# South Carolina Surface Water Quantity Modeling Project

And Overview of the Simplified Water Allocation Model (SWAM)

Kirk Westphal, PE John Boyer, PE, BCEE February 13, 2015





#### **Project Purpose**

- Build surface water quantity models capable of:
  - Accounting for inflows and outflows from a basin
  - Accurately simulating streamflows and reservoir levels over the historical inflow record
  - Conducting "What if" scenarios to evaluate future water demands, management strategies and system performance.
- CDM Smith's contract ends after the models are built and training is conducted







#### **Project Purpose**

- Once they are built and accepted by DNR/DHEC, the models will be made available for use by water utilities, energy producers, river basin organizations, and other stakeholders.
- The surface water models, and other available tools, can be used to support development of regional water plans



#### **Development of Surface Water Quantity Models**







# Simplified Water Allocation Model (SWAM)

- Developed in response to an increasing need for a desktop tool to facilitate regional and statewide water allocation analysis
- Calculates physically and legally available water, diversions, storage consumption and return flows at user-defined nodes
- Used to support large-scale planning studies in Colorado, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Texas



The Tool

#### The Tool

# The Models Can Be Used To...

- Determine surface-water availability
- Predict where and when future water shortages would occur
- Test alternative water management strategies, new operating rules, and "what-if" scenarios
- Consolidate hydrologic data
- Evaluate the impacts of future withdrawals on instream flow needs
- Evaluate interbasin transfers
- Support development of Drought Management Plans
- Compare managed flows to natural flows

# **River Basin Flow and Operations Models**

#### Similarities between SWAM, OASIS, CHEOPS, and RiverWare:

- Used in major river basin studies and/or statewide water plans
- Operating Rules of varying complexity
- Monthly and Daily Timesteps
- Visual Depiction of the River Network

#### **Unique Features:**

#### SWAM

- Familiar and adaptable environment: Visual Basic and Spreadsheets
- Built in functions for reservoirs, river operations, discharges, irrigation, return flows, etc.

#### OASIS

- Built in Probability Analysis for Real-Time Ops
- Optimization toward objectives in each timestep

#### CHEOPS

- Tailored specifically for hydropower
  - Energy Calculations
  - Reservoir Tracking
- Familiar Visual Basic programming

#### **RiverWare**

The Tool

- Fully linked graphical network development
- 3 modes:
  - Pure simulation
  - Rules-based simulation
  - Optimization

# Simplified Water Allocation Model (SWAM)

 Object-oriented tool in which a river basin and all of its influences can be linked into a network with user defined priorities



The Tool

#### The Tool

## Simplified Water Allocation Model (SWAM)

- Intuitive & Resides within and interfaces directly with
   Transparent Microsoft Excel
- Ease-of-Use Point-and-click setup and output access
- Simple & Mass balance calculations, but handles
   Robust operating rules, use priorities, etc.

	Agricultural Water Main Source Wate	User r   Return Flows	Input Fo	rms	_									
	User Na	me: Delete Node □ Multiple Sources of Water ?			Nod	e C		ut Formulas	Data Revie 11406	SWAM w View	Arkansas Bas Develope	in 2014 for te r Add-In	am 6-20-14.xl: s Bluebea	sm - Microso am
	- Supplemental S	upply/Demand Alternatives Demands			A	В	EY	EZ	FA	FB	FC	FD	FE	FF
Agr Mai	icultural Water User n Source Water Re	turn Flows			Outpu 1	t		Priority Rank	<u>Reach (mi)</u>	Location	<u>Water</u> <u>Right</u> (AFM)	Ditch Capacity (AFM)	Storage Capacity (AF)	
	Source Stream	Source Water Type Downstream Priority Date			2		Pueblo4	32	Mainstem	136	420 GW	1,000,000	5,000	Return
		C Reservoir			3	Date	Physically Avail. (AFM)	Legally Avail. (AFM)	Diverted (AFM)	Storage (AF)	Pumping (AFM)	Demand (AFM)	Shortage (AFM)	Flow (AFM)
		C Reservoir      Agricultural Water User Main Source Water Return Flows		<b>—</b>	3	Date Min Max	Physically Avail. (AFM) 1,200 423,253 44,588	Legally Avail. (AFM) 0 420 117	Diverted (AFM) 0 420 33	Storage (AF) 0 5,000 4 340	Pumping (AFM) 0 0	Demand (AFM) 0 0	Shortage (AFM) 0 0	Flow (AFM) 0 0
ſ	Ditch Capacity	C Reservoir     C Reservoir     Agricultural Water User     Main   Source Water Return Flows       Return Flow Locations       Return Flow Locations			3 4 5 6 7	Date Min Max Avg Oct-81	Physically Avail. (AFM) 1,200 423,253 44,588 14,837 23,186	Legally Avail. (AFM) 0 420 117 0	Diverted (AFM) 0 420 33 0	Storage (AF) 0 5,000 4,340 0	Pumping (AFM) 0 0 0 0	Demand (AFM) 0 0 0	Shortage (AFM) 0 0 0	Flow (AFM) 0 0 0
[ [	Ditch Capacity (AFM) (_CFS)	• Direct River     Location (mi)       • Reservoir     1/1/2008       Agricultural Water User     Main   Source Water Return Flows         Return Flow Locations     • single point       • multiple points     • 0	tion Time Lag (months) 0		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Date Min Max Avg Oct-81 Nov-81 Dec-81 Jan-82 Feb-82	Physically Avail. (AFM) 1,200 423,253 44,588 14,837 23,186 24,424 17,870 16 694	Legally Avail. (AFM) 0 420 117 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Diverted (AFM) 0 420 33 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Storage (AF) 0 5,000 4,340 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Pumping (AFM) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Demand (AFM) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Shortage (AFM) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Flow (AFM) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
[ [	Ditch Capacity (AFM) (_CFS)	C Reservoir      C Reservoir      Agricultural Water User      Main Source Water Return Flows      Return Flow Locations     G single point     C multiple points      Monthly Return Flows      Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun J	tion Time Lag (months) 0 ul Aug Sep Oct No	v Dec	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13	Date Min Max Avg Oct-81 Nov-81 Dec-81 Jan-82 Feb-82 Mar-82 Apr-82	Physically Avail. (AFM) 1,200 423,253 44,588 14,837 23,186 24,424 17,870 16,694 25,120 11,977 27,025	Legally Avail. (AFM) 420 117 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Diverted (AFM) 420 33 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Storage (AF) 0 5,000 4,340 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Pumping (AFM) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Demand (AFM) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Shortage (AFM) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Flow (AFM) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

