CS - 90

APPLICATION OF WAHS MODEL TO HEMAVATI UPTO SAKLESHPUR BASIN

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HYDROLOGY
JAL VIGYAN BHAVAN
ROORKEE (UP) -247 667

1992-93

PREFACE

The estimation of flood from a watershed is a very important component of the water resources planning and design. Different methods for estimation of design floods invariably need some observed data of discharge, rainfall etc. Even the conventional techniques for derivation of the unit hydrograph need observed rainfall and runoff data. However, the observed data are not available at all the points along the river reach. This is more so in the case of smaller river systems or the tributaries. Even in the case of gauged rivers, the observed data may not be available at the desired interval or may not be representative of the conditions which are essential for derivation of the unit hydrograph or the instantaneous unit hydrograph. If runoff data are inadequate or not available, it becomes necessary to adopt techniques in which geomorphological characteristics of the basin, the hydrometeorological features of the region and other factors are used to derive the unit hydrographs. Such unit hydrographs are termed as regional unit hydrographs or synthetic unit hydrograph or geomorphological unit hydrographs. The geomorphological characteristics can be easily derived from maps/toposheets having details of stream network as well as contours. Such maps/toposheets are readily available and are very reliable.

The project on "Development of a Hydrological Model using Geomorphological Parameters" was formulated for a collaborative research study between the National Institute of Hydrology, Louisiana State University and Gujarat Irrigation Department, with the objective of developing a suitable model where the geomorphological characteristics of the basin are used for synthesis of the runoff hydrograph and peak flows.

In this report an attempt has been made to apply geomorphology based WAHS model to Hemavati Basin upto Sakleshpur to simulate flood events recorded in the basin. This study has been carried out by Sri M K Jain, Scientist B, in the Mountain Hydrology Division, National Institute of Hydrology, Roorkee.

DECEMBER 1993

(S. M. Seth)
Director

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The watershed hydrology simulation model (WAHS) is a quasi-conceptual event based model intended to simulate discrete rainfall-runoff events in a river basin using its geomorphological parameters . It is a two parameters model and assumes that the transformation of effective rainfall to direct runoff is linear and time invariant. The model computes IUH of the basin using geomorphological approach and DSRO is calculated by convoluting derived IUH with effective rainfall hyetograph.

Calibration and valediction of the WAHS model have been carried out in the report by applying it to the Hemavati up to Sakleshpur basin. Rainfall runoff data from 1978-80 were used. In all twelve events were identified for this purpose and divided in to two groups.The model calibration was done using events of first group and testing was performed on remaining events. The results of the study indicate that the model is capable of predicting peak and shape of the flood hydrograph reasonably well.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Stream flow synthesis for ungauged basins has long been a subject of scientific inquiry. A survey of hydrological literature (Dooge 1976, Singh 1978) suggests three fundamental approaches is: (i) empirical, (ii) conceptual, and (iii) physically based. The first approach comprises empirical relations for determining some key characteristics of stream flow hydrographs, such as lag time, peak discharge, time to peak, or hydrograph duration. These relations are developed by standard curve fitting methods based on data from gauged catchments and are then applied to ungauged basins with the hope that they will yield satisfactory results.

The second approach basically incorporates what are commonly referred to as systems analysis and synthesis techniques (Dooge, 1973; Nash and Foley, 1982). These techniques use spatially lumped parameters. In other words, they do not explicitly take into account spatial variability of rainfall or runoff, even though attempts have been made to partly relax this restriction . (Singh, 1978). Most of these techniques revolve around the estimation of effective rainfall, separating the stream flow hydrograph, and applying spatially lumped form (integrated over space) of the continuity equation in conjunction with a storage discharge relation.

The third approach employs, in some form, principles of mathematical physics which are the laws of conservation of mass, momentum and energy (Woolhiser, 1982). The development of techniques associated with this approach has paralleled, for the most parts, those of the second approach, i.e. development of effective rainfall direct runoff relationship has been the major thrust. The consequences has been two fold: (a) the technique have been refined little more than those of second approach and (b) they have been less than practical working tools.

On the other hand, geomorphic techniques have recently been advanced for hydrograph synthesis Body 1978; Body, Pilgrim, and Cordery 1979; Rodriguez-Iturbe and Valdes 1979; Rodriguez-Iturbe, Devoto and Valdes 1979; Gupta, Waymire, and Wang 1980; Wang, Gupta, and Waymire 1981;' Rodriguez -Iturbe 1982). These techniques have added a new dimension to application of geomorphology to the effective rainfall direct runoff relationship. However, they remain to be tested to a wide variety of gauged basins and have yet to be applied to ungauged basins.

Consequently Singh and his associates developed a quasi conceptual model which employed geomorphologic techniques given by Valdes, Rodriguez- Iturbe et al and modern hydrologic system analysis and synthesis approach to synthesis approach stream flow hydrographs. The model developed by Singh V.P. and his associates is referred in literature as WAHS (or watershed Hydrology Simulation Model). In this report suitability of WAHS model is being evaluated by applying it to the Hemavati up to Sakleshpur Basin.

