difference.....	118
4.3.1.3	Comparison of spatial variation of results	121
4.3.2	Comparison of climate change related scenarios (Scenario 4, 5 and 6) 131	
4.3.2.1	Comparison of temporal variation of results.....	131
a)	Results of Nitrogen components	131
b)	Results of Phosphorus components.....	134
c)	TSS variation.....	137
4.3.2.2	Comparison of nutrient concentrations with flow values	138
a)	Results of Nitrogen components	138
b)	Results of Phosphorus components.....	140
c)	Comparison of percentage difference.....	143
4.3.2.3	Comparison of spatial variation of results	148
5	Conclusions and Recommendations	159
5.1	Conclusions.....	159
5.2	Summary of Findings.....	160
5.3	Recommendations for Future Studies	163
	References.....	164
	Appendix A: Additional Data for Materials and Methods.....	170
	Appendix B: Additional Results	193

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Malwathu Oya River Basin (original in colour).....	1
Figure 2.1: Nachchaduwa Catchment and the Malwathu Oya Basin (original in colour)	8
Figure 2.2: (a) The Temporal Variation of NO_3^- in all Six Reservoirs Studied by Wijesundara et al. (2012, 2013) (b) The Temporal Variation of PO_4^{3-} in all Six Reservoirs Studied by Wijesundara et al. (2012, 2013)	16
Figure 2.3: (a) The Spatial Variation of NO_3^- in Each Reservoir Studied by Wijesundara et al. (2012, 2013) (b) The Spatial Variation of PO_4^{3-} in Each Reservoir Studied by Wijesundara et al. (2012, 2013)	17
Figure 2.4: The Structure of the WEP Model - Vertical Structure within a Grid Cell (Rajapakse et al., 2010).....	27
Figure 2.5: The Structure of the WEP Model - Horizontal Structure (Rajapakse et al., 2010)	28
Figure 3.1: Methodology Flow Chart	37
Figure 3.2: Land use of the Nachchaduwa Catchment (original in colour).....	40
Figure 3.3: Soil Types of the Nachchaduwa Catchment (original in colour)	40
Figure 3.4: Delineation of Sub Catchments (original in colour).....	40
Figure 3.5: Thiessen Polygons for the Catchment (original in colour).....	41
Figure 3.6: Thiessen Average Daily Rainfall (mm) and Total Daily Outflow (m^3) from the Reservoir (original in colour).....	42
Figure 3.7: Annual Demand and Supply - Current Situation (original in colour)	44
Figure 3.8: Verification of the Reservoir Operation Study Model Outputs with the Actual Operational Data - Current Situation (original in colour)	45
Figure 3.9: Annual Demand and Supply - Alternative Situation (original in colour).....	45
Figure 3.10: Verification of the Reservoir Operation Study Model Outputs with the Actual Operational Data - Alternative Situation (original in colour)	46
Figure 3.11: Hourly Temperature Data Series	47
Figure 3.12: Hourly Wind Velocity Data Series.....	47
Figure 3.13: Hourly Relative Humidity Data Series.....	47
Figure 3.14: Hourly Sunshine Data Series.....	48
Figure 3.15: Water Quality Sampling Locations in the Yala (Dry) Season (original in colour)	49
Figure 3.16: Location 1 (original in colour)	50
Figure 3.17: Location 3 (original in colour)	50
Figure 3.18: Location 4 (original in colour)	50
Figure 3.19: Location 5 (original in colour)	50
Figure 3.20: Location 6 (original in colour)	50
Figure 3.21: Location 7 (original in colour)	50
Figure 3.22: Water Quality Test Results with the Sampling Locations - Yala Season (original in colour)	53
Figure 3.23: Water Quality Sampling Locations in the Maha (Wet) Season (original in colour)	54
Figure 3.24: Location 4 (original in colour)	54
Figure 3.25: Location 5 (original in colour)	54
Figure 3.26: Location 6 (original in colour)	55

