C.2.5. PERMEABILITY TEST

| frmamury its neur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { and }}{\text { minem }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -m |  |
| $\cdots$ | am | $\cdots$ | $\sqrt{2}$ | \% | \% | ${ }^{1 \times 1}$ |  | $=$ | .em | \%ome |
| min | Sese |  | un | \% | (,.en |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% | come | - | , m | $\ldots$ | os. |  |  | ${ }^{10}$ | x | chine |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

C.2.6. TRIAXIAL SHEAR TEST

TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST (UU-TEST)
SAMPLING SPOT
a PLACE: $\qquad$ KHLQNG - SI - YAT
SAMPLE NO.
QDEPTH: $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ TPB $-1(1.90-5.50)$

|  | SCOPE OF STTRESS | C $\mathrm{kgf/cm}$ | $\varnothing$ degree | $\tan \phi$ | $C^{\prime} \mathrm{kgf/cm}$ | A'degree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MORMALLY COMSOLDATEO REGION | 0.105 | 13.723 | 0.244 |  |  |
|  | over consolioateo meton |  |  |  |  |  |




NORMAL STRESS $\sigma\left(\mathrm{kgf} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}\right)$

TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST (UU-TEST)
SAMPLING SPOT
\& PLACE: TPB-1 (1.90-5.50)
DATE 4-4-1990

|  | SPECIMEN NO. | 10 | 20 | $3 \Delta$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MINOR PRINCIPAL STRESS $\sigma 3 \mathrm{l}$ ( $\mathrm{kl} / 1 / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ |  | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |  |
|  | PRINGIPAL STRESS $(611-63) \mathrm{kgt} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ | 0.877 | 1.537 | 2.121 |  |
|  | COMPRESSION STRAIN $\varepsilon$ f $\%$ | 15.072 | 11.842 | 17.880 |  |
|  | PORE WATER PRESSURE Uf hot/cm ${ }^{2}$ | . |  |  |  |
|  | PORE PRESSURE COEFFIENT. A $f$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\cdots$. |  |  |  |  |



TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST (CU-TEST)
SAMPLING SPOT
\& PLACE: KHLONG-SI-YAT DATE 29-3-1990
SAMPLE No:
QDEPTH: NO $\quad$ TPB-1 $1.90-5.50)$

|  | SCOPE OF STRESS | C $\mathrm{kgt} / \mathrm{cm}$ | $\not)^{\text {DE }}$ DREE | $\tan \phi$ | $\mathrm{C}^{\prime} \mathrm{kgt/cm}$ | S'OEGREE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (VorkAlit | 0.049 | 18.051 | 0.326 | 0.084 | 24.194 |
|  | OVER COMSOLIDATTED |  |  |  |  |  |




TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST ( $\overline{C U}-T E S T$ )
SAMPLING SPOT
Q PLACE:TPB-1 $(1.90-5.50)$


Q PLACE: KHLONG-SI-YAT DATE 29-3-1990
SAMPLE No. NO TPB-1 (1.90-5.50)

$$
P=0.08\left(\mathrm{~kg} / / \mathrm{cm}^{2}\right) \quad \alpha=24.21 \text { DEGREE }
$$



TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST (UU-TEST)

| SAMPLING SPOT a PLACE: |  | KHLONG - SI-YAT |  |  | DATE 6-4-1990 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAMPLE NO. QDEPTH: NO, TPB-2(0.00-4.00) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\sim}$ | SCOPE OF STRESS | C. $\mathrm{kgf} / \mathrm{cm}$ | ¢ DEgREE | $\tan \phi$ | $c^{\prime} \mathrm{kgf/cm}$ | ¢' degree |
| ${ }_{4}^{6}$ | RORMALIY CONSOLIOATEO REGION | 0. 244 | 10.242 | 0.181 |  |  |
|  | OVER CONSOLIAATED |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |




NORMAL STRESS \& $\left(\mathrm{kgf} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}\right)$

TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST (UU-TEST)
SAMPLING SPOT
$\qquad$ DATE 6-4-1990

|  | SPECIMEN No. | 10 | $2 \bigcirc$ | $3 \Delta$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MINOR PRINCIPAL STRESS $63 \mathrm{kof} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ |  | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |  |
|  | PANGIPAL STEESS $(\sigma 1-83) \mathrm{kot/cm}^{2}$ | 1.047 | 1.391. | 1.912 |  |
|  | Compression strain $\varepsilon$ I \% | 18.408 | 15.092 | 19.898 |  |
|  | PORE WATER PRESSURE Uf $\mathrm{kg} / / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pore pressure coeffient af |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST ( CU-TEST)
SAMPLING SPOT KHLONG-SI-YAT DATE 8-3~1990
SAMPLE No. NO TPQ-2(0.00-4.00)

|  | SCOPE OF STRESS | C $\mathrm{kgf/cm}$ | ¢ DEGREE | $\tan \beta$ | $c^{\prime}$. $\mathrm{kgf/cm}$ | $\phi^{\prime}$ degree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NORMALLY Consolioated region | 0.098 | 15.010 | 0.268 | 0.049 | 35.965 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST (CU-TEST)


| SPECIMEN No. |  | 10 | 20 | $3 \Delta$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MINOR PRINCIPAL STRESS $\sigma^{\prime} 3$ kgl/ $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ |  | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |  |
|  | PRINCIPACSTRESS $(8)-63) \mathrm{kgt/cm}^{2}$ DIFERENCE | 0.985 | 1.830 | 2.363 |  |
|  | COMPRESSION STRAIN E | 11:186 | 8.530 | 9.174 |  |
|  | PORE WATER PRESSURE Uf Kigt $/ \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ | 0.722 | 1.505 | 2.232 |  |
|  | PORE FRESSURE COEFFIENT Af | 0.748 | 0.923 | 0.945 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST $(C U-T E S T) \quad$ (STRESS PATH)

| SAMPLINGSPOT KHLONG-SI-YAT |
| :--- |
| Q PLACE: |
| SAMPLENO <br> QDEPTH: NO TPB- $2(0.00-4.40)$ |
| DATE $-8-3-1990$ |
| $P=0.04\left(\mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}\right) \quad \alpha=35.98$ DEGREE |


C.2.7. ROCK TEST

คุณสมบัติของหินย่อยแสะกร่วต


| บนาตระบิกร่ |  |  | Invaxin \% 4 ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q 1 | Q 2 |  |
|  | $\underset{\substack{\text { Khao Ba Ra Rum Quarry } \\ \text { ( } 3 \mathrm{~km} \\ \text { far froa damsite })}}{ }$ | Xhao Yai Ma Noi Quariy <br> ( 8 km far from damsite) |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| ความดางจาเหาะ | . 2.639 | 2.608 |  |
|  <br> การขักี่ โดย <br>  | - . | - | $\text { ไม่ากก่าว่า } 50$ |
| ส่วยสููหายเ เี่วหตลลงงตัวย <br> โิ่ดียมชัลเฟตต้รอยละ | - | - | ข่ม่ากาว่า 12 |
| การถูกน้า-รองละ | 0.579 | 2.059 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

C.3.1. SEISMICITY MAP



## C.4.1. Bang Pakong Diversion Dam

(1) Topographic Survey for Diversion Dam and Diversion Channel

Scale 1:2,000
(2) Profile Survey for Diversion Channel

Scale Horizontal $1: 2,000$
Vertical 1 : 100
(3) Sectional Survey for Diversion Channel

Scale Horizontal 1:500
Vertical 1:100
Interval $\quad 100 \mathrm{~m}$
(4) Additional River Cross Section Survey

- to clarify the dike of the river upstream of the proposed Diversion Dam

Scale Horizontal $1: 500$
Vertical 1 : 100
Interval $\quad \because \quad 200 \mathrm{~m}$
Section from the proposed diversion dam to the conjunction of the Tha Lat river
(5) Geological Investigation

1) Drilling Test

- Additional Drilling for Diversion Dam
2 hole, Depth
: 50 m
- At least 3 hole for Diversion Channel

Depth : 20 m
2) Laboratory Test

- Specific Gravity
- Moisture Content
- Gradation
- Consistency
- Standard Proctor Compaction
- Permeability
(6) Survey for navigation frequency
-to clarify the transportation on the river
Station : at the Chachoengsao bridge
at the proposed diversion dam site
at Bang Khla
(7) Transportation Survey
-to clarify the traffic on the Chachoengsao bridge and Route 304 and 315,
Station : at the Chachoengsao bridge at the junction of route 304 and 315


## C.4.2. CANAL NETWORKS

(1) Route Selection

- Detail route selection on the basis of Topo-map scaled $1: 10,000$ through field investigation
(2) Route Survey
- Topographic Survey Width $100 \mathrm{~m}, ~$
- Profile

Scale Horizontal 1: 500
Vertical 1:100

- Section

Scale 1: 100
(3) Drilling Test

- At the point of structures Depth : at least 20 m


## C.4.3. Khlong Si Yat Dam

(1) Plan Map Survey
$\frac{\text { Location }}{\text { Quarry }} \frac{\text { Quantity }}{40 \mathrm{ha}}$
Spillway
Total $\frac{60 \mathrm{ha}}{100 \mathrm{ha}}$
(2) Strip Topography Survey
$\frac{\text { Location }}{\substack{\text { Road } \\
\text { Others }}} \frac{\text { Quantity }}{23 \mathrm{~km}}$

| Total |
| :---: |$\frac{25 \mathrm{~km}}{25 \mathrm{~km}}$

(3) Seismic Prospecting

| Location | Quantity |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Quarry | 2.0 km |  |
| Main Dam : dam axis | 3.2 km |  |
| Main Dam :cross section | 0.8 km |  |
| Saddle Dam | 1.0 km | $(0.4 \mathrm{~km} \times 2)$ |
| Outlet Works | 1.0 km |  |
| Spillway | 1.0 km |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 9.0 km |  |

(4) Core Drilling

| Location | Quantity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dam | $20 \mathrm{~m} \times 60$ Nos. | $1,200 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Spillway \& Others | $20 \mathrm{~m} \times 30$ Nos. | 600 m |
| Quarry | $50 \mathrm{~m} \times 4$ Nos. | 200 m |
| Total |  | $2,000 \mathrm{~m}$ |

(5) Test Pit \& Auger Drilling

| Location | Test Pit | Auger Drilling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Damsite | 20 Nos. | 300 m |
| Borrow Area | 40 Nos. | 600 m |
| Spillway | 30 Nos. | 500 m |
| Total | 90 Nos. | $1,400 \mathrm{~m}$ |

(6) Laboratory Test

| Location | Physical Test | Mechanical Test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Damsite | 20 Nos. | 10 Nos. |
| Borrow Area | 40 Nos. | 20 Nos. |
| Spillway | 30 Nos. | 20 Nos. |
| Quarry | 10 Nos. | 10 Nos. |
| Total | 100 Nos. | 60 Nos. |
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## D. 1 IRRIGATION HATER REQUIREMENT

The following tables and figures present procedures employed in estimating irrigation water requirement:

Table D-1-1 Crop Water Requirement by Modified Penman (Prachinburi)
Table D-1-2 Crop Water Requirement by Modified Penman (Chonburi)
Figure $D-1-1 \quad K c$ and $K p$ values by crop
Figure D-1-2 Field Water Requirement (Wet Season Paddy:Broadcasted)
Figure D-1-3 Field Water Requirement (Wet Season Paddy:Transplanted)
Figure $D-1-4$ Field Water Requirement (Dry Season Paddy:Broadcasted)
Figure D-1-5 Field Water Requirement (Dry Season Paddy:Transplanted)
Figure D-1-6 Field Water Requirement (Soybean:Dry Season)
Figure D-1-7 Field Water Requirement (Groundnuts:Dry Season)
Figure D-1-8 Field Water Requirement (Mungbean:Dry Season)
Tigure D-1 -9 Rainfall - Effective Rainfall Relationship
Figure D-1-10 Proposed Cropping Calendar

# Table D-1-1 Crop Water Requirement by Modified Penman (Prachinburi) 

```
STATION: PRACHINBURI
Station Index:48430
Latitude: }1\mp@subsup{4}{}{\circ}0\mp@subsup{3}{}{\prime}=
Longitude: 101* 22' E
Elevation of Station above MSL : 5m
Height of Barometer above MSL : : 6m
Height of Thermometer above Ground: 1.20m
Height of Wind Vane above Ground : 11.00m
```

