Annex 5-1

Division of Inland and Transboundafry Catchments of NERM



Annex 5-2

Study on Applicability of Frequency Analysis Using Simulated Water Levels

Study on Applicability of Frequency Analysis Using Simulated Water Levels

1. Availability of Observed Water Levels

Availability of observed water levels is examined by using water level data observed at 4 stations (Bhairab Bazar, Itna, Sunamganj and Sylhet), which are located along the Surma-Baulai Rivers. These data were provided for the Study by IWM.

The observed data were used for the Study after correction due to river channel movement and land settlement in the haor area. Table 1 compiles the observed water level data after correction.

Station Name	Data Period	Correction	Remarks		
		value* (m)			
Bhairab Bazar	1980-2010	-0.62	Corrected data were provided for		
			the Study in September 2013 by		
			IWM.		
Itna	2003-2010	-1.45	The data in and after 2003 were		
			used for the Study, because no		
			reliable correction value before		
			2003 had been obtained from		
			IWM.		
Sunamganj	1980-2010	-0.67	The correction value obtained		
Sylhet	1980-2010	-0.61	from IWM was used for the 31		
			years (1980 to 2010).		

 Table 1
 Observed Water Level Data for the Study (after correction)

Note: * These values were added to the observed water levels for correction.

Figures 1 to 4 present the observed water levels after correction.



Figure 1 Observed Water Levels at Bhairab Bazar Station (1/2: 1980–1995)



Figure 1 Observed Water Levels at Bhairab Bazar Station (2/2: 1996–2010)











Figure 3 Observed Water Levels at Sunamganj Station (2/2: 1996–2010)



Source: JICA Study Team





Figure 4 Observed Water Levels at Sylhet Station (2/2: 1996–2010)

The annual average water levels during pre-monsoon and monsoon seasons, which were calculated using the corrected water levels in Table 1, and 3 year moving averages of the annual average water levels at the 4 stations are presented in Figure 5.

The observed water levels at Bhairab Bazar, Sunamganj and Sylhet after correction were used in the succeeding study, because unsteadiness of water levels such as change of long-term trend and jump (sudden change) is not found in Figure 5. The water level data at Itna were not used because of its short period data with data missing.



(a) Annual Average Water Level

(b) 3-year Moving Average of Annual Average Water Levels



Source: JICA Study Team



Seasons

2. Applicability of Flood Frequency Analysis Using Water Levels

Applicability of flood frequency analysis using not discharges but water levels was verified at the Sylhet station. The work flow of verification is as explained below (see Figure 6).

- (1) Calculation of (a) probable water levels converted from probable discharges,
 - Conversion of observed water levels (WLs) to observed discharges through H-Q curves prepared by the Study Team,
 - Frequency analysis of the observed discharges, and
 - Conversion of probable discharges to probable WLs through the H-Q curves.
- (2) Calculation of (b) probable water levels estimated from observed water levels,
 - Frequency analysis of observed WLs
- (3) Verification of applicability of frequency analysis using WLs through comparison between probable WLs (return periods: 2, 5, 10 and 20years) of the (a) and (b)

Selection criteria of probable distribution model in frequency analysis

The frequency analysis in the (1) and (2) was carried out for each of the pre-monsoon season (4/1-5/15) and monsoon season (5/16-10/31) by using annual maximum values during each season and the hydrological statistic utility program developed by Japan Institute of Country-ology and Engineering (JICE).

Out of 13 probable distribution models for annual events, the model which has an index of "Standard Least Square Criterion (SLSC)" of less than 0.04 and a comparatively smaller "Jackknife Estimation Error" was selected as an optimum one, referring to "Technical Criteria for River Works: Practical Guide (Investigation; Japanese Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism, June 2012)"

If each model has a SLSC index of more than 0.04, the model which has a comparatively smaller value as the index of "Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)" was selected, after confirming its adaptability on a probability paper in 10 and 20 year return period cases.