Figure 3.27: Location 7 (original in colour)	55
Figure 3.28: Water Quality Test Results for Nitrogen Components, for the Samples Collected in Maha Season (original in colour)	57
Figure 3.29: Water Quality Test Results (Nitrogen Components) with the Sampling Locations, for the Samples Collected in Maha Season (original in colour)	57
Figure 3.30: Water Quality Test Results for Phosphorus Components, for the Samples Collected in Maha Season (original in colour)	58
Figure 3.31: Water Quality Test Results (Phosphorus Components) with the Sampling Locations, for the Samples Collected in Maha Season (original in colour)	58
Figure 3.32: Agrarian Service Centres (ASC) inside the Nachchaduwa Catchment (original in colour)	60
Figure 4.1: Streamflow Comparison with HEC-HMS Model Results for the Calibration Period	73
Figure 4.2: Streamflow Comparison with HEC-HMS Model Results for the Validation Period	73
Figure 4.3: Temporal Variation of TSS with the Thiessen Average Rainfall, for the Calibration Period (original in colour).....	77
Figure 4.4: Temporal Variation of TSS with the Thiessen Average Rainfall, for the Validation Period (original in colour).....	78
Figure 4.5: Temporal Variation of Nitrogen Components for the Calibration Period (original in colour)	79
Figure 4.6: Temporal Variation of Nitrogen Components for the Validation Period (original in colour)	79
Figure 4.7: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Nitrogen Components for the Low Flows (Calibration Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	80
Figure 4.8: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Nitrogen Components for the Mid Flows (Calibration Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	80
Figure 4.9: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Nitrogen Components for the High Flows (Calibration Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	81
Figure 4.10: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Nitrogen Components for the All Flows (Calibration Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	81
Figure 4.11: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Nitrogen Components for the Low Flows (Validation Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	82
Figure 4.12: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Nitrogen Components for the Mid Flows (Validation Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	82
Figure 4.13: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Nitrogen Components for the High Flows (Validation Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	83

Figure 4.14: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Nitrogen Components for the All Flows (Validation Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	83
Figure 4.15: Temporal Variation of Phosphorus Components for the Calibration Period (original in colour)	85
Figure 4.16: Temporal Variation of Phosphorus Components for the Validation Period (original in colour)	86
Figure 4.17: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Phosphorus Components for the Low Flows (Calibration Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	86
Figure 4.18: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Phosphorus Components for the Mid Flows (Calibration Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	87
Figure 4.19: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Phosphorus Components for the High Flows (Calibration Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	87
Figure 4.20: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Phosphorus Components for the All Flows (Calibration Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	88
Figure 4.21: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Phosphorus Components for the Low Flows (Validation Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	88
Figure 4.22: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Phosphorus Components for the Mid Flows (Validation Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	89
Figure 4.23: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Phosphorus Components for the High Flows (Validation Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	89
Figure 4.24: Comparison of WEP Model Results of Phosphorus Components for the All Flows (Validation Period) with the Entire Duration of the Three Published Results	90
Figure 4.25: Critical Months and Critical Parameter of “fort.108” Results File; (a) Calibration Period (October 2009, ANI1) and (b) Validation Period (September 2012, ANI1) (original in colour)	93
Figure 4.26: Critical Months of “n-andrn1.asc” Results File; (a) Calibration Period (November 2009) and (b) Validation Period (October 2012) (original in colour)	94
Figure 4.27: Critical Months of “p-apdrn1.asc” Results File; (a) Calibration Period (November 2009) and (b) Validation Period (October 2013) (original in colour)	95
Figure 4.28: Critical Months of “n-fxce.asc” Results File; (a) Calibration Period (November 2011) and (b) Validation Period (December 2014) (original in colour)	96
Figure 4.29: Critical Months of “n-fxpnce.asc” Results File; (a) Calibration Period (February 2011) and (b) Validation Period (December 2014) (original in colour)	97