|  | ITEH | (Unit) | JAN | FEB. | AR | AP | HAX | June | $\underline{1}$ | IUUG. | SEP. | - | . | DEC. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Tmax | ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 32.4 | 34.1 | 35.7 | 36.0 | 34.4 | 33.0 | 32.2 | 31.8 | 31.6 | 31.8 | 31.8 | 31.6 |
| 2 | Tmin | $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | 19.4 | 22.1 | 23.9 | 24.9 | 25.1 | 24.9 | 24.6 | 24.6 | 24.5 | 24.3 | 22.4 | 19.3 |
| 3 | Tmean | $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | 25.9 | 28.1 | 29.8 | 30.5 | 29.8 | 29.0 | 28.4 | 28.2 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 27.1 | 25.8 |
| 4 | ea | (mbar) | 33.4 | 38.0 | 41.9 | 43.7 | 41.9 | 40.1 | 38.7 | 38.3 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 35.8 | 33.2 |
| 5 | RHmax | (\%) | 83.1 | 86.2 | 87.9 | 89.4 | 91.4 | 92.7 | 93.5 | 593.9 | 94.1 | 90.0 | 84.5 | 9 |
| 6 | RHmin | (\%) | 40.7 | 43.3 | 44.5 | 49.9 | 59.2 | 64.5 | 67.1 | 68.6 | 69.1 | 63.5 | 52.9 | 7 |
| 7 | RHmean | (\%) | 61.9 | 64.8 | 66.2 | 69.7 | 75.3 | 78.6 | 80.3 | 81.3 | 81.6 | 76.8 | 68.7 | 63.3 |
| 8 | ed=ea*RHmean $/ 100$ | (mbar) | 20.7 | 24.6 | 27.7 | 30.5 | 31.6 | 31.5 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 31.0 | 29.2 | 24.7 | 21.0 |
| 9 | (ea-ed) | (mbar) | 12.7 | 13.4 | 14.2 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 8.6 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 8.8 | 11.2 | 12.2 |
| 10 | U ( $h=11.00 \mathrm{~m}$ ) | (knots) | 3.6 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 4.3 |
| 11 | U ( $h=2 \mathrm{~m}$ ) | (km/day) | 112 | 103 | 90 | 75 | 75 | 65 | 65 | 72 | 68 | 93 | 128 | 134 |
| 12 | $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{u})=0.27(1+1 / 100)$ |  | 0.57 | 0.55 | 0.51 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.52 | 0.62 | 0.63 |
| 13 | 1-w (Eleva | (1on=5m) | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.25 |
| 14 | ( $1-w$ ) $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{u})$ (ea-ed) | (mm/day) | 1.81 | 1.70 | 1.59 | 1.30 | 1.07 | 0.85 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.72 | 1.05 | 1.67 | 1.92 |
| 15 | Ra (14.03' N ) | (mm/day) | 12.4 | 13.6 | 14.9 | 15.7 | 15.8 | 15.7 | 15.7 | 15.7 | 15. | 14.1 | 12.8 | 12.0 |
| 16 | Cloudiness | (0-10) | 3.7 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 6.3 | 7.6 | 8.3 | 38.4 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 6.6 | 4. | 8 |
| 17 | n/N |  | 0.68 | 0.58 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 0.34 | 0.26 | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.27 | 0.44 | 0.58 | 0.67 |
| 18 | 0.25+0.5n/N |  | 0.59 | 0.54 | 0.52 | 0.49 | 0.42 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.39 | 0.47 | 0.54 | 0.59 |
| 19 | $\mathrm{Rs}=15 * 18$ | (ma/day) | 7.32 | 7.34 | 7.75 | 7.69 | 6.64 | 5.97 | 5.81 | 5.50 | 5.89 | 6.63 | 6.91 | 7.08 |
| 20 | Rns $=0.75 \mathrm{Rs}$ | (mam/day) | 5.49 | 5.51 | 5.81 | 5.77 | 4.98 | 4.48 | 4.36 | 4.13 | 4.42 | 4.97 | 5.18 | 5.31 |
| 21 | f (T) |  | 15.9 | 16.3 | 16.7 | 16.8 | 16.7 | 16.5 | 16.4 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 6.1 | 5.9 |
| 22 | $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{ed})=0.34-0.044 \mathrm{sq}$ | grt(ed) | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 4 |
| 23 | $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{N})=0.1+0.9 \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{N}$ |  | 0.71 | 0.62 | 0.59 | 0.52 | 0.41 | 0.33 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.50 | 0.62 | 70 |
| 24 | $\mathrm{Rnl}=21 * 22 * 23$ | (mm/day) | 1.58 | 1.21 | 1.08 | 0.87 | 0.62 | 0.49 | 0.47 | 0.41 | 0.55 | 0.82 | . 20 | 56 |
| 25 | Rn=Rns-Rnl | (ma/day) | 3.91 | 4.30 | 4.73 | 4.90 | 4.36 | 3.99 | 3.89 | 3.72 | 3.87 | 4.15 | 3.98 | 3.75 |
| 26 |  |  | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.75 |
| 27 | W*Rn | (mm/day) | 2.93 | 3.31 | 3.69 | 3.87 | 3.40 | 3.11 | 3.00 | 2.86 | 2.98 | 3.20 | 3.02 | 2.81 |
| 28 | $14+27$ | (mm/day) | 4.74 | 5.01 | 5.28 | 5.17 | 4.47 | 3.96 | 3.79 | 3.62 | 3.70 | 4.25 | 4.69 | 4.73 |
| 29 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 30 | ET0 | (mm/day) | 4.74 | 5.01 | 5.28 | 5.17 | 4.47 | 3.96 | 3.79 | 3.62 | 3.70 | 4.25 | 4.69 | 4.73 |

Table D-1-2 Crop Water Requirement by Modified Penman (Chonburi)

```
STATION: CHONBURI
Station Index: 48459
Latitude: }1\mp@subsup{3}{}{\circ}2\mp@subsup{2}{}{\prime}\textrm{N
Longitude: 100 59' E
Elevation of Station above MSL : 1m
Height of Barometer above MSL : 2m
Height of Thermometer above Ground: 1.50m
Height of Wind Vane above Ground : 13.45m
```

|  | ITEH | (Unit) | JAN |  |  | APR. | M | JUNE | JULY | Y AUG. | SEP. | 0 C | NOV. | DEC. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tmax | ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 31.7 | 32.4 | 33.5 | 34.3 | 33.6 | 32.7 | 32.2 | 231.9 | 31.6 | 31 | 31 | 31.7 |
|  | 2 Tmin | $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.$ | 20. | . 5 | 24. | 25.4 | 25.5 | 25.5 | 25.1 | 24.9 | 24.3 | 23.6 | 22 | 20.4 |
|  | 3 Tmean | $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.$ | 25.9 | 27.5 | 28.9 | 29.9 | 29.6 | 29.1 | 28.7 | 728.4 | 28.0 | 27.7 | 26.9 | 26.1 |
|  | 4 ea | (mbar) | 33.4 | 36.8 | 39.9 | 42.2 | 41.5 | 40.3 | 39.4 | 38.7 | 37.8 | 37.2 | 35.5 | 33.8 |
|  | 5 RHm |  | 84.4 | . 4 | 86.8 | 87.0 | 88.0 | 87.2 | 8. | 89.2 | 22.2 | 2.3 | 88.0 | 83.3 |
|  | 6 RHmin | (\%) | 48.8 | . 8 | 55.2 | 55.3 | 59.3 | 60.4 | 81.4 | 62.4 | 65.8 | 84.3 | 0 | 7.5 |
|  | 7 Rlimean | (\%) | 66.6 | 1 | 71.0 | 71.2 | 73.7 | 73.8 | 74.9 | 75.8 | 79.0 | 78.3 | 5 | 5.4 |
|  | 8 ed=ea*RHmean/100 | (mbar) | 22.2 | 26.2 | 28.3 | 30.0 | 30.6 | 29.7 | 29.5 | 529.3 | 29.9 | 29. | 25.4 | 22.1 |
|  | 9 (ea-cd) | (mbar) | 11.2 | 10.6 | 11.6 | 12.2 | 10.9 | 10.6 | 9.9 | 98.4 | 47.9 | 8.1 | 10.1 | $11 . ?$ |
| 10 | $10 \cup(h=13.45 \mathrm{~m})$ | (knots) | 4.7 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 4.6 | $6 \quad 4.6$ | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 5.1 |
|  | U ( $h=2 \mathrm{~m})$ | (km/day) | 146 | 162 | 165 | 149 | 131 | 152 | 143 | 143 | 109 | 109 | 152 | 159 |
|  | $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{u})=0.27(1+\mathrm{U} / 100$ |  | 0.66 | 0.71 | 0.72 | 0.67 | 0.62 | 0.68 | 0.66 | 6.66 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.68 | 0.70 |
| 13 | 1-w (Ele | (1a) | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.25 |
| 14 | (1-w)f (u) (ea-ed) | (ma/day) | 1.85 | 73 | 1.92 | 1.80 | 1.48 | 1.59 | 50 | 1.43 | 1.02 | 1.04 | 1.65 | 2.05 |
| 15 | Ra (13.22' N ) | (mm/day) | 12.5 | 13 | 15.0 | 15.7 | 15.8 | 15 | 15.6 | 15.7 | 15 | 14 | 13.0 | 12.2 |
| 16 | Cloudiness | (0-10) | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 0 | 2 | 4.1 |
| 17 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{N}$ |  | 0.65 | 62 | 0.60 | 0.53 | 0.37 | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.40 | 0.54 | 0.64 |
| 18 | $0.25+0.5 \mathrm{n}$ |  | 0.58 | 0.56 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.45 | 0.52 | . 57 |
| 19 | Rs=15*18 | (mm/day) | 7.25 | 7.67 | 8.25 | 8.16 | 6.95 | 6.24 | 6.24 | 5.81 | 89 | 6.39 | 6.76 | . 95 |
| 20 | Rns $=0.7$ | (mm/day | 44 | 75 | 18 | 6.12 | 21 | . 68 | 68 | 4.36 | 42 | 4.79 | 5.07 | . 21 |
|  | f( T ) |  | . 9 |  | 16.5 | 7 | 16.6 | 16.5 | 16:4 | 416.4 | 16.3 | 16.2 | 16.1 | 9 |
| 22 | $f(\mathrm{ed})=0.34-0.044$ | (ed) |  |  | 0.11 | 10 | 0.10 | 10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 10 | . 10 | 12 |  |
| 23 | $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{N})=0.1+0.9 n / \mathrm{N}$ |  | 0.69 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.58 | . 43 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.32 | . 34 | 0.48 | . 59 | 88 |
|  | $\mathrm{Rnl}=21 * 22 * 23$ | (mm/day) | 1.43 | 18 | 16 | 0.97 | 71 | 0.61 | 0.59 | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.75 | 14 |  |
| 25 | $\mathrm{Rn}=\mathrm{Rn}$ S-Rn] | (mm/day) | 4.01 | 57 | 5.03 | 5.15 | 4.50 | 07 | 4.09 | 3.84 | 3.87 | 4.04 | 3.93 | . 80 |
| 26 | 6W |  | 0.75 | 77 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.76 | . 75 |
|  | $\mathrm{W} * \mathrm{Rn}$ | (mm/day) | 3.01 | 52 | 3.87 | 4.02 | 3.51 | 3.17 | 3.15 | 2.96 | 2.98 | 3.11 | 2.99 | 2.85 |
| 28 | $14+27$ | (mm/day) | 4.86 | 5.25 | 5.79 | 5.82 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4.65 | 4.39 | 4.00 | 4.15 | 4.64 | . 90 |
| 29 | 9 c |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0 ET0 | (mm/day) | 4.86 | 5.25 | 5.79 | 5.82 | 5.00 | 4.76 | 4:65 | 4.39 | 4.00 | 4.15 | 4.64 | 4.90 |

Figure D-1-1 Kc and Kp values by crop


Figure 0-1-2 Field Water Requirement (Wet Season Paddy:Broadcasted)

| Honth | July |  |  | Rugust |  |  | Septerber |  |  | October |  |  | Novester |  |  | Decender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Cropping Pattern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. ELEMERT <br> 1 of Growing sesson | 10 | 19 | 29 | 38 | 48 | 57 | 67. | 76 | 86 | 95 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop Coefficient (Kc) | 0.96 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.09 \\ & 0.96 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.17 \\ & 1.07 \\ & 0.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 1.25 \\ 1.77 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.50 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.29 \\ & 1.25 \\ & 1.17 \\ & 1.07 \\ & 10.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.32 \\ & 1.29 \\ & 1.25 \\ & 1.17 \\ & 1.07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 133 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1: 29 \\ & 1.25 \\ & 1.17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.32 \\ & 133 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.29 \\ & 1.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.20 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.33 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.06 \\ & 1.20 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.33 \\ & 1.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.85 \\ & 1.28 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.85 \\ & 1.20 \\ & 1.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.05 \\ & 1.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.05 \end{aligned}$ | 0.93 |  |  |  |
| Kc Averose | 0.96 | 1.02 | 1,0? | 1.11 | 1.15 | 1.22 | 1.27 | 1. 30 | 1.28 | 1.24 | 1.12 | 1. 13 | 1.06 | 0.99 | 0.83 |  |  |  |
| ET0 dy Penman (ma/day) | 4.22 |  |  | 4.01 |  |  | 3.85 |  |  | 4.20 |  |  | 4.67 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elc (mm/day) | 4.05 | 4.39 | 4. 52 | 4.45 | 4.61 | 4.89 | 4.89 | 5.01 | 4.97 | 5.21 | 4.91 | 4. 75 | 4.95 | 4.62 | 4.34 |  |  |  |
| Percolation ( $P$. an/day) | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{E l e}+\mathbf{P}$ (om/day) | 6.05 | 6.30 | 6.52 | 6.45 | 6.61 | 6.80 | 0.89 | 7.01 | 6.97 | 7.21 | 6.91 | 6.75 | 6.95 | 6.62 | 6.34 |  |  |  |
| Initial Lesching (mot | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lond Preparation (ma) | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Eothition initial lexching | $2 / 9$ | $2 / 9$ | $2 / 9$ | 219 | 1/8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Preparation | 273 | $2 / 8$ | 219 | $2 / 9$ | $1 / 9$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Norasl Irrigation | $1 / 9$ | $3 / 9$ | 5/9 | $7 / 9$ | 35/36 | $1 / 1$ | 1/1 | 1/1 | 111 | $1 / 1$ | $35 / 30$ | $7 / 9$ | 5/9 | $3 / 9$ | $1 / 9$ |  |  |  |
| 3. HITER REOUIGETENT Initial tesching (m) | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Preparation (m) | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 16.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hornal Irrigation (ma) | 6.7 | 21.0 | 36.2 | 50.2 | 64.3 | 68.9 | 68.9 | \%. 1 | 69.7 | 72.1 | 67.2 | 52.5 | 33.6 | 22.1 | 7.0 |  |  |  |
| Requiresent (ms/monht | 197.1 |  |  | 259.2 |  |  | 208.7 |  |  | 191.8 |  |  | 67.7 |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure D-1-3. Field Water Requirement (Wet Season Paddy:Transplanted)

| Month | July |  |  | Rugust |  |  | Septesber |  |  | October |  |  | Noventer |  |  | Decester |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Cropping Pattern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I. ELEPENT <br> $x$ of Growing Season | 10 | 19 | 29 | 38 | 48 | 57 | 67 | 76 | 85 | 95 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop Coefficient ( $\mathrm{KC}_{\text {c }}$ ) | 0.96 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.07 \\ & 0.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{\|l\|} 1.17 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.96 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.25 \\ & 1.17 \\ & 1.07 \\ & 0.98 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 1.28 \\ 1.25 \\ 1.17 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.56 \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 1.32 \\ & 1.29 \\ & 1.25 \\ & 1.77 \\ & 1.02 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.33 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.29 \\ & 1.25 \\ & 1.17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.32 \\ & 1.33 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.29 \\ & 1.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 1.20 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.33 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.29 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.05 \\ & 1.20 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.33 \\ & 1.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0.93 \\ 1.05 \\ 1.20 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.33 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.05 \\ & 1.20 \\ & 1.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.05 \\ & 1.20 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.05 \end{aligned}\right.$ | 0.93 |  |  |  |
| XC Average | 0.96 | 1.122 | 1.07 | 1.11 | 1. 15 | 1.22 | 1.27 | 1. 30 | 1.29 | 1.24 | 1. 17 | 1.13 | I. 06 | 0.39 | 0.93 |  |  |  |
| ET0 ty Pennsan (midday) |  | 4.22? |  |  | 4.01 |  |  | 3.85 |  |  | 4.20 |  |  | 4.67 |  |  |  |  |
| Elc (mm/day) | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.52 | 4.45 | 4.61 | 4.89 | 4.88 | 5.01 | 4.97 | 5.21 | 4.91 | 4. 75 | 4.95 | 4.62 | 4.34 |  |  |  |
| Percolation (P, miday) |  | 2.101 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.01 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{E I C}+\mathrm{P}$ (mx/day) | 6.05 | 6.30 | 6.52 | 6.45 | 6. 61 | 6.89 | 6.89 | 2.01 | 8.97 | 7.21 | 6.91 | 6.75 | 6.95 | 6.62 | 6.34 |  |  |  |
| Initial Leachimg (min) |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Land Preparation (ma) |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. EMUATION Initial Leacting |  |  | $2 / 9$ | $2 / 8$ | $2 / 9$ | 219 | 1/8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Pregaration |  |  | 1/9 | $2 / 9$ | $2 / 9$ | $2 / 3$ | $7 / 36$ | 1/36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mormal İrigation |  |  |  | 1/9 | 3/9 | 519 | $7 / 9$ | 35/36 | $1 / 1$ | 1/1 | 35/36 | 719 | 5/3 | 3/9 | 1/9 |  |  |  |
| 3. WhER REOUIREMEAT Initial Leaching (ma) |  |  | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Preparstion (mm) |  |  | 16.7 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 29.2 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Norial Irrigation (ma) |  |  |  | 2.2 | 22.0 | 38.3 | 53.6 | 68.2 | 69.7 | 32.1 | 67.2 | 52.5 | 38.6 | 22.1 | 7.0 |  |  |  |
| Requiresent (ardmonth) | 27.3 |  |  | 200.7 |  |  | 230.5 |  |  | 191.8 |  |  | 67.7 |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure D-1-4 Field Water Requirement (Dry Season Paddy:Broadcasted)

