

**SWAT MODEL APPLICATION TO ESTIMATE  
STREAMFLOW IN ATTANAGALU OYA BASIN FOR  
SUSTAINABLE WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Choki Zam

(189252T)

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa  
Sri Lanka

September 2019

**SWAT MODEL APPLICATION TO ESTIMATE  
STREAMFLOW IN ATTANAGALU OYA BASIN FOR  
SUSTAINABLE WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Choki Zam

(189252T)

Supervised by  
Professor N.T.S. Wijesekera

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

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

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

September 2019

## 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 acknowledgment is made in 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***

Choki Zam

2019. 09. 23  
.....

Date

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

***UOM Verified Signature***

∨  
Professor N.T.S.Wijesekera

2019. 09. 23  
.....

Date

# SWAT MODEL APPLICATION TO ESTIMATE STREAMFLOW IN ATTANAGALU OYA BASIN FOR SUSTAINABLE WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

## ABSTRACT

Water crisis is prevailing as a result of the ever increasing population across the globe with advances in society and economy which significantly affects the ecosystems, environment and economy. Water resources are limited and needs to be efficiently managed by estimating streamflow. The Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) model is a physically based, continuous, computationally efficient, and distributed model considering similar slope, landuse and soil conditions as its smallest unit in the basin. It has been effectively applied at a wide range of watershed scales under different circumstances around the globe to estimate streamflow. Therefore, a process-based distributed model has to be defined and evaluated to estimate the streamflow in order to meet water demands for efficient watershed management. The objective is to evaluate the potential of process based distributed SWAT model for the estimation of streamflow in Attanagalu Oya Basin for sustainable water resource management.

In this study, the SWAT model has been applied over Dunamale watershed in Attanagalu Oya basin for a period of 10 years from 2008 to 2018 on a daily time scale basis. SWAT-CUP was used as calibration and validation tool with SUFI-2 as the optimization algorithm. The model was semi auto calibrated from 2008 to 2012 and validated from 2013 to 2018. Nine parameters were selected from literature review for calibration and validation. The calibrated and validated results are plotted in flow duration curve. A total of 34 iterations were carried out with each iteration having a total simulation of 200 numbers.

The process based distributed SWAT model can be developed for Attanagalu Oya Basin in Dunamale watershed to estimate streamflow with  $R^2$  value of 0.77 during calibration and 0.58 during validation with hydrograph matching pattern. The model gives a better matching for medium flow when compared to high flow and low flow and hence it can be used for sustainable water resource management. Daily model results when accumulated into monthly time frame has higher accuracy in the outcome when compared to daily and can be used in efficient decision making for water planning and management. SWAT model has more parameters and is complex when applied but the results are generated in a detailed manner with HRU as its basic unit and can be used for a better understanding of the watershed.

**Keywords:** Process based hydrologic model, Water Crisis, HRU

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to express my sincere and heartfelt gratitude to my research supervisor, Professor N.T.S. Wijesekera for the continuous support of my study with his patience, motivation and immense knowledge. Without his dedicated supervision and continued guidance, this thesis would not be successfully completed within the time frame. During my period, he consistently allowed this research to be my own work, but steered me in the right direction whenever he thought I needed it. He is a great teacher, not only to complete this research but also for my career success.

It is my duty to extend my gratitude to the course coordinator Dr. R.L.H. Lalith Rajapakse for providing me all necessary assistance and consistent encouragement while guidance when required even working under busy schedule.

Further I would like to extend my gratitude to Mr. Wajira Kumarasinghe and staff of University of Moratuwa for their support in different ways during this research period.

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

Also, I must thank Director of Irrigation (Hydrology), for her kind assistance and the Department of Irrigation for approvals to collect necessary data.