Figure 4.30: Critical Months of “p-fxdpce.asc” Results File; (a) Calibration Period (February 2011) and (b) Validation Period (December 2014) (original in colour).....	98
Figure 4.31: Critical Months of “p-fxppce.asc” Results File; (a) Calibration Period (February 2011) and (b) Validation Period (December 2014) (original in colour).....	99
Figure 4.32: DP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “surfaceC.csv” File (original in colour).....	100
Figure 4.33: PP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “surfaceC.csv” File (original in colour).....	101
Figure 4.34: TP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “surfaceC.csv” File (original in colour).....	101
Figure 4.35: DP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “riverC.csv” File (original in colour).....	102
Figure 4.36: PP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “riverC.csv” File (original in colour).....	103
Figure 4.37: TP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “riverC.csv” File (original in colour).....	103
Figure 4.38: DP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “nonpointsource.csv” File (original in colour).....	104
Figure 4.39: PP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “nonpointsource.csv” File (original in colour).....	105
Figure 4.40: TP in Each Model Run (mg/l) in “nonpointsource.csv” File (original in colour).....	105
Figure 4.41: The Variation of PN in Present Condition, Scenario 1 (S1), Scenario 2 (S2) and Scenario 3 (S3) (original in colour).....	107
Figure 4.42: The Variation of DN in Present Condition, Scenario 1 (S1), Scenario 2 (S2) and Scenario 3 (S3) (original in colour).....	108
Figure 4.43: The Variation of TN in Present Condition, Scenario 1 (S1), Scenario 2 (S2) and Scenario 3 (S3) (original in colour).....	109
Figure 4.44: The Variation of PP in Present Condition, Scenario 1 (S1), Scenario 2 (S2) and Scenario 3 (S3) (original in colour).....	110
Figure 4.45: The Variation of DP in Present Condition, Scenario 1 (S1), Scenario 2 (S2) and Scenario 3 (S3) (original in colour).....	111
Figure 4.46: The Variation of TP in Present Condition, Scenario 1 (S1), Scenario 2 (S2) and Scenario 3 (S3) (original in colour).....	112
Figure 4.47: The Variation of TSS in Present Condition, Scenario 1 (S1), Scenario 2 (S2) and Scenario 3 (S3) (original in colour).....	113
Figure 4.48: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Nitrogen Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the Low Flows.....	114
Figure 4.49: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Nitrogen Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the Mid Flows.....	114
Figure 4.50: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Nitrogen Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the High Flows.....	115
Figure 4.51: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Nitrogen Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the All Flows.....	115

Figure 4.52: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Phosphorus Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the Low Flows	116
Figure 4.53: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Phosphorus Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the Mid Flows	117
Figure 4.54: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Phosphorus Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the High Flows.....	117
Figure 4.55: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Phosphorus Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the All Flows.....	118
Figure 4.56: Comparison of Discharged DN from each layer (“fort.108” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 1, (c) Scenario 2, (d) Scenario 3 (original in colour)	124
Figure 4.57: Comparison of DN in Gravity Drain/Subsurface Losses (“n-andrn1.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 1, (c) Scenario 2, (d) Scenario 3 (original in colour)	125
Figure 4.58: Comparison of DP in Gravity Drain/Subsurface Losses (“p-apdrn1.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 1, (c) Scenario 2, (d) Scenario 3 (original in colour)	126
Figure 4.59: Comparison of Mesh Influx DN Quantity (“n-fxce.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 1, (c) Scenario 2, (d) Scenario 3 (original in colour)	127
Figure 4.60: Comparison of Mesh Influx PN Quantity (“n-fxpnce.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 1, (c) Scenario 2, (d) Scenario 3 (original in colour)	128
Figure 4.61: Comparison of Mesh Influx DP Quantity (“p-fxdpce.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 1, (c) Scenario 2, (d) Scenario 3 (original in colour)	129
Figure 4.62: Comparison of Mesh Influx PP Quantity (“p-fxppce.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 1, (c) Scenario 2, (d) Scenario 3 (original in colour)	130
Figure 4.63: The Variation of PN in Present Condition, Scenario 4 (S4), Scenario 5 (S5) and Scenario 6 (S6) (original in colour).....	132
Figure 4.64: The Variation of DN in Present Condition, Scenario 4 (S4), Scenario 5 (S5) and Scenario 6 (S6) (original in colour).....	132
Figure 4.65: The Variation of TN in Present Condition, Scenario 4 (S4), Scenario 5 (S5) and Scenario 6 (S6) (original in colour).....	133
Figure 4.66: The Variation of PP in Present Condition, Scenario 4 (S4), Scenario 5 (S5) and Scenario 6 (S6) (original in colour).....	134
Figure 4.67: The Variation of DP in Present Condition, Scenario 4 (S4), Scenario 5 (S5) and Scenario 6 (S6) (original in colour).....	135
Figure 4.68: The Variation of TP in Present Condition, Scenario 4 (S4), Scenario 5 (S5) and Scenario 6 (S6) (original in colour).....	136
Figure 4.69: The Variation of TSS in Present Condition, Scenario 4 (S4), Scenario 5 (S5) and Scenario 6 (S6) (original in colour).....	137
Figure 4.70: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Nitrogen Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the Low Flows.....	138
Figure 4.71: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Nitrogen Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the Mid Flows	139