| $\cdots$ Henth | Deceater |  |  | January |  |  | February |  |  | Morch |  |  | April |  |  | May |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-doy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1. | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Cropping Pattern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. ELEMEHT <br> I of Growing Season | 10 | 19 | 29 | 38 | 48 | 57 | 67 | 76 | 86 | 35 | 100 |  |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  |
| Crop Coefficient ( $X$ C) | 0.88 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1.07 \\ 0.98 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 1.19 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.98 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.25 \\ 1.17 \\ 1.00 \\ 0.96 \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 1.29 \\ 1.77 \\ 1.07 \\ 10.96 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 1.32 \\ 1.29 \\ 1.25 \\ 1.02 \\ 1.02 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left[\left.\begin{array}{l} 1.33 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.23 \\ 1.55 \\ 1.17 \end{array} \right\rvert\,\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 1.32 \\ 1.33 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.29 \\ 1.25 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1000 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.33 \\ 1,32 \\ 1.29 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 1.05 \\ 1: 20.32 \\ 1: 322 \\ 1: 33 \\ 1.32 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.93 \\ 1.05 \\ 1.20 \\ 1: 32 \\ 1.33 \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 0.93 \\ 1.05 \\ 1.20 \\ 1.82 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 0.93 \\ 1,65 \\ 1,20 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 0.93 \\ 1.05 \end{gathered}$ | 0.93 |  |  |  |
| Kc Averoge | 0.96 | 1.02 | 1.07 | 1.11 | 1. 15 | 1.22 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.29 | 1.24 | 1.17 | 1. 13 | 1.06 | 0.98 | 0.93 |  |  |  |
| Ell by Peman (m/day) | 4.82 |  |  | 4.80 |  |  | 5.13 |  |  | 5.54 |  |  | 5.50 |  |  | 4.74 |  |  |
| EIc $\quad \therefore$ (aiddoy) | 4.63 | 4.92 | 5. 16 | 5.33 | 5.52 | 5.86 | 6.52 | 6.67 | 6.62 | 6.87 | 6.48 | 6.26 | 5.83 | 5.45 | 5.12 |  |  |  |
| Percolation (P. Em/day) | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{E I C}+\mathrm{P} \quad$ (m/day) | 6. 63 | 6.92 | 7.16 | P. 33 | 7.52 | 7.88 | 8.52 | 8.67 | 8.62 | 8.82 | 8. 48 | 8.26 | 1.83 | 7. 85 | 7.12 |  |  |  |
| Initial leaching (m) | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Preparstion (mm) | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. EOUHION Initial Leaching | $2 / 9$ | 219 | $2 / 8$ | 219 | 1/9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lond Preparation | 219 | $2 / 9$ | 219 | 219 | 1/9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Horaal Imrigation | $1 / 9$ | 3/8 | 5/9 | $7 / 9$ | 35/36 | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | 111 | 35/36 | $7 / 9$ | 5/9 | 3/3 | $1 / 9$ |  |  |  |
| 3. $\operatorname{HITER}$ RECUIREFERT Initial Leaching | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lend Preparation (m) | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 16.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Horsal Irrigation (m) | 7.4 | 23.1 | 39.8 | 57.0 | 73.1 | 78.0 | 85.2 | 86.7 | 88.2 | 88.? | 82.4 | 64.2 | 43.5 | 24.8 | 7.9 |  |  |  |
| Requirenent (mindmonth) | 203.5 |  |  | 225.5 |  |  | 258.1 |  |  | 235.3 |  |  | 76.2 |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure D-1-5 Field Water Requirement (Dry Season Paddy:Transplanted)

| Month | Decenter |  |  | Jamuary |  |  | February |  |  | Harch |  |  | April |  |  | May |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Cropping Pattern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. ELEFENT <br> I of Groxing Season | 10 | 19 | 29 | 38 | 48 | 57 | 67 | 76 | 86 | 95 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop Cuefficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ) | 0.96 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1.07 \\ 0.36 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} 1.17 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.96 \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 1.25 \\ & 1.17 \\ & 1.07 \\ & 0.96 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 1.29 \\ 1.25 \\ 1.17 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.96 \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 1.32 \\ & 1.29 \\ & 1.25 \\ & 1.17 \\ & 1.07 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.33 \\ & 1.32 \\ & 1.29 \\ & 1.25 \\ & 1.17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 1.32 \\ 1.33 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.29 \\ 1.25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1.20 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.33 \\ 1.32 \\ 1.29 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1.05 \\ 1.20 \\ 1.232 \\ 1.33 \\ 1.32 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} 0.93 \\ 1.55 \\ 1.20 \\ 1.232 \\ 1.33 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.05 \\ & 1.02 \\ & 1.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.93 \\ & 1.05 \\ & 1.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 0.93 \\ 1.05 \end{array}\right\|$ | 0.93 |  |  |  |
| Xc Averoge | 10.96 | $1: 82$ | 1.103 | 1.11 | 1. 15 | 1.22 | 1.23 | 1.30 | 129 | 1.24 | 1. 17 | I. 13 | 1.06 | 0. 99 | 0.93 |  |  |  |
| EIt by Permari (m/day) | 4.82 |  |  | 4.80 |  |  | 5. 13 |  |  | 5.54 |  |  | 5.50 |  |  | 4.74 |  |  |
| EIc (am/day) | 4.63 | 4.92 | 5. 16 | 5.33 | 5.52 | 5.86 | 6.52 | 6. 67 | 6.62 | 6.87 | 6.48 | 6.28 | 5.83 | 5.45 | 5.12 |  |  |  |
| Percoiation (P, mm/day) | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{\mathrm{EIc}+\mathrm{P}} \quad$ (uri/day) | 6.63 | 6. 92 | 7.16 | ?.33 | 7.52 | 7.86 | 8.52 | 8.67 | 8.62 | 8.87 | 8.48 | 8.26 | 7.83 | 3.45 | 7. 12 |  |  |  |
| Initial Leaching (ma) | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Preparation (ma) | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. EOURTION lnitial Leaching |  |  | $2 / 9$ | 219 | $2 / 3$ | $2 / 9$ | $1 / 3$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Preparation |  |  | 1/9 | $2 / 9$ | $2 / 9$ | $2 / 8$ | $7 / 36$ | 1/36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Normal irrigation |  |  |  | 1/3 | 3/9 | 5/9 | $7 / 9$ | 35/36 | $1 / 1$ | 1/4. | 35/36 | 7/9 | 5/3 | 3/9 | 1/9 |  |  |  |
| 3. 㚅TER REOUIRESERT loitial Leaching |  |  | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Preparation (mm) |  |  | 16.7 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 29.2 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hornal Irrigation (m) |  |  |  | 8.1 | 25.1 | 43.7 | 66.3 | 84.3 | 86.2 | 88.7 | 83.9 | 64.2 | 43.5 | 24.8 | 7.9 |  |  |  |
| Requirement (mm/month) | 27.8 |  |  | 210.1 |  |  | 275.8 |  |  | 238.8 |  |  | 76.2 |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure D-1-6 Field Water Requirement (Soybean:Dry Season)

| Honth | Decente: |  |  | January |  |  | Februsa |  |  | Harch |  |  | Repil |  |  | May |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Cropping Pattem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. ELEFEAT <br> $z$ of Growing Seasen |  | 5 | 15 | 25. | 35 | 45 | 55 | 65 | 75 | 85 | 95 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop coelticient (Xp) |  | 0.36 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.55 \\ & 0.36 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.73 \\ & 0.55 \\ & 0.56 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} 0.93 \\ 0.73 \\ 0.55 \\ 0.36 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1.14 \\ 0.93 \\ 0.73 \\ 0.55 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.21 \\ & 1.14 \\ & 0.93 \\ & 0.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.09 \\ & 1.21 \\ & 1.14 \\ & 0.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 0.95 \\ 1.09 \\ 1.21 \\ 1.16 \end{array}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 0.79 \\ 0.95 \\ 1.09 \\ 1.21 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.85 \\ & 0.79 \\ & 0.95 \\ & 1.95 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.59 \\ & 0.65 \\ & 0.79 \\ & 0.95 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.59 \\ & 0.65 \\ & 0.79 \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l} 0.59 \\ 0.65 \end{array}\right.\right]$ | 0.59 |  |  |  |
| Kp Average |  | 0.36 | 0.46 | 0.55 | 0. 64 | 0.84 | 1.00 | 1.69 | 1.10 | 1.01 | 0.87 | 0.75 | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0. 59 |  |  |  |
| E(Pan E) (m/day) |  | 4.58 |  |  | 4.45 | $\because$ |  | 4.70 |  |  | 5.50 |  |  | $5: 53$ |  |  | 5.14 |  |
| Elc - ${ }^{\text {convday) }}$ |  | 1.64 | 2.10 | 2.45 | 285 | 3. 74 | 4.70 | 5.12 | 5.17 | 5.58 | 4.79 | 4.13 | 3.76 | 3.71 | 3.26 |  |  |  |
| 2. EOBNION Normal Irrigation |  | $1 / 24$ | 1/3 | $2 / 3$ | $23 / 24$ | $1 / 1$ | 1/1 | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | 1/1 | 5/6 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 6$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. WIER REQUIREFENT Horagl Irrigation (m9) |  | 0.7 | 7.0 | 16.3 | 27.3 | 37.4 | 47.0 | 51.2 | 51.7 | 55.6 | 39.9 | $20 . ?$ | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Requirement (manonth) | 7.7 |  |  | 81.0 |  |  | 149.9 |  |  | 116.2 |  |  | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure D-1-7 Field Water Requirement (Groundnuts:Dry Season)

| Menth | Decenber |  |  | Jaxnary |  |  | February |  |  | Herch |  |  | Rpril |  |  | Hes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Gropping Pattem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. EIEMERT <br> $I$ of Groking Season |  | 4 | 13 | 21 | 23 | 38 | 48 | 54 | 63 | 71 | 79 | 88 | 96 | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Grop Coefficient (kp) |  | 0.42 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.58 \\ & 0.42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75 \\ & 0.58 \\ & 0.42 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0.91 \\ & 0.95 \\ & 0.58 \\ & 0.52 \\ & 0.82 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.89 \\ & 0.91 \\ & 0.75 \\ & 0.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.88 \\ & 1.89 \\ & 0.91 \\ & 0.97 \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 1.00 \\ 1.08 \\ 1.09 \\ 0.91 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.88 \\ & 1.00 \\ & 1.08 \\ & 1.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 0.78 \\ 0.88 \\ 1.00 \\ 1.08 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.20 \\ & 0.78 \\ & 0.88 \\ & 1.90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.65 \\ & 0.70 \\ & 0.78 \\ & 0.88 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.61 \\ & 0.65 \\ & 0.70 \\ & 0.78 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.58 \\ & 0.61 \\ & 0.65 \\ & 0.70 \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 0.58 \\ & 0.61 \\ & 0.65 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.58 \\ & 0.61 \end{aligned}$ | 0.58 |  |
| $x_{p}$ Averase |  | 0. 22 | 0.51 | 0.58 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 0.96 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 0.94 | 0.84 | 0. 75 | 0.69 | 0.84 | 0.61 | 0.60 | 0.58 |  |
| $E$ (Pan E) - (mi/day) |  | 4.56 |  |  | 4. 45 |  |  | 4.70 |  |  | 5.50 |  |  | 5.53 |  |  | 5.14 |  |
| EIc (ma/day) |  | 1.92 | 2.28 | 2.58 | 2.98 | 3.69 | 4.51 | 4.79 | 4.75 | 5.17 | 4. 62 | 4. 13 | 3.82 | 3.54 | 3.37 | 3.08 | 2.98 |  |
| 2. ECAMTION Nareal Irrigation |  | $1 / 24$ | $1 / 3$ | $2 / 3$ | 23128 | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | 5/6 | 1/2 | 1/6 |  |  |  |
| 3. HMER REOUIREFEM Normal Ifrigation (m) |  | 0.8 | 7.6 | 17.2 | 28.6 | 36.9 | 45.1 | 47.9 | 47.5 | 51.7 | 46.2 | 41.3 | 30.8 | 17.7 | 5.6 |  |  |  |
| Requi renent (gro/month) | 8.4 |  |  | 82.3 |  |  | 140.5 |  |  | 139.2 |  |  | 54.1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure D-1-8 Field Water Requirement (Mungbean:Dry Season)

| Month | Farch |  |  | paril |  |  | May |  |  | June |  |  | dily |  |  | Rugust |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Eropping Pattern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. ELEGERT <br> I of Growing Season |  |  |  | 14 | 23 | 43 | 57 | 31 | 86 | 100 |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |
| Crop Coetficient ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{p}}$ ) |  |  |  | 0. 48 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 0.73 \\ 0.48 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.90 \\ & 0.73 \\ & 0.48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} 1.14 \\ 1.90 \\ 0.73 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 080 \\ & 1.8 \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.42 \\ & 0.20 \\ & 1.14 \\ & 1 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.15 \\ & 0.42 \\ & 0.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.15 \\ & 0.42 \end{aligned}$ | 0. 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kp Average |  |  |  | 0.48 | 0.61 | 0.74 | 0.96 | 0.98 | 0.79 | 0.46 | 0.23 | 0. 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E (Pon E) (mm/day) | 5.50 |  |  | 5.53 |  |  | 5.14 |  |  | 4.50 |  |  | 4.81 |  |  | 4.30 |  |  |
| EIc (mivday) |  |  |  | 2.65 | 3.37 | 4.09 | 4.93 | 5. 04 | 4.06 | 2.07 | 1.31 | 0.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. ENUATION Mornal Irrigation |  |  |  | 1/6 | 1/2 | 5/6 | 1/1 | $1 / 1$ | $1 / 1$ | 5/6 | $1 / 2$ | 1/6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. WIER REOUIREEAT <br> Horsol Irrigation (mm) |  |  |  | 4.4 | 16,9 | 34.1 | 49.3 | 50.4 | 40.5 | 17.3 | 6.6 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Requirement (mi/month) |  |  |  | 55.4 |  |  | 140.3 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