Preparation of H-Q Curve

A H-Q curve was worked out based on discharge measurement data (2003-2009) at Sylhet. Taking into account the dates of discharge measurements, the measured discharges were divided into two flow conditions, namely low and flood flows, with a threshold of $300m^3/s$, and H-Q formulas: $Q=a(H+b)^2$ and H=aQ+b were applied to low and flood flows, respectively, as shown in Figure 7. The coefficients of "a" and "b" were calculated by the "Least Squares Method".

In this study, the correlation coefficient is employed as an index to assess adaptability of the H-Q curve. The correlation coefficients of the H-Q curve in Figure 7 have rather high values of 0.94 and 0.95 for low and flood flows, respectively.



Figure 7 H-Q Curve at Sylhet Station

Figure 8 presents comparison between probable WLs of the (a) and (b) above, wherein 2, 5, 10 and 20 year water levels during pre-monsoon and monsoon seasons are plotted. As the probable WLs of (a) and (b) show similar tendency in Figure 8, the applicability of frequency analysis using water levels was confirmed. Table 2 and Figures 9 to 12 present the results of the above mentioned frequency analyses.

It is noted that each probability distribution model has an SLSC index of more than 0.04 in selection optimum ones for probable discharges and probable water levels during the monsoon season. Therefore, probability distribution models were selected based on AIC indices and their adaptability on probability papers (see Figures 10 and 12 for the results on frequency analyses of observed discharge and observed water levels, respectively).



Figure 8 Comparison between Probable Water Levels Analyzed Using Observed Discharges and Observed Water Levels

Table 2 Probable Water Levels at Sylhet Estimated from Probable Discharges and Observed Water Levels

Sylhet Station			Pre-monsoon Seasor	l	Monsoon Season		
Estimation Method		(a) Probable Discharge		(b) Observed WL.	(a) Probable Discharge		(b) Observed WL.
		Discharge	Water Level	Water Level	Discharge	Water Level	Water Level
Probability Distribution Function		LP3Rs	-	GEV	LN2PM	-	Gumbel
Parameter Estimation Method			-	L-moment method	Moment method	-	L-moment method
Estimated value by Jackknife method	1/2	812	8.0	8.0	1,681	10.8	10.7
	1/5	1,356	9.8	9.5	1,780	11.2	11.0
	1/10	1,552	10.4	10.2	1,834	11.3	11.3
	1/20	1,644	10.7	10.7	1,879	11.5	11.5
Estimated Error by Jackkhife method	1/2	127	-	0.4	20	-	0.1
	1/5	87	-	0.3	28	-	0.1
	1/10	96	-	0.3	37	-	0.1
	1/20	129	-	0.4	46	-	0.2
SLSC		0.030	-	0.024	0.058	-	0.056
Correlation (X-COR)		0.984	-	0.994	0.964	-	0.963
pAIC		0.0	-	127.4	363.3	-	47.2
Number of sample		31	-	31	31	-	31

Note: LP3Re: Log Poison Type III Distribution (Real space method),

GEV: Generalized Extreme Value Distribution, LN2PM: Log Normal Distribution (2 parameter) Gumbel: Gumbel Distribution



Source: JICA Study Team

Figure 9 Frequency Analysis of Discharge Data in Pre-monsoon Season at Sylhet Station





Figure 10 Frequency Analysis of Discharge Data in Monsoon Season at Sylhet Station





Figure 11 Frequency Analysis of Observed Water Level in Pre-monsoon Season at Sylhet Station



Figure 12 Frequency Analysis of Observed Water Level in Monsoon Season at Sylhet Station

3. Applicability of Frequency Analysis Using Simulated Water Levels

The applicability of frequency analysis using simulated water levels has been verified at Bhairab Bazar, Sunamganj and Sylhe stations by comparing with the results of frequency analysis using observed water levels. The Itna station is excluded in this verification because the number of available observed water level data at this station is small.

In Figure 13, the annual maximum observed and simulated water levels are compared for pre-monsoon and monsoon seasons. As seen in Figure 13, the observed and simulated water levels at Bhairab Bazar are mostly the same, while there is a tendency that the observed water levels are higher than the simulated ones at Sunamganj and Sylhet. Thus, three stations have different tendency from one another. However, it is assessed that there is no data plotted extremely far from the bold lines at these stations.