2.0 MODEL DESCRIPTION

2.1 General

The Watershed Hydrology Simulation (WAHS) model, developed by Singh (1983, 1987), is designed for prediction of DRH for a specified rainfall event from an ungauged watershed. Rainfall hyetograph, observed at one or more points, constitutes input to the model. In addition, soil vegetation-land use and geomorphic characteristics are needed to estimate model parameters. It is a two parameter linear model, wherein the watershed unit hydrograph is determined using geomorphologic concepts involving one parameter the watershed lag (Singh and Aninian 1984, 1985) estimated simply from watershed area. The DR amount is obtained from SCS curve number method. Then the Effective Rainfall Hyetograph is estimated using Philip two term infiltration equation, where the steady infiltration parameter is obtained from soil characteristics and the sorptivity term comes from satisfying the continuity equation. If stream flow observations are available, then the DR amount is obtained by base flow separation. If needed information on soil characteristics is not available, the Rosenbrock Palmer algorithm is provided to optimize model parameters based on minimizing the sum of squares of the deviations between observed and computed peaks over a number of rainfall-runoff events.

2.2 Theoretical Description of the Model

The model is designed to principally compute,

1. Volume of direct runoff
2. Infiltration

3. The effective rainfall hydrograph (ERH),
4. The instantaneous unit hydrograph (IUH),
5. The direct runoff hydrograph (DRH), and
6. Optimal parameters, if necessary

A brief description of each term is given below:

2.2.1 Volume of direct runoff

The volume of direct runoff VQ resulting from a specified rainfall of volume VP is computed by SCS curve number method which is based on the assumption:

$$\frac{F}{S} = \frac{VQ}{VP - IA}$$

In which IA is initial abstraction; S is potential maximum retention; and F is actual retention excluding IA. and can be expressed as

$$F = VP - VA - IA$$

From the above two equations

$$VQ = \frac{(VP - IA)^2}{VP - IA + S}$$

The initial abstraction depends upon antecedent soil moisture, soil vegetation, land use complex, and interception and can be expressed as

$$IA = a \cdot S$$

Where a is normally been taken between 0.1 and 0.2 . and S is calculated empirically from curve number (CN) by

$$S = \frac{1000}{CN} - 10$$

Where CN denotes curve number which has been determined by the soil conservation service for various hydrologic soil cover complexes corresponding to these antecedent soil moisture conditions with a = 0.2

In case where discharge measurements are available, the DSRO volume may be calculated by hydrograph separation method.

2.2.2 Effective rainfall hyetograph (ERH)

The effective rainfall hyetograph was computed by subtracting infiltration rate from the rainfall hyetograph such that the residual rainfall volume is the same as volume of direct runoff. The infiltration for each rainfall runoff event is computed by Philip two term infiltration model (Philip 1969),

$$f = A\ t + 0.5\ S\ t^{-0.5}$$

where

f = rate of infiltration at time t(cm/hr)

A = steady state infiltration, approximately equal to saturated hydraulic conductivity (cm/hr)

S = Sorptivity, depends on antecedent soil moisture conditions and soil properties (cm/sqrt hr.) , and

t = time (hr)

2.2.3 The instantaneous unit hydrograph (IUH)

The IUH is derived by an approach developed by Rodriguez-Iturbe and Valdes (1979) and generalized by Gupta, Waymier and

Wang (1980) by employing empirical laws of geomorphology and techniques of linear hydrologic systems.

A basin of order w contains streams of order from one to W (following Horton Strahler ordering system). The network of these streams and their drainage area determine the paths to be followed by rainwater from the point of its landing to the watershed outlet. The number of paths specified by basin geomorphology will be less then or equal to, 2^{W-1}. Each path is composed of an overland region (r) and one or more channels (c) and is, in turn, represented by a cascade of unequal linear elements. The travel time of a particle must therefore be specified by the particular path it takes to reach the outlet. The travel time T_s is the sum of the times spent by the particle in the various states forming its path.

$$T_S = T_{x1} + T_{x2} + \dots + T_{xM} , M > 1 \qquad \dots(1)$$

where T_x is the time a particle spends in the state x ($x = r_i$ or C_i for some i) and M is the number of states. T_x is assumed to be a random variable. T_x can have an arbitrary probability density function (PDF), and for different states x and y, T_x and T_y can have different PDF's. However, T_x and T_y are assumed to be independent for $x \neq y$. If T_B denotes the random time that a particle spends in the basin, then

$$T_B = \sum_{s \in S} I_s T_s \qquad \dots(2)$$

where I_s is the indicator function for the path s; that is, $I_s = 1$ if the particle follows the path s, and $I_s = 0$ otherwise. The PDF of T_B , denoted by $f_B(t)$, is obtained as follows.