TABLE D-1-10 PROPOSED CROPPING CALENDAR


D. 2 CHANNEL STORAGE VOIUME IN WATER CONSERVATION AREA (EXPERIENCE IN PRA-ONG CHAIYANUCHIT PROJECT AREA)
(PRA-ONG CHAIYANUCHIT AREA)


รูปตัดตามฐวางคอองषอประทาน
มาตธาฐ่วน 1:200
46.5 sq. ाn $\times 452.2 \mathrm{~km}=21.027 \mathrm{MCM}$
(2) Other Clannels


รปตามขวางคझองธรรมซา
มาตราส่วน $1: 200$
14.8 sq. m x $470.75 \mathrm{~km}=6.967 \mathrm{MCM}$
(3) Unit Area Storage Volume
$(21.027+6.967) \mathrm{MCM} / 81,600 \mathrm{ha}=3.43 \times 10^{-1} \mathrm{MCM} / \mathrm{ha}$

## D. 3 WATER BALANCE SIMULATION

The following tables present the basic data and procedures employed in the water balance simulation study:

Table D-3-1 List of Data Given in Water Balance Computation
Figure D-3-1 0verall Basin Development Plan (Alternative Plan-1)
Figure $D-3-2$ 0verall Basin Development Plan (Alternative Plan-2)
Figure D-3-3 0verall Basin Development Plan (Alternative Plan-3)
Figure D-3-4 0verall Basin Development Plan (Alternative Plan-4)
Table D-3-2 Simulated Results by Sub-Basin (1)
Table $D-3-3$ Simulated Results by Sub-Basin (2)
Table D-3-4 Simulated Results by Sub-Basin (3)
Table D-3-5 Sumary of Water Demand Computation (average in 20 years 1968-1987)

Table D-3-6 Summary of Water Balance Computation (average in 20 years 1968-1987)

Table D-3-7 Summary of Water Balance Computation (specific year of 1979)

Table D-3-7 Summary of Nater Balance Computation (specific year of 1983)

Table D-3~1 List of Data Given in Water Balance Computation


FIGURE D-3-1 OVERALL BASIN DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ALTERNATIVB PLAN-1)


CROPPING AND IRRIGATION PLAN (ALTERNATIVE PLAN-1)


Notes : 1) Req. C stands for water shortage analyzed in terms of the required live storage of reservoirs.
2) Ava.S stands for available storage capacity at the proposed damsites.
3) Effective live storage of freshwater at the proposed Bang Pakong diversion dam is estimated at 30 MCM and is treated as the available channel storage in the water balance simulation study.

FIGURE D-3-2 OVERALL, BASIN DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ALTERNATIVE PLAN-2)


CROPPING AND IRRIGATION PLAN (ALTERNATIVE PLAN-2)


Notes : 1) Req. C stands for water shortage analyzed in terms of the required live storage of reservoirs.
2) Ava.S stands for available storage capacity at the proposed damsites.
3) Effective live storage of freshwater at the proposed Bang Pakong diversion dam is estimated at 30 MCM and is treated as the available channel storage in the water balance simulation study.


CROPPING AND IRRIGATION PLAN (ALTERNATIVE PLAN-3)


Notes: 1) Req. C stands for water shortage analyzed in terms of the required live storage of reservoirs.
2) Ava. $S$ stands for available storage capacity at the proposed damsites.
3) Effective live storage of freshwater at the proposed Bang Pakong diversion dam is estimated at 30 MCM and is treated as the available channel storage in the water balance simulation study.


CROPPING AND IRRIGATION PLAN (ALTERNATIVE PLAN-4)


Notes: 1) Req. C stands for water shortage analyzed in terms of the required live storage of reservoirs.
2) Ava.S stands for avai lable slorage capacity at the proposed damsites.
3) Effective live storage of freshwater at the proposed Bang Pakong diversion dam is estimated at 30 MCM and is treated as the available channel storage in the water balance simulation study.

Table D-3-2 Simulated Results by Sub-Basin (1)
UPPER PHRA PRONG
BLOCK NO $=1+2+3+$


## KHLONG PHRA SATHUNG



MIDDLE PHRA PRONG


| YEAR | HATER DEMAND | BASIN RUHOFF | E.RAIN RETURH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TAIL-END } \\ & \text { OUTFLOH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RIVER } \\ & \text { RATER } \end{aligned}$ | SUPPLY F <br> CHANNEL | FROM---A) | REQUIREO CAPACITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (MCM) | (MCH) | (HCN) | (NCH) | (MCM) | (19CF) | (HCH) | (HCM) |
| 1968. | 145.905 | 354.283 | 56.424 | 1379.176 | 137.507 | 2.142 | 54.449 | 37.072 |
| 1969 | 134.818 | 429.241 | 67.306 | 1723.136 | 120.470 | 1.318 | 60.746 | 60.278 |
| 1970 | 127.947 | 458,783 | 61.625 | 1747.008 | 116.565 | 2.142 | 51.913 | 49.364 |
| 1971 | 125,083 | 416.768 | 59.214 | 1428.711 | 118.625 | 1.071 | 45,354 | 45.354 |
| 1972 | 118.136 | 429.801 | 69.148 | 1799.805 | 106.623 | 1.071 | 43.897 | 43.897 |
| 1973 | 130.998 | 395.176 | 61.894 | 1500.926 | 128.067 | 2.162 | 34.795 | 30.996 |
| 1974 | 122.203 | 424.830 | 60.956 | 1514.899 | 115.700 | 1.581 | 33.175 | 33.175 |
| 1975 | 124.393 | 413.648 | 59.656 | 1501.780 | 121.476 | 2.069 | 31.269 | 31.268 |
| 1976 | 117.258 | 572.639 | 88.231 | 2118.118 | 99.667 | 1.071 | 59.605 | 59.805 |
| 1977 | 108.690 | 488.483 | 74.393 | 1641.912 | 101.295 | 2.142 | 37.658 | 36.795 |
| 1978 | 128.329 | 513.346 | 75.093 | 1561.082 | 120.761 | 1.741 | 42.593 | 42.593 |
| 1979 | 148.895 | 519.910 | 76.148 | 1715.676 | 141.604 | 2.045 | 41.800 | 41.536 |
| 1980 | 109.610 | 606.151 | 87.532 | 2031.387 | 100.439 | 1.071 | 40.319 | 40.319 |
| 1981. | 108.068 | \$39.508 | 75.421 | 1986.838 | 103.120 | 2.142 | 34.251 | 22.707 |
| 1982 | 121.449 | 516.830 | 73.803. | 1847.269 | 101.840 | 1.990 | 80.159 | 60.159 |
| 1983 | 110.089 | 607.864 | 96.915 | 2295.905 | 105.776 | 1.071 | 40.520 | 65.447 |
| 1984 | 123.068 | 501.278 | 68.980 | 1785.404 | 114.005 | 2.142 | 50.564 | 48.913 |
| 1985 | 117.930 | 502.113 | 66.727 | 1863.045 | 108.645 | 1.071 | 39.227 | 39.227 |
| 1986 | 119.070 | 509.273 | 72.681 | 1839.998 | 111.914 | 1.071 | 40.149 | 40.149 |
| 1987 | 132.082 | 396.129 | 56.118 | 1381.583 | 126.766 | 2.142 | 34.348 | 29.207 |
| TOTAL | 2474.021 | 9596.027 | 1408.259 | 34663.633 | 2300.862 | 33.236 | 876.791 | 858.061 |
| MEAN | 123.701 | 479.801 | 70.413 | 1733.182 | 115.043 | 1.662 | 43.840 | 42.903 |
|  |  | $1 / 2=41.9$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { ROBABILIT } \\ 1 / 5= \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TY OF REQUIR } \\ & =\quad 52.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RED CAPAC1TY } \\ & 1 / 7=55.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (\mathrm{MCH})=- \\ 1 / 10= \end{array}$ | $0=58.3$ |  |

Table D-3-3 Simulated Results by Sub-Basin (2)
MAENUM HANUMAN SUB-BASIN
BLOCK NO. $=9+10+11+12+13+14+15+16+17+$


| YEAR | HATER DEMANO | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OASIN } \\ & \text { RUNOF } \end{aligned}$ | E.RAIH RETURA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TAIL-END } \\ & \text { OUTFLOW } \end{aligned}$ | ---MATER <br> RIVER | SUPPLY CHANNEL. | $\text { FRON- } \quad \text { DAM }$ | REQUIRED CAPACITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (MCM) | (HCM) | (MCH) | (MCM) | (MCM) | (MCM) | ( HCH ) | (MCH) |
| 1968 | 220.930 | 993.190 | 91.365 | 933.115 | 168.248 | 3.459 | 71.631 | 46.118 |
| 1969 | 193.363 | 1359.310 | 127.290 | 1410.913 | 104.091 | 2,648 | 117.677 | 111.208 |
| 1970 | 203.509 | 1164.884 | 93.025 | 1135.753 | 141.755 | 2.342 | 80.198 | 78.067 |
| 1971 | 213.963 | 1115.632 | 98.325 | 1091.393 | 146.650 | 2,675 | 92.555 | 86.656 |
| 1972 | 191.870 | 1260.967 | 125.322 | 1303.609 | 104.660 | 2,617 | 109.165 | 101.553 |
| 1973 | 210.029 | 1081:619 | 117.177 | 1059.106 | 157.717 | 3.833 | 70,340 | 59.798 |
| 1974 | 204.166 | 1257.609 | 111.362 | 1236.313 | 150.533 | 2,818 | 71.636 | 68.606 |
| 1975 | 169.502 | 1466.837 | 152.495 | 1523.851 | 117.676 | 2.604 | 73,860 | 69.286 |
| 1976 | 185.185 | 1353.187 | 123.179 | 1390.707 | 112.223 | 2,368 | 98,398 | 92,184 |
| 1977 | 197.013 | 1172.852 | 12.761. | 1180.701 | 126.794 | 3.080 | 93.169 | 86.818 |
| 1978 | 204.199 | 1412.236 | 132.895 | 1451.991 | 119.716 | 2.690 | 109.651 | 106.178 |
| 1979 | 281.455 | 1406.468 | 128.194 | 1363.923 | 196.337 | 4,756 | 91.163 | 80.363 |
| 1980 | 182.286 | 1489.140 | 137.104 | 1549.784 | 100.216 | 2.337 | 88.816 | 80.187 |
| 1981 | 192.247 | 1460.575 | 121.350 | 1476.081 | 123.747 | 3.644 | 88.602 | 79.628 |
| 1982 | 200.321 | 1202.721 | 107.202 | 1238.013 | 100.497 | 2.849 | 126.273 | 119.922 |
| 1983 | 208.963 | 1360.917 | 131.666 | 1377.397 | 145.474 | 2.654 | 95.918 | 75.803 |
| 1984 | 207.466 | 1369.610 | 122.438 | 1398.102 | 121.069 | 2.767 | 113.324 | 108.809 |
| 1985 | 209.052 | 1245.842 | 100.272 | 1228.473 | 139.478 | 2.635 | 81.610 | 81.186 |
| 1986 | 221.714 | 1139.028 | 95.023 | 1103.780 | 155.186 | 3,689 | 91.318 | 84.779 |
| 1987 | 206.405 | 1107.474 | 99.343 | 1082.798 | 142.939 | 4,550 | 81.148 | 54.778 |
| TOTAL | 4083.737 | 25420.066 | 2327.785 | 2S535.773 | 2676.002 | 60.817 | 1852.451 | 1669.886 |
| MEAN | 203.187 | 1271.003 | 116.389 | 1276.789 | 133.800 | 3.041 | 92.623 | 83.494 |
|  |  | $1 / 2=82.8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PR08ABILIT } \\ & 9 \quad 1 / 5= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & Y \text { of REQU1 } \\ & 99.7 \end{aligned}$ | ED CAPACITY $1 / 7=104.3$ | (HCH) $1 / 10$ | $0=108.8$ |  |

UPPER BANG PAKONG SUB-BASIM

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { BLOCK } \\ & \text { TCA }= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{NO}=18+19+ \\ 275700 .(H A) \end{gathered}$ |  | $20+21+$ | (CUM) | rcv= | 1 (HCM) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | YEAR | VATER DETMAND | 8ASIN RUNOFF <br> RUtiof | E.RAIN RETURN | TALL-END OUTFLOW | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HATER } \\ & \text { RIVER } \end{aligned}$ | SUPPLY CHANNEL | ROM-- DAM | REQUIRED CAPACITY |
|  |  | (MCH) | (MCH | ( HCM ) |  |  | (H) |  |  |
|  | 1968 | 1477.558 | 919.948 | 503.269 | 2991.430 | 911.790 | 57.447 | 733.585 | 665.862 |
|  | 1969 | 1323.624 | 1031.288 | 524.214 | 3964.426 | 896.594 | 27.029 | 624.646 | 622.543 |
|  | 1970 | 1320.959 | 1155.714 | 557.152 | 3867.957 | 892.653 | 51.250 | 567.163 | 509.896 |
|  | 1971 | 1363.887 | 998.761 | 495.484 | 3339.593 | 852.307 | 62.109 | 695.208 : | 651.714 |
|  | 1972 | 1247.638 | 1011.558 | 512.230 | 3896.590 | 861.862 | 47.431 | 520.492 | \$17.220 |
|  | 1973 | 1480.174 | 783.270 | 446.026 | 3020.708 | 925.802 | 57.677 | 725.619 | 629.628 |
|  | 1974 | -1369.339 | 920.723 | 512.266 | 3463.072 | 917.737 | 46.604 | 626.645 | 590.684 |
|  | 1975 | 1389.501. | 849.638 | 483.920 | 3611.993 | 921.949 | 51.618 | 646.263 | 593.558 |
|  | 1976 | 1308.806 | 933.217 | 553.740 | 4377.367 | 832.187 | 29.047 | 687.186 | 679.785 |
|  | 1977 | 1378.124 | 890.751 | 479.464 | 3381.842 | 972.032 | 48.162 | 567.427 | 545.305 |
|  | 1978 | 1502.359 | 900.816 | 486.445 | 3662.463 | 934.362 | 46.351 | 764.226 | 729.743 |
|  | 1979 | 1718.399 | 817.646 | 459.598 | 3623.588 | 951.813 | 51.945 | 984.435 | 908.709 |
|  | 1980 | 1343.315 | 1078.714 | 561.998 | 4461.387 | 935.472 | 42.404 | 590.375 | 588.061 |
|  | 1981 | 1409.996 | 1180.879 | 566.793 | 4382.648 | 976.698 | 47.207 | 576.194 | 544.469 |
|  | 1982 | 1443.929 | 920.152 | 491.350 | 3721.757 | 929.102 | 61.278 | 667.172 | 541.757 |
|  | 1983 | 1211.509 | 1130.852 | 631.439 | 4756.406 | 855.513 | 39.708 | 557.869 | 500.867 |
|  | 1984 | 1356.048 | 900.768 | 498.844 | 3945.563 | 830.564 | 40.096 | 715.663 | 696. 317 |
|  | 1985 | 1425.993 | 938.101 | 518.521 | 3839.861 | 912.652 | 45:513 | 695.052 | 657.618 |
|  | 1986 | 1396.982 | 982.130 | 541.057 | 3863.335 | 830.573 | 26.997 | 793.362 | 788.312 |
|  | 1987 | 1454.466 | 881.066 | 471.079 | 3004.458 | 939.656 | 76.895 | 644.745 | 458.231 |

