

AIT

Asian Institute of Technology
Bangkok Thailand

thesis No. WA - 90 - 19

RAINFALL - RUNOFF MODELING FOR UNGAGED BASINS
IN CENTRAL VIETNAM

Le Anh Tuan

**RAINFALL-RUNOFF MODELING FOR UNGAGED BASINS
IN CENTRAL VIETNAM**

by

Le Anh Tuan

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Engineering.

Examination Committee : Mr. Niels Einar Jensen (Chairman)
Dr. Guna Nidhi Paudyal (Co-Chairman)
Dr. Thian Yew Gan
Dr. Huynh Ngoc Phien

Le Anh Tuan

Nationality : Vietnamese
Previous Degree : B. Eng. Water Management
Cantho University, Vietnam
Scholarship Donor : His Majesty the King
The Royal Thai Government

Asian Institute of Technology
Bangkok, Thailand
August, 1990

ABSTRACT

Longterm hydrologic data (such as Streamflow, Rainfall, etc.) is of vital importance in the analysis, design and planning of any type of water resources project. In Central Vietnam as in other developing regions, few streams are gaged i.e. provided with a recording system. For large numbers of ungaged streams there is commonly no provision for recording data.

The NAM model was first applied in Thubon basin of Quangnam - Danang province, Central Vietnam. For the purpose of predicting the continuous runoff at ungaged basins, initially the model was applied at Thubon gaged basin as a "reference" one. Then, the model was calibrated and verified in order to gain the best fit between the computed and observed hydrographs. The verification of the calibrated NAM model was carried out also to another small basins Tamky and Lung which are located in the same region as Thubon. The rainfall and streamflow records of Lung basin have recently been gaged at the basin outlet and its data was used to validate the model.

After the calibration, the model was applied to ungaged basins (which are Truong, Khang, Lung, Tranh, and Namnim basins) without calibration by transferring calibrated parameter values of a gauged basin after being adjusted according to the area characteristics of the ungaged basin. Sensitivity analysis of some parameters was also carried out to investigate the effect of these parameters on the model simulation and to increase the efficiency of the calibration process.

It was found that prospects of model's applicability to daily streamflow estimation is promising in Quangnam - Danang province, Central Vietnam and the model is inevitably a good engineering tool for the prediction of annual discharge. It can be used as a tool for water resources investigations in small basins.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his profound gratitude to his esteemed advisers Mr. Niels Einar Jensen and Dr. Guna Nidhi Paudyal for the invaluable guidance, advice and continuous encouragement that they have given him in the completion of this study.

The author wishes to express his sincere thanks to Dr. Thian Yew Gan and Dr. Huynh Ngoc Phien for giving useful comments, suggestions and kindly acting as members of the thesis committee.

The author wishes to thank His Majesty the King of Thailand for providing the financial support, which enabled the author to study at the Asian Institute of Technology. His sincere thanks are also due to World Vision International and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) for supporting finance for this study.

Credit is also due to the Hydraulic Service Department of Quangnam - Danang province for providing necessary data and information.

Sincere thanks are due to the Division of Water Resources Engineering, AIT for providing useful facilities associated with this study.

Finally, deep gratitude is expressed to the author's parents, wife and son, and friends for their moral and spiritual supports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Title	Page
	ABSTRACT	ii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
	LIST OF TABLES	vi
	LIST OF FIGURES	vii
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xii
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Introduction of the Problem	1
	1.2 Objective and Scope of Work	1
	1.3 General Approach	2
II	LITERATURE REVIEW	3
III	THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	6
	3.1 Concept of Water Balance Equation	6
	3.2 The NAM Model	6
	3.2.1 Snow Routine	7
	3.2.2 Surface Storage	7
	3.2.3 Lower zone Storage	8
	3.2.4 Time Constant for Routing	10
	3.3 Model Parameters	10
	3.3.1 Storage Capacities	10
	3.3.2 Overland Flow Runoff Coefficient	11
	3.3.3 Time Constant for Interflow	11
	3.3.4 Baseflow Parameters	11
	3.3.5 Capillary Flux	12
	3.3.6 Threshold Value	12
	3.3.7 Time Constants for Overland Flow Routing	12
	3.4 Model Calibration and Verification	13
	3.4.1 Model Calibration	13
	3.4.2 Model Verification	13
	3.5 Data Requirements	14
	3.6 Test of Goodness of Fit	14
	3.4.1 Statistical Criteria	14
	3.4.2 Criteria for Peak Rate and Water Balance	16
IV	DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA AND DATA USED	20