In Figure 14, compared are 2, 5, 10 and 20 year water levels calculated for pre-monsoon and monsoon seasons using observed and simulated water levels.

There is no significant difference between them at Bhairab Bazar. On the other hand, at Sunamganj and Sylhe, though a similar tendency is seen in Figure 14, the probable water levels of observed ones are bigger: in the case of the 2 year water level at Sylhet during pre-monsoon season, the difference is 60 cm.

Furthermore, the pre-monsoon difference of the 10 year water levels is 30 cm at maximum at Sunmganj, and the monsoon difference of the 20 year waters is 40 cm at maximum at Sylhet. A 10 year pre-monsoon water level and a 20 year monsoon water level are used for design of submergible and full embankments, respectively. Tables 3 to 5 and Figures 15 to 26 present the results of frequency analyses at the 3 stations.

Each probability distribution model has an SLSC index of more than 0.04 in both observed and simulated water level cases at Sylhet during the monsoon season. Therefore, probability distribution models were selected based on AIC indices and also their adaptability on probability papers (see Figures 25 and 26 for frequency analyses of observed and simulated water levels, respectively)

The analysis results mentioned above are summarized as stated below:

- (1) The probable WLs of observed ones are bigger than those of simulated WLs at Sunamganj and Sylhet.
- (2) The maximum difference of 10 year pre-monsoon water levels for design of submergible embankment is 30 cm and the maximum difference of 20 year monsoon water levels for design of full embankment is 40 cm.



Figure 13 Comparison of Maximum Water Levels between Observed and Simulated WLs in Pre-monsoon Season(4/1-5/15) and Monsoon Season(5/16-10/31)



Source: JICA Study Team



Furthermore, it could be pointed out that the following are included in the causes of the (1) and (2) above :

- Since the observed WLs for 31 years (1980-2010) are corrected with one constant correction value for each station, the WLs after correction fail to properly reflect the actual chronological changes due to river bed/channel movement, settlement, etc. in the haor area. And
- Since the simulation of water levels is carried out by using the meteoro-hydrologic data from 1980 to 2010 and current river cross sections, the reproducibility of water levels under past river conditions is not necessarily high.

Table 3 Probable Water Levels Estimated by Observed and Simulated Water Levels at

Bhairab Bazar

Bhairab Bazar Station		Pre-monsoon Season			Monsoon Season		
		Observed WL.	Simulated WL.	Obs Sim.	Observed WL.	Simulated WL.	Obs Sim.
Probability Distribution Function		GEV	GEV		GEV	LN3PM	
Parameter Estimation Method		L-moment method	L-moment method		L-moment method	Ishihara-Takase	
Estimated value by Jackknife method	1/2	2.4	2.4	0.0	5.8	5.9	-0.1
	1/5	2.7	2.7	0.0	6.3	6.4	-0.1
	1/10	2.9	2.9	0.0	6.6	6.6	0.0
	1/20	3.0	3.0	0.0	6.8	6.9	-0.1
Estimated Error by Jackkhife method	1/2	0.1	0.1		0.1	0.1	
	1/5	0.1	0.1		0.1	0.1	
	1/10	0.1	0.1		0.2	0.2	
	1/20	0.1	0.1		0.2	0.2	
SLSC		0.036	0.033		0.036	0.039	
Correlation (X-COR)		0.991	0.992		0.987	0.984	
pAIC		22.2	23.2		55.7	55.4	
Number of sample		31	31		31	31	

Note: GEV: Generalized Extreme Value Distribution, LN3PM: 3parameter Log normal Distribution







Source: JICA Study Team

(EL.m)

Figure 16 Frequency Analysis of Simulated Water Level in Pre-monsoon Season at Bhairab Bazar Station





Figure 17 Frequency Analysis of Observed Water Level in Monsoon Season at Bhairab Bazar Station





Figure 18 Frequency Analysis of Simulated Water Level in Monsoon Season at Bhairab Bazar Station

Table 4 Probable Water Levels Estimated by Observed and Simulated Water Levels at Sunamganj