Let A_{ri} be the ratio of the area of r_i to the basin area A_w, and $P_{ci,cj}$ the proportion of channels of order i merging into channels of order j, $j > i$, $2 < j \leq W + 1$. Obviously $P_{cW,cW+1} = 1$; this is not strictly true since a basin of any given order may outlet into a stream several orders higher. However, this is convenient and does not affect the model. Similarly, $P_{ri,ci} = 1$. Then for a path $s \in S$ of the form $s = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k\}$ where $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k \in \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_W; r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_W\}$. The path probability function is defined as

$$p(s) = A_{x1} \cdot P_{x1,x2} \cdots P_{xk-1,xk} \qquad \ldots(3)$$

It should be emphasized that the paths are all distinct. Therefore, the probability of $T_B < t$ is

$$\begin{aligned} P(T_B < t) &= \sum_{s \in S} P(T_s < t) \cdot p(s) \\ &= \sum_{s \in S} F_{x1} * F_{x2} * \ldots * F_{xk}(t) \cdot p(s), \qquad \ldots(4) \\ s &= \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k\} \end{aligned}$$

where

t = specific time

F_x = cumulative density function of T_x

$*$ = convolution operation

Differentiation with respect to t on both sides yields

$$f_B(t) = \sum_{s \in S} f_{x1} * f_{x2} * \ldots * f_{xk} \cdot p(s) \qquad \ldots(5)$$

where f_x denotes the PDF of T_x . Gupta, Waymire, and Wang (1980) have established the equivalence of $f_B(t)$ and the IUH, h(t). Therefore,

$$h(t) = \sum_{s \in S} f_{x1} * f_{x2} * \ldots * f_{xk} \cdot p(s) \qquad \ldots(6)$$

where h(t) is the result of an instantaneous burst of effective rainfall of unit volume.

Thus, the direct runoff hydrograph synthesis reduces to synthesis of h(t) using Equation 6. In Equation 6 the path probability function p(s) can be specified completely from the drainage network morphometry. However, specification of f_{xi} cannot be entirely based on physical considerations. For simplicity, f_{xi} is assumed to be exponentially distributed with some parameter $K_{xi} > 0$. This is consistent with the assumption of basin linearity. Then $f_{x1} * f_{x2} * \ldots * f_{xk}$ in Equation 6 become the k-fold convolution of independent but nonidentically distributed exponential random variables. That is,

$$f_{x1} * f_{x2} * \ldots * f_{xk}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} C_{ik} \exp(-K_{xi}\, t) \qquad \ldots(8)$$

Where the coefficients C_{ik} are given by Feller (1971) as

$$C_{ik} = K_{x1} K_{x2} \ldots K_{xk-1} \Big[(K_{x1} - K_{xi}) \cdot (K_{xi-1} - K_{xi}) \ldots (K_{xi+1} - K_{xi}) \ldots (K_{xk} - K_{xi}) \Big]^{-1} \qquad \ldots(9)$$

in which $K_{xi} \neq K_{xk}$ unless i = k. Therefore, the IUH is given as

$$h(t) = \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{i=1}^{k} C_{ik} \exp(-K_{xi}\, t) \cdot p(s), \qquad \ldots(10)$$

$$s = \{ x_1, x_2, \ldots , x_k \}$$

To apply equation 10, the parameters K_{xi} must be determined. Following Gupta, Waymier and Wang (1980), the mean holding time of an ith order Strahler channel (state) is given as

$$\frac{1}{K_{ci}} = \gamma \left[\bar{L}_i \right]^{1/3} \quad , 1 \leq i \leq W \qquad \ldots(11)$$

where γ is an empirical constant and $\bar{L}_i$ is the average channel length of order i. Likewise, the mean holding time $1/K_{ri}$ of an ith order overland region can be given by

$$\frac{1}{K_{ri}} = \gamma \left[\frac{A_{ri}\ A_W}{2N_i\ \bar{L}_i} \right]^{1/3} , 1 \leq i \leq w \qquad \ldots(12)$$

The constant γ is determined empirically and plausibly may remain more or less constant from one state to another within a given basin. To use Equations 11 and 12 the constant γ must be specified. The first moment of the IUH, h(t), being equal to the mean holding time of the basin, K_B, can be written as

$$K_B = \int_0^{\infty} t\ h(t)\ dt \qquad \ldots(13)$$

From equation 10 and 13 it can be shown that

$$K_B = \sum_{s \in S} p(s) \left[\frac{1}{K_{x1}} + \frac{1}{K_{x2}} + \ldots + \frac{1}{K_{xk}} \right], \qquad \ldots(14)$$

$$s = \{ x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_k \}$$

If Equation 11 and 12 are substituted in Equation 14 the only unknown is γ. However, K_B is estimated following Body (1978) as

$$K_b = b \left(A_w \right)^{0.38} \qquad \ldots(15)$$

where K_B is in hours and A_W is in square kilometers. The parameter b must be determined empirically. Thus, for a specific value of K_B, γ can be determined. Thus the IUH can be completely specified by watershed geomorphology.