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Contd)

Chapter	Title	Page
	4.1 Description of Study Area	20
	4.1.1 General	20
	4.1.2 Topography and Geology	21
	4.1.3 Soil and Vegetation	21
	4.2 Data Used	22
	4.2.1 Rainfall Data	22
	4.2.2 Potential Evapotranspiration Data	23
	4.2.3 Discharge Data	24
	4.3 Program Used	24
	4.3.1 Model Parameters	24
	4.3.2 Initial Conditions	27
V	PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	47
	5.1 General Viewpoint	47
	5.2 Calibration of the Model	47
	5.2.1 Model Parameters	48
	5.2.2 Initial Conditions	48
	5.3 Application of the Model to Ungaged Basin	48
	5.3.1 Transfer from Gaged Basin	48
	5.3.2 Recalibration	49
	5.3.3 By adjustment of Time Constants	49
	5.4 Simulation of Water Balance	49
	5.5 Simulation of Peak Discharge	49
	5.6 Simulation of Baseflow	50
	5.7 Statistical Evaluation of the Results	50
	5.8 Parameter Sensitivity	51
	5.9 Discussion	52
	5.10 Sources of Errors	53
VI	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	63
VII	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES	64
	REFERENCES	65
	APPENDIX A	67
	APPENDIX B	93
	APPENDIX C	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
4.1	Basin Names Referred in the Study	28
4.2	Weight Percentage of Rainfall Stations	28
4.3	Location of Meteorological Stations	29
4.4	Moisture Content for 11 Soil Textural Classes	30
4.5	Groundwater Table Depth Corresponding to a Capillary Flux of 1 mm/day for 20 Soil Types	31
5.1	NAM Model Parameters	55
5.2	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Yearly Flow	56
5.3	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Peak Discharge and Time of Peak	56
5.4	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Monthly Flow during Dry Season	57
5.5	Statistical Evaluation of the Results	58
5.6	Parameter Sensitivity Analysis	58

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Title	Page
3.1	Structure of the NAM Model	18
3.2(a)	The Physical Meaning of the Parameter GWLBF.	19
3.2(b)	The Annual Variation of GWLBF.	19
3.3	The Function of the Threshold Value from the Overland Flow Equation (3.2)	19
4.1	Location Map	32
4.2	Location of Hydrometeorological Stations in Thubon	33
4.3(a)	Map of Sub-basins under Study	34
4.3(b)	Map of Sub-basins under Study	35
4.4	Lung Basin Map	36
4.5	Tamky Basin Map	37
4.6	General Landscape of the Study Area	38
4.7	Soil in the Study Area	39
4.8	Streamflow of Lung River	40
4.9	Measurement of Streamflows in Lung river	41
4.10	Mean Monthly Temperature in Thubon	42
4.11	Yearly Rainfall in Thubon Basin	42
4.12(a)	Monthly Rainfall in Thubon Basin (1979)	43
4.12(b)	Monthly Rainfall in Thubon Basin (1980)	43
4.12(c)	Monthly Rainfall in Thubon Basin (1981)	44
4.12(d)	Monthly Rainfall in Thubon Basin (1982)	44
4.12(e)	Monthly Rainfall in Thubon Basin (1983)	45
4.12(f)	Monthly Rainfall in Thubon Basin (1984)	45

LIST OF FIGURES (Contd)

Figure	Title	Page
4.13	Polygonal Subareas Constructed under Thiessen Diagram	46
5.1	Comparison of Qobs. & Qsim. with the variation of U_{max}	59
5.2	Comparison of Qobs. & Qsim. with the variation of L_{max}	60
5.3	Comparison of Qobs. & Qsim. with the variation of CQ_{of}	61
5.4	Comparison of Qobs. & Qsim. with the variation of $CK_1 = CK_2$	62
5.5	Dry Period Flow-Depth in Thubon	63
A.1(a)	Rainfall in Thubon from 1/4/1979 to 31/3/1980	69
A.1(b)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Hydrographs (Thubon basin, Cal. period 1/4/1979 - 31/3/1980)	69
A.1(c)	Cumulative Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Calibration period 1/4/1979 - 31/3/1980)	70
A.1(d)	Difference between Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Calibration period 1/4/1979 - 31/3/1980)	70
A.1(e)	Overland Flow Component in Thubon 1979 under NAM	71
A.1(f)	Interflow and Baseflow in Thubon 1979 under NAM	71
A.1(g)	Rel. moisture contents of L and U in Thubon 1979	72
A.1(h)	Groundwater in Thubon 1979 under NAM	72
A.2(a)	Rainfall in Thubon from 1/4/1980 to 31/3/1981	73
A.2(b)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Hydrographs (Thubon basin, Cal. period 1/4/1979 - 31/3/1980)	73
A.2(c)	Cumulative Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Calibration period 1/4/1980 - 31/3/1981)	74
A.2(d)	Difference between Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Calibration period 1/4/1980 - 31/3/1981)	74