Sunamganj Station		Pre-monsoon Season			Monsoon Season		
		Observed WL.	Simulated WL.	Obs Sim.	Observed WL.	Simulated WL.	Obs Sim.
Probability Distribution Function		LP3Rs	LP3Rs		LP3Rs	LP3Rs	
Parameter Estimation Method							
Estimated value by Jackknife method	1/2	5.9	5.6	0.3	8.2	7.9	0.3
	1/5	6.8	6.5	0.3	8.4	8.2	0.2
	1/10	7.2	6.9	0.3	8.5	8.3	0.2
	1/20	7.4	7.3	0.1	8.5	8.4	0.1
Estimated Error by Jackkhife method	1/2	0.2	0.2		0.0	0.1	
	1/5	0.2	0.2		0.0	0.1	
	1/10	0.2	0.2		0.0	0.1	
	1/20	0.3	0.3		0.1	0.1	
SLSC		0.030	0.029		0.027	0.039	
Correlation (X-COR)		0.991	0.992		0.993	0.983	
pAIC		81.3	80.3		0.1	20.1	
Number of sample		27	27		28	28	

Note: LP3Rs: Log Poison Type III Distribution (Real space method)







Source: JICA Study Team







Figure 21 Frequency Analysis of Observed Water Level in Monsoon Season at Sunamganj Station





Figure 22 Frequency Analysis of Simulated Water Level in Monsoon Season at Sunamganj Station

Table 5 Probable Water Levels Estimated by Observed and Simulated Water Levels at Sylhet

Sylhet Station		Pre-monsoon Season			Monsoon Season		
		Observed WL.	Simulated WL.	Obs Sim.	Observed WL.	Simulated WL.	Obs Sim.
Probability Distribution Function		GEV	LP3Rs		Gumbel	LP3Rs	
Parameter Estimation Method		L-moment method			L-moment method	Moment method	
Estimated value by Jackknife method	1/2	8.0	7.4	0.6	10.7	10.5	0.2
	1/5	9.5	9.2	0.3	11.0	10.8	0.2
	1/10	10.2	10.1	0.1	11.3	11.0	0.3
	1/20	10.7	10.6	0.1	11.5	11.1	0.4
Estimated Error by Jackkhife method	1/2	0.4	0.5		0.1	0.1	
	1/5	0.3	0.4		0.1	0.1	
	1/10	0.3	0.3		0.1	0.2	
	1/20	0.4	0.4		0.2	0.2	
SLSC		0.024	0.024		0.056	0.049	
Correlation (X-COR)		0.994	0.994		0.963	0.972	
pAIC		127.4	134.0		47.2	40.6	
Number of sample		31	31		31	31	

Note:

GEV: Generalized Extreme Value Distribution, LP3Rs: Log Poison Type III Distribution (Real space method) Gumbel: Gumbel Distribution





Figure 23 Frequency Analysis of Observed Water Level in Pre-monsoon Season at Sylhet Station





Figure 24 Frequency Analysis of Simulated Water Level in Pre-monsoon Season at Sylhet Station
Final Report



Source: JICA Study Team

Figure 25 Frequency Analysis of Observed Water Level in Monsoon Season at Sylhet Station





Figure 26 Frequency Analysis of Simulated Water Level in Monsoon Season at Sylhet Station

Annex 7.1

Impact of New Haor Project

Study on the Impact to Upstream Area after Construction of New Haor Projects

1 Background

Many new haor projects are planned at downstream area along the Surma-Baulai River. If these projects affect to the upstream existing haor projects, heightening of existing submergible embankment in the existing haor projects are carried out or some new haor projects shall be rejected. And many rehabilitation projects decided by BWDB are on-going. Therefore, some new projects will be rejected. The hydraulic calculation by HEC-RAS is carried out to estimate the impact to upstream existing haor projects.

2 Simulation

The hydraulic simulation is carried out non-uniform flow calculation by using HEC-RAS. The assumptions of simulation are as follows;

- \succ Water levels at Bhairab Bazar, Itna, Sunamganj are applied at 10-year pre-monsoon maximum water level for calibration of simulation model because the submergible embankment is considered to new and existing haor projects,
- > Peak discharge is decided from 10-year pre-monsoon maximum water level. The peak discharge is estimated from the simulated discharge by NERM.
- Roughness coefficient is assumed at 0.03 in river and 0.09 at the flood plain area.