2.2.4 Computation of Direct Runoff Hydrograph (DRH)

The DRH Q(t) is computed by

$$Q(t) = \int_0^t h(t-s)\ I(s)\ ds$$

where I(t) is the ERH, and h(t) is the IUH. In discrete form,

$$Q_j = \sum_{i=0}^{j} h_{j-1}\ l_j\ \Delta t \quad , \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\ldots$$

where Δt is the discretization time interval used for discretizing the ERH and IUH.

in which $K_{xi} \neq K_{xk}$ unless i = k. Therefore, the IUH is given as

$$h(t) = \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{i=1}^{k} C_{ik} \exp(-K_{xi}\, t) \cdot p(s), \qquad \ldots(10)$$

$$s = \{ x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k \}$$

To apply equation 10, the parameters K_{xi} must be determined. Following Gupta, Waymier and Wang (1980), the mean holding time of an ith order Strahler channel (state) is given as

$$\frac{1}{K_{ci}} = \gamma \left(\bar{L}_i \right)^{1/3} \quad , \; 1 \leq i \leq W \qquad \ldots(11)$$

where γ is an empirical constant and $\bar{L}_i$ is the average channel length of order i. Likewise, the mean holding time $1/K_{ri}$ of an ith order overland region can be given by

$$\frac{1}{K_{ri}} = \gamma \left[\frac{A_{ri}\; A_W}{2N_i\; \bar{L}_i} \right]^{1/3} , \; 1 \leq i \leq w \qquad \ldots(12)$$

The constant γ is determined empirically and plausibly may remain more or less constant from one state to another within a given basin. To use Equations 11 and 12 the constant γ must be specified. The first moment of the IUH, h(t), being equal to the mean holding time of the basin, K_B, can be written as

$$K_B = \int_0^{\infty} t\; h(t)\; dt \qquad \ldots(13)$$

From equation 10 and 13 it can be shown that

$$K_B = \sum_{s \in S} p(s) \left[\frac{1}{K_{x1}} + \frac{1}{K_{x2}} + \ldots + \frac{1}{K_{xk}} \right], \qquad \ldots(14)$$

$$s = \{ x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_k \}$$

If Equation 11 and 12 are substituted in Equation 14 the only unknown is γ . However, K_B is estimated following Body (1978) as

$$K_b = b \left[A_w \right]^{0.38} \qquad \ldots(15)$$

where K_B is in hours and A_W is in square kilometers. The parameter b must be determined empirically. Thus, for a specific value of K_B, γ can be determined. Thus the IUH can be completely specified by watershed geomorphology.

2.2.4 Computation of Direct Runoff Hydrograph (DRH)

The DRH Q(t) is computed by

$$Q(t) = \int_0^t h(t-s)\, I(s)\, ds$$

where I(t) is the ERH, and h(t) is the IUH. In discrete form,

$$Q_j = \sum_{i=0}^{j} h_{j-1}\, 1_j\, \Delta t \quad , \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\ldots$$

where Δt is the discretization time interval used for discretizing the ERH and IUH.

2.3 Model Structure

The Watershed Hydrology Simulation Model (WASH) consists of a number of component models. The arrangement of these components is shown in Figure 1, and depends on whether or not optimization of model parameters is required. A flow chart of the model is given in Figure 2. A brief discussion of the subroutines is given below.

The program MAIN provides general information on the WASH model, sets its objectives and specifies inputs required by subsequent routines. It also monitors whether optimization of model parameters is required or not.

The rainfall-runoff data are processed by a subroutine PRECIP. These data are properly arranged and their units are specified. The rainfall is partitioned into (1) the effective rainfall, and (2) the portion not contributing to direct runoff. This requires a two-step computation. First, the volume of the effective rainfall, which by virtue of continuity equals the volume of direct runoff, is to be computed. Second, the ERH is determined. To that end, a subroutine CURVE is designed which employs such basin surfacial characteristics as vegetation cover, land use, and soil type. This computes an integrated curve number for the entire basin which is an indicator of its runoff producing efficiency. This number is then included in another subroutine RUNOFF which actually computes the volume of direct runoff by employing the SCS hypothesis. On the other hand, the stream flow hydrograph is separated into direct runoff and base flow by a subroutine HSEP. This also then computes the volume of direct



Figure 1. **Components of Watershed Hydrology Simulation Model**



Figure 2. Computer flow chart of WAHS model

runoff. Thus, in this manner, the volume of direct runoff is obtained in two ways: (1) by the SCS method, and (2) by the hydrograph separation.

The effective rainfall is computed by utilizing the subroutine INFIL. The time difference between the start of the effective rainfall and that of the direct runoff is noted. To represent the portion of rainfall not contributing to direct runoff, a subroutine INFIL is included. This computes infiltration capacity as a function of time using the two-term Philip infiltration model. The infiltration model has two parameters: sorptivity and saturated hydraulic conductivity. The former is determined for each rainfall-runoff event by a volume balance technique. The latter is specified for each watershed and is assumed constant from one event to another. These computations are carried out in the subroutine NEWTON.

The basin characteristics are analyzed by a subroutine BASIN. The principal geomorphologic characteristics are: (1) basin area, (2) drainage area of channels, (3) channel lengths, and (4) number of channels of a specified order. This subroutine estimates mean lengths of and areas required by channels of a given order. Another subroutine LAG computes the basin lag utilizing basin area.