TOTAL $27922.57419223 .95710294 .969 \quad 75176.37518081 .285 \quad 956.76613383 .29712518 .258$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { MEAN } & 1396.129 & 961.198 & 514.748 & 3758.819 & 904.064 & 47.838 & 669.165 & 625.913\end{array}$

MAENUM NAKHON NAYOK SUB-BASIN

$T C V=26.711(\mathrm{MCN})$

| YEAR | HATER DEMAND | $\begin{array}{r} \text { BASIM } \\ \text { RUNDFF } \end{array}$ | E. RAIM RETURN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TAIL-ENDC } \\ & \text { OUYFLOH } \end{aligned}$ | RI-HATER RIVER | SUPPLY CHANNEL |  | REQUIRED CAPACITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (HCM) | (HCM) | ( HCM ) | (MCH) | (NCM) | (MCH) |  |  |
| 1968 | 677.444 | 1011.944 | 313.230 | 864.848 | 390.292 | 58.980 | 243.831 | 223.042 |
| 1969 | 586.315 | 1318.528 | 379.088 | 1307.969 | 353.962 | 62.381 | 186.835 | 162.623 |
| 1970 | 540.482 | 1489.544 | 382.115 | 1477.600 | 360.372 | 53.969 | 136.916 | 114.544 |
| 1971 | 595.114 | 1209.438 | 358.766 | 1176.410 | 326.082 | 71.785 | 215.299 | 185.582 |
| 1972 | 481.163 | 1350.879 | 394.902 | 1378.324 | 357.405 | 32,332 | 105.397 | 99.385 |
| 1973 | 689.673 | 1017.213 | 294.831 | 895.854 | 380.856 | S2.125 | 273.485 | 250.516 |
| 1974 | 554.380 | 1119.865 1323 | 329.871 | .993.857 | 435.820 359.45 | 42.689 83.247 | 91.314 | 84.162 |
| 1975 1976 | 585.941 526.394 | 1323.782 1305.378 | 381.014 445.251 | 1280.621 1404.110 | 359.454 337.650 | 83.247 28.593 | 158.362 | 118.737 |
| 1977 1978 | 514.681 | 1305.378 970.908 | 445.251 311.425 | 1404.110 816.581 | 337.650 403.783 | 28.593 66.210 | 180.283 160.480 | 178.545 144.540 |
| 1978 | 679.570 | 1081.064 | 340.250 | 1074.433 | 317.556 | 44.068 | 180.480 340.405 | 178.540 332.585 |
| 1979 | 758.058 | 980.445 | 304.345 | 858.059 | 386.446 | 54.893 | 336.001 | 300.436 |
| 1980 | 539.220 | 1297.450 | 394.260 | 1316.116 | 362.696 | 35.291 | 159.712 | 153.199 |
| 1981 | 575.223 | 1315.833 | 364.795 | 1277.376 | 347.533 | 67.632 | 177.601 | 128.913 |
| 1982 | 602.048 | 1320.244 | 372.122 | 1291.140 | 369.242 | 55,544 | 194.358 | 118.929 |
| 1983 | 506.298 | 1540.531 | 485.399 | 1653.078 | 308.969 | 73.308 | 147.839 | 109.419 |
| 1984 | 615.767 | 1155.201 | 362.821 | 1114.289 | 339.898 | 48.919 | 243.850 | 240.858 |
| 1985 | 649.826 | 1227.306 | 394.834 | 1187.323 | 404.267 | 77.599 | 188.301 | 180.055 |
| 1986 | 607.808 | 1301.444 | 397.958 | 1302.401 | 361.397 | 46.639 | 217.280 | 213.387 |
| 1987 | 818.458 | 874.758 | 264.589 | 624.600 | 440.974 | 95.482 | 298.085 | 164.841 |
| total | 12203.836 | 24191.727 | 7252.352 | 23294.953 | 7344.641 1 | 1151.682 | 4055.614 | 3484.275 |
| MEAN | 610.192 | 1209.586 | 362.617. | 1164.748 | 367.232 | 57.584 | 202.781 | 174.214 |
|  |  | $1 / 2=160$. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { KOBABILIT } \\ 1 / 5= \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OF REQUI } \\ & 222.4 \end{aligned}$ | RED CAPACIIY $1 / 7 \approx 243.6$ | (MCM) $1 / 10=$ | $0=265.9$ |  |

Table D-3-4 Simulated Results by Sub-Basin (3)
KHLONG THA LAT SUB-BASIN


| YEAR | HATER DEMAND | BASIM RUNOFF | E,RAIH RETURN | TAIL-END OUTFLOH | RIVER RATER | SUPPLY F <br> CHANNEL | FROM---D | REQUIRED CAPACITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ( MCH ) | (MCH) | (MCM) | ( HCH ) | (HCM) | (MCM) | (MCM) | (MCM) |
| 1968 | 83.631 | 586.191 | 11.839 | 581.327 | 65.966 | 4.614 | 66.930 | 49.421 |
| 1969 | 69.462 | 638.222 | \% 11.927 | 618.978 | 57.854 | 5.577 | 42.671 | 51.206 |
| 1970 | 70.750 | 995.801 | 13.618 | 979.139 | 58.327 | 6.488 | 38.025 | 34.200 |
| 1971 | 78.432 | 847.510 | 12.329 | 638.879 | 62.230 | 5. 509 | 59.685 | 43.844 |
| 1972 | 82.541 | 554.388 | 11.927 | 535.528 | 66.587 | 8.204 | 51.996 | 39.595 |
| 1973 | 79.737 | 524.992 | 10.889 | 503.773 | 86.863 | 6.612 | 47.391 | 36.736 |
| 1974 | 79.405 | 487.495 | 12.195 | 480.194 | 63.880 | 4.489 | 55.969 | 43.515 |
| 1975 | 75.394 | 672.195 | 12:822. | 844.315 | 86.013 | 5.442 | 39.077 | 36.617 |
| 1976 | 74.188 | 680.627 | 12.888 | 667.520 | 59.516 | 6.807 | 46.530 | 36.211 |
| 1977 | 71.504 | 719.477 | 12.236 | 675.451 | 65.398 | 6.949 | 16.911 | 23.578 |
| 1978 | 75.449 | 744.328 | 12.710 | 724.736 | 63.056 | 6.245 | 42.911 | 38.581 |
| 1979 | 84.514 | 724.634 | 12.634 | 718.799 | 66.788 | 7.122 | 63.775 | 45.434 |
| 1980 | 76.711 | 785.773 | 12.496 | 761.175 | 64.729 | 5.072 | 42.132 | 38.350 |
| 1981 | 76.342 | 1089.290 | 15.390 | 1083.560 | 60.252 | 4.405 | 50.927 | 40.956 |
| 1982 | 82.054 | 586.383 | 11.155 | 568.846 | 64.902 | 4.654 | 53.286 | 41.661 |
| 1983 | 70.567 | 877.295 | 14.573 | 856.236 | 60.450 | 7.041 | 39.052 | 27.461 |
| 1984 | 73.424 | 590.213 | 11.458 | 554.771 | 86.982 | 5.438 | 26.299 | 13.871 |
| 1985 | 78.820 | 604.058 | 12.070 | 595.543 | 62.100 | 4.776 | 54.456 | 44.599 |
| 1986 | 74.000 | 889.100 | 13.341 | 691.849 | 56.240 | 4.377 | 63.307 | 45.908 |
| 1987 | 75.513 | 559.185 | 11.129 | 519.241 | 67.024 | 6.289 | 27.865 | 5.668 |
| TOTAL | 1532.437 | 13757.133 | 249.424 | 13399.83? | 1265.155 | 114.113 | 928.993 | 737.389 |
| MEAN | 76.622 | 887.858 | 12.471 | 689.991 | 63.258 | 5.706 | 46.450 | 36.869 |
|  |  | $1 / 2=33$. | R08A81LIT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IY of REQUI } \\ & =52.1 \end{aligned}$ | RED CAPACITY $1 / 7=58.5$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{1 / 10}$ | $0=65.3$ |  |

LOWER BAMG PAKONG SUB-BASIM
$\mathrm{BLOCK} N 0 .=38+39+40+41+42+43+44+45+46+47+48+49+50+51+52+53+54+$
TCA= $310600 .(\mathrm{HA})$

| YEAR | HATER DEMAND | BASIN RUNOFF | E,RAIN RETURH | $\begin{gathered} \text { TAIL-ENDS } \\ \text { OUTFLOH } \end{gathered}$ | --HATER RIVER | SUPPLY <br> CHANEEL | FROM----M) | REQUIRED CAPACITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ( M CH CH ) | (MCH) | (MCH) | ( HCM CH ) | ( MCM ) | (MCM) | (19CM) | (MCH) |
| 1968 | 1124.968 | 597.754 | 166.907 | 4573.270 | 818.693 | 52.137 | 498.042 | 436.371 |
| 1969 | 1073.045 | 536.618 | 176.116 | 6007.594 | 745.824 | 46.075 | 512.181 | 444.232 |
| 1970 | 1101.788 | 632.798 | 173.279 | 6483.055 | 813.712 | 67.275 | 418.206 | 371.681 |
| 1971 | 1064.335 | 607.613 | 187.397 | 5440.117 | 717.125 | 67.439 | 554.673 | 461.364 |
| 1972 | 1126.173 | 525.039 | 175.974 | 5853.113 | 795.050 | 47.801. | 468.292 | 395.333 |
| 1973 | 1095.015 | 539.252 | 172.184 | 4530.695 | 772.637 | 86.685 | 496.530 | 407.490 |
| 1974 | 1035.804 | 850.847 | 197.119 | 5211.707 | 752.617 | 50.708 | 457.796 | 397.206 |
| 1975 | 1109.873 | 533.885 | 188.182 | 5626.141 | 824.174 | 46.271 | 498.786 | 408.629 |
| 1976 | 1063.538 | 563.216 | 178.791 | 6660.801 | 715.715 | 69.600 | 531.723 | 449.260 |
| 1977 | 1119.612 | 473.669 | 165.548 | 4830.645 | 842.018 | 47.857 | 442.563 | 397.479 |
| 1978 | 1125.317 | \$21.425 | 179.275 | 5634.465 | 752.193 | 50.784 | 592.892 | 512.140 |
| 1979 | 1229.848 | 383.351 | 158.450 | 5187.242 | 807.293 | 44.955 | 675.812 | 588.144 |
| 1980 | 1084.232 | 495.527 | 173.958 | 6645.410 | 769.590 | 52.399 | 520.145 | 434.932 |
| 1981 | 1101.396 | 568.823 | 180.833 | 6860.527 | 784.348 | 48.671 | 469.692 | 405.387 |
| 1982 | 1094.307 | 506.231 | 175.167 | 5879.469 | 739.327 | 73.102 | 509.079 | 450.078 |
| 1983 | 979.778 | 695.531 | 210.318 | 7850.164 | 704.022 | 49.197 | 479.144 | 338.458 |
| 1984 | 1152.975 | 469.223 | 167.383 | S692.418 | 806.457 | 45.941 | 574.492 | 514.416 |
| 1985 | 1111.525 | 416.291 | 172.937 | 5643.148 | 750.895 | 50.648 | 541.825 | 472.735 |
| 1986 | 1117.381 | 550.172 | 188.391 | 6054.488 | 752.206 | 46.303 | 576.838 | 502.833 |
| 1987 | 1108.732 | 568.275 | 174.175 | 4161.891 | 856.894 | 75.693 | 379.421 | 282.201 |
| TOTAL | 22019.410 | 10835.520 | 3542.36011 | 4426.0621 | 15520.7581 | 1119.541 | 10198.117 | 8670.328 |
| MEA ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1100.970 | 541.776 | 177.118 | 5721.301 | 776.038 | 55.977 | 509.906 | 33.516 |