Figure 4.72: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Nitrogen Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the High Flows	139
Figure 4.73: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Nitrogen Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the All Flows	140
Figure 4.74: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Phosphorus Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the Low Flows	141
Figure 4.75: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Phosphorus Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the Mid Flows	142
Figure 4.76: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Phosphorus Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the High Flows.....	142
Figure 4.77: Comparison of Nutrient Concentration Values (Phosphorus Components) of All Scenarios with the Published Results for the All Flows.....	143
Figure 4.78: Comparison of Discharged DN from each layer (“fort.108” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 4, (c) Scenario 5, (d) Scenario 6 (original in colour)	152
Figure 4.79: DN in Gravity Drain/Subsurface Losses (“n-andrn1.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 4, (c) Scenario 5, (d) Scenario 6 (original in colour)	153
Figure 4.80: Comparison of DP in Gravity Drain/Subsurface Losses (“p-apdrn1.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 4, (c) Scenario 5, (d) Scenario 6 (original in colour)	154
Figure 4.81: Comparison of Mesh Influx DN Quantity (“n-fxce.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 4, (c) Scenario 5, (d) Scenario 6 (original in colour)	155
Figure 4.82: Comparison of Mesh Influx PN Quantity (“n-fxpnce.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 4, (c) Scenario 5, (d) Scenario 6 (original in colour)	156
Figure 4.83: Comparison of Mesh Influx DP Quantity (“p-fxdpce.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 4, (c) Scenario 5, (d) Scenario 6 (original in colour)	157
Figure 4.84: Comparison of Mesh Influx PP Quantity (“p-fxppce.asc” Results File); (a) Present Condition, (b) Scenario 4, (c) Scenario 5, (d) Scenario 6 (original in colour)	158

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Water Quality in Reservoirs in Malwathu Oya Basin	15
Table 2.2: Mathematical Equations and Methods used in the WEP Model	26
Table 3.1: Data Sources and Data Resolution.....	38
Table 3.2: Water Quality Sample Details for Samples collected in Yala Season.....	51
Table 3.3: Summary of Water Quality Test Results for the Samples Collected in Yala Season	51
Table 3.4: Water Quality Sample Details for Samples collected in Maha Season	56
Table 3.5: Summary of the Water Quality Test Results (Concentrations in ppm)	59
Table 3.6: Crop area in every ASC.....	61
Table 3.7: Required Amounts of Fertilizers for Crops	62
Table 3.8: Comparison of the Monthly Average Values of Applied Nitrogen Amounts (kg/ha) of Each Month, with the Required Amount, for Paddy (original in colour)	63
Table 3.9: Comparison of the Monthly Average Values of Applied Phosphorus Amounts (kg/ha) of Each Month, with the Required Amount, for Paddy (original in colour)	64
Table 3.10: Comparison of the Monthly Average Values of Applied Nitrogen Amounts (kg/ha) of Each Month, with the Required Amount, for Other Crops (original in colour)	65
Table 3.11: Comparison of the Monthly Average Values of Applied Phosphorus Amounts (kg/ha) of Each Month, with the Required Amount, for Other Crops (original in colour).....	66
Table 3.12: Comparison of the Monthly Average Values of Applied Nitrogen Amounts (kg/ha) of Each Month, with the Required Amount, for Homesteads (original in colour)	67
Table 3.13: Comparison of the Monthly Average Values of Applied Phosphorus Amounts (kg/ha) of Each Month, with the Required Amount, for Homesteads (original in colour).....	68
Table 4.1: Error Coefficients for the Calibration and Validation Period.....	72
Table 4.2: Average Values of Nitrogen and Phosphorus Components, Classified for the Low Flow, Mid Flow, and High Flow, for the Calibration and Validation Periods.....	75
Table 4.3: TSS Values for the Calibration and Validation Period for the Wet and Dry Seasons.....	77
Table 4.4: Critical Months and Critical Parameters of the Selected Spatial Variation Results Files	92