The mean holding times of overland flow and channel flow are computed by a subroutine HOLD. The instantaneous unit hydrograph is computed by a subroutine IUH. The IUH is then convoluted with the ERH obtained from the subroutine PRECIP by the subroutine CONVOL to obtain the direct runoff hydrograph. This subroutine also compares computed runoff hydrograph with the corresponding observed hydrograph and computes error of prediction.

The subroutine EXOP provides pertinent information required by the optimization algorithm, including specification of initial guesses, upper and lower bounds on parameter values, number of stage searches, and convergence limit. The subroutine OBJECT specifies the objective function to be used in optimization of model parameters. The objective function is defined as the sum of squares of deviations between observed and computed discharge peaks and their times of occurrence. Optimization of parameters is performed by subroutine BROSEN which combines the original Rosenbrock method, the Palmer version and the penalty function constrained minimization problem requiring the vector always to be an interior point of the feasible set.

2.4 Important Features of the Model

The most important feature of the model is that it takes into account the drainage network properties. This feature suggests that the model may be applicable to ungauged basins with relative ease and produce superior results. This feature also makes it possible to carry out flood hydrograph computations and can be extended to frequency estimation without making unrealistic assumptions about basin representation.

With the use of the various parameters representing the drainage network properties, only a few parameters are left to be decided by trial & error or by optimization techniques. Therefore, the model can be applied to a new catchment with relatively more confidence if certain basic information is available.

2.5 Data requirement

The data requirement of the model can be classified into two broad groups .

1. hydrological data and
2. data based on geomorphology of the basin

Under hydrological data, the data required include rainfall hyetograph, saturated hydraulic conductivity, observed runoff hydrograph for calculating volume of direct runoff or soil cover complex data to calculate volume of direct runoff by SCS method.

The rainfall data can be supplied in units such as mm, cm or inches and runoff data can be supplied in cusecs or cumecs or cm or inch. A suitable control is also supplied to the model to understand the proper units of data supplied.

The principal geomorphological characteristics needed are basin area, areas of overland regions, channel length, number of channels, basin order, and path matrix of the basin. The length parameters are given in km and area in square kilometers respectively.

3.0 THE STUDY AREA

The Hemavati, a tributary to Cauvery, takes its origin near Darali in Mudigere taluk of Chikmangalur district in Karnataka and follows south easterly course in the study area which comprises of the 632.1 sq.km. head water catchment of the Hemavati defined by the WRDO gauging site at Sakleshpur.The Hemavati basin up to Sakleshpur lies between 12°55′ and 13°11′ north latitude and 75°20′ and 75°51′ east longitude in the south western parts of Chickmaglur and Hassan districts. The area is a typical example of monsoon type of climate. It is a hilly catchment with steep to moderate slopes. The area is covered under survey of India toposheet No.48 0 and 48 P. Fig. 3 shows the map of the study area .

The basin Hemavati up to Sakleshpur is a fourth order basin having drainage area of 632.1 sq.km. The tree structure of the basin is given in Fig. 4. Table 3.1 shows the drainage properties of the basin. Fig. 5 shows the overland-channel flow path network of the basin . Detailed geomorphological properties of the study basin are given in Technical Report No. 127 (Jain, 1992,) of National Institute of Hydrology, Roorkee.



FIG. 3-HEMAVATI UPTO SAKLESHPUR BASIN



FIG.4. TREE STRUCTURE RERESENTING STREAM NETWORK OF HEMAVATI (UPTO SAKLESHPUR) BASIN

Table 3.1: Drainage Network Properties of Hemavati upto Sakleshpur Basin.
(Watershed Drainage Area = 632.1 Sq. Km.)

Serial Number	Channel length Kilometers	Contributing Area Square Kilometers
<u>Order 1</u>		
1.	2.730	6.90
2.	1.830	3.10
3.	3.753	5.60
4.	2.470	5.60
5.	2.660	6.30
6.	2.620	8.10
7.	4.930	18.10
8.	2.000	1.90
9.	1.760	3.80
10.	2.910	3.10
11.	2.850	3.10
12.	2.320	1.90
13.	1.330	5.00
14.	2.500	5.10
15.	3.560	6.30
16.	6.780	5.00
17.	5.480	4.10
18.	2.230	9.40
19.	2.690	8.80
20.	1.900	3.10
21.	2.150	5.00
22.	1.950	3.80
23.	1.820	3.10
24.	1.620	1.90
25.	7.180	14.40
26.	3.230	5.60
27.	1.590	6.30
28.	1.740	1.30
29.	1.180	2.50
30.	1.930	4.40
31.	1.450	1.90
32.	5.730	3.10
33.	6.920	10.00
34.	3.770	11.30
35.	2.010	8.10
36.	1.830	3.10
37.	1.470	3.10
38.	4.240	3.10
39.	2.930	8.10

