MODELLING OF RUNOFF AND SOIL EROSION USING SWAT MODEL IN SALEBHATA CATCHMENT OF MAHANADI BASIN
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ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken during the year 2019 for partial fulfilment of M.Tech thesis under the Dept. of SWCE, CAET, OUAT, Bhubaneswar. In the present study physical based, semi-distributed river basin scale Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) model interface with Geographical Information System (ArcGIS) tool was used to simulate the runoff, sediment yield and to understand the sensitivity of model input parameters in Salebhata catchment area Mahanadi river basin (4,588.9 km²) Odisha, India. The study was conducted to calibrate, validate and parameter sensitivity analysis was performed using the semi-automated algorithm (SUFI-2) in SWAT-CUP package. The model was calibrated for 10 years of time period starting from 1997 to 2006 which include 3 years of the warm-up period from 1997 to 1999, where the validation was done for 4 year period starting from 2007 to 2010 using field measured flow and sediment yield data. Performance of the SUFI-2 in SWAT-CUP was evaluated using various statistical indices such as Nash–Sutcliffe coefficient (ENS), coefficient of determination (R²) and Percentage Bias (PBIAS) showed a good correlation between the measured and model-simulated data. Model sensitivity analysis was carried out by recognizing 11 stream flow and 18 sediment yield parameters. Out of which Base flow alpha factor (ALPHA_BF) and Sediment concentration in runoff (SED_CON) was found to be most influencing parameters for runoff and sediment yield respectively. The observed and model simulated monthly stream flow with R² of 0.74 and 0.77, NSE of 0.69 and 0.62 with varying PBIAS of 4.4 to 20.3 respectively, during calibration and validation period. While sediment yield computed with R² of 0.65 and 0.72, NSE of 0.65 and 0.69 with varying PBIAS of (-) 23.0 to (-) 24.50 respectively, during calibration and validation period. Also, an attempt has been made to identify the critical sub-basin based on both runoff and sediment yield rank combination and performed the best management practices priority in order to reduce the runoff and sediment yield. From the performance efficiency of the model to simulate runoff and sediment yield, it can be concluded that the SWAT model really a good tool for simulation of runoff and sediment yield and could be used for the implementation of best management practices on critical sub-basin sale level.
INTRODUCTION

Today, food security and environment protection are the most challenging responsibility in the world. Due to continuous increasing the population growth, the optimum use of available land and water resources is crucial for improving food security. To meet the demand for food, the forest area brought under continuous intensive cultivation lead to deterioration of the quality in terms of functionally land use capability.

About 85% of land in the world is affected by soil erosion (Angima et al., 2003). In India, about 113.3 million hectares of land is subjected severely eroded to water erosion, while 69 million hectares are critically degraded due to shifting cultivation and water logging condition.

Used to assess the long-time impact of management practices and global climate change on soil erosion, water movement, crop growth, nutrient, pesticide yield, and non-point source pollution control, etc. with varying soil, land use, and management conditions over a long period of time in the large and complex watershed (Arnold et al., 1998).

Model provides the number of algorithms programs to perform the calibration process they are SUFI-2 (Sequential Uncertainty Fitting ver.2), MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo), GLUE (Generalized Likelihood Uncertainty Estimation), and Parasol (Parameter Solution) for calibration and validation, the uncertainty analysis are performing using the un-certainty program (SWAT-CUP) (Abbaspour et al. 2007). The objective of the study is to calibrate and validate the soil water assessment tool (SWAT) model to simulate runoff and soil erosion from Salebhata catchment area.

METHODOLOGY

Description of the study area

Salebhata Catchment comprising of Ong river basin, a major tributary of Mahanadi River, situated in the middle reach of Mahanadi river basin of Odisha, India was selected for the study. It covers Salebhata gauging station of the Ong catchment, and part of Balangir, Bargarh, Nuapada, Sonpur districts in the Odisha and Mahasamund district of Chhattisgarh. The catchment extending over an area of 4588.9 km² and lies between 20° 40’ 12” N to 21° 25’ 08” N latitude and 82° 33’24” E to 83° 24’11” E longitude as shown in Fig. 1.
It flows all across Odisha and joins Mahanadi in Sambalpur 11 km upstream of Sonpur where Tel River is merged. The river rises at an elevation of 457 m and runs 204 km before it meets Mahanadi. A major part of the study area under agricultural practices (75%), followed by forest, paddy is the main crop grown in the cultivable land. Fig.1 shows the Location of Salebhata catchment in Mahanadi basin at Odisha and Chhattisgarh.

**SWAT Model**

Srinivasan et al., (1994) develop the integration of a basin-scale model (SWAT) with GIS to automate inputs, to predict the effect of alternative management practices on water, sediment, and chemical yields from ungaged rural basins. The model was developed by modifying the SWRRB model for application to large, heterogeneous rural basins.

**Data required for the SWAT model**

1. **Meteorological data**

The observed climatic data of the study area were collected from the Indian Meteorological Department (IMD) Bhubaneswar, from the period of 1997-2010. It is one of the important datasets for analysis of the watershed hydrology. The
climatic parameters include daily precipitation, maximum and minimum temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, and sunshine hour.