According to the simulated discharge by NERM model, there are several discharges at same water level due to impact from Padma River and other noise of the NERM. Therefore, maximum and mean discharges of the NERM result are used in the simulation.

2.1 Simulation Method

The simulation is carried out from following steps;

1st step: Calibration of present condition

Present condition is considered. The water levels at 3 points, Bhairab Bazar, Itna and Sunamganj, are fixed to the 10-year pre-monsoon maximum water level as shown below;

Location	Water Level (EL.m)		
Bhairab Bazar	2.86		
Itna	4.52		
Sunamganj	6.95		

Source: JICA Study Team

The peak discharges at 3 points are applied to maximum and mean discharge cases.

Discharge Case				
Location	Case 1(Max.) (m ³ /s)	Case 2 (Mean) (m ³ /s)		
Bhairab Bazar	4,360	3,000		
Itna	500	380		
Sunamganj	3,700	2,400		
	•	•		

Source: JICA Study Team

The water levels at 3 points are adjusted to same water level of 10-year pre-monsoon maximum water level.

2nd Step: Calculation of impact after completion of all proposed new projects

All proposed new projects are completed in this step. In this step, the submergible embankment is constructed along the new projects. Therefore, the upstream water level will be raised. The rising height and affected area are estimated. If the impact of the upstream existing haor area is small, the calculation is finished. Affected area is evaluated from difference between the present condition and the completion condition. The affected area is judged from 5cm difference of water level.

3rd Step: Calculation of impact after completion of selected proposed new projects

The bottle neck sections along the new projects area are checked, and its new projects are rejected. If the impact of the upstream existing haor area is small, the calculation is finished. Then, rejected new projects are fond out. Affected area is evaluated from difference between the present condition and the selected one. The affected area is judged from 5cm difference of water level.

2.2 Simulation Results

Location	Rising (cm)			
	Case 1		Case	2
	All	Proposed	All	Proposed
Bhairab Bazar	0	0	0	0
Itna	14	6	16	7
Sunamganj	6	2	5	2

The simulation results are shown in following table and figure.

Note: Proposed scheme is not included Charigram Haor project. Source: JICA Study Team

Location	Affected Area from Itna (km)			
	Case 1		Case 2	
	All	Proposed	All	Proposed
Itna	104	13	84	16

Note: Proposed scheme is not included Charigram Haor project. Source: JICA Study Team

2.3 Recommendation

Charigram haor project shall be rejected from the hydraulic viewpoint.