40.	3.660	6.90
41.	1.910	3.40
42.	1.300	4.40
43.	1.730	4.40
44.	3.660	6.90
45.	4.270	5.00
46.	3.130	3.10
47.	2.000	7.50
48.	4.620	6.90
49.	4.560	5.60
50.	2.410	6.30
51.	3.010	12.50
52.	6.230	11.30
53.	5.460	4.40
54.	2.540	3.80
55.	1.780	3.10

Order 2

1.	14.230	35.80
2.	6.560	11.00
3.	10.140	15.50
4.	5.700	10.00
5.	11.450	23.10
6.	8.700	17.90
7.	4.460	10.00
8.	1.810	3.80
9.	0.820	0.60
10.	5.020	13.60
11.	2.000	1.30
12.	9.700	14.00
13.	6.360	15.30
14.	3.687	9.60

Order 3

1.	4.360	10.90
2.	1.900	7.80
3.	5.230	12.80
4.	12.420	22.80
5.	0.955	2.00

Order 4

1.	29.395	84.40

Path S_1 : $r_1 \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_2 \longrightarrow C_3 \longrightarrow C_4 \longrightarrow C_5$

Path S_2 : $r_1 \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_3 \longrightarrow C_4 \longrightarrow C_5$

Path S_3 : $r_1 \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_4 \longrightarrow C_5$

Path S_4 : $r_1 \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_2 \longrightarrow C_4 \longrightarrow C_5$

Path S_5 : $r_2 \longrightarrow C_2 \longrightarrow C_3 \longrightarrow C_4 \longrightarrow C_5$

Path S_6 : $r_2 \longrightarrow C_2 \longrightarrow C_4 \longrightarrow C_5$

Path S_7 : $r_3 \longrightarrow C_3 \longrightarrow C_4 \longrightarrow C_5$

Path S_8 : $r_4 \longrightarrow C_4 \longrightarrow C_5$

C_5 denotes trapping state
r_i denotes overland region
C_i denotes channel element

Fig. 5 Overland-channel flow path structure of the basin.

4.0 PROCESSING AND PREPARATION OF DATA

4.1 Selection of the Events

The rainfall runoff records of the catchment from 1977 to 1980 were available and analyzed. Flood events which recorded peak flood more than 120 cumecs were identified. Out of the identified events, the single peaked and well shaped hydrographs were selected by plotting discharge vs. time on simple graph paper.The different identified flood events along with observed peaks are given in table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Selected Flood Events at Gauging Site at Sakleshpur

Event No.	Date of event	Observed DSRO peak (cumecs)
1	28.6 - 02.7.1977	129.0
2	04.7 - 10.7.1977	152.1
3	20.7 - 29.7.1977	191.2
4	01.9 - 06.9.1977	175.0
5	15.6 - 18.6.1978	87.8
6	23.6 - 27.6.1978	363.0
7	11.7 - 14.7.1978	316.2
8	26.6 - 29.6.1979	323.8
9	06.6 - 09.6.1980	101.5
10	19.6 - 26.6.1980	373.2
11	30.6 - 06.7.1980	1029.4
12	08.7 - 10.7.1980	829.0

4.2 Processing of Rainfall Data

The rainfall data observed at Mudigere, Kotigere, Sakleshpur, Hanbal and Arehalli are being used for the study. Out of these five rain gauge stations, the first these stations, namely Mudigere, Kotigere and Sakleshpur are self recording (SRRG) stations and Hanbal and Arehalli are non-recording (ORG) stations. The hourly data at all the three SRRG's is available for most of the duration of the study i.e. 1980.

The rainfall pattern observed at all the three stations were studied and it was found that there is considerable variation in the pattern of rainfall observed at various stations. This is mainly observed at various stations. This is mainly due to orographic effects observed in mountainous areas. By analyzing the rainfall pattern closely, it was noticed that the rainfall pattern observed at Hanbal and Arehalli is similar as of Kotigere and Mudigere respectively. To take care of the orography of the basin, the daily rainfall data observed at Hanbal and Arehalli were distributed into hourly data in accordance with the hourly data observed at Kotigere and Mudigere respectively. The Thiessen weights for each raingague station. were calculated and weighted average hourly rainfall for the catchment is calculated by employing Thiessen method. Table 4.2 shows the thiessen weights for the raingauges and fig. 3 shows the location of raingauges.

Table 4.2 Thiessen Weights of Various Rain Gauge Stations

Name of Station	Area Represented Square Kilometer	Weight
Arehalli	208.59	0.33
Hanbal	101.14	0.16
Kotigere	107.46	0.17
Mudigere	158.02	0.25
Sakleshpur	56.89	0.09

4.3 Preparation of Data File

The data file was prepared according to the input requirement of the WAHS model. The input data file can be divided in to three sections. Ist section contains details about Geomorphological properties of the basin. This section also contain details about optimization switch and land use and soil type information in case if volume of direct runoff is to be computed by SCS method.

The second section of the data file read information about parameter optimization, If optimization of parameters is desired then it need information about number of parameters to be optimized, their initial values, upper and lower limit of the parameter value, convergence criterion, weighing factor used for optimization. If optimization of the parameters is not needed then value of the parameter is read in this section. This section also read information about how many events are to be used for optimization of the model parameters.

