

**EVALUATION OF THE EFFECT OF LOSS AND
TRANSFORM METHODS ON THE PERFORMANCE
OF HEC-HMS MODEL: A CASE STUDY IN
KELANI RIVER BASIN, SRI LANKA**

Chathurgika Dulani Kothalawala

179238X

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

August 2022

**EVALUATION OF THE EFFECT OF LOSS AND
TRANSFORM METHODS ON THE PERFORMANCE
OF HEC-HMS MODEL: A CASE STUDY IN
KELANI RIVER BASIN, SRI LANKA**

Chathurgika Dulani Kothalawala

179238X

Supervised by

Prof. R. L. H. L. Rajapakse

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
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

August 2022

DECLARATION OF THE CANDIDATE AND SUPERVISOR

“I declare that this is my own work, and this thesis/dissertation 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).

UOM Verified Signature

12/08/2022

Chathurgika Dulani Kothalawala

Date

The above candidate has carried out research for the Master’s Thesis/Dissertation under my supervision.

UOM Verified Signature

2022-08-12

Prof. R. L. H. L. Rajapakse

Date

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of the Effect of Loss and Transform Methods on the Performance of HEC-HMS Model: A Case Study in Kelani River Basin, Sri Lanka

Hydrological modelling plays a vital role in understanding the hydrological system of any watershed and providing reliable data to manage the water resources of the relevant watershed in a sustainable manner. Among the numerous types of hydrological models, HEC-HMS is very popular among hydrologic modellers due to its user-friendliness. Different methods are available in HEC-HMS to compute the hydrological process in a relevant watershed and the selection of appropriate methods among different available methods plays an important role in the performance of the model.

The objective of this study is to select the most suitable loss and transform methods for Kelani river basin, comparing different combinations of selected loss and transform methods available for event-based simulations. Seethawaka subbasin was selected as the study area. From the possible methods embedded in the HEC-HMS, two loss methods (SCS Curve Number method, Initial Constant method) and three transform methods (SCS Unit Hydrograph method, Clark Unit Hydrograph method, Snyder Unit Hydrograph method) were selected for this study. Six (06) different combinations using those loss and transform methods were tried out to evaluate the performance of the model. Percent Error in Peak (PEP) and Percent Error in Volume (PEV) objective functions were selected for this study to determine the performance of the model. Hourly rainfall and streamflow data for four (04) extreme flood events (May 2014, May 2016, May 2017, May 2018) which occurred in the recent past were used in this study as this is an event-based simulation. The 2018 flood event was used for the model calibration and other three events were used for the validation of the calibrated model.

Combination 01 (SCS-CN Loss Method and SCS-UH Transform Method) shows a better performance compared to other combinations w.r.t both PEP and PEV objective functions. N.S.E. and RMSE values were reported as 0.816 and 0.400 after calibrated w.r.t PEP objective function and as 0.830 and 0.400 after calibrated w.r.t. PEV objective function. Even considering the validation results, it was confirmed that Combination 01 shows the best results among all the 06 combinations.

It can be concluded that the SCS-CN loss method and SCS-UH transform method provides more reliable estimates w.r.t. both PEP and PEV objective functions in streamflow forecasting in Kelani river using HEC-HMS. Considering the ability of the model to predict the peak discharge and the time to peak, this developed model can be used to provide early flood warnings to the Deraniyagala area during extreme rainfall events as well.

Keywords: Event-based simulation, HEC-HMS, Hydrological modelling, Seethawaka river basin

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my research supervisor Prof. R.L.H. Lalith Rajapakse for the continuous guidance, support and encouragement given throughout my research work. His patient guidance and dedicated supervision were the key factors in the success of this study. I take this chance to declare my heartfelt thankfulness to my research supervisor for spending his valuable time for me to succeed in my research work.

Even though he is not in that position currently, I must thank Senior Professor N.T.S. Wijesekara, the former Centre Chairman of the UNESCO Madanjeet Singh Center for South Asia Water Management (UMCSAWM) for his valuable guidance given throughout my study period. I must thank my batchmates including N.L. Engiliyage, M.A.D.N. Ariyasena and S.P.S.P. Kulathunga for the immense support and motivation which was given by them through out the research work as well as the master degree program. The staff of UMCSAWM should also be heartfully remembered at this moment for providing all the necessary assistance and support during the study period. Besides, I would like to thank my office colleagues including G.H.R de Silva who motivated and helped me in many ways to successfully complete my research work.