#### SWAM Model Main Screen

AK1  $\checkmark$  :  $\times \checkmark f_x$ 



#### **Tributary Input Form**



#### **Instream Flow Input Form**

🐹   🚽 🤊 🔹 🕅 🗧 🐨 🖓 😴 🐨 🖓 🐨 🕅 🐨 SWAM Arkansas Basin 2014 for team 6-20-14.xlsm - Microsoft Excel	22 🖷 🗆
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Developer Add-Ins Bluebeam	∞ 🕤 🗆 🕅
AF15 • <i>f</i> <sub>x</sub>	¥
Object Palette     Simplified Water Allocation Model (SWAM)     = exchange       Simulation Period     Simulation Period     = transbasin import,       Start Year     Start Wonth     End Year       Instream Flows     Instream Flows	/export
Water Right Water Right Water Right Mainstem HW Water Right Instream Flow Name: Delete Node Target Stream: Downstream Location (mi) 0	
Priority Date Rules Rules I/1/2007 TNC IHA Methodology	: Basin puffer
Avg. Monthly Flow Rights Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec	
(03)	8. Meredith
Comments:	Dye & Høfbrook vrage
Ready	

# **Output Tables**

	9 <b>- (* 5</b>	iiv  <del>,</del> ne Inc	ert Page Lavo	ut Formu	lac	Data Pevi	SWAM	Arkansas Bas	in 2014 for te	am 6-20-14.x	lsm - Micr	osoft Excel		No	de	Outi	กมโ			
	C7	iie 1115	The free free free free free free free fr	1519.4000	1244	1406		Develope	Add-In	is bluebe			_	1000		Car	542	¥		
	A	В	EY	EZ		FA	FB	FC	FD	FE	FF	FG	FH	FI	FJ	FK	FL			
1	Output		Pueblo4	Priority Ra 32	<u>ank</u>	<u>Reach (mi)</u> Mainstem	Location 136	Water Right (AFM) 420	Ditch Capacity (AFM) 1,000,000	Storage Capacity (AF) 5,000				Fo	untain2	Priority Rank 44	<u>Reach</u> Mainst	(mi)		
3		Date	Physically Δvail. (ΔFM)	Legally Avail (AF	M	Diverted (AFM	Storage	GW Pumping (AFM)	Demand (AFM)	Shortage (AFM)	Return Flow (AFM)	Release (AFM)	Evap Losses (AFM)	Ph	ysically	Legally Avail. (AFM)	Diverted	(Δ <b>F</b> I		
4		Min	1,200	0	,		<u>ر ایک از</u> 0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1,200	0	0			
5		Max	423,253	420		420	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	52	43	23,201	0	0			
6		Avg	44,588	117		33	4,340	0	0	0	0	0	21	4	14,555	0	0	_		
-		Oct-81	14,837	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14,837	0	0			
9		Dec-81	23,100	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	23,100	0	0			
10		Jan-82	17,870	0		0	Ő	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17.870	ů 0	0			
11		Feb-82	16,694	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16,694	0	0			
12		Mar-82	25,120	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25,120	0	0			
13		Apr-82	11,977	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11,977	0	0			
14		May-82	35,025	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	35,025 46.407	0	0	-		
15		Jul-82	97 301	0	X	🚽 🍠 🕈 (°i 🗸	-					SWAM	Arkansas Basin 2	014 for team 6-	-20-14.xlsr	n - Microsoft E	Excel			
17		Aug-82	75,150	0	-	ila Homa	Incart	Page Lave	ut Eorm	ular Da	ta Ba	view View	Davalopar	Add Inc	Rhushaar	Doc	on	nir (	luto	
18		Sep-82	73,884	420		Home	Insert	Fage Layo				view view	Developei	Add-Ins	Diuebear	LES	$e_{IV}$	OII O	ναιρι	
19		Oct-82	39,997	420		Q19		$f_x$	26140.14	184375										
20		Nov-82	4,595	0		A	В	С	D		E	F	G	Н		1	J	K	L	M
21		Dec-82	4,215	0		Output														