Especially I must express my very profound gratitude to my parents (Tshering and Khando Wangmo) for all their encouragement and faith in me.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION .....	i
ABSTRACT .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES .....	ix
LIST OF TABLES .....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATION .....	xiii
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 General .....	1
1.1.1 Water crisis.....	1
1.1.2 Water Demand .....	2
1.1.3 Importance of process based distributed models .....	2
1.1.4 Sustainable Water resource management.....	3
1.2 Problem Identification .....	3
1.3 Study area selection and justification .....	4
1.4 Study Objective .....	5
1.4.1 Main Objective.....	5
1.4.2 Specific Objectives.....	5
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
2.1 Introduction to hydrologic modelling.....	6
2.2 The need for watershed modelling. ....	6
2.2.1 Classification of models.....	7
2.3 Current status of process based hydrologic models .....	7
2.4 Comparison of process based hydrologic models .....	9
2.5 Initial Model Selection .....	9
2.5.1 Capability of model.....	9
2.5.2 Temporal Resolution.....	10
2.5.3 Availability of the model .....	10
2.5.4 Data requirement for modelling.....	10
2.5.5 User friendliness.....	11
2.5.6 Technical support .....	11



2.5.7	Wide range of model applications.....	11
2.6	Shortlisted models .....	14
2.6.1	SWAT .....	14
2.6.2	WetSpa .....	14
2.6.3	MIKE-SHE.....	15
2.6.4	HEC-HMS.....	15
2.7	Detailed Model selection.....	15
2.7.1	Number of process simulated.....	16
2.7.2	Number of process options .....	16
2.7.3	Temporal scale .....	16
2.7.4	Spatial extent.....	17
2.7.5	Details of output.....	17
2.7.6	Spatial distribution of outputs .....	17
2.7.7	Global popularity of the model .....	17
2.7.8	Importance of research; Number of Sri Lankan application.....	18
2.7.9	Ease of modelling.....	18
2.8	Discussion .....	21
2.9	Data filling.....	21
2.10	Model Evaluation.....	22
2.10.1	Objective function.....	22
2.10.1	Warm up period.....	23
2.10.2	Sensitivity Analysis.....	24
2.10.3	Model Calibration and validation.....	24
2.11	SWAT model .....	25
2.11.1	Description .....	25
2.11.2	Data Requirement.....	26
2.11.3	SWAT model component selection .....	26
2.11.4	Parameters .....	26
2.11.5	Calibration and validation .....	29
2.11.6	Search Algorithm .....	29
3	METHODOLOGY.....	30
4	DATA COLLECTION AND DATA CHECKING .....	33
4.1	Study Area .....	33

4.1.1	Landuse data.....	35
4.1.2	Soil data.....	35
4.2	Data checking .....	36
4.2.1	Station density .....	36
4.2.2	Visual checking.....	37
4.3	Double Mass Curve .....	39
4.4	Missing Data.....	39
4.5	Monthly Rainfall .....	41
4.5.1	Annual Water Balance .....	41
4.5.2	Variation of annual runoff coefficient and evaporation.....	42
4.6	Flow Duration Curve .....	43
5	SWAT MODEL DEVELOPMENT.....	45
5.1	Model Schematic .....	45
5.2	Database Preparation for SWAT .....	47
5.2.1	UserSoil database .....	47
5.2.2	Weather generation database.....	48
5.3	Watershed Delineation .....	48
5.4	Weather Data .....	49
5.5	Initial Model Results .....	50
5.5.1	Warm up period.....	50
5.6	Model Streamflow and Observed Streamflow .....	50
5.7	Flow components .....	52
5.8	Calibration Dataset .....	53
5.9	Validation Dataset .....	53
5.10	Model Iterations for Calibration .....	54
6	ANALYSIS AND RESULTS .....	56
6.1	ANALYSIS .....	56
6.1.1	Watershed delineation.....	56
6.1.2	Landuse map .....	56
6.1.3	Soil map .....	58
6.1.4	Slope map.....	59
6.2	Calibration Results .....	59
6.2.1	Statistical goodness of fit measures .....	59