Table 4.5: Comparison of TN in Different Flows (mean±standard deviation).....	113
Table 4.6: Comparison of TP in Different Flows (mean±standard deviation)	116
Table 4.7: S1 Percentage Difference Compared to the Present Condition ((S 1 Average - Present Condition Average)*100)/(Present Condition Average)	119
Table 4.8: S2 Percentage Difference Compared to the Present Condition ((S 2 Average - Present Condition Average)*100)/(Present Condition Average)	119
Table 4.9: S3 Percentage Difference Compared to the Present Condition ((S 3 Average - Present Condition Average)*100)/(Present Condition Average)	119
Table 4.10: Comparison of Critical Months and the Percentage Differences in the Maximum Values - Present and S1	121
Table 4.11: Comparison of Critical Months and the Percentage Differences in the Maximum Values - Present and S2.....	122
Table 4.12: Comparison of Critical Months and the Percentage Differences in the Maximum Values - Present and S3.....	122
Table 4.13: Comparison of TN in Different Flows (mean±standard deviation).....	138
Table 4.14: Comparison of TP in Different Flows (mean±standard deviation)	140
Table 4.15: S4 Percentage Difference Compared to the Present Condition ((S4 Average - Present Condition Average)*100)/(Present Condition Average)	144
Table 4.16: S5 Percentage Difference Compared to the Present Condition ((S5 Average - Present Condition Average)*100)/(Present Condition Average)	144
Table 4.17: S6 Percentage Difference Compared to the Present Condition ((S6 Average - Present Condition Average)*100)/(Present Condition Average)	144
Table 4.18: Comparison of Critical Months and the Percentage Differences in the Maximum Values - Present and S4.....	149
Table 4.19: Comparison of Critical Months and the Percentage Differences in the Maximum Values - Present and S5.....	149
Table 4.20: Comparison of Critical Months and the Percentage Differences in the Maximum Values - Present and S6.....	150

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Additional Data for Materials and Methods.....	171
Appendix B: Additional Results	193

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
APHA	American Public Health Association
ASC	Agrarian Services Centres
BMP	Best Management Practices
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
CEA	Central Environmental Authority
CCME	Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment
CKDu	Chronic Kidney Disease of Unknown aetiology
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
DN	Dissolved Nitrogen
DP	Dissolved Phosphorus
DO	Dissolved Oxygen
DON	Dissolved Organic Nitrogen
DP	Dissolved Phosphorus
DSD	Divisional Secretariat Divisions
EC	Electrical Conductivity
FIMS	First Inter Monsoon Season
GCM	General Circulation Models
HERT	Hydrologic Engineering Research Team
HLMC	High Level Main Canal
HMIS	Hydro-meteorological Management Information System
HYV	High-Yielding Varieties
IGCI	International Global Change Institute

IN	Inorganic Nitrogen
IP	Inorganic Phosphorus
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPCC-TGCIA	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Task Group on Scenarios for Climate Impact Assessment
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
LB	Left Bank
LBHL	Left Bank High Level
LLMC	Low Level Main Canal
MCM	Million Cubic Meters (10^6 m^3)
MOP	Muriate of Potash
NCP	North Central Province
NEM	North East Monsoon
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
OFC	Other Field Crops
ON	Organic Nitrogen
OP	Organic Phosphorus
PBSD	Physically Based Spatial Distributed
PN	Particulate Nitrogen
PON	Particulate Organic Nitrogen
PP	Particulate Phosphorus
RB	Right Bank
RBHL	Right Bank High Level
RBLL	Right Bank Low Level
RSC	Residual Sodium Carbonate

SAR	Sodium Absorption Ratio
SCS	Soil Conservation Service
SLS	Sri Lanka Standards
SS	Suspended Solids
SIMS	Second Inter Monsoon Season
SRES	Special Report on Emission Scenarios
SWM	South West Monsoon
SWMS	South West Monsoon Season
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
TN	Total Nitrogen
TP	Total Phosphorus
TSP	Triple Super Phosphate
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
VBA	Visual Basic for Applications
WEP	Water and Energy transfer Processes
WHO	World Health Organisation
WQI	Water Quality Index