2 Hydrological data
The hydrological flow and sediment yield data were required for calibration, uncertainty, performing sensitivity analysis and validation of the model. The hydrological data of the study area were collected for a period of 1997-2010 from Water Resources Information System (India-WRIS). In this study, the model was calibrated from the period of 1997-2006 including 3 years warm-up period and validation carried out from the period of 2007-2010 done by using SWAT CUP tool SUFI-2 algorithm.

3 GIS data
A geographic information system (GIS) data are used to detailed analysis and mapping of the watershed topography, soil and land use/land cover is important for proper hydrological modeling. In the present study SRTM GLOBAL digital elevation data were acquired from USGS Earth Explorer, land use/land cover (LULC) map were collected from NRSC, ISRO Hyderabad and soil map were obtained from FAO World soil database. The source and description of the data have been present in Table 3.1.

Table 1 Data required for the SWAT model

| Data Type       | Source                      | Scale/Period | Data Description                          |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------|
| DISCHARGE       | India WRIS                  | 1997-2010    | Daily discharge data                      |
| SEDIMENT        | India WRIS                  | 1997-2010    | Daily sediment data                       |
| SOIL MAP        | FAO World soil database     | 1:500000     | Soil type and classification              |
| LAND USE        | NRSC, ISRO, Hyderabad       | 1:250000     | LISS III Land use classification          |
| WEATHER         | Indian Meteorological       | 1997-2010    | Daily rainfall, maximum/minimum temperature, Wind speed and Sunshine hour |
|                 | Department, BBSR            |              |                                           |
| DEM/TERRAIN     | SRTM Global file from USGS Earth Explorer | 30m ×30m | Digital elevation model                  |

4 Software used

1 ArcGIS 10.3
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Table 2 Performance evaluation of sediment yield during calibration and validation period

| Performance evaluation     | Statistical parameters |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
|                            | $R^2$ | NSE | PBIAS% |
| Calibration (2000-2006)    | 0.65  | 0.64 | -24.5  |
| Validation (2007-2010)     | 0.72  | 0.69 | -25.0  |

Table 3 Sub-basin wise distribution of sediment yield

| Sl. No | Sub-basin | Surface runoff (mm) | Sediment yield (ton/year) |
|--------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1      | 1         | 62.654              | 5.674                     |
| 2      | 2         | 62.644              | 6.086                     |
| 3      | 3         | 62.652              | 6.813                     |
| 4      | 4         | 62.65               | 5.325                     |
| 5      | 5         | 39.943              | 3.467                     |
| 6      | 6         | 39.942              | 3.638                     |
| 7      | 7         | 58.032              | 6.066                     |
| 8      | 8         | 45.846              | 5.242                     |
| 9      | 9         | 71.553              | 7.125                     |
| 10     | 10        | 48.776              | 6.045                     |
| 11     | 11        | 51.962              | 5.680                     |
| 12     | 12        | 67.895              | 6.592                     |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 13 | 71.618 |   | 7.013 |
| 14 | 14 | 66.287 |   | 3.445 |
| 15 | 15 | 56.204 |   | 6.819 |
| 16 | 16 | 61.02  |   | 4.008 |
| 17 | 17 | 66.285 |   | 3.945 |
| 18 | 18 | 66.286 |   | 3.812 |
| 19 | 19 | 52.139 |   | 7.361 |
| 20 | 20 | 66.288 |   | 3.126 |
| 21 | 21 | 66.29  |   | 4.783 |
| 22 | 22 | 60.603 |   | 6.670 |
| 23 | 23 | 59.044 |   | 6.732 |
| 24 | 24 | 56.786 |   | 6.099 |
| 25 | 25 | 55.605 |   | 6.155 |
| 26 | 26 | 59.062 |   | 4.499 |
| 27 | 27 | 58.784 |   | 6.223 |
| 28 | 28 | 57.004 |   | 4.770 |
| 29 | 29 | 59.115 |   | 5.848 |
| 30 | 30 | 63.453 |   | 4.666 |
| 31 | 31 | 69.73  |   | 5.307 |
| 32 | 32 | 53.74  |   | 5.768 |
| 33 | 33 | 70.366 |   | 8.986 |
| 34 | 34 | 56.3   |   | 7.778 |
| 35 | 35 | 59.787 |   | 7.549 |
| 36 | 36 | 53.262 |   | 6.082 |
| 37 | 37 | 67.005 |   | 10.518 |
| 38 | 38 | 67.351 |   | 11.101 |
| 39 | 39 | 27.092 |   | 2.980 |
| 40 | 40 | 52.075 |   | 7.845 |
| 41 | 41 | 27.361 |   | 2.792 |
| 42 | 42 | 23.937 |   | 3.192 |
| 43 | 43 | 27.394 |   | 2.822 |
| 44 | 44 | 27.357 |   | 3.517 |
From the table 3 it is clear that sub-basin 37 and 38 contribute high rate of sediment yield 10.518 and 11.101 (ton/year) respectively, and majority (62%) of the sub-basins comes under moderate rate of sediment yield varies from 5.242 to 8.986 (ton/year), those sub-basin are 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and, 40 respectively.

CONCLUSION

From the performance efficiency of the model to simulate runoff and sediment yield, it can be concluded that the SWAT model really a good tool for simulation of runoff and sediment yield and could be used for the implementation of best management practices on critical sub-basin sale level.
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