The third section of the data file contains details of rainfall runoff events. It reads information about unit of measurements, number of rainfall readings. Before reading runoff reading it read information about whether base flow Separation is required or not, method to compute volume of direct runoff, if direct runoff is to be computed by SCS method then antecedent soil moisture conditions for each event are to be specified. This part contains details about all the events used in the study sequentially.

5.0 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

As reported earlier, the model has the capability to compute the volume of direct runoff by two methods, the SCS method and hydrograph separation method. In this study, second method i.e. hydrograph separation method was employed to compute the volume of direct runoff. Infiltration for each rainfall runoff event was determined by using Philip two term infiltration model (Philip 1968). The parameter A depends on the soil type and therefore fixed for a given basin. The value of A was taken as 0.29 cm/hr. (0.07 m/day) for this study. By employing this technique, we test the shape, peak and time to peak predicted by the model by comparing it with the observed hydrographs.

In all a total of 12 events have been identified for model calibration and testing (validation). Out of these 12 events listed in table 4.1, events no. 1 to 6 were used for calibration of the model and remaining 6 events were used for testing the model performance. The only parameter 'b' in the lag-area relation was optimized using Rosenbrock Palmer optimization algorithm available in the model. The other parameter which is exponent in the lag-area relationship was fixed as 0.38 as proposed by Body (1979). After successful execution of the model, the value of the parameter 'b' was found to be 2.5067. Using these parameters value, the IUH was determined for the study basin. The ordinates of IUH are given in table 5.1 and IUH is shown in fig. 6. Table 5.2 gives the value of observed and computed peak discharge and their relative error for calibration.

Table 5.1 IUH of Hemavati at Sakleshpur

Time HR	h(t) 1/HR	Time HR	h(t) 1/HR	Time HR	h(t) 1/HR	Time HR	h(t) 1/HR
0	0.0000	3	0.0100	6	0.0150	9	0.0190
12	0.0223	15	0.0244	18	0.0254	21	0.0253
24	0.0244	27	0.0228	30	0.0208	33	0.0187
36	0.0165	39	0.0143	42	0.0123	45	0.0105
48	0.0089	51	0.0074	54	0.0062	57	0.0051
60	0.0042	63	0.0035	66	0.0028	69	0.0023
72	0.0019	75	0.0015	78	0.0012		

Table 5.2 Relative errors in peak discharge for calibration

Event No.	Observed (cumecs)	Computed (cumecs)	Relative error
1	129.0	105.35	0.183
2	252.1	334.13	- 0.325
3	191.2	221.41	- 0.158
4	175.0	154.70	0.116
5	87.8	70.00	0.201
6	362.0	235.30	0.350

It may be seen that the computed and observed values of the peak discharge match reasonably well in most of the events. The relative errors in the time of occurrence for the peak is illustrated in table 5.3.



Fig. 6 IUH of Hemavati Basin

Table 5.3 Relative errors in time to peak discharge for calibration

Event No.	Observed (hour)	Computed (hour)	Relative error
1	48	30	0.375
2	63	54	0.143
3	99	114	- 0.152
4	48	57	- 0.188
5	39	18	0.538
6	45	42	0.067

The calibrated model has been used to simulate the flood hydrograph for remaining events (events no. 7 to 12 , table 4.1). The values of relative errors in the computed rates of peak discharges for various test events is summarized in table 5.4 .

Table 5.4 Relative errors in peak discharge for validation

Event No.	Observed (cumecs)	Computed (cumecs)	Relative error
7	316.20	250.03	0.21
8	323.80	326.05	- 0.01
9	101.50	102.50	- 0.01
10	373.25	363.98	0.02
11	1029.40	1201.34	- 0.17
12	829.00	657.34	0.21

Fig. 7 to 12 show the observed and computed flood hydrographs for different events. It may be seen that computed and observed values of the peak discharges match reasonably well in most of the events. The relative errors in the time of occurrence of peak is illustrated in table 5.5 .

Table 5.5 Relative errors in time to peak discharge for validation

Event No.	Observed (hour)	Computed (hour)	Relative error
7	30	51	- 0.70
8	33	34	0.00
9	42	21	0.50
10	66	39	0.41
11	66	69	- 0.05
12	48	60	- 0.25

The results indicate that in general the model has simulated the flood hydrograph reasonably well. Even in case of complex hydrograph, the model has been found to be capable of predicting the shape of the hydrograph reasonably well.