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 / 2=428.4 & 1 / 5=490.5 & 1 / 7=508.6 \quad 1 / 10=526.4
\end{array}
$$

entire bang pakong river basin
BLOCK NO, $=1+2+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9+10+11+12+13+14+15+16+17+18+19+203$
$21+22+23+24+25+26+27+28+29+30+31+32+33+34+$
$41+42+43+44+45+46+47+48+49+50+51+52+53+54+$
$\mathrm{ICA}=1766000 .(\mathrm{HA}) \quad \mathrm{QMA}=17.660(\mathrm{CUM}) \quad 47+48+49+5 \mathrm{TCV}^{+}{ }^{+}{ }^{+}$

| YEAR | HATER DEMAND | BASIH RUNOFF | E.RAI ${ }^{\prime}$ RETURN | $\begin{gathered} \text { TAIL-END } \\ \text { OUTFLOH } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { RIVER } \\ \text { RATER } \end{gathered}$ | SUPPLY <br> Chaminel | FROM~~--> | REMUIRED CAPACITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (MCM) | (HCM) | (NCM) | (MCH) | (MCM) | (MCH) | (MCM) | (HCM) |
| 1968 | 4347.113 | 5599.316 | 1329.358 | 4573.270 | 2833.312 | 190.687 | 2024.789 | 1767.199 |
| 1969 | 3945.469 | 6637.352 | 1522.883 | 6007.594 | 2619,309 | 154.417 | 1851.952 | 1736.862 |
| 1970 | 3912.260 | 7274.230 | 1487.769 | 8483.055 | 2720.677 | 194.264 | 1555.260 | 1397.800 |
| 1971 | 4010.345 | 6141.273 | 1401.050 | 5440.117 | 2586.713 | 223.532 | 1930.703 | 1727.075 |
| 1972 | 3753.365 | 6514.508 | 1527.135 | \$853.113 | 2595.300 | 146.523 | 1561.982 | 1442.931 |
| 1973 | 4256.496 | 5588.082 | 1318.671 | 4530.695 | 2814.614 | 219.417 | 1896.793 | 1637.385 |
| 1974 | 3885.148 | 6106.734 | 1415.642 | 5211.707 | 2811.333 | 158.226 | 1535.138 | 1398.162 |
| 1975 | 4009.908 | 6482.199 | 1452.352 | 5626.141 | 2781.062 | 201.239 | 1708.573 | 1487.996 |
| 1976 | 3812.944 | 6855.668 | 1673.975 | 6660.801 | 2449.655 | 144.598 | 1933.095 | 1814.187 |
| 1977 | 3998.460 | 5884.707 | 1395.802 | 4830.645 | 2332.334 | 183.852 | 1570.928 | 1475.049 |
| 1978 | 4282.977 | 6236.402 | 1460.447 | 5634.665 | 2662.003 | 159.641 | 2199.455 | 2040.994 |
| 1979 | 4838.523 | 6101.750 | 1401.140 | - 5187.242 | 2940.581 | 176.150 | 2527.765 | 2227.863 |
| 1980 | 3831.776 | 7155.723 | 1636.513 | 6645.410 | 2665.620 | 148.792 | 1691.206 | 1555.191 |
| 1981 | 3932.445 | 7600.270 | 1563.484 | 6860.527 | 2694.079 | 188.599 | 1625.029 | 1414.762 |
| 1982 | 4085.028 | 6376.453 | 1479.884 | 5679.469 | 2628.490 | 210.547 | 1893.378 | 1691.911 |
| 1983 | 3594.122 | 7797.113 | 1873.969 | 7650.164 | 2481.919 | 181.964 | 1646.835 | 1367.121 |
| 1984 | 4062.702 | 6256.371 | 1455.448 | 5692.418 | 2571.675 | 154.476 | 2032.161 | 1917.341 |
| 1985 | 4094.425 | 6325.762 | 1503.394 | 5643.148 | 2706.426 | 191.302 | 1851.723 | 1678.427 |
| 1986 | 4072.399 | 6572.508 | 1553.565 | 6054.488 | 2639.385 | 136.891 | 2008.661 | 1895.910 |
| 1987 | 4443.402 | 5555.398 | 1264.388 | 4161.891 | 2965.569 | 273.658 | 1781.331 | 1237.421 |
| TOTAL | 81 | 9061.562 | 29716. | 426.062 | 53999.992 | 3636.753 | 36826.828 | 32911.359 |
| MEAK | 4058.456 | 6453.078 | 1485.846 | 5721.301 | 2700.000 | 181.838 | 1841.341 | 1645.568 |
|  | PROBABILITY OF REQUIRED CAPACITY (KCM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table D-3-5 Summary of Water Demand Computation (average in 20 years 1963-1987)


# Table D-3-6 Sumiary of Water Balance Computation (average in 20 years 1968 - 1987) 



Table D-3-7 Sumary of Water Balance Computation (specific year of 1979)


Table D-3-7 Summary of Water Balance Computation (specific year of 1983)


## D. 4 OPTIMUM SCALE OF WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Tha following tables summarize the procedures employed to determine the optimum scale of water resources development:

Table D-4-1 Irrigable Area by Alternative Plan
Table D-4-2 Required Dam Storage by Alternative Development Plan
Table D-4-3 Net Production Value by Alternative Development Plan
Table D-4-4 Amount of Hater Resources to be Allocated to Sectors
Table D-4-5 Construction Cost (Agricultural Sector) by Alternative Plan

Table D-4-6 B/C Ratio by Alternative Development Plan

TABLE D-4-1 IRRIGABLE AREA BY ALTERNATIVE PLAN
(Unit = ha)

|  | Wet Season |  | Dry Season |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Net } \\ & \text { Irrigation } \\ & \text { Area } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Paddy | Veget. | Paddy | Upland C | Veget. | Orchrd |  |
| Alt. Plan-1 | 339,600 | 28,000 | 67,200 | 120,000 | 28,000 | 24, 200 | 406,800 |
| Alt. Plan-2 | 339,600 | 28,000 | 38,200 | 120,000 | 28,000 | 24, 200 | 406,800 |
| Alt. Plan-3 | 339,600 | 28,000 | 0 | 120,000 | 28,000 | 24,200 | 406,800 |
| Alt. Plan-4 | 339,600 | 28,000 | 0 | 15,000. | 28,000 | 24, 200 | 406,800 |

Note: Net irrigation area $=339,600+28,000+15,000+24,200=406,800$ ha

TABLE D-4-3 NET PRODUCTION VALUE BY ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(Unit = million baht)

| Sub-Basin | Alt. Plan-1 | Alt. Plan-2 | Alt. Plan-3 | Alt. Plan-4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lower Bang Pakong | 648 | 624 | 547 | 501 |
| Tha Lat | 103 | 100 | 95 | 92 |
| Upper Bang Pakong | 1,365 | 1,300 | 1,194 | 382 |
| Nakhon Nayok | 160 | 137 | 62 | 62 |
| Middle Phra Prong | 96 | 85 | 85 | 59 |
| Maenum Hanuman | 254 | 240 | 240 | 198 |
| Phra Sathung | 254 | 239 | 239 | 205 |
| Upper Phra Prong | 412 | 390 | 390 | 338 |
| Total | 3,292 | 3,115 | 2,852 | 1,837 |

TABLE D-4-4 AMOUNT OF WATER RESOURCES TO BE ALLOCATED TO SECTORS
(Unit $=\mathrm{MCM} \& \%$ )

| Sector | Alt. Plan-1 | Alt. Plan-2 | Alt. Plan-3 | Alt. Plan-4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Irrigation | $4,066(92 \%)$ | $3,607(92 \%)$ | $2,997(91 \%)$ | $2,412(87 \%)$ |
| Industrial Suupply | $215(5 \%)$ | $215(5 \%)$ | $215(6 \%)$ | $215(8 \%)$ |
| Water Supply | $116(3 \%)$ | $116(3 \%)$ | $116(3 \%)$ | $116(4 \%)$ |
| Fishery | $14(0 \%)$ | $14(0 \%)$ | $14(0 \%)$ | $14(1 \%)$ |
| Total | 4,412 | 3,953 | 3,343 | 2,758 |

Note: Irrigation and fishery are counted as agricultural sector.

TABLE D-4-5 CONSTRUCTION COST (AGRICULTURAL SECTOR) BY ALTERNATIVE PLAN
(Unit = million baht)

| Iten | Dam No. | Alt. Plan-1 | Alt. Plan 2 | Alt. Plan-3 | Alt. Plan-4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dam | 1 | 814 | 685 | 685 | 615 |
|  | 4 | 961 | 820 | 820 | - |
|  | 5 | - | - | \%-\% - | 170 |
|  | Rabom | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97. |
|  | 8 | 1,185 | 1,056 | 896 | 786 |
|  | 10 | 738 | 738 | 696 | 696 |
|  | 11 | 247 | 223 | 223 | $\square$ |
|  | 12 | 885 | 754 | 754 | 577 |
|  | 15 | 174 | 150 | 139 | - |
|  | 18+19 | 1,943 | 1,939 | 1,951 | 1,419 |
|  | 20 | 1,820 | 1,548 | 1,548 | 1,222 |
|  | 21 | 169 | 152 | 111 | 111 |
|  | 22 | 1,048 | 837 | 616 | 616 |
|  | Total | 9,957 | 8,902 | 7,839 | 6,212 |
|  | Agri. | $92 \%=9,160$ | 92\% $=8,190$ | $91 \%=7,133$ | $88 \%=5,466$ |
| Diversion Dam |  | 595 | 595 | 595 | 595 |
| Main Facilities |  | 12,302 | 12,302 | 12,302 | 12,302 |
| On-farm Facilities |  | 4,037 | 4,037 | 4,037 | 4,037 |
| Total |  | 26,094 | 25, 124 | 24,067 | 22,400 |

Note: (1) The Rabom dam is at present under construction.
(2) The proposed Khlong Luang dam is assigned as the No. 1 dam.
(3) About 1,500 million bahts of construction cost of the Bang Pakong diversion dam is allocated fiftyfifty between agriculture and other sectors. The cost for agricultural sector is then allocated between both banks of the Bang Pakong river, as;
$1,500 \times 50 \% \times 384.6 \mathrm{MCM} / 484.6 \mathrm{MCM}=595$ million bahts (Left bank) and $1,500 \times 50 \%-595=155$ (Right bank).

TABLE D-4-6 B/C RATIO BY ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPHENT PLAN

| Item | Alt. Plan-1 | Alt. Plan-2 | Alt. Plan-3 | Alt. Plan-4 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Benefit. |  |  |  |  |
| - Benefit (1) | 3,292 | 3,115 | 2,852 | 1,837 |
| $-0 /$ M Cost (2) | 302 | 301 | 300 | 299 |
| $-((1)-(2)) / 0.12$ | 24,917 | 23,450 | 21,267 | 12,817 |
| Cost |  |  |  |  |
| Financial Cost | 26,094 | 25,124 | 24,067 | 22,400 |
| - Bcononic (0.9) | 23,484 | 22,611 | 21,660 | 20,160 |
| B/C Ratio | 1.06 | 1.04 | 0.98 | 0.64 |

Note: Discount rate was taken at $12 \%$ and project life was considered to be 60 years as an average.

TABLE D-4-2 RROUIRED DAM STORAGE BY ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (Unit $=$ MCM)

| Dam No. | Alt. Plan-1 | Alt. Plan-2 | Alt. Plan-3 | Alt. Plan-4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 172 | 119 | 119 | 79 |
| 4 | 370 | 300 | 300 | - |
| 5 | - | - | - | 81 |
| Rabom | $(40)$ | $(40)$ | $(40)$ | $(40)$ |
| 8 | 565 | 470 | 288 | 157 |
| 10 | 160 | 160 | 122 | 122 |
| 11 | 105 | 86 | 86 | - |
| 12 | 350 | 290 | 290 | 193 |
| 15 | 150 | 98 | 45 | - |
| 18 | 327 | 322 | 204 | 204 |
| 20 | 152 | 133 | 133 | 99 |
| 21 | 230 | 188 | 90 | 90 |
| 22 | 126 | 98 | 71 | 71 |
| Total | 2,747 | $2,304 *$ | 1,788 | 1,136 |

Note: (1) Rabom dam is under construction.
(2) $2,304 \mathrm{MCM}(*)$ includes losses due to evaporation and seepage, that correspond to $10 \%$ of the required capacity.

## D. 5 SELECTION OF PRIORITY PROJECT

The following tables sumarized the procedures employed to select the priority sub-project:

Table D-5-1 Evaluation from National Economic Point of View
Table D-5-2 Evaluation from Technical Point of View
Table D-5-3 Evaluation from Social Point of View
Table D-5-4 Evaluation from Farm Economic Point of View

TABLE D-5-1 EVALUATION FROM NATIONAL ECONOMIC POINT OF VIEW (B/C RATIO)

| Sub-Basin | Incremental Benefit |  |  | Feasible Investment |  | Cost |  | B/C Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Incre. Beneft | $0 / \mathrm{M}$ Cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bene } \\ & \text {-fit } \end{aligned}$ | Discount Rate |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Finan- } \\ \text { cial } \end{array}$ | Economic | Discount Rate |  |
|  |  |  |  | $10 \%$ | 12 \% |  |  | $10 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Lower Bang Pakong | 624 | 52.7 | 571.3 | 5,713 | 4,761 | 5,168 | 4,651 | 1.23 | 1.02 |
| Tha Lat | 100 | 6.9 | 93.1 | 931 | 776 | 707 | 636 | 1.46 | 1.22 |
| Upper Bang Pakong | 1,300 | 97.7 | 1202.3 | 12,023 | 10,019 | 8,118 | 7,306 | 1.65 | 1.37 |
| Nakhon Nayok | 137 | 54.4 | 82.6 | 826 | 688 | 3,379 | 3,041 | 0.27 | 0.23 |
| Middle Phra Prong | 85 | 13.5 | 71.5 | 715 | 596 | 822 | 740 | 0.97 | 0.80 |
| Maenum Hanuman | 240 | 21.4 | 218.6 | 2,186 | 1,822 | 3,060 | 2, 754 | 0.79 | 0.66 |
| Phra Sathung | 239 | 22.4 | 216.6 | 2,166 | 1,805 | 1,957 | 1,761 | 1.23 | 1.02 |
| Upper Phra Prong | 390 | 32.0 | 358.0 | 3,580 | 2,983 | 1,808 | 1,627 | 2.20 | 1.83 |
| Total | 3,115 | 301 | 2,814 | 28, 140 | 23,450 | 25, 019 | 22,516 | 1.25 | 1.04 |

Note: Benefit, feasible investment and cost are given in million bahts.

TABLE D-5-2 EVALUATION FROM TECHNICAL POINT OF VIEL (DAM CONSTRUCTION AND COMPENSATION)


Note: (1) No proposed damsite in the Middle Phra prong sub-basin.
(2) Decimal point denotes 0.5 point (ex. $1 .=1.5$ ). Three(3) point is given for the grade " $A$ "(excellent or no problem), 2 point is given for " $B$ ", while 1 point for " $C$ " and " $D$ ", and 0 point for " $\S$ " (difficult).
(3) For compensation of the reservoir area, 3 point is given for " $A$ " where no or less impact is evaluated, 2 point for " $B$ " (moderate) and 1 point for " $C$ " where a considerable impact is presumed.

TABLE D-5-3 EVALUATION FROM SOCIAL POINT OF VIEW (URGENCY AND INIABITANT'S NEEDS)

|  | Inhabitant's Needs |  |  |  |  | Supply Urgency |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sub-Bas in | Irrigat. | Domestic | Road | Elec | Evaluat. | Industry | Domes. |
| Lower Bang Pakong | 2 | 1 | $(3)$ | $(1)$ | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Tha Lat | 3 | 1 | $(2)$ | $(1)$ | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Upper Bang Pakong | 3 | 1 | $(2)$ | $(1)$ | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Nakhon Nayok | 2 | 1 | $(3)$ | $(1)$ | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Middle Phra Prong | 2 | 1 | $(3)$ | $(1)$ | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Maenum Hanuman | 2 | 1 | $(3)$ | $(1)$ | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Phra Sathung | 1 | 1 | $(3)$ | (2) | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Upper Phra prong | 1 | 1 | $(3)$ | (1) | 2 | 1 | 1 |

Note: Needs for road and electricity were excluded from overall evaluation. Inhabitants's needs: $3=$ eager, $2=$ moderate and $3=$ modest. Urgency: $3=$ very urgent, $2=$ moderate and $1=$ not urgent.