6.2.2	Calibrated parameters range of Dunamale model .....	60
6.2.3	Observed and simulated hydrograph comparison .....	61
6.2.4	Flow Duration Curve Matching .....	63
6.2.5	Annual water balance error .....	64
6.3	Monthly Comparison.....	64
6.3.1	Monthly Observed and Calculated Hydrograph .....	64
6.3.2	Monthly Correlation of Observed and Calculated Streamflow.....	65
6.4	Model Verification .....	66
6.4.1	Statistical goodness of fit measures .....	66
6.4.2	Observed and simulated hydrograph comparison .....	66
6.4.3	Flow Duration Curve Matching .....	69
6.4.4	Annual Water Balance Error .....	69
6.5	Monthly Comparison.....	70
6.5.1	Monthly observed and calculated hydrograph .....	70
6.5.2	Monthly Correlation of Observed and Calculated Streamflow.....	71
7	DISCUSSION .....	72
7.1	SWAT Model application in water resource management.....	72
7.2	Watershed Demarcation .....	72
7.3	Model Component Selection .....	72
7.4	Objective Function Selection .....	73
7.5	Model Warm up Period .....	73
7.6	Data and Data Period.....	73
7.6.1	Selection of data period.....	73
7.6.2	Error in dataset .....	74
7.7	Selection of Initial Model Parameters .....	74
7.8	Model Performance .....	75
7.8.1	Calibration and validation results.....	75
7.8.2	Hydrograph matching.....	75
7.8.3	Matching of Flow Duration Curve.....	75
7.8.4	Annual water balance error .....	75
7.8.5	Monthly Performance.....	75
7.9	Reliability of Results .....	76
7.9.1	Uncertainty in meteorological data .....	76

7.9.2	Uncertainty in parameters .....	76
8	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	77
8.1	CONCLUSIONS .....	77
8.2	RECOMMENDATION.....	77
	REFERENCES.....	78
	APPENDIX A: STREAMFLOW RESPONSE WITH RAINFALL .....	87
	APPENDIX B: THIESSEN WEIGHTAGES TO FILL MISSING DATA.....	98
	APPENDIX C: DOUBLE MASS CURVE AFTER FILLING MISSING DATA..	102
	APPENDIX D: FLOW COMPONENT FOR EACH WATER YEAR.....	104
	APPENDIX E: CALIBRATION HYDROGRAPH TIPS AND CALIBRATION STATISTICS TIP .....	109

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Dunamale watershed .....	4
Figure 4-1: Thiessen Polygon- Dunamale.....	33
Figure 4-2:Landuse map of Dunamale watershed .....	35
Figure 4-3:Soil map of Dunamale watershed.....	36
Figure 4-4: Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station daily data for water year 2008/2009 .....	38
Figure 4-5: Monthly Rainfall data of Dunamale watershed.....	41
Figure 4-6: Variation of annual rainfall and streamflow of Dunamale watershed ....	42
Figure 4-7:Variation of annual evaporation and runoff coefficient of Dunamale watershed.....	43
Figure 4-8: Flow duration curve classification of Dunamale watershed .....	44
Figure 5-1:Model Schematic Diagram.....	45
Figure 5-2:SWAT watershed delineation .....	49
Figure 5-3:Model Warm Up.....	50
Figure 5-4:Observed and modelled streamflow daily .....	51
Figure 5-5:Observed and modelled streamflow monthly .....	51
Figure 5-6:Model process result.....	52
Figure 5-7:Flow components for the water year 2008/2009 .....	52
Figure 5-8:Calibration dataset.....	53
Figure 5-9:Validation dataset.....	53
Figure 6-1:Sub basin delineation by SWAT model .....	56
Figure 6-2:Landuse map of the watershed .....	57
Figure 6-3: Soil map of the watershed .....	58
Figure 6-4:Slope map of the watershed .....	59
Figure 6-5:Simulated vs observed hydrograph (semi-log) .....	61
Figure 6-6:Simulated vs observed hydrograph (normal plot) .....	62
Figure 6-7:FDC at Dunamale (both sorted) .....	63
Figure 6-8:FDC at Dunamale(sorted only observed).....	63
Figure 6-9:Annual water Balance error at Dunamale .....	64
Figure 6-10:Monthly hydrograph in semi-log plot .....	64