LIST OF FIGURES (Contd)

Figure	Title	Page
A.2(e)	Overland Flow Component in Thubon 1980 under NAM	75
A.2(f)	Interflow and Baseflow in Thubon 1980 under NAM	75
A.2(g)	Rel. moisture contents of L and U in Thubon 1980	76
A.2(h)	Groundwater in Thubon 1980 under NAM	76
A.3(a)	Rainfall in Thubon from 1/4/1981 to 31/3/1982	77
A.3(b)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Hydrographs (Thubon basin, Cal. period 1/4/1981 - 31/3/1982)	77
A.3(c)	Cumulative Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Calibration period 1/4/1981 - 31/3/1982)	78
A.3(d)	Difference between Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Calibration period 1/4/1981 -31/3/1982)	78
A.3(e)	Overland Flow Component in Thubon 1981 under NAM	79
A.3(f)	Interflow and Baseflow in Thubon 1981 under NAM	79
A.3(g)	Rel. moisture contents of L and U in Thubon 1981	80
A.3(h)	Groundwater in Thubon 1981 under NAM	80
A.4(a)	Rainfall in Thubon from 1/4/1982 to 31/3/1983	81
A.4(b)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Hydrographs (Thubon basin, Cal. period 1/4/1982 - 31/3/1983)	81
A.4(c)	Cumulative Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Calibration period 1/4/1982 - 31/3/1983)	82
A.4(d)	Difference between Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Calibration period 1/4/1982 -31/3/1983)	82
A.4(e)	Overland Flow Component in Thubon 1982 under NAM	83
A.4(f)	Interflow and Baseflow in Thubon 1982 under NAM	83
A.4(g)	Rel. moisture contents of L and U in Thubon 1982	84
A.4(h)	Groundwater in Thubon 1982 under NAM	84

LIST OF FIGURES (Contd)

Figure	Title	Page
A.5(a)	Rainfall in Thubon from 1/4/1983 to 31/3/1984	85
A.5(b)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Hydrographs (Thubon basin, Ver. period 1/4/1983 - 31/3/1984)	85
A.5(c)	Cumulative Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Verification period 1/4/1983 - 31/3/1984)	86
A.5(d)	Difference between Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Verification period 1/4/1983 -31/3/1984)	86
A.5(e)	Overland Flow Component in Thubon 1983 under NAM	87
A.5(f)	Interflow and Baseflow in Thubon 1983 under NAM	87
A.5(g)	Rel. moisture contents of L and U in Thubon 1983	88
A.5(h)	Groundwater in Thubon 1983 under NAM	88
A.6(a)	Rainfall in Thubon from 1/4/1984 to 31/3/1985	89
A.6(b)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Hydrographs (Thubon basin, Ver. period 1/4/1984 - 31/3/1985)	89
A.6(c)	Cumulative Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Verification period 1/4/1984 - 31/3/1985)	90
A.6(d)	Difference between Qob. & Qsim. in Thubon (Verification period 1/4/1984 -31/3/1985)	90
A.6(e)	Overland Flow Component in Thubon 1984 under NAM	91
A.6(f)	Interflow and Baseflow in Thubon 1984 under NAM	91
A.6(g)	Rel. moisture contents of L and U in Thubon 1984	92
A.6(h)	Groundwater in Thubon 1984 under NAM	92
B.1(a)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Runoff in Tamky (Case "Transfer all parameters ...)	94
B.1(b)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Runoff in Tamky (Case "Recalibration", ...)	94
B.1(c)	Rainfall in Tamky from 1/1/1978 to 31/3/1978	95

LIST OF FIGURES (Contd)