TABLE D-5-4 EVALUATION FROM FARM ECONOMIC POINT OF VIEL (PER HA BENEFIT)

| Sub-Basin | Annual <br> Benef it <br> (Million B) | Benef ic- <br> ial Area <br> (ha) | Unit Area <br> Benef it <br> (1000baht/ha) | Evalua <br> -tion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lower Bang Pakong | 624 | 68,900 | 9.1 | 2 |
| Tha Lat | 100 | 6,900 | 11.8 | 3 |
| Upper Bang Pakong | 1,300 | 136,900 | 9.4 | 2 |
| Nakhon Nayok | 137 | 76,400 | 1.8 | 1 |
| Middle Phra Prong | 85 | 16,600 | 5.1 | 1 |
| Maenum Hanuman | 240 | 28,100 | 8.2 | 2 |
| Phra Sathung | 239 | 29,700 | 8.0 | 2 |
| Upper Phra Prong | 390 | 43,300 | 9.2 | 2 |
| Total | 3,115 | 406,800 | 7.7 |  |

Notes: Evaluation; 3 points for benefit $>10.0,2$ points for $10.0 \leqq$ benefit $\leqq 7.5$ and 1 point for benefit $<7.5$.

## D. 6 FLOOD RUNOFF ANAIYSIS

## D. 6.1 Flood Rainfall

## Probable 3 Day Consecutive Rainfall

As is seen in Figure D-6-1, probable 3 day consecutive rainfall has a close relation with the average annual rainfall at selected rain stations, where storm rainfall data are available. The following equation was developed to estimate probable consecutive rainfall in each irrigation block (see Tables D-6-1 and D-6-2).
$X=0.0865 \times Y+65.1$
where, $X: 3$ day consecutive rainfall which would occur once in 10 years, in mm

Y : Average annual rainfall (mm)

Hourly Distribution of Storm Rainfall

Hourly distribution of storm rainfall was determined in proportion to the actual pattern of the storm rainfall measured at stations in September 1972 (cf. Appendix A-2-10).

Runoff Coefficient during Flood

Amount of flood runoff was plotted against the amount of flood rainfall at stations. An envelope curve was drawn mainly from the data obtained at the station kgt.12, as shown in Figure D-6-1. This envelope curve was then converted into an equation showing relation between the accumulated storm rainfall and rainfall loss as under:
$\mathrm{SL}=0.5 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{SR}$, when $\mathrm{SR}<100 \mathrm{~mm}$
$\mathrm{SL}=0.375 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{SR}+12.5$, when $\mathrm{SR}>100 \mathrm{~mm}$
where, SL : Cumulative loss of rainfall (mm) SR : Cumulative rainfall (mm)

## Effective Rainfall

Effective rainfall is, then, calculated as follows:
$S R E_{t}=S R_{t}-S L_{t}$
$R E_{t}=S R E_{1}-S R E_{t-1}$
where, SRE : Cumulative effective rainfall (mn)

$$
\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{t}-1: \text { time }
$$

## D.6.2 Flood Runoff Model

The mechanism of surface runoff may fall generally into two parts; namely (1) the behaviour of rain water which flows down a sloping surface and pours directly into river channel and (2) the behaviour of lateral inflow which pours into such a stream. As a simplified stream condition, the behaviour of unsteady flow in an open channel with distributed lateral inflow along a channel is studied hydraulically to establish the basic relationship between the rate of inflow and runoff in a strean or on a sloping surface. Hydrographs under this simplified condition are easily computed for both laminar and turbulent flows, and the hydraulic character of hydrographs resulting from simulated inflow at a given rate are investigated. The method of characteristics was employed to express this phenomenon. Breif explanation is as below:

If the law of resistance of Manning's type is used, unsteady flow in an open channel with a given rate of lateral inflow would be expressed for the practical purposes by the equations;

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=n \times I^{-1 / 2} \times R^{2 / 3} \times Q=k Q^{p} \text { and } \\
& \frac{\partial A}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial Q}{\partial X}=q .
\end{aligned}
$$

The method of characteristics is applied in order to solve the above equations and the characteristic curves are given as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d X}{1}= & \frac{d t}{d A / d \bar{Q}}=\frac{d t}{p k Q^{n}}=\frac{d Q}{q} \\
\text { where, } & A: \text { cross-sectional area of flow (sq. } \mathrm{m}) \\
& n: \text { Manning's roughness coefficient } \\
& I \text { : water surface slope of flow } \\
R & : \text { hydraulic radius ( } \mathrm{m} \text { ) } \\
Q & : \text { discharge (cu. } \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}) \\
\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{p} & : \text { constants } \\
t & : \text { time } \\
X & : \text { distance along channel (m) } \\
& q: \text { lateral inflow per unit length of channel }(\mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{m})
\end{aligned}
$$

This means that to solve the former equations is to solve the following two equations on a characteristic curve, which is expressed as $\mathrm{dX} / \mathrm{dt}=\mathrm{Q}^{1-\mathrm{p}} / \mathrm{pk}$. Thus;

$$
\begin{aligned}
& q d t=p k Q^{p-1} \text { or } q t=k Q^{p}+\text { constant, and } \\
& \mathrm{qdX}=\mathrm{d} \mathrm{Q} \quad \text { or } \mathrm{qX}=\mathrm{Q}+\text { constant }
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking that constant $=0$, the flow condition is expressed for a given magnitude of lateral inflow $q$, as;

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t=k Q^{P} / q \text { and } \\
& t=k X Q^{p-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

When $q=0$, it is expressed on a characteristic curve given above that $\mathrm{A}=$ constant and $\mathrm{Q}=$ constant $=(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{k})^{1 / \mathrm{p}}$. The flow condition is so given as follows:

$$
X=\left(Q^{1-p} / \mathrm{pk}\right) \mathrm{t} .
$$

The time lag of concentration of runoff is generally recognized to be remarkable for drainage area mainly composed of low flat paddy because of storage capacity on a paddy plot. A paddy plot surrounded by levees with certain depth of flooding water can be regarded as a small reservoir and, therefore, the conception of simplified reservoir operation could be introduced to take into account the effect of rain water deposit on a paddy plot.

A storage function is introduced to calculate the specific runoff capacity from a paddy plot by the following equation:
$\frac{d V}{d t}=I-0$
where $V$ denotes storage on a paddy plot, $I$ and 0 , inflow into and outflow from a paddy plot respectively, and time. The above equation can be divided by the water surface area on a plot, A, and then transformed:

$$
\frac{d H}{d t}=i-0
$$

where $H$ shows ponding depth on a plot, i specific inflow corresponding to effective rainfall on a plot, and o specific outflow corresponding to the specific runoff capacity from a paddy plot. A differencial equation is constructed to solve the above equation by a computer as;

$$
H_{t+1}=H_{t}+\left(\mathrm{RE}_{2}, \mathrm{t}+1=\frac{0_{1}-0_{2}+1}{2}\right) \Delta \mathrm{t}
$$

where $R_{t, t+1}$ represents effective rainfall between time $t$ and $t+1$ and $\Delta t$ is a time interval given for computation. The specific runoff capacity from paddy fields is thus computed at corresponding time $t$, and then this is considered as a lateral inflow of drainade canal or stream.

## Application of the Characteristic Method to a Real Problem

(1) For a Slope


- In the case when $r \neq 0$
$\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{kq}^{\mathrm{p}} / \delta \mathrm{r}$
$\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{kXq}^{\mathrm{p}-1}$
- When $\mathrm{r}=0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{t}=\mathrm{pkX} / \mathrm{q}^{1-\mathrm{p}}=0.6 \mathrm{q}^{-0.4}\left(\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{I}^{1 / 2}\right)^{0.6} \mathrm{X} \\
& \text { where, } \delta: \text { conversion rate from } \mathrm{min} / \mathrm{hr} \text { to } \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}=0.2778 \times 10^{-6} \\
& \mathrm{r}: \text { effective rainfall (malhr) } \\
& \mathrm{q}: \text { discharge per unit width of slope }\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{m}\right) \\
& \mathrm{N}: \text { equivalent roughness coefficient of slope } \\
& \mathrm{I}: \text { slope }=\sin \theta \\
& \mathrm{X}: \text { flow distance }
\end{aligned}
$$

(2) For River or Channel : As stated previously with theoretical conception.
(3) For Paddy Field

- for ditch

$$
A_{m}=k Q_{m}{ }^{p}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial A_{\mathrm{m}}}{\partial \mathrm{t}}+\frac{\partial Q_{\mathrm{m}}}{\partial \mathrm{X}}=(2 \mathrm{~b} 0) \alpha, \text { and }
$$

- for lateral drainage canal

$$
A_{b}=k Q_{b}{ }^{p}
$$

$$
-\frac{\partial A_{b}}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial Q_{b}}{\partial X}=\frac{Q_{m}}{2 b}
$$

where, $A_{m}, Q_{m}$ : flow area and discharge in a ditch
$A_{b}, Q_{b}$ : flow area and discharge in a laretal canal
$\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{p}:$ constants
$\alpha:=0.2778 \times 10^{-6}$
b : see Figure
0 : runoff capacity per unit area ( $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ )

Table D-6-3 presents basin characteristics given for flood runoff analysis, and Figure D-6-2 shows the concept of runoff capacity from the paddy field.

TABLE D-6-1 DAILY RAINFALL IN OCTOBER, 1983
Daily Rainfall in (1983 October) (1)

| Day | -0304 | 0308 | 0321 | -0522. | 0606 | 0001 | 0916. | 0917 | 2204 | 2207 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - |  |  |  | 6.2 | 7.1 |  |  | 2.6 |  | 0.9 |
| 7 | - | 13.0 | - |  | 8.1 |  |  |  |  | - |
| 8 | - | 12.4 |  | 9.1 | 17.6 | 3.2 | 7.4 | - | 14.5 | - |
| 9 | - | 24.0 | - | 1.0 | 16.0 | 13.0 | 4.5 | 63.1 | 22.5 | 43.2 |
| 10 | 35.1 | 38.6 | 30.4 | 44.1 | 12.7 | 13.2 | 18.7 | 21.8 | 62.5 | 70.5 |
| 11 | 16.2 | 45.6 | 40.4 | 49.3 | 6.4 | 15,6 | 7.8 | 25.6 | 26.6 | 92.3 |
| 12 | 8.2 | 5.7 |  | 2.8 | 48.8 | 18.8 | -- | 0.3 | 35.8 | 9.5 |
| 13 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 40.0 | 36.7 | 2.3 | 40.1 | $\bigcirc$ | 10.0 | 22.6 | 56.2 |
| 14 | 14.5 | 10.0 | 15.5 | 21.0 | 14.7 | - | 35.8 | 0.7 | 10.2 |  |
| 15 | 0.0 | 8.4 | ${ }^{-}$ | - | 7.4 | 10.3 | 7.6 |  | 16.2 | 27.5 |
| 16 | 10.1 | - | 6.5 | 2.7 |  |  | - | $\cdots$ | 12.1 | - |
| 17 | 0.0 | 11.5 |  |  | 48. 4 | 6.0 | 17.6 | 26.1 | 5.2 | 28.2 |
| 18 | 25.6 | 40.0 | 45.5 | 41.1 | 39.4 | 50.1 | 132.0 | 37.6 | 22.3 | 73.9 |
| 19 | 56.6 | 3.3 | 40.4 | 14. 9 | 28.7 | 25.8 | 6.9 | 1.5 | 8.6 |  |
| 20 | 0.0 | - | 8.5 |  | 25.1 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 7.8 | 29.5 | 4.2 |
| 21 | . | -- | 0.5 | - | -- | 14.5 | 0.9 |  | 6.2 |  |
| 22 | : - | - | - | , | - | 0.9 | 9.6 | 11.0 | 15.8 | - |
| 23 | - | .. | - | 3.3 | - | 4.2 | 27.9 | 51.5 | 3.5 | - |
| 24 | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | .- | - | - |
| 25 | . | - | - | - | $\cdots$ | - | . | - | 51.2 | - |
| Total | 196.3 | 231.2 | 277.7 | 262. 2 | 283.0 | 215.8 | 280.3 | 259.6 | 324.3 | 406.4 |

Daily Rainfall in October 1983 (2)

| Day | 2215 | 2517 | 2553 | 4402 | -4404. | 4106 | 4408 | 1412 | 4413. | 2513 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | -- | - | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 |
| 7 | 5.7 |  |  | 10.0 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 8 | 2.4 | 7.9 | 4.8 | -- | 6.0 | 5.8 | 6.7 | 26.0 | 25.3 | 6.0 |
| 9 | 22.8 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 35.5 | 2.9 | 11.2 | 13.1 | 31.8 | 4.0 | 2.9 |
| 10 | 83.2 | 111.0 | 55.1 | 10.0 | 51.3 | 60.2 | 49.5 | 97.5 | 88.0 | 69.4 |
| 11 | 16.7 | 59.0 | 2.4 | G0. 0 | 1.0 | - | 2.8 | 4.9 |  | 3.0 |
| 12 | 5.6 | 110.0 | 41.0 | 15.0 | 8.2 | - | 48.5 | 1.8 | 51.0 | 51.7 |
| 13 | 22.4 | 136.7 | 5.7 | 20.5 | 5.2 | - | 33.3 | 43.9 | 26.3 | 7.2 |
| 14 | 22.6 | 8.3 | 0. 1 | - | 2.9 | 15.0 | -- |  | 52.6 | 0.5 |
| 15 | 107.4 | 33.5 | 21.3 | 15.0 | 21.8 | 16.5 | - | 24.5 | 3.7 | 26.8 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | - | 8.0 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 17 | 35.5 | - | 27.7 | 30.5 | 55.3 | - | 65.9 | 85.3 | 37.6 | 34.9 |
| 18 | 31.4 | 49.6 | 21.7 |  | 34.1 | 23.0 | 5.0 | 18.8 | 9.0 | 27.3 |
| 19 | 12.3 | .. |  | - | 0.7 | 30.5 | - | - | 1.3 | - |
| 20 | - | - | 5.7 | - | 6.7 | 25.0 | 6.8 | 25.6 | 7.2 | 7.2 |
| 21 | - | 1.3 | - | - | , |  | - | .. | 7.1 | - |
| 22 | - | 3.2 | 7.0 | - | 0.8 | $\cdots$ | - | 66.0 | 0.4 | 8.8 |
| 23 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| 24 | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | 8.3 | - | - |
| 25 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |

$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { Total } & 398.0 & 524.4 & 195.9 & 226.5 & 199.5 & 187.2 & 239.6 & 434.4 & 316.5 & 246.7\end{array}$

TABLE D-6-2 AREAL DISTRIBUTION OF DAILY RAINFALL IN OCTOBER, 1983
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## D. 6. 3 Flood Discharge

The following peak discharge and total amount of the design flood were obtained for (1) existing basin condition and (2) anticipated condition in future, as the result of the preliminary study of flood analysis. For the computation, topographic condition of irrigation block including drainage area and surface slope by land use and length and slope of river channel was read on $1 / 50,000$ topo-maps (Table D-6-3).