22		Jan-63 Feb-83	16,663	420		Output						Total	Release							
23		Mar-83	26 208	420	1							Capacity (AF	<u>Location</u>							
25		Apr-83	42,386	420	2			F	Pueblo Res	ervoir		330000.0	143.0							JMR
26		May-83	47,647	420								0	T-(-11-0	lotal			0.48			
27		Jun-83	349,601	420	2		D-4-		C		XCess	Overflow		Vithdrav	NI R	elease	Outflow			C
28		Jul-83	178,891	420	3		Date		Storage	(AF) VOIU	me (AF)		(AFM)	(AFM)				Evap (AFM)		Storage (/
29		Aug-63 Sen-83	93,139	420	4		Min Max		220.00	0	0	10 602	2,002	4,373	,	0	7 000	3 451		1,545
31		Oct-83	13 990	0	6				212.00	2	0	1 352	A6 753	39.940		0	1,000	1 009		430,000
32		Nov-83	1,200	0	7		Avg		02 74	0	0	1,552	40,755	46.985		0	0	532		200 277
33		Dec-83	1,200	0	8		lov-81		90.78	3	0	240	14 646	16 371		0	0	0		176 741
34		Jan-84	18,621	420	9		ec-81		88 11	1	0	680	11 817	13 808		0	0	0		154 539
35		Feb-84	17,647	420	10	J	an-82		86.61	0	0	680	8,105	8.927		0	0	0		134,969
37		Apr-84	40,025	420	11	F	eb-82		87,31	5	0	680	7,549	6,165		0	0	0		119,018
38		May-84	224,609	420	12	N	Aar-82		88,01	9	0	680	10,218	8,834		0	0	0		107,688
39		Jun-84	261,443	420	13	A	Apr-82		82,26	4	0	614	24,650	29,220		0	0	571		98,144
40		Jul-84	147,595	420	14	N	lay-82		64,85	2	0	624	55,732	71,830		0	0	690		90,661
41		Aug-84	99,322	420	15	J	un-82		62,62	0	0	728	98,054	98,922		0	0	637		95,890
42		Sep-84	30,073	0	16		Jul-82		52,25	1	0	525	79,954	89,142		0	0	655		94,416
43		VCt-84	37,219	420	17	A	wg-82		42,02	9	0	600	61,795	70,950		0	0	466		102,863
45		Dec-84	4,940	420	18	S	ep-82		38,78	4	U	810	50,284	52,424		U	0	299		110,282
46		Jan-85	22,847	420	19		JCI-62		53,54	4 0	0	1,087	56,442	40,384		0	1 126	206		107,965
17	<b>РН _</b>		n Mode Node	Output	20		10V-02		100 65	7	0	1,304	44,501	12,995		0	1,130	0		91,376
Read	dy 🎦		noue	Sucput	21		an-83		110 34	7	0	1 384	19 931	6 721		0	2 135	0		90 684
-6		<b>_</b>			23	F	eb-83		118 42	1	0	1,384	17 965	6 165		0	2,133	0		83 248
					24	N	Aar-83		127,48	2	0	1,384	22,397	9,440		0	2.512	Ŭ Ŭ		89,077
			7		25	A	Apr-83		136.42	9	0	1,213	43,943	30,270		0	2,687	827		97,669
					26	N	lay-83		132,16	9	0	936	74,268	73,580		0	2,870	1,144		108,757
					27	J	un-83		330,00	0	0	728	303,831	101,197	'	0	2,776	1,299		258,390
					00		1.1.00		220.00	0	0	505	400.045	04.040		0	0.007	0.454		074 500

#### **Calibration Result Graphs**



2

#### **Major Tasks**



## **Schedule for Developing the Models**

- **Pilot Model** of the Saluda River Basin
- Other models to follow, with order based on data availability
- 2-year schedule requires that groups of models be constructed in parallel





#### Data is Needed to Support...

1. Development of Unimpaired Flows (UIFs)

UIF Definitions: - Flow in a river as it would be in a completely unaltered state - Historically observed flows with human influences removed

UIFs Provide: A baseline for evaluating impacts of human use by allowing analysts to compare altered flows to UIFs

- 2. Development of each baseline model
  - A. Withdrawal and return amounts and locations
  - B. Current reservoir operating rules
  - C. Drought Management Plans and Requirements
  - D. Instream flow requirements



# **THANK YOU**