Fig 7. Observed and computed hydrograph (event no. 7)



Fig. 8 Observed and computed hydrograph (event no. 8)



Fig. 9 Observed and computed hydrograph (event no. 9)



Fig.10 Observed and computed hydrograph (event no. 10)



Fig.11 Observed and computed hydrograph (event no.11)



Fig.12 Observed and computed hydrograph (event no.12)

6.0 Summary and Concluding Remarks

The Watershed Hydrology Simulation (WAHS) model which primarily uses the geomorphological characteristics of the basin for derivation of the IUH of the basin was successfully applied for simulation flood events of river Hemavati at Sakleshpur. The results of the simulation of the flood events indicate that the model can be very effectively used for estimation reasonable accurate values of peak floods as well as complete flood hydrograph. Of course, in a few events the errors were found to be quite considerable both in terms of magnitude of flood peak as well as the time of its occurrence. One of the reasons may be attributed to the fact the rainfall variations within the basin are quite significant. Further, sufficient number of flood events having the observed record of rainfall and discharge data at desired interval were not available and the model calibration was done with relatively few events.

Keeping in view the above facts, the results of simulation from the model can be rated as reasonably good particularly in view of the fact that only one parameter of the model was optimized and all other information were estimated from geomorphological characteristics and other hydrological data of the basin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

Thanks are due to Dr.S.M.Seth, Director, National Institute of Hydrology for providing opportunity to carry out this study. Thanks are also due to Dr.Vijay P.Singh, Professor, Louisiana State University, USA, for help and guidance during the course of study. In last but not least, thanks are due to those all directly or indirectly associated with this study.

References

Boyd, M.J.,1978 "A storage routing model relating drainage basin hydrology and geomorphology", Water Resources Research, Vol.14, No.5, pp 921-928

Boyd, M.J., Pilgrim, D.H., and Cordery, I., 1979 "A storage routing model based on catchment geomorphology", Journal of Hydrology, Vol42, pp.209-230.

Dooge, J. C. I. 1973 "Linear theory of hydrologic systems", Technical Bulletin No.1468 , Agricultural Research Service, US Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

Feller, W.1971 "An introduction to probability theory and its applications", Vol.2, John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Gupta, V.K., Waymire, E., and Wang, C.T. 1980 "A representation of an instantaneous unit hydrograph from geomorphology", Water Resources Research, Vol.16, no.5, pp 855-862.

Jain, M.K. 1992. Geomorphological Characteristics of Western Ghats Part III Hemavati (upto Sakleshpur) Basin. TR-127. National Institute of Hydrology, Roorkee.

Nash, J.E., and Foley, J.J. 1982 "Linear models of surface runoff systems", V.P. Singh, ed., Rainfall runoff relationship, Water Resources Publications, Littleton, Co.

Palmer, J.R. 1969, "An improved procedure for Orthogonalizing the search vectors in Rosenbrock and Swann's direct search optimization methods", Computer Journal, Vol.12, pp, 69-71

Philip, J.R. 1969, "Theory of infiltration", Advances in Hydroscience, Vol.5, pp. 215-296.

Rodriguez Iturbe, I. 1982 "The coupling of climate and geomorphology in rainfall runoff analysis ", V.P. Singh, ed., Rainfall Runoff Analysis, Water Resources Publications, Littleton, Co.

Rodriguez Iturbe, I., Devoto, G., and Valdes, J.B. 1979 "Discharge response analysis and hydrologic similarity - the Interrelation between the geomorphologic IUH and the storm characteristics ", Water Resources Research, Vol15, No.6, pp. 1435-1444.

Rodriguez Iturbe, I., and Valdes, J.B. 1979. "The geomorphologic structure of hydrologic response," Water Resources Research, Vol.15, no.6.

Rosenbrock, H.H. 1960 "An automatic method for finding the greatest or least value of a function", Computer Journal, Vol. 4, pp. 175-184.

Sherman,B., and Singh V.P. 1976a "A distributed converging overland flow model. 1, Mathematical solutions", Water Resources Research, Vol.12 no.15. pp. 889-896

Sherman,B., and Singh V.P. 1976b "A distributed converging overland flow model. 2, "Effect of Infiltration",Water Resources Research, Vol.12 no.15. pp. 898-901.

Singh V.P. (1989) "Military hydrology report 17, A quasi-conceptual linear model for synthesis of direct runoff with potential application to ungauged basin".Miscellaneous paper EL.79-6, Prepared by Mississippi State University, Starkville, MS, for the US. Army Engineers Waterways Experimental Station, Vicksburg, MS, USA.

Smith, R.E., and Woolhiser, D.A.1971."Overland flow on a infiltrating surface", Water Resources Research,Vol.7,No.4,pp. 899-913.

Valdes, J.B. ,Fiallo, Y., and Rodriguez-Iturbe, I. 1979."A rainfall-runoff analysis of the geomorphologic IUH", Water Resources Research,Vol.15, No.6, pp 1421-1435.

Wang, C.T., Gupta, V.K., and Waymire, E. 1981,"A geomorphologic synthesis of nonlinearity in surface runoff", Water Resources Research, Vol.17, No.3, pp 545-554.

Woolhiser, D.A. 1982 "Physically based models of watershed runoff", V.P. Singh, ed., Rainfall-runoff relationship, Water Resources Publications, Littleton, Co.

DIRECTOR : S M SETH

STUDY GROUP : MANOJ KUMAR JAIN
K S RAMASASTRI

ASSISTANCE : NARESH KUMAR