Figure 6-11:Monthly hydrograph in normal plot.....	65
Figure 6-12:Monthly observed vs simulated streamflow .....	65
Figure 6-13:Simulated vs observed hydrograph (semi-log) .....	67
Figure 6-14:Simulated vs observed hydrograph (normal plot).....	68
Figure 6-15:FDC at Dunamale (both sorted).....	69
Figure 6-16:FDC at Dunamale (sorted only observed streamflow).....	69
Figure 6-17:Annual water balance error at dunamale.....	70
Figure 6-18:Monthly hydrograph in semi-log plot .....	70
Figure 6-19:Monthly hydrograph in normal plot.....	71
Figure 6-20:Monthly observed vs simulated streamflow .....	71
Figure A 1:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2008/2009 log graph.....	88
Figure A 2:Dunamale daily stream flow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2009/2010 log graph.....	89
Figure A 3:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2010/2011 log graph.....	90
Figure A 4:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2011/2012 log graph.....	91
Figure A 5:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2012/2013 log graph.....	92
Figure A 6:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2013/2014 log graph.....	93
Figure A 7:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2014/2015 log graph.....	94
Figure A 8:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2015/2016 lo graph.....	95
Figure A 9:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2016/2017 log graph.....	96
Figure A 10:Dunamale daily streamflow response with each rainfall station data for water year 2017/2018 log graph.....	97
Figure B 1:Thiessen weight of Dunamale except karasnagala station.....	99
Figure B 2:Thiessen weight of Dunamale except for pasyala station .....	99

Figure B 3: Thiessen weight of Dunamale except for vincit station.....	99
Figure B 4: Thiessen weight of Dunamale except for chesterford station.....	100
Figure B 5: Thiessen weight of Dunamale except for nittambuwa and pasyala station .....	100
Figure B 6: Thiessen weight of Dunamale except for vincitand pasyala station .....	101
Figure B 7: Thiessen weight of Dunamale except for nittambuwa station .....	101
Figure C 1: Double mass curve .....	103
Figure D 1: Flow components for the water year 2008/2009 .....	105
Figure D 2: Flow components for the water year 2009/2010 .....	105
Figure D 3: Flow components for the water year 2010/2011 .....	105
Figure D 4: Flow components for the water year 2011/2012 .....	106
Figure D 5: Flow components for the water year 2012/2013 .....	106
Figure D 6: Flow components for the water year 2013/2014 .....	106
Figure D 7: Flow components for the water year 2014/2015 .....	107
Figure D 8: Flow components for the water year 2015/2016 .....	107
Figure D 9: Flow components for the water year 2016/2017 .....	108
Figure D 10: Flow components for the water year 2017/2018 .....	108

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Initial model shortlisting criteria .....	12
Table 2-2: Initial Model Selection Evaluation .....	13
Table 2-3: Detailed model selection criteria .....	19
Table 2-4: Detailed Model Selection Evaluation .....	20
Table 2-5: Major SWAT parameters.....	28
Table 4-1: Rainfall station at Dunamale watershed .....	33
Table 4-2: Location of Dunamale gauging station.....	34
Table 4-3: Data source and resolution .....	34
Table 4-4: Comparison of Distribution of Gauging Stations of Dunamale Catchment .....	36
Table 4-5: Missing data.....	39
Table 4-6: Thiessen weights for filling data .....	40
Table 4-7: Annual water balance of Dunamale catchment .....	41
Table 5-1: Soil physical properties required by SWAT .....	48
Table 5-2: SWAT parameter and their range .....	54
Table 5-3: Best parameter range from 1st iteration .....	55
Table 6-1: Land use, SWAT codes and their areal coverage in the watershed.....	57
Table 6-2: Major soil classes of watershed and their areal coverage.....	58
Table 6-3: Dunamale model calibration results .....	60
Table 6-4: Optimized parameter's ranges of dunamale .....	60
Table 6-5: Comparison of model validation results .....	66
Table E 1: Calibration hydrograph tips for issue 1 and 2 .....	110
Table E 2: Calibration hydrograph tips for issue 3 and 4 .....	111
Table E 3: Calibration statistic tips for hydrograph .....	112

## LIST OF ABBREVIATION

Abbreviation	Description
ALPHA_BF	Groundwater baseflow alpha factor
CN2	SCS runoff curve number
EPCO	Plant uptake compensation factor
ESCO	Soil Evaporation Compensation factor
FDC	Flow Duration Curve
GW_DELAY	Groundwater delay
GW_REVAP	Groundwater “revap” coefficient
R <sup>2</sup>	The coefficient of determination
REVAPMN	Threshold depth of water in shallow aquifer required for return flow to occur
SOL_AWC	Available water capacity of the soil layer
SUFI-2	Sequential Uncertainty Fitting
SWAT	Soil Water and Assessment Tool
SWAT-CUP Procedures	SWAT Calibration and Uncertainty Procedures
SWRM	Sustainable Water Resource Management