Finally, my special thanks go to my family members including my mother and husband for their unconditional love, support and encouragement given throughout my study period. Without their support and motivation, this work would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION OF THE CANDIDATE AND SUPERVISOR.....	III
ABSTRACT.....	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	VII
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	IX
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XIII
LIST OF TABLES.....	XV
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 General.....	1
1.1.1 Hydrological Modelling in Sri Lanka.....	2
1.1.2 Why HEC-HMS?	3
1.1.3 Kelani River Basin	5
1.2 Problem Statement.....	5
1.3 Overall Objective.....	6
1.4 Specific Objectives	6
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 Hydrological Modelling.....	7
2.2 Classifications of Hydrological Modelling.....	8
2.3 HEC-HMS Model.....	11
2.3.1 HEC-HMS Model Structure.....	12
2.3.2 Precipitation Loss Model.....	13
2.3.3 Transform Model.....	14
2.3.4 Baseflow Model	15
2.4 Model Optimization, Calibration and Validation	17
2.4.1 Selection of Events.....	17

TABLE OF CONTENT

2.4.2	Objective Function	18
2.4.3	Selection of objective function based on the study purpose.....	21
2.4.4	Calibration and Validation Process	24
2.5	Sensitivity Analysis.....	26
2.6	Selection of Most Suitable Modelling Methods in HEC-HMS	27
2.7	Summary of the Literature Survey	35
3	METHODOLOGY	37
3.1	Methodology Outline	37
3.2	Methodology Flowchart	39
4	DATA CHECKING AND ANALYSIS.....	40
4.1	Study Area.....	40
4.2	Data Collection.....	44
4.2.1	Storm Events	44
4.3	Data Checking	45
4.3.1	Visual Data Checking.....	45
4.3.2	Thiessen Average Rainfall	46
4.4	Selection of Computing Methods.....	50
5	MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATIONS	53
5.1	HEC-HMS Model Development.....	53
5.1.1	Development of Basin Model.....	53
5.1.2	Development of Loss Model	53
5.1.3	Development of Transform Model.....	56
5.1.4	Development of Baseflow Model.....	59
5.1.5	Development of Routing Model.....	60
5.1.6	Development of Precipitation Model	61
5.1.7	Control Specifications	61
5.1.8	Simulation Time Interval	61

5.2	Selection of Objective Function.....	61
5.3	Sensitivity Analysis	62
5.4	Model Calibration	62
5.5	Model Validation	63
5.6	Selection of the Best Option	63
6	RESULTS.....	65
6.1	General.....	65
6.2	Results of Sensitivity Analysis	65
6.2.1	Combination 01 (SCS-CN Loss method and SCS-UH Transform method).....	65
6.2.2	Combination 02 (SCS-CN loss method and Clark-UH Transform method)	68
6.2.3	Combination 03 (SCS-CN Loss method and Snyder-UH Transform method)	69
6.2.4	Combination 04 (Initial Constant Loss method and SCS-UH Transform method)	70
6.2.5	Combination 05 (Initial Constant Loss method and Clark-UH Transform method)	71
6.2.6	Combination 06 (Initial Constant Loss method and Snyder-UH Transform method)..	72
6.3	Model Calibration Results	73
6.3.1	Outflow Hydrographs in Calibration Period	74
6.3.2	Flow Duration Curve for Calibration Period	76
6.4	Model Validation Results	77
6.4.1	Outflow Hydrographs in Validation Period.....	79
6.4.2	Flow Duration Curves for Validation Period	83
7	DISCUSSION	87
7.1	Event Selection	87
7.2	Data Resolution.....	87
7.3	Sensitivity Analysis	88
7.4	Model Calibration	88
7.5	Model Validation	89
7.6	Selection of the Best Combination	90

TABLE OF CONTENT

7.7 Summary of the Discussion.....	90
8 CONCLUSIONS.....	93
9 RECOMMENDATIONS	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY	97
ANNEXURE 01 : ISOHYETAL MAP OF SRI LANKA.....	105
ANNEXURE 02 : VISUAL DATA CHECKING	107
ANNEXURE 03 : CALIBRATION AND VALIDATION RESULTS.....	110

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3-1: Methodology Flowchart -----	39
Figure 4-1: Study Area -----	41
Figure 4-2: Land Use Classification of Study Area -----	42
Figure 4-3: Streamflow Vs Rainfall of Three Stations for 2018 Flood event -----	46
Figure 4-4: Thiessen Polygon for Seethawaka Watershed -----	47
Figure 4-5: Thiessen Average Rainfall Vs Streamflow for Deraniyagla Catchment for 2014 Storm Event -----	48
Figure 4-6: Thiessen Average Rainfall Vs Streamflow for Deraniyagla Catchment for 2016 Storm Event -----	48
Figure 4-7: Thiessen Average Rainfall Vs Streamflow for Deraniyagla Catchment for 2017 Storm Event -----	49
Figure 4-8: Thiessen Average Rainfall Vs Streamflow for Deraniyagla Catchment for 2018 Storm Event -----	49
Figure 5-1: Developed Basin Model -----	60
Figure 6-1: Parameter Sensitivity to Peak Discharge (Combination 01) -----	67
Figure 6-2: Parameter Sensitivity to Runoff Volume (Combination 01) -----	67
Figure 6-3: Parameter Sensitivity to Peak Discharge (Combination 02) -----	68
Figure 6-4: Parameter Sensitivity to Runoff Volume (Combination 02) -----	68
Figure 6-5: Parameter Sensitivity to Peak Discharge (Combination 03) -----	69
Figure 6-6: Parameter Sensitivity to Runoff Volume (Combination 03) -----	69
Figure 6-7: Parameter Sensitivity to Peak Discharge (Combination 04) -----	70
Figure 6-8: Parameter Sensitivity to Runoff Volume (Combination 04) -----	70
Figure 6-9: Parameter Sensitivity to Peak Discharge (Combination 05) -----	71
Figure 6-10: Parameter Sensitivity to Runoff Volume (Combination 05) -----	71
Figure 6-11: Parameter Sensitivity to Peak Discharge (Combination 06) -----	72
Figure 6-12: Parameter Sensitivity to Runoff Volume (Combination 06) -----	72
Figure 6-13: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for Combination 01 during Calibration w.r.t. PEP -----	74
Figure 6-14: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for Combination 01 during Calibration w.r.t. PEV -----	74
Figure 6-15: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for Combination 02 during Calibration w.r.t. PEP -----	75
Figure 6-16: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for the Combination 02 during Calibration w.r.t. PEV -----	75

