Impact of Point Rainfall Data Uncertainties on SWAT Simulations

Michael Rode & Gerald Wenk

Department of Hydrological Modelling

Magdeburg, Germany

4th International SWAT Conference 2007 4.- 6. July UNESCO-IHP University, Delft The Netherlands



Motivation

- Input data uncertainties are increasingly recognised
- Rainfall data are most important input data for rainfall runoff models
- Point rainfall data are associated with systematic and random errors





Systematic point rainfall measurement errors

 Mean correction (%) of the average annual precipitation total (1961/90)

 Moderate wind-sheltered sites in Germany



Source: (WMO, 1998)



Mean correction (%) of precipitation in the Weiße Elster River Basin

													\frown
Shelter class	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Year
a	31.6	33.5	26.9	18.3	12.5	10.4	10.8	10.5	12.6	15.5	21.8	26.5	18.2
b	23.3	24.5	20.3	15.1	11.2	9.8	10.0	9.5	11.5	12.7	16.8	19.8	14.6
С	17.3	17.9	15.5	12.7	10.1	8.8	9.1	8.5	10.2	11.0	13.3	15.0	12.0
d	11.5	11.8	10.7	10.0	8.6	7.7	8.0	7.5	8.7	8.8	9.5	10.3	9.3

Time series 1961/90, according to Richter (1995)



Objectives

- Investigate the impact of systematic and random rainfall point measurement errors
- Assess simulated discharge and nitrogen with SWAT
- Analyse scaling effects of these errors



The Weisse Elster Basin: Study area

Overview

Catchment area:	5360 km ²
River length:	253 km
Mean discharge:	25.2 m ³ /s
Rainfall gauge	
stations:	49
Discharge gauge	
stations:	18



Land use

Agricultural land:	62%
Forest:	23%
Urban areas:	13%



Methodological approach

•Add randomly generated correctionvalues to uncorrected rainfall measurement values

Assume Gumbel error distribution of PDFs

 Standard deviations of PDFs are defined by the correction factor

•Generate 200 time series for each rainfall gauge station (DUE)

•Compare SWAT simulations with respect to variables and scales





Data Uncertainty Engine (DUE)

 Characterisation and assessment of uncertainty in data

•Generates time series including systematic and random errors

 Monte Carlo based approach using pdf's





Calibration discharge gauge stations





SWAT calibration discharge gauge station Läwitz (98 km²)



•Reasonable calibration results

 Problems to represent the discharge dynamics



SWAT calibration discharge gauge station Zeitz (2504 km²)





SWAT calibration of DIN load, gauge station Gera-Langenberg (2186 km²)



Gera-Langenberg

- •Reasonable agreement between observed and simulated DIN loads
- Slightly overestimated nitrogen loads
- •Oversimplified representation of nitrate denitrification in the aquifer



Mean simulated discharge using four different correction factors



- •Systematic errors of mounthly values
- •Large differences in the case of low flows



Mean simulated discharge using four different correction factors



•Comparable differences with increasing catchment size



Mean simulated nitrogen using four different correction factors



•Small effects on simulated nitrogen loads



Mean and maximum monthly error ranges of simulated discharge



- •Correction factor of 18.2%
- •Randomly generated rainfall time series
- •Gumbel distribution
- •Decrease of errors with increasing rainfall gauge stations



Mean and maximum monthly error ranges of simulated nitrogen



- Considerable mean errors only when using small numbers of stations
- Maximum errors in single month can still be significant



Conclusions

- Systematic rainfall measurement errors can have considerable impact on simulated discharge and nitrogen
- These errors can be increased by random rainfall errors
- Effect of random error rapidly decreases with increase rainfall stations
- Nitrogen load calculations are much less sensitive to random precipitation errors than simulated discharge