Case 2

Source: JICA Study Team

Figure 1 Water Level of with/without Scheme

Annex-7.2

Project Map

	Name of Haor Project	Crest Level (height) of embankment	Volume of Embankment	Re-excavation of Canal	Regulator	
n-1	Boro Haor (Nikli)	5.4m (0 – 3.2 m)	9.6 km	10 km	9-vent: 2nos 3-vent: 1nos	
n-2	Naogaon Haor	5.3m (0 – 1.7 m)	34.1 km	20 km	9-vent: 2nos 8-vent: 1nos 4-vent: 1nos	
n-3	Jaliar Haor	7.6m (0 – 1.6 m)	6.8 km	8 km	2-vent: 1nos 2-vent: 1nos	
n-4	Dharmapasha Rui Beel	6.4m (0 – 2.7m)	57.1 km	5 km	9-vent: 3nos 8-vent: 2nos 6-vent: 1nos 3-vent: 1nos	
n-5	Chandpur Haor	5.2m (0 – 0.6 m)	2.1 km	5 km	4-vent: Inos I-vent: Inos	
n-6	Sunair Haor	5.9m (0 – 0.4 m)	16.2 km	25 km	4-vent: Inos I-vent: Inos	
n- 7	Badla Project	5.2m (0 - 1.8m)	10.8 km	2 km	2-vent: 2nos	
n-8	Nunnir Haor	4.7m (0 – 2.5 m)	25.5 km	20 km	5-vent: Inos 2-vent: 2nos	1
n-9	Dakhshiner Haor	5.1m (0 – 2.3 m)	18.3 km	10 km	6-vent: 1nos 3-vent: 1nos	
n-10	Chatal Haor	5.7m (0 – 2.3 m)	5.7 km	11 km	1-vent: 2nos	1
n-11	Ganesh Haor	6.4m (0 – 2.2 m)	22.5 km	3 km	3-vent: Inos 2-vent: Inos	
n-12	Dhakua Haor	6.3m (0 – 3.2 m)	36.5 km	30 km	5-vent: 1nos 3-vent: 1nos 1-vent: 1nos	
n-13	Mokhar Haor	5.5 - 6.2m (0 - 5.8 m)	68.8 km	110 km	5-vent: 1nos 4-vent: 2nos 3-vent: 2nos	
n-14	Noapara Haor	4.9m (0 – 3.5 m)	28.3 km	7 km	3-vent: Inos 2-vent: Inos 1-vent: Inos	
n-15	Dulalpur Haor	4.3m (0 – 2.9 m)	8.3 km	3 km	2-vent: Inos	
n-16	Bara Haor	6.3m (0 – 4.6 m)	27.0 km	40 km	5-vent: 1nos 1-vent: 1nos	
n-17	Bansharir Haor	6.1m (0 – 2.8 m)	18.0 km		1-vent: 2nos	1
n-18	Korati Haor	5.2m (0 – 4.3 m)	40.4 km	4 km	4-vent: Inos 1-vent: Inos	
n-19	Sarishapur Haor	4.6m (0 – 1.8 m)	7.1 km	5 km	1-vent: Inos	
n-20	Shelnir Haor	5.5m (0 – 1.6 m)	30.1 km	2 km	1-vent: 3nos	
n-21	Kuniarbandh Haor	4.3m (0 – 3.0 m)	8.3 km		1-vent: 1nos	
n-22	Ayner Gupi Haor	4.3m (0 - 3.0m)	13.7 km		3-vent: Inos	1
	Charigram Project	4.9m (0 - 2.2m)	25.7 km	3 km	4-vent: 1nos	
Ľ,	Bara Haor (Austagram)	4.8m (0 – 2.2 m)	60.3 km	40 km	11-vent: 2nos 4-vent: 1nos 3-vent: 1nos	
	Golaimara Haor	4.2m (0 m)	-	-	-	f
	Joyariya Haor	4.2m (0 m)	÷	-	- ÷	
	Total					

New Project List

No.	Name of Haor Project	Re-sectioning of	Replace of Gate and	Re-excavation of
		Embankment	Regulator	Canal
r-1	1. Dampara Water Management	Full 200 m	Gate 15 nos	12km
	Scheme	Sub 400 m		
r-2	2. Kangsa River Scheme	Full 40 m	Gate 16 nos	
r-3	3. Singer Beel Scheme	Full 100 m	Gate 1 nos	2 km
		Sub 125 m		
r-4	4. Baraikhali Khal Sub-Project	Full 10 m	Gate 6 nos	24.5 km
r-5	5. Aladia-Bahadia Scheme		Gate 2 nos	8 km
r-6	6. Modkhola Bairagirchar Scheme	Full 500 m		
r-7	7. Ganakkahali Scheme		Gate 3 nos	
r-8	8. Kairdhala Ratna	Sub 60 m	Gate 9 nos	
r-9	9. Bashira River Re-excavation Schme	Sub 6,000 m	2vent Reg. 2 nos	20 km
r-10	10. Aralia Khal Scheme		Gate 4 nos	2.4 km
r-11	11. Chandal Beel Scheme	Full 100 m	2vent Reg. 1 nos	1.5 km
r-12	12. Satdona Beel Scheme		2vent Reg. 2 nos	
r-13	15. Gangajuri FCD	Full 600 m	Gate 20 nos	4.5 km
r-14	20. Kaliajuri Polder #02	Sub 810 m	Gate 19 nos	
r-15	21. Kaliajuri Polder #04	Sub 630 m	Gate 3 nos	

Rehabilitation Project List













24"18"0"N

























24°40'




