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 6-17: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEP (Normal Scale) -----	76
Figure 6-18: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEP (Log Scale) -----	76
Figure 6-19: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEV (Normal Scale) -----	77
Figure 6-20: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEV (Log Scale) -----	77
Figure 6-21: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for Combination 01 during Validation using 2017 event w.r.t. PEP -----	80
Figure 6-22: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for Combination 01 during Validation using 2017 event w.r.t. PEV -----	80
Figure 6-23: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for Combination 01 during Validation using 2016 event w.r.t. PEP -----	81
Figure 6-24: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for Combination 01 during Validation using 2016 event w.r.t. PEV -----	81
Figure 6-25: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for Combination 01 during Validation using 2014 event w.r.t. PEP -----	82
Figure 6-26: Observed and Simulated Hydrographs for the Combination 01 during Validation using 2014 event w.r.t. PEV -----	82
Figure 6-27: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEP (Normal Scale) -----	83
Figure 6-28: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEP (Log Scale) -----	83
Figure 6-29: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEV (Normal Scale) -----	83
Figure 6-30: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEV (Log Scale) -----	84
Figure 6-31: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEP (Normal Scale) -----	84
Figure 6-32: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEP (Log Scale) -----	84
Figure 6-33: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEV (Normal Scale) -----	84
Figure 6-34: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEV (Log Scale) -----	85
Figure 6-35: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEP (Normal Scale) -----	85
Figure 6-36: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEP (Log Scale) -----	85
Figure 6-37: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEV (Normal Scale) -----	86
Figure 6-38: Flow Duration Curve for Combination 01 w.r.t. PEV (Log Scale) -----	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Literature Summary of Hydrological Model Classification.....	10
Table 2-2: Literature Summary of Computing methods of HEC-HMS model	16
Table 2-3: Literature Summary of Objective Function	23
Table 2-4: Literature summary of selection of most suitable modelling methods in HEC-HMS.....	32
Table 4-1: Locations of gauging stations in Seethawaka Catchment used for the study.....	43
Table 4-2: Land Use Classification of Seethawaka Watershed.....	43
Table 4-3: Data Sources and Resolutions.....	44
Table 4-4: Storm Event Details	45
Table 4-5: Thiessen weights for each rainfall gauging station.....	47
Table 4-6: Combination of Methods used in the Study.....	51
Table 5-1: Weighted Curve Number Calculations for each Sub-basin in Seethawaka Catchment	55
Table 5-2: Values assigned for parameters of Initial and Constant loss method.....	56
Table 5-3: Calculation of Time of Concentrations and Lag time for Subbasins	57
Table 5-4: Calculations of Storage Coefficient for each Sub-basin	58
Table 5-5: Calculation of Standard Lag time	59
Table 5-6: Calculations of Lag time in River Reaches.....	60
Table 5-7: Thiessen Weight for Each Sub-basin.....	61
Table 6-1: Results of model sensitivity to changes in Initial Abstraction parameter	66
Table 6-2: Results of model sensitivity to changes in Curve Number parameter	66
Table 6-3: Results of model sensitivity to changes in Impervious (%) parameter	66
Table 6-4: Results of model calibration with respect to PEP objective function	73
Table 6-5: Results of model calibration with respect to PEV objective function.....	73
Table 6-6: Results of model validation using 2017 event w.r.t. PEP objective function	77
Table 6-7: Results of model validation using 2017 event w.r.t. PEV objective function.....	78
Table 6-8: Results of model validation using 2016 event w.r.t. PEP objective function	78
Table 6-9: Results of model validation using 2016 event w.r.t. PEV objective function.....	78
Table 6-10: Results of model validation using 2014 event w.r.t. PEP objective function	79
Table 6-11: Results of model validation using 2014 event w.r.t. PEV objective function.....	79
Table 7-1: Final Results of the Validation	90