Figure	Title	Page
B.1(d)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Hydrographs (Tamky basin, Cal. period 1/1/1978 - 31/12/1978)	95
B.1(e)	Cumulative Qob. & Qsim. in Tamky (Calculation period 1/1/1978 - 31/12/1978)	96
B.1(f)	Difference between Qob. & Qsim. in Tamky (Calculation period 1/1/1978 - 31/12/1978)	96
B.2(a)	Rainfall in Lung from 1/11/1989 to 30/4/1990	97
B.2(b)	Comparison of Observed and Simulated Hydrographs (Lung basin, Cal. period 1/11/1989 - 30/4/1990)	97
B.2(c)	Cumulative Qob. & Qsim. in Lung (Calculation period 1/11/1989 - 30/4/1990)	98
B.2(d)	Difference between Qob. & Qsim. in Lung (Calculation period 1/11/1989 - 30/4/1990)	98
C.1(a)	Rainfall in Truong from 1/4/1979 to 31/4/1985	100
C.1(b)	Runoff Prediction Hydrograph for Truong basin (from 1/4/1989 to 31/3/1985)	100
C.2(a)	Rainfall in Khang from 1/4/1979 to 31/4/1985	101
C.2(b)	Runoff Prediction Hydrograph for Khang basin (from 1/4/1989 to 31/3/1985)	101
C.3(a)	Rainfall in Lung from 1/4/1979 to 31/4/1985	102
C.3(b)	Runoff Prediction Hydrograph for Lung basin (from 1/4/1989 to 31/3/1985)	102
C.4(a)	Rainfall in Tranh from 1/4/1979 to 31/4/1985	103
C.4(b)	Runoff Prediction Hydrograph for Tranh basin (from 1/4/1989 to 31/3/1985)	103
C.5(a)	Rainfall in Namnim from 1/4/1979 to 31/4/1985	104
C.5(b)	Runoff Prediction Hydrograph for Namnim basin (from 1/4/1989 to 31/3/1985)	104

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A	=	Basin area (km ²)
CK ₁	=	Time constant for routing interflow (hrs)
CK ₂	=	Time constant for routing overland flow (hrs)
CKBF	=	Time constant for routing baseflow (hrs)
CK _{IF}	=	Time constant for interflow (hrs)
CQ _{OF}	=	Overland flow runoff coefficient
C _{s melt}	=	Snow melt coefficient (mm/°C/day)
D	=	Coefficient of determination
E _{pan}	=	Pan evaporation
E _{piche}	=	Piche evaporation
ET _p	=	Potential evapotranspiration
GWLBF ₀	=	Maximum groundwater depth causing baseflow (m)
GWLBF ₁	=	Groundwater depth for unit capillary flux (m)
K	=	Empirical coefficient of crop seasons
K _p	=	Pan evaporation coefficient
L	=	Soil moisture content in root zone (mm)
L _{max}	=	Maximum water content in root zone (mm)
N	=	Number of days
OF	=	Overland flow depth (mm/hour)
P _n	=	Excess water (mm)
P _s	=	Amount of melting water (mm/day)
Q _{o 1}	=	Lowest observed discharge (m ³ /s)
Q _{o 1}	=	Daily observed discharge (m ³ /s)
Q _{o p}	=	Peak observed discharge (m ³ /s)
\bar{Q}_o	=	Mean daily observed discharge (m ³ /s)
Q _{s 1}	=	Lowest simulated discharge (m ³ /s)
Q _{s 1}	=	Daily simulated discharge (m ³ /s)
Q _{s p}	=	Peak simulated discharge (m ³ /s)
\bar{Q}_s	=	Mean daily simulated discharge (m ³ /s)
R ²	=	Correlation coefficient
RE	=	Relative error (%)
REP	=	Relative error of peak discharge (%)
RQ _o	=	Range of observed discharge (m ³ /s)
RQ _s	=	Range of simulated discharge (m ³ /s)
STDQ _o	=	Standard deviation of the observed flows (m ³ /s)
STDQ _s	=	Standard deviation of the simulated flows (m ³ /s)
Sy	=	Specific yield of groundwater reservoir
TOF	=	Root zone threshold value for overland flow (mm)
TIF	=	Root zone threshold value for interflow (mm)
TG	=	Root zone threshold value for groundwater recharge (mm)
U	=	Soil moisture content in surface storage (mm)
U _{max}	=	Maximum water content in surface storage (mm)