Peak Discharge and Flood Volume Analyzed

|  | Drainage | Basin | Existing |  | Anticipated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Peak | Specific | Peak | Specific |
| Station | $\frac{\text { Area }}{(\mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{km})}$ | $\frac{\text { Rainfali }}{(\mathrm{mm})}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Discharge } \\ & (\text { cum } / \mathrm{sec}) \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\text { Volume }}{(\mathrm{mm})}$ | Discharge <br> (cum/sec) | $\frac{\text { Volume }}{(\mathrm{mm})}$ |
| 801 | 1,628 | 247.6 | 1500.6 | 115.2 | 2056.0 | 131.8 |
| 701 | 2,643 | 227.9 | 1203.3 | 82.8 | 1408.6 | 88.6 |
| 601 | 5,241 | 223.3 | 3079.0 | 91.4 | 3941.0 | 102.3 |
| 501 | 2,130 | 247.6 | 1492.2 | 118.5 | 1700.6 | 125.1 |
| 401 | 10,128 | 171.2 | 5750.9 | 85.8 | 7063.8 | 102.8 |
| 301 | 1,933 | 199.0 | 1085.4 | 97.0 | 2129.1 | 118.4 |
| 201 | 2,493 | 153.9 | 1042.7 | 68.8 | 1060.0 | 70.2 |
| 101 | 17,660 | 145.8 | 8,361. 8 | 72.3 | 10181.3 | 89.8 |

FIGURE B-6-2 RUNOFF CAPACITY FROM PADDY GIELD


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sub } \\ & \text { Basin } \end{aligned}$ | Site No | Watershed Area (sq. kim) |  |  |  | Slope Gradient. |  |  | River Chan. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Paddy | Upland | Others | Total | Pad. | Upld | 0thr | ling t | Slope |
| UPP-3 | 803 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 266.0 | 266.0 | 300 | 200 | 30 | 30 | 90 |
|  | 802 | 215.2 | 103.0 | 455.6 | 774.0 | 200 | 170 | 10 | 58 | 1450 |
| -1 | 801 | 250.4 | 272.1 | 65.5 | 588.0 | 200 | 160 | 10 | 58 | 2900 |
| KPS-4 | 704 | 19.7 | 231.2 | 363.1 | 614.0 | 200 | 150 | 40 | 48 | 170 |
| -3 | 703 | 26.2 | 304.2 | 507.6 | 838.0 | 200 | 120 | 80 | 45 | 1100 |
| -2 | 702 | 92.4 | 103.3 | 605.3 | 801.0 | 200 | 150 | 120 | 38 | 1900 |
| -1 | 701 | 161.3 | 163.2 | 65.5 | 390.0 | 300 | 200 | 100 | 50 | 5000 |
| MPP-1 | 601 | 195.2 | 218.2 | 556.6 | 970.0 | 500 | 450 | 200 | 63 | 6300 |
| MHM-5 | 505 | 0.0 | - 0.0 | 68.0 | 68.0 | 400 | 300 | 25 | 8 | 90 |
| -6 | 506 | 0.0 | 56.5 | 39.5 | 96.0 | 500 | 400 | 15 | 7 | 35 |
| -4 | 504 | 38.8 | 3.9 | 131.3 | 174.0 | 800 | 500 | 60 | 18 | 450 |
| -8 | 508 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.0 | 64.0 | 200 | 100 | 60 | 10 | 250 |
| -9 | 509 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 147.0 | 147.0 | 1000 | 500 | 50 | 20 | 80 |
| -7 | 507 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 232.0 | 232, 0 | 1000 | 800 | 100 | 28 | 350 |
| -3 | 503 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 273.0 | 273.0 | 200 | 150 | 110 | 37 | 300 |
| -2 | 502 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 159.0 | 159.0 | 500 | 300 | 170 | 28 | 40 |
| -1 | 501 | 206.4 | 340.6 | 370.0 | 917.0 | 2000 | 800 | 80 | 53 | 1300 |
| UBP-3 | 403 | 346.9 | 374.5 | 28.6 | 750.0 | 1000 | 400 | 300 | 40 | 8000 |
| -5 | 405 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 107.0 | 107.0 | 300 | 200 | 130 | 15 | 35 |
| -4 | 404 | 230.3 | 103.6 | 60.1 | 394.0 | 500 | 250 | 110 | 35 | 1200 |
| -2 | 402 | 177.2 | 262.8 | 6.0 | 446.0 | 1000 | 250 | 60 | 38 | 8000 |
| -1 | 401 | 919.4 | 134.8 | 5.8 | 1060.0 | 5000 | 3000 | 400 | 43 | 8000 |
| MNN-6 | 306 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 151.0 | 151.0 | 200 | 100 | 10 | 18 | 450 |
| - -5 | 305 | 34.3 | 82.1 | 339.6 | 456.0 | 3000 | 500 | 300 | 40 | 110 |
| -4 | 304 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 114.0 | 114.0 | 200 | 100 | 10 | 8 | 60 |
| -3 | 303 | 179.4 | 14.1 | 121.5 | 345.0 | 1000 | 300 | 60 | 25 | 1700 |
| -2 | 302 | 260.3 | 46.2 | 62.5 | 369.0 | 5000 | 5000 | 400 | 15 | 1900 |
| -1 | 301 | 342.8 | 8.0 | 147.2 | 498.0 | 5000 | 5000 | 400 | 35 | 3500 |
| KTL-9 | 209 | 1.3 | 24.5 | 559.2 | 585.0 | 200 | 100 | 70 | 38 | 420 |
| -8 | 208 | 3.8 | 36.4 | 350.8 | 391.0 | 200 | 100 | 20 | 38 | 380 |
| -7 | 207 | 2.5 | 98.7 | 293.8 | 395.0 | 200 | 140 | 70 | 33 | 1700 |
| -4 | 204 | 7.9 | 100.8 | 28.3 | 137.0 | 200 | 100 | 100 | 25 | 2500 |
| -6 | 206 | 1.8 | 82.3 | 96.9 | 181.0 | 200 | 180 | 100 | 18 | 1800 |
| -5 | 205 | 7.6 | 121.2 | 488.2 | 617.0 | 200 | 200 | 100 | 43 | 1100 |
| -3 | 203 | 0.0 | 62.7 | 6.3 | 69.0 | 5000 | 3000 | 200 | 18 | 1000 |
| -2 | 202 | 1.3 | 77.3 | 7.4 | 86.0 | 5000 | 3000 | 200 | 15 | 7500 |
| -1 | 201 | 13.7 | 15.2 | 3.1 | 32.0 | 5000 | 3000 | 400 | 22 | 9000 |
| LBP-17 | 117 | 11.9 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 20.0 | 5000 | 500 | 400 | 7 | 3500 |
| -16 | 116 | 22.0 | 160.8 | 16.2 | 199.0 | 5000 | 400 | 400 | 30 | 1250 |
| -15 | 115 | 18.5 | 41.8 | 4.7 | 65.0 | 5000 | 300 | 300 | 12 | 500 |
| -14. | 114 | 12.5 | 171.3 | 17.2 | 201.0 | 5000 | 250 | 300 | 25 | 830 |
| -13 | 113 | 27.8 | 12.7 | 15.5 | 56.0 | 5000 | 400 | 400 | 8 | 800 |
| -12 | 112 | 1.4 | 250.0 | 92.6 | 344.0 | 2000 | 100 | 70 | 15 | 500 |
| -11 | 111 | 6.4 | 137.9 | 39.7 | 184.0 | 2000 | 200 | 70 | 15 | 1000 |
| -10 | 110 | 25.3 | 53.9 | 5.8 | 85.0 | 2000 | 200 | 300 | 13 | 1300 |
| -9 | 109 | 26.2 | 54.6 | 7.2 | 88.0 | 2000 | 200 | 70 | 15 | 300 |
| -8 | 108 | 99.5 | 77.8 | 4.7 | 182.0 | 5000 | 500 | 300 | 28 | 2800 |
| -7 | 107 | 39.7 | 415.5 | 45.8 | 501.0 | 2000 | 100 | 70 | 25 | 190 |
| -6 | 106 | 59.6 | 13.0 | 7.4 | 80.0 | 2000 | 200 | 200 | 25 | 1050 |
| -3 | 103 | 438.9 | 82.2 | 4.9 | 526.0 | 5000 | 3000 | 400 | 45 | 15000 |
| -2 | 102 | 48.4 | 12.6 | 58.0 | 119.0 | 5000 | 3000 | 400 | 8 | 15000 |
| -5 | 105 | 104.8 | 172.2 | 2.0 | 279.0 | 2000 | 100 | 70 | 20 | 670 |
| -4 | 104 | 83.9 | 41.6 | 16.5 | 142.0 | 5000 | 800 | 400 | 15 | 5000 |
| -1 | 101 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 33.4 | 35.0 | 5000 | 500 | 400 | 10 | 1700 |

## D. 7 INTAKE-RATE TEST

Intake-rate tests were conducted at the selected five (5) sites in the proposed Tha Lat Expansion irrigation area. Figure D-7-1 shows the selected sites, and the measurenents are summarized in Table D-7-1. They were further analyzed in order to obtain the basic intake-rates and others as given in Figure $\mathrm{D}-7-2$.
FIGURE D-7-1 LOCATION OF INTAKE-RATE TEST SITES
(

TABLE D-7-1 Data Sheet for Intake Rate Test

| Reading | Time between |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Readings | Water Level | Difference | Accumulation |
| ( Hr ) | (min.) | (cm.) | (min) | ( mm ) |
| (1) No. 1 | site |  |  |  |
| 11:24 | 0 | 24.33 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 30 | 6 | 23.42 | 9.1 | 9.1 |
| 40 | 16 | 22.83 | 5.9 | 15.0 |
| 50 | 26 | 22.30 | 5.3 | 20.3 |
| 12:10 | 46 | 21.40 | 9.0 | 29.3 |
| 30 | 66 | 20.67 | 7.3 | 36.6 |
| 13:00 | 96 | 19.72 | 9.5 | 46.1 |
| (2) No. 2 | site |  |  |  |
| 11:32 | 0 | 19.50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| - 37 | 5 | 19.08 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| 45 | 13 | 18.65 | 4.3 | 8.5 |
| 12:05 | 33 | 18.03 | 6.2 | 14.7 |
| 25 | 53 | 17.57 | 4.6 | 19.3 |
| 55 | 83 | 17.14 | 4.3 | 23.6 |
| (3) No. 3 | site |  |  |  |
| 13:30 | 0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 35 | 5 | 19.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| 40 | 10 | 18.7 | 8.0 | 13.0 |
| 50 | 20 | 17.3 | 14.0 | 27.0 |
| 14:00 | 30 | 16.6 | 7.0 | 34.0 |
| 15 | 45 | 16.1 | 5.0 | 39.0 |
| 30 | 60 | 15.7 | 4.0 | 43.0 |
| 15:00 | 90 | 15.1 | 6.0 | 49.0 |
| - 30 | 120 | 14.6 | 5.0 | 54.0 |
| 16:00 | 150 | 14.2 | 4. 0 | 58.0 |
| 30 | 180 | 14.0 | 2.0 | 60.0 |
| 17:30 | 240 | 13.5 | 5.0 | 65.0 |
| (4) No. 4 | site |  |  |  |
| 10:45 | 0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 50 | 5 | 18.7 | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| 55 | 10 | 18.2 | 5.0 | 18.0 |
| 11:05 | 20 | 17.3 | 9.0 | 27.0 |
| 15 | 30 | 16.6 | 7.0 | 34.0 |
| 30 | 45 | 16.0 | 6.0 | 40.0 |
| 45 | 60 | 15.7 | 3.0 | 43.0 |
| 12:15 | 90 | 15.3 | 4.0 | 47.0 |
| 45 | 120 | 15.0 | 3.0 | 50.0 |
| 13:15 | 150 | 14.8 | 2.0 | 52.0 |
| 4.45 | 180 | 14.6 | 2.0 | 54.0 |
| 14:45 | 240 | 14.2 | 4.0 | 58.0 |
| (5) No. 5 | site |  |  |  |
| 9:50 | 0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 55 | 5 | 19.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| 10:00 | 10 | 19.3 | 2.0 | 7.0 |
| 10 | 20 | 19.0 | 3.0 | 10.0 |
| 20 | 30 | 18.9 | 1. 0 | 11.0 |
| 35 | 45 | 18.7 | 2.0 | 13.0 |
| 50 | 60 | 18.4 | 3.0 | 16.0 |
| 11:20 | 90 | 18.0 | 4. 0 | 20.0 |
| 50 | 120 | 17.7 | 3.0 | 23.0 |
| 12:20 | 150 | 17.5 | 2.0 | 25.0 |
| 50 | 180 | 17.2 | 3.0 | 28.0 |
| 13:50 | 240 | 16.8 | 4.0 | 32.0 |



## D. 8 PEAK IRRIGATION REQUIREMENT

Peak Irrigation Requirements


Note(*): Probable value during 5-year drought period.

## D. 9 RESULTS OF WATER BALANCE SIMULATION

The following tables summarize the simulated results of water balance for the subject feasibility study area:

| Tables | Case of Computation |
| :---: | :---: |
| D-9-1 | 1 |
| D-9-2 | 1 |
| D-9-3 | 1 |
| $D-9-4$ | 2 |
| $D-9-5$ | 2 |
| D-9-6 | 2 |

Remarks
Water demand computation Runoff and water diversion Water balance at the water sources Water demand computation Runoff and water diversion Water balance at the water sources
TABLE D-9-1 WATER DEMAND COMPUTATION (COMPUTATION CASE-1)
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| $\infty$ | 0 | 0 | $\rightarrow$ | $N$ | $\cdots$ | $\checkmark$ | ! | $\omega$ | $N$ | $\infty$ | 0 | 0 | $\square$ | c | $m$ | $\checkmark$ | in | $\infty$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\cdots 10$ | 0 | $N$ | $\cdots$ | $N$ | A | N | $\cdots$ | 0 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| 山10 | 0 | on | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | or | on | 0 | On | $\sigma$ | $\infty$ | 0 | 0 | $0 \cdot$ | on | $\infty$ | 0 |
| >180 | - | $\leftarrow$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | r | $\rightarrow$ | - | 5 | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ }$ | $\cdots$ | F | $\rightarrow$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\square$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - |




