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#### Abstract

ASSESSING THE POTENTIAL OF RAINWATER HARVESTING SYSTEM AT THE MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY - NORTHERN CYPRUS CAMPUS

Harb, Rayaan<br>M.Sc., Sustainable Environment and Energy Systems

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Bertuğ Akıntuğ August 2015, 142 pages

Rainwater harvesting system (RWHS), where runoff from roofs and impervious areas is collected and utilized, is a prominent solution to deal with water scarcity by conserving available water resources and the energy needed to deliver water to the water supply system. The impact of climate change on water resources can also be reduced by rainwater harvesting. RWH is becoming an important part of the sustainable water management around the world. The Eastern Mediterranean countries with semi-arid climate obtain low precipitation and high temperature. Therefore, applying RWHS will be very beneficial in these areas to provide non-potable uses such as irrigation and household use. This study investigates the potential of RWH in the METU-NCC. Two approaches for runoff calculation were compared, the traditional Soil Conservation Service (SCS) method and the Storm Water Management Model (SWMM) using monthly and hourly rainfall data from 1978 to 2009. A RWHS was proposed to assess the potential of rainwater harvesting. The reservoir locations of the system were chosen with their relative irrigation areas and their volumes were calculated after computing the irrigation consumption of the campus. The study was not aimed at optimizing the system rather the system serves the purpose to show if there is a potential in RWH. The tank volumes were found to be $2300 \mathrm{~m}^{3}, 3500 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ and 1100 $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ with efficiencies of $37.8 \%, 41.3 \%$ and $90.5 \%$ respectively and $41.2 \%$ of the campus irrigation was met. According to the findings, there is potential for collecting rainwater for irrigation purposes on the campus.
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## ÖZ

# ORTA DOĞU TEKNIK ÜNIVERSİTESİ - KUZEY KIBRIS KAMPUSU'NDA YAĞMURSUYU TOPLAMA SİSTEMİ POTANSİYELİNIN İNCELENMESİ 

Harb, Rayaan<br>Master, Sürdürülebilir Çevre ve Enerji Sistemleri<br>Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bertuğ Akıntuğ

Ağustos 2015, 142 sayfa

Çatılardan ve geçirimsiz yüzeylerden akışa geçen yağmur suyunun toplanarak kullanılmasını sağlayan yağmursuyu toplama sistemleri, su kitlğgyla mücadele kapsamında mevcut su kaynaklarının korunacak olmasından ve ayrıca içme suyu sağlayan sistemler için gerekli enerjin azaltılacak olmasından dolayı etkin çözüm sağlamaktadır. Yağmursuyu toplama sistemleri iklim değişikliğinin su kaynakları üzerindeki etkisinin azaltılmasına da katkı sağlamaktadır. Yağmursuyu toplama sistemleri dünya genelinde sürdürülebilir su yönetiminin önemli bir parçası olmaktadır. Yarı kurak iklime sahip Doğu Akdeniz ülkelerinde düşük yağışlar ve yüksek sıcaklıklar gözlenmektedir. Bu bölgelerde yağmur suyu toplama sistemlerinin uygulanmaya başlamasıyla depolanan su, kullanım ve sulama suyu ihtiyacına katkıda bulunacaktır. Bu çalışmada ODTÜ-KKK'de yağmursuyu toplama sistemi kurmak için yeterli potansiyel olup olmadığı araştırılmıştır. Yüzey akışının hesaplanmasında 1978-2009 yıllarına ait aylık ve günlük yağıs değerleri kullanılarak geleneksel Amerikan Toprak Muhafaza Kurumunun yöntemi ve Yağmursuyu Yönetimi Modeli (Storm Water Management Model - SWMM ) yazılımı kullanılmıştr. Yağmursuyu toplama depolarının konumu mevcut yağmursuyu drenaj hatlarına ve her bir depodan hangi yeşil alanın sulanacağına bakılarak karar verilmiştir. Bu çalışma kapsamında en uygun sistem ve depo hacmini bulmak için herhangi bir optimizasyon çalışması yapılmamıştr. Sadece böyle bir sistemin kurulması için yeterli potansiyel olup olmadığına bakılmıştır. Yapılan çalışma sonucunda kamusa yapılması önerilen $2300 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, $3500 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ve $1100 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ hacimlerdeki depoların verimlilik oranları strasıyla $\% 37.8, \% 41.3$ ve $\% 90.5$ olarak elde edilmiştir. Bu çalışmadan elde edilen sonuçlara göre sulama amaçlı kullanım için kampusa yağmursuyu toplama sisteminin kurulması için yeterli potansiyel olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yağmursuyu Toplama Sistemi; Depo Hacmi; Yağı̧̧; Kuzey Kıbrıs.
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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

Cyprus is the third largest island in the Mediterranean Sea with an area of 9,251 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$, the island experiences hot and dry summers while winters are mild (T.C. Başbakanlık Yayınları, 2000). The island witnesses a problem of water scarcity mainly due to low annual precipitation and unfavorable distribution of annual rainfall. Moreover, groundwater is being depleted and the quality of groundwater has reduced due to overpumping of the aquifers leading to the entry of saltwater (Priscoli and Wolf, 2009). Therefore, an approach of supplying water from Turkey was adopted (Priscoli and Wolf, 2009). An approach to collect and utilize the rainwater that is discarded by urban drainage systems can provide an annual supply of water to sustain the irrigation demands in a specific area. The hydraulic system that applies this approach is called rainwater harvesting system (RWHS). Conventionally, urban rainwater management considered rainwater runoff as a waste to be guided away in a controlled manner. Collection of rainfall runoff grants an adequate supply of water for ample uses whether outdoor or indoor. Moreover, rainwater harvesting system reduces effects of urbanization such as flooding, erosion and pollution problems. This leads to the statement that rainwater is a resource that can be stored and used.

Rainwater harvesting is not a new concept, it was applied as early as 4500 B.C. by the inhabitants of southern Mesopotamia (present day Iraq) and by other inhabitants of different regions in the Middle East. The Romans later developed the primitive rainwater harvesting systems into more sophisticated systems in order to irrigate their lands (Sivanappan, 2006). Moreover, rainwater harvesting systems were also employed in ancient Persia, where large underground cisterns were deployed to store the surface runoff; remains of these cisterns are still visible (Pazwash, 2011). There are ample objectives of rainwater harvesting systems that include directing storm water runoff to natural depressions or reservoirs. Moreover, this water can be used for irrigation, supplying household water, supplying drinking water and injecting this water into the ground to replenish groundwater supply (Pazwash, 2011). Furthermore, in-situ rainwater
harvesting systems may reduce the carbon footprint of water collection and the distribution cycle, as well as reducing the cost of water transportation (Zuberi et al., 2013).

### 1.2 Objective of the study

The main objective of this study is to assess the potential of rainwater harvesting on the campus of the Middle East Technical University - Northern Cyprus (METU-NCC) and to propose a rainwater harvesting system that can provide water for irrigation. Moreover, this system should easily be integrated with the existing system. Although this study focuses on the METU-NCC, the findings of this work may be implemented in different locations of Cyprus as well as countries with similar climate as Cyprus.

### 1.3 Organization of the thesis

The study commences with an introduction including a statement of the problem, objectives and purpose as well as the methods used in the study. The second chapter comprises of the background literature. Then, the third chapter describes the site of METU-NCC; the area, existing water consumption and the systems used to supply nonpotable water. In the fourth chapter, the methodology of the study, and data used to calculate the monthly rainwater runoff and the water tank calculations will be presented. The fifth chapter discusses the results of the runoff and the water tank volumes as well as the location of the tanks and the integration of the rainwater harvesting system with the existing system. Finally, the paper is concluded including the future modifications to the rainwater harvesting system and the future research possibilities are addressed.

## CHAPTER II

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Rainwater harvesting systems

Rainwater harvesting is defined as collecting from catchment areas such as roofs or other urban structures to meet demand for domestic, industry, agriculture, and environmental purposes when water sources are becoming scarce or low quality (Aladenola and Adeboye, 2009; Hamid and Nordin, 2011; Worm and Hattum, 2006). This process has been used by ancient civilizations for agricultural irrigation and as a source of drinking water and this allowed those civilizations to flourish in semi-arid regions. Nowadays, RWHS are being used in water-limited locations, such as western U.S. regions and in some African countries in order to provide potable water, household water as well as for irrigation (Ling and Benham, 2014). Moreover, RWH is used as a method of urban flood control through redirecting the rainwater away from regions of low water drainage.

Collecting and using rainwater may decrease the use of municipal and groundwater. Since the rainwater collected from roofs is relatively cleaner than the rainwater collected from other impermeable surfaces such as roads, roofs are the largest impervious surface in residential areas to be used as catchment areas and allow the harvest of water that would otherwise enter into the storm-water drainage system. This may reduce storm-water runoff and the necessity for downstream storm-water management and treatment. Rainwater is clean as it falls, but the surface that this water is collected from contains the contaminants, therefore necessary treatment and filtration is needed before storing this water. Harvested rainwater is used mainly for irrigation and toilet flushing (Ling and Benham, 2014).

According to Hamid and Nordin (2011), there are six components of any RWHS:
I. Catchment area
II. Gutters and downspouts
III. Filtration system
IV. Storage system
V. Delivery system
VI. Treatment system

The quantity of rainwater that can be collected from a surface such as a roof is dependent on its size and texture. Moreover, the material of the catchment surface will affect the rainwater quality through the contaminants that might be present on the surface (Ling and Benham, 2014).

The gutters and downspouts will lead the rainwater from the catchment surfaces to the storage system. The purpose of the filtration system is to prevent the flow of debris from the surfaces to the pipes of the storage system. This can be done by installing screens that can accumulate the debris and may be cleaned manually. The size and material of the debris will dictate the size of the screens. Moreover, leaf guards can be installed to prevent the entry of leaves to the pipes. An important part of the filtration system is the first "flush" removal. The first flush of rainwater will contain material that has collected on the catchment surface since the last rainfall event, which may include dust, pollen, leaves, insects, bird feces, and other residues (Ling and Benham, 2014). It is recommended to divert from 0.2 mm to 2 mm of the runoff as first flush depending on the quality of water (Doyle, 2008).

The storage system is usually the largest investment aspect of the rainwater harvesting system. Therefore it requires careful analysis to provide the optimal storage capacity and structural durability at the lowest possible cost. Storage reservoirs are in two categories: surface and sub-surface storage tanks (Worm and Hattum, 2006). The water reservoir may be constructed from many different materials that include fiberglass, polypropylene, concrete or metal. Cisterns should be made to inhibit algal growth and they should be screened to prevent mosquito breeding. Furthermore, they should be cleaned regularly to ensure the cleanliness of the stored water (Ling and Benham, 2014).

In the systems intended for non-potable uses such as irrigation and toilet flushing, screens and first flush diverters are sufficient for treatment thereby reducing the cost of the system. On the other hand, potable use of the collected rainwater will require treatment and disinfection to remove contaminants and toxins in order to meet drinking water standards (Ling and Benham, 2014).

### 2.2 Studies about Rainwater Harvesting Systems

In a study conducted by Zuberi et al. (2013), the theoretical potential of rainfall at METU-NCC was studied to supply water for toilet flushing in the dormitories. It was found that a RWHS installed to collect rainwater from the roof areas of the three dormitories present would be sufficient for the flushing consumption of the second dormitory. $2831 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ of water can be collected annually with a reliability of $93 \%$. This study showed that there is an opportunity for water scarce areas to utilize their limited resources in an efficient way.

A study was conducted by Dwivedi et al. (2013) to estimate the rooftop harvesting potential of the buildings as well as the planning and designing of the RWHS, the delivery system, and the groundwater recharge system. This study is performed for the Dhule town in India and a $50 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ rainfall intensity was assumed for the modelling of this system. Moreover, the cost of different components of the system was studied and an annual equivalent capital cost was estimated. The unit cost of water appeared to be high in comparison to the market price, however, the environmental benefits of the groundwater recharging with good quality water validates such projects.

Hamid and Nordin (2011) selected a male residential college in Malaysia to perform their case study in order to determine the reliability of rainwater harvesting system installation. Malaysia receives about 3000 mm of rainfall annually. Moreover, this study illustrates that $90 \%$ reliability may be achieved based on the rainfall data and roof catchment area of the college and it was estimated that the system would save RM 10460 (3275.40 USD) annually on the water bill.

In another research conducted for Abeokuta, Nigeria, by Aladenola and Adeboye (2009) showed that rainwater harvesting systems can satisfy the monthly water consumption for toilet flushing and laundry except for the months from November till February. Abeokuta has a mean annual rainfall of 1156 mm . Moreover, provided there is sufficient rainfall, the excess rainwater stored during September and October is adequate to supply water during the dry months.

Furumai et al. (2008) conducted a study to explain the trend of promotion of rainwater storage and harvesting in Japan with an estimated average annual total precipitation of 640 billion $\mathrm{m}^{3}$, after evapotranspiration leaving a potential of 410 billion
$\mathrm{m}^{3}$ of water to be utilized for industry, household and agriculture. Moreover, this paper further emphasizes that there are different uses of this water. A new type of rainwater use, which is water supply to heated road surface, is highlighted. This was introduced to diminish the urban heat-island phenomena. Moreover, this paper introduces research on detailed land-cover classification of rooftops using satellite image and GIS data, this is beneficial for advanced urban runoff simulation and for estimation of potential of rainwater storage and harvesting facilities.

In a research conducted by Jothiprakash and Sath (2009) different RWH techniques were evaluated to identify the most appropriate method for a large-scale industrial area in Maharashtra, India, to satisfy its daily water demand. The industry is located in an area that receives an average annual rainfall of 2983 mm . Moreover, the volume of water to be stored was determined through mass balance method, Ripple diagram method, analytical method and sequent peak algorithm method. Then Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) was used to determine the most appropriate type of RWH technique and the required number of RWH structures. The results showed that AHP can be a useful tool to evaluate RWH methods and structures.

The Department of Water in Perth, Australia, conducted a study to evaluate the potential use of storm water in Perth. The storm water discharge was estimated as rainfall over the percentage of impervious surface that drains to the environment. The study indicated that a significant volume of water is generated in the region and could be harvested as a potable or non-potable water supply. The water can be pumped to infiltrate or injected into the superficial aquifer for storage (Department of Water, 2008).

In a study performed in Tehran, Iran by Mehrabadi and Motevalli (2012) on the operation of rooftop rainwater harvesting systems to reduce urban flood, have found that by collecting the rainfall runoff from residential rooftops, urban flood control can be attained. Tehran has an average annual rainfall of 238.9 mm , and by modelling different tank volumes to collect rooftop runoff, it was found that with increasing tank size and subsequently the volume of collected water, the urban flood frequency decreased.

Tobin et al. (2013) performed a study on the assessment of rainwater harvesting systems in the rural area of Edo State in Nigeria. They collected data using quantitative data collection methods such as a survey questionnaire, checklist and bacteriological
assessment of water quality. The data was analyzed using the statistical package for social sciences and the results showed that the rooftop rainwater harvesting was used by over $80 \%$ of the households. The stored water was mainly utilized for personal hygiene purposes. The water samples tested showed an unacceptable levels of coliforms and E. coli bacteria.

Nafisah and Matsushita (2009) conducted a comparative study on the metropolis rainwater harvesting practices Sumida-Ku in Tokyo, Japan and Selangor, Malaysia. The paper states that the rainwater harvesting systems in Tokyo are well developed and this technique has started few decades ago, while in Malaysia they are behind in implementing the rainwater harvesting systems. The paper discusses and compares the policy and planning, design and social issues attributed to the rainwater harvesting systems in Japan and Malaysia. Moreover, the aspects implemented in Japan that Malaysia should work on to improve and adopt are shown.

A research conducted by Grady and Younos (2008) analyzed the water and energy conservation of rainwater harvesting system on a single family house. They have analyzed and compared the efficiency of two water systems, a local groundwater and rainwater harvesting systems. This residence is located in Montgomery County, Virginia in the United States. The rainwater harvesting system collects water from the rooftop runoff and stores this water in an underground storage tank. The rainwater is utilized for outdoor and indoor purposes as well as for potable use. The rainwater harvesting system exhibited a supply of $84 \%$ of the water consumption of the household with an average annual rainfall of 987.6 mm . Moreover, the study showed that for this case the groundwater system was more efficient and cost-effective but both systems were more cost-effective and energy effective than extending a public water line to the residence.

A field study performed by Strand (2013) to show how rainwater harvesting systems in the urban areas of Colombo, Sri Lanka, can act as a solution for sustainable water management issue and that this system might lead to economic and environmental advances. The aim of this study was to find solutions to improve the water management in Sri Lanka. Moreover, the annual rainfall in Sri Lanka is between 2500 to 5800 mm in the south west region of the island and about 1250 mm in the other regions of the island. The rain often comes in short heavy bursts causing floods. Furthermore, the result of the
field study showed that the economic and environmental benefits associated with rainwater harvesting systems are possible sustainable solutions to the water issues on the island. In addition, this study opts to illustrate the areas where the rainwater harvesting systems have the best potential with the highest impact.

A report prepared by the Maryland Department of the Environment provides a summary on the development and calibration of a watershed model for the Patapsco/Back River Watershed using the SWMM software. This report includes sections on the watershed properties, model structure, development and calibration. The report discusses the watershed from the hydrological and water quality perspectives. Two precipitation gauges were used and the simulation was performed from 1/1/1992 to 9/31/2001 and results showed the infiltration rate and runoffs in the basin as well as pollutant transport such as heavy metals in the watershed (Maryland Department of the Environment, 2002).

Nnaji and Mama (2014) conducted a study to assess the potential for rainwater harvesting in Nigeria to focus on flood mitigation and domestic water supply. This work was done by using 26 locations in the major ecological zones of Nigeria and classifying residential buildings into different classes with different amounts of water consumption. A water balance approach was utilized for each class to evaluate the fraction of water demand that can be satisfied by the rainwater and so defining the minimum water storage capacity to be used. Results illustrated that for the reliability of system was over $80 \%$ for the rainforest and guinea savanna zone. Monthly precipitation data between 17 and 30 years were used for each location and the average coefficient of variation of this was calculated and the results showed that the rainwater harvesting potential was a power function of rainfall coefficient of variation.

Zura, a village in India has scarce water resources that are under threat due to droughts, increasing ground water salinity and groundwater over-exploitation. A study was conducted as an attempt to assess the potential of rainwater harvesting in this village with an average annual rainfall of 332 mm . The results found in this research is that a decentralized management strategy of the rainwater is greatly needed in order to make the people self-dependent in obtaining their drinking water requirements (Tripathi and Pandey, 2005).

Another study in Kanai, Mali, was performed to determine the rate of water consumption and current water sources in order to estimate the volume of rainwater that can be collected using questionnaires administered to households. Questions related to the socio-economic state of households, source of water, methods of rainwater harvesting and purpose of use of the water were asked in the questionnaires. A survey suggested that more than half of the households depend on sources that are susceptible to drought while only $3 \%$ of them utilize rainwater. The study area has an average annual rainfall of 1064 mm and the amount could not satisfy the water consumption if the present techniques are not improved by increasing the involvement of the villagers (Lekwot et al., 2012).

Ward et al. (2010) evaluated the design of two different rainwater harvesting systems using an advanced continuous simulation model. The systems illustrated between $36 \%$ and $46 \%$ of the WC demand. Moreover, the simple tank design methods resulted in larger tank sizes compared to the simulation model. This has led to an over-sizing in the tanks installed. The catchment size, a parameter neglected in the simple method, was found to be important in tank sizing. Furthermore, a cost analysis was conducted and it was found that the rainwater harvesting systems are more feasible in large commercial buildings compared to smaller domestic systems.

Rahman et al. (2012) investigated the water savings potential of rainwater tanks installed in 10 houses in different locations in Sydney, Australia. Three different tank sizes were studied, $2 \mathrm{~kL}, 3 \mathrm{~kL}$ and 5 kL , using a water balance simulation model. The analysis was conducted on a daily time scale and the water saving, reliability and cost feasibility were observed. The findings of the study showed that the average annual water saving was correlated with the average annual rainfall, while the benefit cost ratios for the rainwater tanks were less than 1.00 without government support. The study noted that the 5 kL tank was a better option than the 2 kL and 3 kL tanks. The rainwater tanks should be supply water to the toilet, laundry and outdoor irrigation to attain the best financial outcome for the users. The results of this study propose that government authorities should maintain or increase the financial support for rainwater tanks.

Since the water balance of RWHS is dominated by the stochastic nature of precipitation. Unami et al. (2015) developed a mathematical model containing stochastic differential equations, with model parameters that can be recognized from observed data
to explain the dynamics of RWHS for irrigation. Stochastic control problems were expressed and then solved to find the optimal irrigation approaches during the dry season. The same procedure may be inversely applied to design the system dimensions. The model parameters were identified with the observed data in an experimental micro RWHS in Japan and in the semi-arid savanna in Ghana. Finally, a real life RWHS that will be employed in the Jordan Rift Valley was discussed.

Imteaz et al. (2012) developed a simple spreadsheet based daily water balance model to assess the performance and design of rainwater tanks. Daily rainfall data, roof catchment area, rainfall loss factor, available storage volume, tank overflow and water demand were used in the analysis. Moreover, this model was used to design the optimum size of domestic rainwater reservoir in southwest Nigeria for the dry months. Two demand situations were evaluated, the first was toilet flushing only and the second was toilet flushing and laundry use. The results of this study were compared with results from earlier studies, which used monthly average rainfall data. It was found that the analysis using monthly average rainfall data over-estimates the rainwater tank volume. This study showed $100 \%$ reliability with a tank volume of $7 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ during low demand, however, during higher demand a larger tank volume of $10 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ was required to obtain $100 \%$ reliability. Furthermore, the large quantities of water was lost as overflow, with a tank size of $10 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, therefore, the collected rainwater could be used for other purposes if large tanks were to be installed.

Imteaz et al. (2011) conducted a study on the evaluation and design of rainwater tank for large roof areas in Melbourne, Australia, using daily rainfall data representing three different climatic scenarios dry, average and wet years. The average annual rainfall in Melbourne is 650 mm . A spreadsheet-based daily water balance model was developed considering the daily rainfall data, the roof areas, the rainfall loss factor, the available storage volume, the tank overflow and the irrigation demand. Two underground rainwater tanks were considered, $185 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ and $110 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. Using the model, the reliability of each tank under different climatic regimes was examined. The results showed that both the tanks were reliable in wet and average years but less effective during the dry years. A payback period analysis showed that the total construction cost of the tanks can be recovered within 15 to 21 years taking into account the tank size, climatic conditions and future water price.

Moreover, a correlation between the water price increase rates and payback periods was developed. The study emphasizes the importance of optimization and cost analysis for large rainwater tanks in order to maximize the benefits.

Al-Ansari et al. (2012) conducted a study on the Sinjar area of northwest Iraq, with an average annual rainfall of 320 mm , by applying RWH modeling methods for agricultural purposes. Linear Programming optimization and Watershed Modeling System methods were used to increase the irrigated area. The methods employed demonstrated to be effective for solving large-scale water demand issues with multiple parameters. Two scenarios were studied, the first scenario was that each reservoir operated as an individual unit while, the second was that all reservoirs in the basin operated as one system. The two scenarios illustrated positive results but the second scenario provided better results than the first.

The utilization of non-dimensional parameters was proposed in a study conducted by Palla et al. (2011) in order to investigate the optimum performance of RWHS. A model was applied to evaluate the inflow, outflow and change in storage volume of a RWHS using a daily mass balance equation; the water-saving efficiency, over-flow ratio and detention time were determined and utilized to measure the system performance over a long-term simulation period. Different scenarios were examined to test the system performance, three precipitation regimes, three levels of water demand and ten storage capacity levels. The demand fraction and the storage fraction were the two nondimensional parameters used to investigate the optimum sizing of the RWHS. The demand fraction was found to affect the water-saving efficiency and the overflow ratio, while the storage fraction affects the detention time which influences the water quality degradation in the system. A sensitivity analysis was conducted to examine the effect of the length of the time series climate records on the reliability of the selected performance indices. The results showed that 30 years of daily rainfall records are adequate for assessment of the system performance.

Since there is a great variation in average annual rainfall between the east and west of Greater Melbourne, ranging from 1050 mm in the east and 450 mm in the east, then there is a difference in rainwater tank size to satisfy similar demands and to provide the same supply reliability. Khastagir and Jayasuriya (2010) presented a novel procedure and
a correlation for the optimal sizing of rainwater tanks taking into account the annual rainfall, the demand for rainwater, the catchment area and the supply reliability. The developed dimensionless curve reflects these variables and sets the path for developing a web-based interactive tool for choosing the optimum rainwater tank size.

Basinger et al. (2010) assessed the reliability of using harvested rainwater as a means of flushing toilets, irrigating gardens, and topping off air-conditioner in residential buildings in New York City by utilizing a new RWHS reliability model. The model can be is not case specific since it is based on a non-parametric rainfall generation method using a bootstrapped Markov chain. The RWHS reliability is determined for userspecified catchment area and tank volume ranges using precipitation generated using the stochastic procedure. The reliability with which backyard gardens and air conditioning units are supplied with rainwater exceeded $80 \%$ and $90 \%$, respectively, while toilet flushing demand can be met with a $7-40 \%$ reliability. When the reliability curves developed were utilized to size RWHS to flush the low flow toilets, it was found that the rooftop runoff to the sewer system was reduced by about $28 \%$ over an average rainfall year, and the potable water demand was decreased by about $53 \%$.

Abdulla and Al-Shareef (2009) evaluated the potential for potable water savings by using rainwater in residential areas of the twelve Jordanian districts and proposed methods to improve both quality and quantity of harvested rainwater. The rainfall varies from 600 mm to less than 200 mm annually over the twelve districts. The results showed that a maximum of $15.5 \mathrm{Mm}^{3} / \mathrm{y}$ of rainwater can be collected from the roofs of residential buildings assuming that all surfaces are utilized and all the rainfall on the surfaces is collected. The estimated collected rainwater is equivalent to $5.6 \%$ of the total domestic water supply of the year 2005. The potential for RWH varies between the districts, ranging from $0.023 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ to $6.45 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, while the estimated potential for potable water savings, ranged from $0.27 \%$ to $19.7 \%$. Samples of harvested rainwater from residential roofs were analyzed; the measure of inorganic compounds matched the World Health Organization standards for drinking water, while fecal coliform, an important bacteriological parameter, exceeded the limits for drinking water.

Ghisi (2009) analyzed the effect of rainfall, roof area, number of residents, potable water demand and rainwater demand on rainwater tank sizing. Computer simulation was used for the analysis, considering daily rainfall data for three cities in the state of São Paulo, Brazil. The roof areas considered were 50, 100, 200 and $400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, the potable water demands were $50,100,150,200,250$ and 300 L per capita per day, while the rainwater demands were taken as a percentage of the potable water demand and the number of residents was considered to be two or four. The results showed a broad variation of rainwater tank sizes for each city and for each parameter. Hence, the conclusion of the study is that rainwater tank sizing for houses must be performed for each specific situation, taking into account the local rainfall, roof area, potable water demand, rainwater demand and number of residents.

Santos and Taveira-Pinto (2013) carried out a study to describe and analyze six different calculation methods for rainwater tank sizing. In order to apply these methods, two cases of RWHS were utilized, a dwelling and a public building. The results indicated that the methods based on the maximum rainwater demand and $100 \%$ efficiency conditions lead to an over-estimation of the rainwater storage tanks, thus need long payback periods. Moreover, daily simulation at $80 \%$ efficiency was the most suitable condition to size the RWHS, since it led to the best ratio of economic savings/installation cost. Furthermore, the Rippl method and the $80 \%$ efficiency condition lead to similar tank volumes.

Campisano and Modica (2012) presented a dimensionless methodology for the optimal design of domestic RWHS. The procedure was based on the results of daily water balance simulations conducted for 17 rainfall gauging stations in Sicily, Italy. The average annual rainfall is 720 mm concentrated in the months from October to March in Sicily. A novel dimensionless parameter to illustrate the intra-annual rainfall patterns was introduced and regional regressive models were developed to estimate the water savings and overflows from the RWHS. A cost-based method and the obtained regressive models were used to evaluate the optimal domestic RWH tank size. The results showed that the economic feasibility of large tanks decreases as rainfall decreases.

In another study Tam et al. (2010) investigated the cost effectiveness of RWHS in Australian residential areas. Seven cities are studied Gold Coast, Brisbane, Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide, Perth and Canberra. The cost of installation and operation of the RWHS and the cost of alternative water sources, such as constructing additional dams and desalination plants were compared. The results indicated that using RWHS is an economic option for households in Gold Coast, Brisbane, and Sydney. Moreover, suitable tank sizes for various household areas were proposed.

Bocanerga-Martinez et al. (2014) proposed an optimization-based approach for designing domestic RWHS. The model considers the installation of RWH devices, pipes and reservoirs for the optimal collection, storage and distribution of the harvested rainwater. In addition, the model functions to satisfy the domestic water demands taking into consideration the reduction of the total annual cost of utilizing fresh water, the capital costs for the catchment areas, storages and pumps, and the cost of pumping, maintenance and treatment. This model was applied in Morelia, Mexico, under various scenarios. The results indicate the possibility to meet a high percentage of the water demands while reducing the cost of employing the system in the long-run.

In a study conducted by Sample and Liu (2014) decentralized RWHS for different land uses and locations in Virginia, USA were evaluated for water supply and runoff collection, using the Rainwater Analysis and Simulation Program (RASP) model. RASP simulates the RWHS using storage volume, roof area, irrigated area, and indoor nonpotable demand as input data. A lifecycle cost-benefit model of the RWHS was developed. Near-optimal solutions were found for each case and location using a nonlinear metaheuristic algorithm. On the other hand, positive net benefits were not attained in any of the cases or locations. The net benefits were found to be sensitive to water and wastewater charges.

Villarreal and Dixon (2005) provided possibilities for applying a RWHS in Ringdansen, Sweden. Four scenarios were analyzed for using rainwater in a dual water supply system to supplement potable water. A computer model was generated to quantify the water saving potential of the RWHS. The performance of the RWHS was defined by the water saving efficiency. Rainwater tank sizes were computed according to the analysis. Assuming that all the roof area at Ringdansen is utilized and the rainwater is used only for

WC flushing, a $40 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ tank would be appropriate, saving more than $60 \%$ of the main water supply. Moreover, if a combination of WC flushing and laundry use is to be supplied with rainwater, a $40 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ tank would save about $30 \%$ of the water demand. On the other hand, an $80 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ rainwater tank with a catchment area of $20,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ would supply about $60 \%$ of the irrigation demand of the central area in each residential block during the summer months.

### 2.3 Rainfall Runoff Methods

The rainfall runoff is required to be calculated in order to design the suitable rainwater harvesting system. There are ample methods to compute the runoff. When rain falls on a certain area, some of the water is intercepted by vegetation, some will infiltrate the soil and some will evaporate before reaching the ground. The remaining amount of water will flow on the surface as runoff. Those losses in rainwater quantity that do not appear as runoff are called abstractions. Abstractions comprise of interception, surface depression storage (puddles), evaporation, transpiration (loss of water from plants) and infiltration. Unless there are prominent vegetation areas, evaporation and transpiration are considered to be negligible in design-storm conditions in urban regions. Rainfall runoff in urban areas is caused by the rainfall excess or effective rainfall. The rainfall excess is calculated by subtracting the abstraction from the total rainfall. Moreover, the rate of rainfall excess is the depth of runoff per unit time. Hence, the total volume of rainfall excess is the total volume of runoff (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

In urban areas, interception and infiltration are assumed to be the main forms of abstraction. Interception storage is defined as the amount of rainwater which is intercepted by the vegetation before reaching the ground, however, this water later evaporates into the atmosphere. This occurs at the start of rainfall events and after the maximum holding capacity of the plants is reached this form of abstraction does not affect the runoff. The amount of interception depends on the type and density of the vegetation and the amount of precipitation (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003). Furthermore, it is suggested that losses in the form of interception may be significant for long-term models but may be assumed negligible in heavy rainfalls during individual rainfall events (Viessman et al., 1989).

Infiltration refers to the entry of the rainwater through the ground surface filling the pores of the soil. This process accounts for most of the abstraction that occurs in a rainfall event. Infiltration is affected by the surface and sub-surface conditions, where surface characteristics affect the availability of water and the sub-surface characteristics influence the water infiltration. The maximum rate of water infiltration is the infiltration capacity. If the rate of rainfall is lower than the infiltration capacity then the rate of infiltration is equal to the rate of the rainfall (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

$$
\begin{align*}
& f=i \text { if } f_{p}>i  \tag{2.1}\\
& f=f_{p} \text { if } f_{p}<i \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

where, $f_{p}$ is the infiltration capacity; $f$ is the actual rate of infiltration; $i$ is the rate of precipitation.

Depression storage is the amount of rainwater trapped in puddles on the surface and is prevented to flow with the runoff. The fate of this water is evaporation on impervious layers while on pervious layers the water will infiltrate until the soil reaches saturation then it will evaporate into the atmosphere. It is complex to model the depression storage, however, depression storage is negligible compared to other forms of abstraction, and therefore it may be neglected (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003). The following methods are the general techniques used in the engineering practices to calculate the abstractions of rainwater in order to compute the rainfall runoff. These methods differ in parameters needed to be collected to calculate the runoff.

The $\Phi$-index model is the simplest method to calculate rainfall runoff. The infiltration capacity is assumed to be a constant index $\Phi$ that is projected using measured rainfall-runoff data. This method is a simple estimation of the losses due to infiltration. The amount of precipitation lower than the value of the $Ф$-index is loss due to infiltration and the amount of precipitation above the value of the $\Phi$-index is rainfall runoff (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

The Green and Ampt model is an algebraic method to compute infiltration. The parameters used in this model are physical and can be computed from the soil texture and land use. In order to further comprehend this model, assume a rain event on a pervious surface, and this surface has a uniform degree of saturation at the beginning of the rain event. The degree of saturation ranges from 0 which means dry to 1.0 which is fully saturated. Furthermore, as the rain infiltrates the surface, the degree of saturation increases, but the increase of saturation will be the greatest near the ground surface and will decrease with depth. The model claims that two different zones separated by a wetting front exist in the sub-surface. The zone closer to the ground surface is called the saturated zone while the dry zone is below the wetting front and it has unlimited depth and the saturation of the dry zone is the same as the initial saturation level. The saturated zone will increase in depth as more water infiltrates the soil. In dry soil or below the wetting front, the infiltration capacity is higher than in moist soil, but this capacity will diminish as the rainwater infiltrates the soil (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

The Horton method is an exponential decay function based on experimental data, expressing the infiltration capacity in terms of the initial and final infiltration capacity, rainfall time and an exponential decay constant. By fitting the equation to measured infiltration data one will be able to determine the initial and final infiltration capacity and the exponential decay constant (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

Horton method has a drawback, because the infiltration capacity only depends on time and the infiltrated water is not considered. If the rate of rainfall is smaller than the infiltration capacity between time 0 and t then the Horton method will cause an underestimation of the infiltration capacity. Therefore, Akan (1992) manipulated the Horton method equation to express the infiltration capacity as a function of the water infiltrated and this method was named the Modified Horton method (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

On the other hand, the Holtan method is based on the idea that the infiltration capacity is proportional to the soil's available water holding capacity. As the water infiltrates the soil this holding capacity decreases and so the infiltration capacity decreases accordingly. This method was developed for agricultural areas but it may be used for wooded areas and areas covered by grass in urban regions.

The Soil Conservation Service method (SCS) is often referred to as the runoff curve number method. This method accounts for interception, depression storage, evaporation and infiltration in the abstraction to calculate the rainfall runoff. In order to use this method, the soil in the region being studied should be classified according its permeability into four different groups (A, B, C and D). Group A includes the soil textures sand, loamy sand and sandy loam, while group B includes silt loam and loam textures. Group C consists of sandy clay loam, while clay loam, silty clay loam, sandy loam, silty clay and clay belong to group D. Group A soils have a low runoff potential and high infiltration rate, while group B soils have moderate infiltration rates. On the other hand, group C soils have low infiltration rates and high runoff potential, while group D soils have the highest runoff potential between the four different soil groups (Cronshey, 1986).

Table 2.1. The hydrologic soil group and the corresponding soil textures (Cronshey, 1986)

| Hydrologic Soil Group | Soil Texture |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | Sand, loamy sand or sandy loam |
| B | Silt loam or loam |
| C | Sandy clay loam |
| D | Clay loam, silty clay loam, sandy clay, silty clay or clay |

The runoff curve number $(\mathrm{CN})$ is a basin parameter that ranges from 0 to 100 and is dependent on the hydrologic soil group, the soil cover type, the land conditions, percentage of impervious areas in the basin, and the moisture level of the soil, as shown in Table 2.2. In the case of an area having sub-catchments with different CNs, then a weighted average should be computed to form a composite CN for the whole area. The SCS runoff expression is shown in Equation 4.4 (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

The initial abstraction consists of the water intercepted by vegetation, the water retained in the surface depressions, evaporation and infiltration before the runoff begins. Moreover, this equation can only be used if the precipitation is greater than the initial abstraction. In addition, this method may be used in order to compute the total rainfall runoff given the total precipitation and it may be used to determine the rate of rainfall runoff given the rainfall hyetograph (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

Table 2.2. Runoff Curve Numbers for urban land uses (Cronshey, 1986).

| Cover description |  | Curve numbers for hydrologic soil group |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cover type and hydrologic condition | Average percent impervious area | A | B | C | D |
| Fully developed urban areas (vegetation established) Open space (lawns, parks, golf courses, cemeteries, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor condition (grass cover < 50\%) |  | 68 | 79 | 86 | 89 |
| Fair condition (grass cover 50\% to 75\%) |  | 49 | 69 | 79 | 84 |
| Good condition (grass cover > 75\%) |  | 39 | 61 | 74 | 80 |
| Impervious areas |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paved parking lots, roofs, driveways, etc. (excluding right-of-way) <br> Streets and roads |  | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Paved; curbs and storm sewers (excluding right-of-way) |  | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Paved; open ditches (including right-of-way) |  | 83 | 89 | 92 | 93 |
| Gravel (including right-of-way) |  | 76 | 85 | 89 | 91 |
| Dirt (including right-of-way) |  | 72 | 82 | 87 | 89 |
| Western desert urban areas |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural desert landscaping (pervious areas only) |  | 63 | 77 | 85 | 88 |
| Artificial desert landscaping (impervious weed barrier, desert shrub with 1 to 2 inch sand or gravel mulch and basin borders) |  | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Urban districts |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial and business | 85 | 89 | 92 | 94 | 95 |
| Industrial | 72 | 81 | 88 | 91 | 93 |
| Residential districts by average lot size |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/8 acre or less (town houses) | 65 | 77 | 85 | 90 | 92 |
| 1/4 acre | 38 | 61 | 75 | 83 | 87 |
| $1 / 3$ acre | 30 | 57 | 72 | 81 | 86 |
| 1/2 acre | 25 | 54 | 70 | 80 | 85 |
| 1 acre | 20 | 51 | 98 | 79 | 84 |
| 2 acres | 12 | 46 | 65 | 77 | 82 |

### 2.4 Water Storage Tanks

Storage tanks come in different materials and specifications. They may be placed above the ground level or underground, depending on the size and material of the tanks and the purpose of use of the water. Polyethylene, fiber glass and the modular system are ordered from the manufacturer and assembled on site, while concrete tanks are constructed on site. When designing water tanks, the hydrostatic pressure should be studied in order to construct a durable tank. Hydrostatic pressure force is a force exerted by a fluid on a solid surface in contact with the fluid. This force is normal to the solid force (Som and Biswas, 2004). The pressure due to the fluid is directly proportional to the depth of fluid, hence at the surface the pressure is zero while at the bottom it is expressed in Equation 2.3. Moreover, Figure 2.1 illustrates the previous statement (Young et al., 2011).

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=\gamma h \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $P$ is the pressure; $\gamma$ is the specific weight of the fluid; $h$ is the height of the tank


Figure 2.1. Pressure at the bottom of a tank (Young et al., 2011).

Applying this concept on the vertical walls of the tank leads to the principle of the pressure prism. The applied force to the interior surface of the tank increases with depth. Moreover, the resultant force acts on the centroid, which is $h / 3$ over the base, as shown in Figure 2.2 (Young et al., 2011).

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{R}=P * A \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $F_{R}$ is the resultant force; $P$ is the pressure; $A$ is the area in contact with the fluid


Figure 2.2. Pressure distribution and 3-D representation on a vertical wall respectively (Young et al., 2011).

When discussing water tank design, Ajagbe et al. (2012) deduced that with the increase of tank volume, the amount of material used for the structure increases. In addition, the quantity of material was verified at different volumes (10, 30, 90, 140 and $170 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ) of the rectangular and cylindrical water tanks and it was found that the quantity of material used for the rectangular water tank is more than the cylindrical water tank with the same volumes. The material studied, consists of steel reinforcement, concrete, and formwork, all of these materials were found to be used more in the rectangular water tank design than the cylindrical water tank, as presented in Figure 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 respectively (Ajagbe et al., 2012).


Figure 2.3. Amount of reinforcement against tank capacity (Ajagbe et al., 2012).


Figure 2.4. Amount of concrete against tank capacity (Ajagbe et al., 2012).


Figure 2.5. Amount of formwork against tank capacity (Ajagbe et al., 2012).

In another study performed Xiao et al. (2014) a rectangular concrete tank and a cylindrical concrete tank were modelled to assess the tensile stress on the walls of the different design of tanks. The tanks were constructed from the same concrete with equal volumes and the walls had the same thickness. The maximum tensile stress on the walls in the rectangular design was found to be 8 MPa , as shown in Figure 2.6, while the
maximum tensile stress on the walls in the cylindrical design was found to be negligible when the tank is full of water as shown in Figure 2.7. The tensile stress in the rectangular tank was concentrated on the corner between the wall and the bottom of the tank. Therefore, the cylindrical tank can withstand higher hydraulic pressure than the rectangular tank leading to less deformation will occur in the cylindrical tank.


Figure 2.6. Tensile stress in the rectangular concrete tank (Xiao et al., 2014).


Figure 2.7. Tensile stress in the cylindrical configuration (Xiao et al., 2014)

Whether to place the tanks above-ground or underground is also another issue. This issue is mainly related to the size of tanks to be installed and the space available on the site (UNEP and CEHI, 2009). Moreover, each case has its own advantages and disadvantages shown in the Table 2.3. The two cases are suitable with different tank materials and sizes (UNEP and CEHI, 2009). Above-ground storage tanks must be UV and impact resistant, as well as opaque to prevent algal growth and they should be screened to prevent mosquito breeding (Hoffmann et al., 2012). On the other hand, underground storage tanks should be constructed to withstand certain loads, as well as having a manhole to facilitate cleaning, inspection and maintenance (Hoffmann et al., 2012). Moreover, if the RWHS is connected to a backup water supply, then it should have a back-flow prevention device in order to keep the rainwater separated from the regular supply (Hoffmann et al., 2012).
Table 2.3. The pros and cons of above-ground versus underground water tanks (UNEP and CEHI, 2009).

|  | Advantages | Disadvantages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underground | - Surrounding ground lends structural support allowing lower wall thickness and lower installation costs. <br> - Can form part of the building foundation. <br> - Unobtrusive - require little or no space above ground; useful where large volume storage is required. | - For relatively small storage requirements, is relatively more expensive. <br> - Water extraction is more problematic, requiring a pump. <br> - Leaks or failures are difficult to detect; pose risk to building foundation failure if constructed on a slope. <br> - Possible contamination of the tank from groundwater intrusion or floodwaters. <br> - Possibility of undetected structural damage by tree roots; allows for entry of contaminants or vermin. |
| Aboveground | - Allows for easy inspection for cracks (masonry structures) or leakage. <br> - Cheaper to install and maintain; particularly the case for small volume household supply needs. <br> - Water extraction can be done by gravity with extraction by tap; allows for easy draining if needed. <br> - Tank(s) can be raised above ground to increase water pressure. | - Requires space for installation, particularly if large storage volume is needed; case for commercial and industrial uses. <br> - Masonry works exposed to deterioration from weathering. <br> - Failure of elevated support structures can be dangerous. <br> - Requires the construction of a solid foundation which may be costly. |
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When constructing a RWHS, tank-sizing is an important step, in order to achieve optimal effectiveness of the storage tank (SOPAC, 2004). There are four methods mainly used to compute the minimum storage capacity. A rule-of-thumb is that $20 \%$ more than the computed storage capacity should be added to ensure air space above the stored water and dead storage at the bottom of the tank (SOPAC, 2004). There are ample methods of calculating the size of the water storage tanks depending on the intended use of the water and the period of time the water is to be stored in order to satisfy the demand.

### 2.4.1 Dry Period Demand Method

In this approach, the longest average period without rainfall for the specific geographic area is estimated; it is called the dry season. Then the average monthly demand is multiplied by the period in months of the dry season and the resulting volume is the minimum storage capacity. The tanks sized using this method are mainly aimed at supplying water for household use (SOPAC, 2004).

### 2.4.2 Simple Method

In the simple method, the average annual water consumption is found and the dry season is expressed in days and found as a ratio of the whole year ( 365 days). The ratio is multiplied by the annual consumption to find the minimum storage capacity of water. This method is mainly utilized for the calculation of water reservoirs aimed at supplying water for household use such as toilet flushing and washing (UNEP and CEHI, 2009).

### 2.4.3 Simple Tabular Method

This method is utilized in the tank sizing based on precipitation and water consumption variability over the course of a year. The tanks sized using the simple tabular method are mainly aimed for household use or irrigation purposes. There are four steps (UNEP and CEHI, 2009):

1. Obtain the monthly rainfall data of a year.
2. Estimate the volume of monthly runoff and volume of water harvested.
3. Obtain the monthly volume of water consumption of a year
4. Use the monthly volume of water harvested and consumed to calculate the minimum storage required. This data is assembled in a tabular form and changes to the cumulative volume harvested and stored, the cumulative consumption and the total amount stored in one month. The difference between the highest volume stored and the amount left in the tank at the end of the year is the minimum storage volume.

### 2.4.4 Graphical Method

The fourth method states that the monthly rainfall runoff and the monthly water consumption should be represented graphically. For more accurate assessment, daily or weekly rainfall data is required. This method is employed to compute the tank size for household or irrigation purposes. There are three main steps (Worm and Hattum, 2006):

1. Plot a bar graph for the mean monthly runoff and add a line for the average monthly water consumption.
2. Plot a graph of the cumulative monthly runoff and add a line showing the cumulative monthly water use.
3. In a month, the greatest difference between the cumulative monthly runoff and water use is the minimum storage capacity.

Moreover, the reliability of the system should be computed to figure out if the system is worth constructing or not. This is done by finding the Water Saving Efficiency, " $E$ ", which is a percentage measure of water conserved in relation to total demand. It is calculated by dividing the total volume of rainwater stored by the total demand. The water saving efficiency is expressed as follows (Ward et al., 2011),

$$
\begin{equation*}
E=\left(\frac{V}{D}\right) * 100 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $E$ is the water saving efficiency; $V$ is the rainwater stored; $D$ is the water demand.

## CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

### 3.1 Overview of the Case Study

METU-NCC is located on the west of Northern Cyprus about 50 km west of Lefkosa (Nicosia) and 6 km north of Guzelyurt (Morphou), as shown in Figure 3.1. The campus is built on an area of 339 hectares and holds about 2500 people from students and staff (METU-NCC, 2014). Since every year the population living on campus is increasing, the energy and water consumption is also increasing accordingly.

At the moment, the university pumps water, for potable and non-potable use (cooking, toilets, washing and irrigation), from three wells in Guzelyurt and stores this water in a concrete reservoir with a capacity of $4000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ near the EBI dormitory building. These wells are owned by the university and so the cost of pumping is the main cost for providing water for the campus. Water on Cyprus is a very precious commodity and water scarcity is a vital problem here (Maden, 2014). This has led to development constraints in North Cyprus as about $90 \%$ of the water supplies go to irrigation. As water is being pumped from wells above the safe yield capacity of the aquifer, seawater along the coast enters and contaminates the aquifer (Maden, 2014). Ergil (2000) identifies this problem in the Guzelyurt aquifer and Maden (2014) states that the saltwater intrusion in the Guzelyurt Basin has caused the quality of water to deteriorate. Maden (2014) states that over-pumping has forced the groundwater table to sink which resulted in saltwater intrusion (Maden, 2014). Moreover, there are other factors polluting the groundwater, such as, contamination by industries, pollution due to ore beds and discharging wastes into reception basins of water resources and into the sea. Therefore, groundwater is damaged in terms of quantity and quality (Maden, 2014). The decrease in groundwater pumping is expected to have a positive effect along with the project of transferring water from Turkey (Maden, 2014). Therefore, a system such as the rainwater harvesting will provide an additional source of water that may be used safely for irrigation and decrease the pressure on the aquifer in Guzelyurt.

The water consumption data acquired from the University administration showed that water used for irrigation was $99,066 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ in the year 2013 and the water consumption from the buildings had a total of $55475 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ during the months from January to June in 2013. This shows that a large amount of water is being pumped to the campus for irrigation in comparison to water utilized for household use. Rainwater harvesting will provide an adequate amount of water without the need for treatment and by that reducing the pressure caused by the campus on the groundwater in Guzelyurt.

A system that will store the rainwater and utilize it later should be connected to the rainwater drainage system. An operational drainage system exists on campus and so only connections between the drainage system and a storage system are needed.


Figure 3.1. Map of Cyprus (Doeleman, 2007).


Figure 3.2. Top view of METU-NCC (Google Earth, 2014)

### 3.2 Description of the Site

There are two entrances for the campus, the A1 Entrance is located to the south of the campus at the bottom of the hill and the second entrance is located to the east of the campus; the town of Kalkanli is a walking distance from this gate. Moving along the road from the A1 Entrance, there are three Academic Blocks and the Preparatory School building situated to the left of the road. North of this complex, the Culture and Convention Center (CCC) and the Engineering Laboratories are located. The Administration building and IT building are directly east of the CCC, and going north of the Administration building, the Library is located. Going south from the Information Technology (IT) building one will find the Cafeteria building and further south the shopping area is located. On campus there are four dormitory complexes, Dorm 1 complex is located to the east of the shopping area buildings, while Dorm 2 complex is located to the south of the shopping area buildings, on the other hand, Dorm 3 complex is to the east of the Dorm 2 complex and to the south of the Dorm 1 complex. East of the Dorm 1 complex the Health Center is located. Directly south of the Health Center and east of the Dorm 3 complex the artificial turf football field is located. Going east from the Health Center one can find the Sports Center along with outdoor basketball and tennis courts consisting of rubber grounds, an
outdoor swimming pool and a beach volleyball field surrounded by a running track. The staff residences are located in the area east of the IT building, north of the Dorm 1 complex and the Health Center and extending to the north of the Sports Center complex. Along the road east of the staff residences towards the east entrance of the campus the Guest House will be to the left of the road while the Science and Technology Center will be to the right below the road, in addition, the EBI dormitory is located to the east of the Guest House. Before reaching the east entrance from the EBI dormitory the water reservoir is located to the left of the road. Figure 3.2 and 3.4 show the top view and the plan of the campus where the structures and topography of the campus can be seen. There are many different surfaces on the campus which are presented in Figure 3.3. Since each surface has a different runoff coefficient that will be used to calculate the volume of rainfall runoff, those surfaces should be distinguished. Asphalt, rooftops and granite have the lowest absorption coefficient while sand has the greatest. The surfaces are characterized into eight groups as follows:

1. Asphalt
2. Rooftops
3. Granite
4. Interlocking tiles (parking lots and pavement)
5. Planted vegetation and Grass areas
6. Natural Environment
7. Rubber (basketball, tennis courts and running track)
8. Artificial compacted sand (Children's playground sand pit, sand volleyball)
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### 3.3 Soil Characteristics

The Harmonized World Soil Database Viewer (HWSD) version 1.2 was used to find the general soil characteristics of this region of Cyprus. This software is adopted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), the International Soil Reference and Information Centre (ISRIC) and the Joint Centre of the European Commission (JRC). When the HWSD software is opened the window shown in Figure 3.5 is seen.


Figure 3.5. HWSD viewer window


Figure 3.6. Map of Cyprus in the HWSD viewer.

The program is equipped by a coordinate system; moreover, the coordinates of the university campus are determined using Google Earth. They were found to be $35.25 \mathrm{~N}, 33.03 \mathrm{E}$ and the same location is chosen on the HWSD viewer software as in Figure 3.6 and the soil characteristics are displayed. The dominant soil group was found to be Calcisols with $50 \%$ loam and $50 \%$ clay to be the most prominent soil textures. Therefore, the dominant soil texture is clay loam and hence this satisfies the Hydrologic Soil Group D. Table 3.1 shows the soil characteristics information obtained from HWSD viewer.

Table 3.1. Soil data from the HWSD viewer of the location specified on the map.

| Cover | Dominant <br> Soil | Associated <br> Soil | Associated <br> Soil | Associated <br> Soil |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soil Mapping Unit | 6683 |  |  |  |
| Dominant Soil Group | CL - <br> Calcisols |  |  |  |
| Share in Soil Mapping Unit <br> (\%) | 40 | 40 | 10 | 10 |
| Soil Unit Name (FAO74) | Calcic <br> Cambisols | Calcic <br> Cambisols | Chromic <br> Luvisols | Vertic <br> Cambisols |
| Topsoil Texture | Medium | Fine | Medium | Fine |
| Reference Soil Depth (cm) | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Drainage class (0-0.5\% slope) | Imperfectly | Imperfectly | Moderately <br> Well | Moderately <br> Well |
| AWC (mm) | 50 | 50 | 150 | 150 |
| Topsoil Sand Fraction (\%) | 38 | 19 | 47 | 21 |
| Topsoil Silt Fraction (\%) | 41 | 33 | 29 | 28 |
| Topsoil Clay Fraction (\%) | 21 | 48 | 24 | 51 |
| Topsoil USDA Texture <br> Classification | $10 a m$ | clay (light) | loam | clay (light) |
| Topsoil Reference Bulk <br> Density (kg/dm ${ }^{3}$ ) | 1.4 | 1.24 | 1.39 | 1.23 |
| Topsoil Bulk Density (kg/dm ${ }^{\mathbf{3}}$ ) | 1.42 | 1.3 | 1.54 | 1.43 |
| Topsoil Gravel Content (\%) | 10 | 8 | 9 | 5 |
| Subsoil Sand Fraction (\%) | 36 | 23 | 39 | 18 |
| Subsoil Silt Fraction (\%) | 41 | 34 | 27 | 28 |
| Subsoil Clay Fraction (\%) | 23 | 43 | 34 | 54 |
| Subsoil USDA Texture <br> Classification | $10 a m$ | clay (light) | clay loam | clay (light) |
| Subsoil Reference Bulk <br> Density (kg/dm3) | 1.38 | 1.26 | 1.33 | 1.22 |
| Subsoil Bulk Density <br> (kg/dm3) | 1.46 | 1.34 | 1.52 | 1.46 |
| Subsoil Gravel Content (\%) | 10 | 6 | 8 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## CHAPTER IV

## DATA AND METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 Precipitation Data

The daily precipitation data for Guzelyurt from 1978 to 2009 was obtained from the Meteorological Department of Northern Cyprus. The monthly and annual rainfall are obtained from the daily rainfall. As seen in Figure 4.1 the average monthly rainfall from 1978-2009 is the highest during the months of February, December and January while the lowest rainfall is witnessed during the months July, September, June and August. On the other hand, the maximum annual rainfall of 494 mm occurred during the water year 2002-2003 while the lowest annual rainfall of 132 mm occurred during the water year 2007-2008 as shown in Figure 4.2.


Figure 4.1. Average monthly rainfall from Guzelyurt station.


Figure 4.2. Annual rainfall versus water year from the Guzelyurt station.

Since the SWMM software needs the input data in a specific format of hourly rainfall, the daily data was disaggregated into hourly data. Using 2000-2009 hourly rainfall data of the Guzelyurt station Şahin (2013) found that the Guzelyurt daily rainfall follows a pattern of four six-hour periods as shown in Figure 4.3.


Figure 4.3. The percent distribution of daily rainfall in Guzelyurt (Şahin, 2013).

According to Şahin (2013) the distribution of daily rainfall was found to be $41 \%$ during the first six hours of rainfall in a day, while the second six hours constitute $33 \%$ of the total daily rainfall, the third six hours are $18 \%$ of the total daily rainfall and the last six hours are $8 \%$ of the total daily rainfall. Using the daily rainfall data (1978-2009) the hourly rainfall data was obtained. For instance, the first six hours of rainfall in a day constitute $41 \%$ of the total daily rainfall, therefore by dividing the obtained depth of daily rainfall in the six hours by six, the hourly rainfall in the first six hours would be obtained. This operation is performed to the 1978-2009 period daily rainfall and, the hourly data were acquired.

### 4.2 Catchment Area

In order to compute the amount of runoff that will be obtained on campus, the catchment characteristics of the campus should be studied. The existing rainwater drainage system is built to collect the rainwater from the campus from seven areas. Using the elevation differences and the suspected movement of rainwater runoff into the drainage system towards the existing discharge outlets, those seven subcatchments were drawn. Each sub-catchment contains a separate discharge outlet and specific surface characteristics. Computing the areas in each sub-catchment was performed with the aid of a plan of the campus showing the route of the drainage system, as well as, the software AutoCAD 2011 to outline the areas of the subcatchments and Google Earth to view the different surfaces. Moreover, the area of the different surfaces was found in order to estimate the runoff. The sub-catchments can be seen in Figure 4.4.

The seven sub-catchments are as follows:

1. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Lodgment Complex. (Yellow)
2. A-Types Lodgments, B-Types Lodgments, Guest House, EBI Dormitory and section of the CD-Types Lodgments. (Green)
3. $1^{\text {st }}$ Lodgment Complex, IT Building, Administration Building and section of the Culture and Convention Center. (Blue)
4. Engineering Laboratories, T-Block, Culture and Convention Center and section of the School of Foreign Languages Building. (Red)
5. Cafeteria Building, Market Area Buildings (Çarşı), $1^{\text {st }}$ Dormitory, Health Center Building, S-Block, R-Block, School of Foreign Languages Building and section of the CD-Types Lodgments. (Purple)
6. Swimming Pool, Sports Complex Building, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Dormitory and $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Dormitory. (Orange)
7. Library (Pink)

Figure 4.4. Plan of METU-NCC with different sub-catchments colored.

### 4.3 Traditional SCS Method

From the methods discussed previously, one of the runoff methods should be chosen according to the available parameters and the suitability of the method. Moreover, the other methods require data that is not available or parameters that need long experimental work to be determined before applying the method. Since the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) method includes all types of abstractions in the runoff calculation and the parameters needed to compute the runoff are available, it is the most suitable method for this case.

The curve number ( CN ) of the surface is dependent on the hydrologic soil group in the study area which is classified according to Table 2.1, the CN of the surfaces present in sub-catchments can be established using Table 2.2. The hydrologic soil group of the soil present in the campus region is closest to soil group D. The description in Table 2.1 defines the type of surface present in the region of study. Moreover, looking at Table 2.2 one can deduce that the CN of impervious areas with soil group D is 98 while grass areas with up to $75 \%$ grass cover is 84 and areas with more than $75 \%$ grass cover is 80 . On the other hand, the CN of open areas with less than $50 \%$ grass cover such as natural forest areas on campus is 89 . The greater the CN , the more the runoff produced by the surface, in other words, the impervious areas have the greatest runoff potential.

After the CN of each surface is determined, a normalized CN of the subcatchment as a whole should be determined by multiplying each specific area with its corresponding CN , summing the result and dividing that by the total area of the sub-catchment.

$$
\begin{equation*}
C N_{N}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{A_{i} * C N_{i}}{A_{T}}\right) \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $C N_{N}$ is the normalized CN of a sub-catchment; $A_{i}$ is the area of each surface in a sub-catchment $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right) ; C N_{i}$ is the CN of each surface in the sub-catchment; $A_{T}$ is the total area of the sub-catchment $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right) ; n$ is the total number of surfaces in the subcatchment.

After finding " $C N_{N}$ ", the soil moisture deficit is needed to found using the Equation 4.2 (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003),

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{D}=\frac{25400-254 C N_{N}}{C N_{N}} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $S_{D}$ is the soil moisture deficit at the time of runoff (mm); $C N_{N}$ is the normalized runoff curve number.

The initial abstraction consisting of the water intercepted by vegetation, retained in the surface depressions, evaporated or infiltrated before the runoff begins is calculated by Equation 4.3. Moreover, this equation can only be used if the precipitation is greater than the initial abstraction (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003),

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{a}=0.2 S_{D} \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $I_{a}$ is the initial abstraction (mm); $S_{D}$ is the soil moisture deficit at the time of runoff (mm).

Finally all after those parameters are computed the SCS runoff expression shown in Equation 4.4 can be employed to compute the runoff (Akan and Houghtalen, 2003).

$$
\begin{equation*}
R=\frac{\left(P-I_{a}\right)^{2}}{\left(P-I_{a}\right)+S_{D}} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $R$ is the rainfall runoff (mm); $P$ is the precipitation (mm); $I_{a}$ is the initial abstraction (mm); $S_{D}$ is the soil moisture deficit at the time of runoff (mm).

After the runoff is calculated, the volume of the runoff from each subcatchment is computed using Equation 4.5.

$$
\begin{equation*}
V=R * A_{T} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $V$ is the volume of runoff $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right) ; R$ is the rainfall runoff $(\mathrm{m}) ; A_{T}$ is the area of the sub-catchment $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$.

### 4.4 SWMM Model

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) developed the Storm Water Management Model (SWMM), which is a software that is capable of presenting a dynamic rainfall-runoff simulation model for single storm event simulation or continuous simulation of runoff quantity and quality from mainly urban subcatchment areas (Rossman, 2010). SWMM generates runoff and pollutant concentrations by operating on a group of sub-catchment areas that receive precipitation. There is a routing section in SWMM capable of simulating the transport of this runoff through pipes, channels, storage or treatment devices, pumps and regulators (Rossman, 2010). Moreover, SWMM is able to track the quantity and quality of runoff produced in each sub-catchment, the flow rate, the flow depth in each pipe and channel during a simulation period. SWMM is widely used for planning, analysis and design of storm-water runoff, sewers and other drainage systems in urban areas.

SWMM 5.1 provides an integrated environment for controlling study area input data as well as running hydrologic, hydraulic and water quality simulations. Furthermore, SWMM allows to view the results in many different formats. SWMM accounts for various hydrologic processes that contribute to runoff in urban areas, such as, time- fluctuating rainfall, evaporation, snow accumulation and melting and infiltration (Rossman, 2010). Dividing the study area into smaller sub-catchment zones, each exhibiting different characteristics will lead to spatial variability in these processes. Moreover, this software possesses a collection of hydraulic modeling options that may be utilized to route runoff and external inflows through the transport systems. In addition, SWMM can also estimate the accumulation of pollutant loads related to the runoff. SWMM has ample applications which include designing and sizing of drainage system components for flood control, sizing of detention facilities and their accessories for flood control and water quality protection, flood mapping of natural channel systems and evaluating the effect of inflow and infiltration on sewer overflows (Rossman, 2010).

This software works by creating a conceptual drainage system where water and pollutants flow through different environmental sections. SWMM has characterized these sections into various objects in the following form (Rossman, 2010):

- The Atmosphere, where the precipitation input data is inserted using the falls Rain Gage object.
- The Land Surface, where the different components and parameters of the basin area is inserted in the Sub-catchment object. It receives precipitation from the Atmospheric section and outflow is simulated in the form of infiltration and surface runoff.
- The Groundwater section receives the infiltration output from the previous section and transfers a part of it to the Transport section. The Aquifer object is used to model this compartment.
- The Transport subdivision, contains a network of transport elements such as channels, pipes, pumps, and regulators, as well as, storage and treatment units that carry water to outfalls. The input of this section may come from surface runoff, groundwater interflow, or from user-defined hydrographs. The Node and Link objects are used to model the components of this section.

Infiltration of rainfall in a sub-catchment into the unsaturated top soil zone can be modelled using three different methods (Rossman, 2010):

- Horton infiltration
- Green-Ampt infiltration
- SCS Curve Number infiltration

Moreover, in order to model snow melting or accumulation, the Snow Pack object should be used, while modelling pollutant accumulation and wash-off the Land Uses should be managed. Some other important input parameters that are used in the Sub-catchment object include the appointed rain gage, the outlet node, the land uses, the imperviousness layer fraction, the sub-catchment slope, the width of overland flow, the Manning's n for both the pervious and impervious areas and the depression
storage in the pervious and impervious areas (Rossman, 2010).
The reason why the SWMM model is chosen is its wide recognition by engineering consultants around the world, it is free to download and therefore readily available to the public, as well as, it provides output for detailed analysis. SWMM 5.0 is a physically based, deterministic model, which depends on the estimation of initial parameters (Vargas, 2009). It can provide either single-event or continuous-storm-event simulations when analyzing the rainfall/runoff relationship (Rossman, 2010). SWMM can simulate hydrologic processes as infiltration and overland flow in a sub-catchment areas while directing this runoff through a drainage system such as pipes, channels, storage/treatment devices, pumps and regulators (Vargas, 2009). Figure 4.5 shows how the SWMM model operates, the rainwater infiltrates into the surface and then runoff emerges the saturation of the surface then the water is collected by the specified drainage system.


Figure 4.5. The SWMM runoff/routing flow in a sub-catchment (Vargas, 2009).

When using SWMM, the first action to be performed is choosing the appropriate units of the project. In this case, meters (m) as the length unit, millimeters ( mm ) as the rainfall depth, hectares (ha) as the sub-catchment area unit and liters (L) as the runoff volume unit were chosen as the units of the project. The method of simulation is chosen to be the SCS method. Moreover, the default routing method is the steady flow, since in this study the flow rates are not our concern. A screen-shot of the campus region from Google Earth was placed as the background in order to fit
the areas to be drawn on SWMM.
Sub-catchments were drawn on the map using the drawing object in the toolbar. In each sub-catchment the total area of the sub-catchment is added, along with the impervious layer percentage, the percent slope of the area and the width of overland flow path. The impervious layer percentage is calculated by dividing the area of interlocking tiles and concrete by the total area of the sub-catchment. The percent slope of the area is determined by subtracting the highest elevation in the subcatchment area by the outlet elevation and dividing that by the distance between these two points (Rossman, 2010). While the width of overland flow path is determined by dividing the area of the sub-catchment by the farthest distance to the outlet in the subcatchment area (Rossman, 2010). The routing in the sub-catchment is chosen to be through the impervious areas since the rainwater gutters and collection system is found in the impervious region of the sub-catchment. The percent of routed rainwater is assumed to be $100 \%$, in order to find the maximum runoff that will result from the rainfall present. This data is filed in the Sub-catchment Editor such as in Figure 4.6. A rain gage holding the rainfall data is assigned in the Rain Gage tab as such as Figure 4.8. The rest of the parameters are kept as the default values since the information about these parameters is not available and these parameters do not affect this specific analysis.


| Infiltration Editor |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Infiltration Method | CURVE_NUMBER |
| Property | Value |
| Curve Number | 93.38 |
| Conductivity | 0.5 |
| Drying Time | 2 |
|  |  |
| SCS runoff curve number |  |
| OK |  |

Figure 4.6. The sub-catchment editor window and infiltration editor window in SWMM.

In the Infiltration Editor window the normalized CN is entered, as well as the soil drying time which has a range from 2 to 14 days. The hydraulic conductivity is not considered and its value is ignored in this method. The previous is done for each sub-catchment.

Moreover, an outfall for each sub-catchment is added on the map, from the Node object under the Hydraulic tab, corresponding to the outlet present in reality. In addition, a junction is created between each sub-catchment and its respective outfall, this is done to keep space for the combination of the outlets of different subcatchments. The tag or name of each junction is added in the Outlet tab in the subcatchment editor of the respective sub-catchment as shown in Figure 4.6. The junction is connected to the outfall by a conduit or pipe and this added from the Link tab. When adding the junction and outfall one must make sure that the elevation of the outfall is lower than that of the junction which is in turn lower than that of the lowest point in the sub-catchment, in order for the rainwater to flow in the direction of the outfall. The exact elevations are not necessary since we are not concerned with the flow rates, the only concern in this study is the volume of outflow. Figure 4.7 shows the junction, conduit and outfall editor windows.

Furthermore, a legend showing the different areas of the sub-catchments can be added from the Map tab on the left on the window. The next step is to add the rainfall data, the rain gage tab is used to add the data. The hourly rainfall data is added in a specific format either in the table present in the Time Series tab or uploaded as an external file in the same window. The model finally should appear as Figure 4.9. Before simulating the data, the dates to be simulated should be chosen, in other words, the start and end of the desired simulation dates should be selected from the Dates tab under the Options tab; Figure 4.10 shows the simulation dates window.

| Junction J13 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property | Value |
| Name | 13 |
| X-Coordinate | 135.000 |
| Y-Coordinate | 796.800 |
| Description |  |
| Tag | NO |
| Inflows | NO |
| Treatment | 25 |
| Invert El. | 0 |
| Max. Depth | 0 |
| Initial Depth | 0 |
| Surcharge Depth |  |
| Ponded Area |  |
| User-assigned name of junction |  |


| Conduit C33 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property | Value |
| Name | C33 |
| Inlet Node | J13 |
| Outlet Node | 55 |
| Description |  |
| Tag | CIRCULAR |
| Shape | 1 |
| Max. Depth | 400 |
| Length | 0.01 |
| Roughness | 0 |
| Inlet Offset | 0 |
| Outlet Offset | 0 |
| Initial Flow | 0 |
| Maximum Flow | 0 |
| Entry Loss Coeff. | 0 |
| Exit Loss Coeff. | 0 |
| Avg. Loss Coeff. | 0 |
| Seepage Loss Rate | 0 |
| Flap Gate | NO |
| Culvert Code |  |
| User-assigned name of Conduit |  |


| Outfall S1 | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property | S1 |
| Name | 1587.000 |
| X-Coordinate | 844.800 |
| Y-Coordinate |  |
| Description | NO |
| Tag | NO |
| Inflows | NO |
| Treatment | FREE |
| Invert El. | 0 |
| Tide Gate | * |
| Type |  |
| Fixed Outfall |  |
| Fixed Stage |  |
| Tidal Outfall |  |
| Curve Name |  |
| Time Series Outfall |  |
| Series Name |  |
| User-assigned name of outfall |  |

Figure 4.7. The junction, conduit and outfall editor windows on SWMM respectively.

| Rain Gage Gage1 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property | Value |
| Name | Gage1 |
| X-Coordinate | 931.800 |
| Y-Coordinate | 388.800 |
| Description |  |
| Tag | INTENSITY |
| Rain Format | $1: 00$ |
| Time Interval | 1.0 |
| Snow Catch Factor | TIMESERIES |
| Data Source | Rainfall |
| TIME SERIES: | - Series Name <br> DATA FILE: <br> - File Name <br> - Station ID <br> - Rain Units <br> Units of rainfall data |



| rainfall.txt - Notepad |  | $\square$ | $x$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| File Edit | Format | View Help |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $0: 00$ | 1.91 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $1: 00$ | 1.91 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $2: 00$ | 1.91 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $3: 00$ | 1.91 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $4: 00$ | 1.91 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $5: 00$ | 1.91 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $6: 00$ | 1.63 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $7: 00$ | 1.63 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $8: 00$ | 1.63 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $9: 00$ | 1.63 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $10: 00$ | 1.63 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $11: 00$ | 1.63 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $12: 00$ | 0.86 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $13: 00$ | 0.86 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $14: 00$ | 0.86 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $15: 00$ | 0.86 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $16: 00$ | 0.86 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $17: 00$ | 0.86 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $18: 00$ | 0.38 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $19: 00$ | 0.38 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $20: 00$ | 0.38 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $21: 00$ | 0.38 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $22: 00$ | 0.38 |  |
| $1 / 3 / 1978$ | $23: 00$ | 0.38 |  |
| $<$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Figure 4.8. The rain gage and time series editor and the rainfall data format.


Figure 4.9. The appearance of the SWMM model.


Figure 4.10. The simulation dates options window.

### 4.5 Irrigation Demand

After the runoff volumes of the sub-catchments are computed, the tank volumes and locations along with the rainwater harvesting system as a whole can be discussed. The first step is to determine the consumption of water in the subcatchments and decide how to distribute the water tanks in order to meet the irrigation demand in the seven sub-catchments. The vegetation on campus which needs irrigation was divided into three groups, as ground cover, trees and bushes, and lawn area. Figure 4.11 shows the three groups of vegetation. The amount of water supplied to each group of vegetation and the map, shown in Figure 4.12, showing all the vegetation on the campus was provided by the Directorate of Administrative Affairs at the METU-NCC in Table 4.1. In order to find the water consumed in each subcatchment, the areas of each vegetation group in each sub-catchment are calculated using the map.


Figure 4.11. The three groups of vegetation on campus.
A. Ground cover. B. Trees and bushes. C. Lawn area.

Table 4.1. The crop type along with the irrigation requirements.

| Crop Type | Months of <br> Irrigation | Duration <br> (months) | Irrigation <br> Period <br> (day/week) | Required <br> Water per <br> $\mathbf{m}^{2}$ <br> (L/day) | Total <br> Water per <br> $\mathbf{m}^{2}$ <br> (L/month) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ground <br> Cover | Jan-Dec | 12 | 2 | 0.87 | 6.96 |
| Trees and <br> Bushes | Jan-Dec | 12 | 1 | 20 | 80 |
| Lawn <br> Area | May-Oct | 6 | 6 | 12 | 288 |
| Lawn <br> Area | Nov-Apr | 6 | 5 | 10 | 200 |
| Fruit | Mar-Oct | 8 | 3 | 1.88 | 22.6 |


Figure 4.12. The AutoCAD map showing the vegetation on the campus.

### 4.6 Location of Reservoirs

Deciding the location and the number of water reservoirs, as well as the areas to be irrigated by those reservoirs will be the last step before calculating the volumes of the water tanks. Since the collection of water is occurring at the lowest elevations of the campus then pumping is a necessity. Since constructing seven water tanks will be costly, combining the runoff from different sub-catchments and storing it in the same reservoir may be a better option keeping in consideration the areas to be irrigated. Many alternatives may be proposed, one option that will be discussed and assessed for the reliability is as shown in Figure 4.10. This option will be discussed to show that the system has the potential to operate and produce adequate results. The runoff of Sub-catchments 1,2 and 7 can be combined in one tank and stored in Position 1 on the map, while the runoff from sub-catchments 3 and 4 can be combined into Position 2 and the runoff from Sub-catchments 5 and 6 can be stored in Position 3 as shown on the map.

Using this combination of reservoirs the areas to be irrigated will be Subcatchments 1, 2, 6 and the top part of Sub-catchment 5 from the reservoir at Position 1, while the reservoir at Position 2 will be used to irrigate Sub-catchments 3, 4, 7 and the lower part of Sub-catchment 5, on the other hand, the reservoir at Position 3 will irrigate the tree fruits at the bottom of the campus, outlined in green in Figure 4.13 and presented in Table 4.2. The blue spots on the map stand for small plastic tanks that act as temporary storage before the water is used by the irrigation system.

Table 4.2. The reservoirs, the sub-catchments supplying their runoff and the corresponding irrigation areas.

| Reservoir | Runoff from Sub-catchments | Sub-catchments to be irrigated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reservoir 1 | Sub-catchments 1, 2 and 7 | Sub-catchments 1, 2, 6 and top part of 5 |
| Reservoir 2 | Sub-catchments 3, 4 | Sub-catchments 3, 4, 7 and lower part of 5 |
| Reservoir 3 | Sub-catchments 5, 6 | Fruit trees |



Figure 4.13. The map with reservoir locations and irrigation areas on campus.



### 4.6 Tank Size Calculation Method

Accordingly, the monthly water consumption for each sub-catchment can be computed and will be used to calculate the reservoir volumes. In order to perform such a task a water balance approach should be adopted, showing the water demand met from the excess precipitation. The water balance approach is similar to the Simple Tabular Method described in Chapter II (page 21). Two types of balances will be adopted the annual balance and the monthly balance. The annual balance will include the carryover of the excess stored water from one year to the next as well as from one month to the next. While the monthly balance will not have any carryover from the previous month or year. The monthly runoff is computed from the monthly simulations of SWMM. The tank volume will be computed using the method given in Nnaji and Mama (2014). In this method the Storage Capacity (SC), is calculated by subtracting the cumulative surplus at the end of the year from the maximum cumulative surplus. The Cumulative Surplus (CS) is computed using Equation 4.6, moreover, if the inflow and the water stored from the previous month is less than the demand then a deficit occurs and a value of zero is assigned (Nnaji and Mama, 2014). When calculating the volumes of the tanks in each year, water years will be considered not the regular year will be studied, for instance 1978-1979 will start at September 1978 and end at August 1979.

$$
C S_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\left.0, \quad \text { if } C S_{i-1}+R_{i}-D_{i} \leq 0\right) \text { else }  \tag{4.6}\\
C S_{i-1}+R_{i}-D_{i}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $C S_{i}$ is the cumulative surplus of the current month; $C S_{i-1}$ is the cumulative surplus of the previous month $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right) ; R_{i}$ is the runoff of the current month $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right) ; D_{i}$ is the demand of the current month $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$.

Equation 4.7 illustrates how to compute the water in storage, if the inflow and the water in storage from the previous month is less than the demand then there will be no water to store. If the same expression is greater than or equal to the storage capacity then the value of the water in the storage is the storage capacity, which is the maximum value for the water in storage, otherwise the difference between the sum of the inflow and the
water storage of the previous month and the demand is the water storage of the current month (Nnaji and Mama, 2014).

$$
W S_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
0, & \left(\text { if } R_{i}+W S_{i-1}-D_{i}<0\right) \text { else }  \tag{4.7}\\
S C, & \text { if } \left.R_{i}+W S_{i-1}-D_{i} \geq S C\right) \text { else } \\
R_{i}+W S_{i-1}-D_{i}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $W S_{i}$ is the water in storage of the current month; $W S_{i-1}$ is the water in storage of the previous month; $S C$ is the storage capacity.

In this study the aim is not to maximize the storage but to investigate if the water demand can be satisfied through the rainfall, therefore, excess water during a month may be spilled. Equation 4.8 shows how the spillage of the annual balance may be computed. There will be no spillage if the water in storage of the current month is less than the storage capacity else the spillage is the difference between the water storage of the current month and the storage capacity (Nnaji and Mama, 2014).

$$
S P 1_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
0, & \text { if } \left.R_{i}+W S_{i-1}-D_{i}<S C\right) \text { else }  \tag{4.8}\\
R_{i}+W S_{i-1}-D_{i}-S C
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $S P 1_{i}$ is the water in storage of the current month in the annual balance.

To compute the demand met for each month in the annual balance Equation 4.9 is used. If the water in storage of the current month is greater than or equal to zero then the demand met is the demand of the current month otherwise the demand met is the sum of the inflow of the current month and the water in storage of the previous month (Nnaji and Mama, 2014).

$$
D M 1_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
D_{i}, \quad\left(\text { if } R_{i}+W S_{i-1}-D_{i} \geq 0\right) \text { else }  \tag{4.9}\\
R_{i}+W S_{i-1}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $D M 1_{i}$ is the demand met of the current month in the annual balance.

Moreover, in turn the monthly rainfall was assessed to identify the sufficiency to satisfy the monthly demand without utilizing water from the previous month. If the difference between the inflow and demand in one month is greater than zero then the demand met is equal to the demand of that month, otherwise the demand met is the inflow of the current month. When the demand in a month is met, the remaining surplus is spilled, otherwise there will be no spill (Nnaji and Mama, 2014). Equation 4.10 and 4.11 show the demand met and spillage expressions respectively in the monthly balance approach.

$$
D M 2_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
D_{i},\left(\text { if } R_{i}-D_{i}>0\right) \text { else }  \tag{4.10}\\
R_{i}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $D M 2_{i}$ is the demand met of the current month in the monthly balance.

$$
S P 2_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
R_{i}-D M_{i}, & \left(\text { if } R_{i}-D M_{i}>0\right) \text { else }  \tag{4.11}\\
0
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $S P 2_{i}$ is the spillage of the current month in the monthly balance.

## CHAPTER V

## CALCULATIONS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 5.1 Catchment Area

Using Figure 4.4 and Google Earth, the areas of each surface in the seven subcatchments were determined as shown in Table 5.1. It can be inferred that the artificial compacted sand surface is only found in sub-catchments 3 and 6 , and that the rubber surface is only present in sub-catchment 6 while sub-catchments 4 and 5 are the only subcatchments that contain natural environment areas. Since gutters are not found in some areas of the campus, not all the area is covered by the rainwater drainage system. The total campus area that rainwater will be collected from is $346,971 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

Table 5.1. Areas ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) of every surface in each sub-catchment

| Sub- <br> catchment | Interlocking <br> Tiles and <br> Concrete <br> Area | Grass <br> Area | Artificial <br> sand Area | Rubber <br> Area | Natural <br> Environment <br> Area | Total <br> Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 10589 | 4299 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 14888 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 28834 | 15857 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44691 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 21376 | 12604 | 589 | 0 | 0 | 34569 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 31646 | 9685 | 0 | 0 | 7029 | 48360 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 72100 | 20232 | 0 | 0 | 32130 | 124462 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 40397 | 25631 | 1311 | 5690 | 0 | 73029 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 5732 | 1239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6971 |
| Total | 210675 | 89547 | 1900 | 5690 | 39159 | 346971 |

### 5.2 Catchment Runoff

After the areas of the surfaces on campus are determined the parameters needed in the runoff calculation need to be computed. For the traditional SCS method parameters such as $S_{D}, I_{a}$ and $C N_{N}$ are required in the runoff calculation. On the other hand, in the SWMM model parameters such as the percent of impervious layer, percent slope and the width of overflow need to be determined before applying the model.

### 5.2.1 Traditional SCS Results

When applying this method the CN of each surface is determined from Table 2.2 according to soil group D. $C N_{N}$ is determined from Equation 4.1, while $S_{D}$ is computed from Equation 4.2 and $I_{a}$ is computed from Equation 4.3. The data is placed into a table similar to Table 5.2, to calculate the monthly runoff produced by each sub-catchment.

Table 5.2. The data used in the spreadsheet SCS method.

| Sub-Catchment <br> Surface Type | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interlocking Tiles and Concrete Area ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | 10589 | 28834 | 21376 | 31646 | 72100 | 40397 | 5732 |
| CN | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Grass Area ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | 4299 | 15857 | 12604 | 9685 | 20232 | 25631 | 1239 |
| CN | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Artificial sand Area } \\ \left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right) \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 589 | 0 | 0 | 1311 | 0 |
| CN | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 |
| Rubber Area (m²) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5690 | 0 |
| CN | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Natural <br> Environment Area <br> $\left(\mathbf{m}^{2}\right)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7029 | 32130 | 0 | 0 |
| CN | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Total Area (m²) | 14888 | 44691 | 34569 | 48360 | 124462 | 73029 | 6971 |
| $\mathrm{CN}_{\mathrm{N}}$ | 93.38 | 92.32 | 92.00 | 93.49 | 93.08 | 92.20 | 95.16 |
| $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathrm{mm})$ | 18.00 | 21.12 | 23.38 | 17.69 | 18.90 | 22.82 | 12.93 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathrm{mm})$ | 3.60 | 4.22 | 4.68 | 3.54 | 3.78 | 4.56 | 2.59 |

After the individual monthly precipitation values are plugged into the spreadsheet from 1978 to 2009, the monthly runoff volumes of each sub-catchment will be obtained by using Equation 4.4. The results showed that the $5^{\text {th }}$ sub-catchment will obtain the largest runoff volume while the $7^{\text {th }}$ sub-catchment will have the least runoff volume, this is mainly
due to the difference in the areas of the sub-catchments, although the $7^{\text {th }}$ sub-catchment has the highest percent of impervious layer. Table 5.3 shows the results of runoff in 1978 according to the traditional SCS method.

Table 5.3. Spreadsheet monthly runoff volume $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ from each sub-catchment.

| 1978 | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 104.7 | 27.5 | 56.2 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 8.0 | 91.1 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 1 | 1277.6 | 202.9 | 583.4 | 176.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 221.3 | 12.9 | 1080.4 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 2 | 3710.4 | 545.4 | 1651.7 | 470.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 597.7 | 25.6 | 3123.2 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 3 | 2802.6 | 389.7 | 1225.1 | 334.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 428.7 | 14.3 | 2351.4 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 4 | 4163.9 | 666.6 | 1906.2 | 580.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 726.5 | 43.4 | 3522.6 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 5 | 10579.9 | 1643.3 | 4795.7 | 1426.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1794.5 | 95.9 | 8934.7 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 6 | 5955.6 | 839.6 | 2615.2 | 720.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 922.8 | 32.8 | 5000.9 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 7 | 631.8 | 114.3 | 301.1 | 100.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 123.6 | 11.1 | 538.4 |

### 5.2.2 SWMM Model Results

In order to apply the SWMM software to compute the runoff the percent impervious layer, width of overflow and the percent slope are calculated and the results of these calculations are shown in Table 5.4. These parameters are placed in the input of the SWMM software in the sub-catchment characteristics. Since the SWMM model requires hourly rainfall, the daily rainfall data was converted to hourly rainfall using Figure 4.3. Some of the hourly rainfall are presented in Table 5.6 and are calculated from the daily rainfall in Table 5.5. Table 5.7 shows the SWMM monthly runoff in 1978.

Table 5.4. The input data in the SWMM model for all the sub-catchments.

| Sub-Catchment | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Area (ha) | 1.4888 | 4.4691 | 3.4569 | 4.836 | 12.4462 | 7.3029 | 0.6971 |
| $\mathbf{C N}_{\mathbf{N}}$ | 93.38 | 92.32 | 92.00 | 93.49 | 93.08 | 92.20 | 95.16 |
| Interlocking <br> Tiles and <br> Concrete Area <br> (ha) | 1.0589 | 2.8834 | 2.1376 | 3.1646 | 7.2100 | 4.0397 | 0.5732 |
| Percent of <br> Impervious <br> Layer (\%) | 71.12 | 64.52 | 63.54 | 65.44 | 57.93 | 64.90 | 82.22 |
| Length from <br> outlet to <br> farthest point <br> (m) | 225.44 | 845.14 | 446.22 | 282.39 | 1340.32 | 847.90 | 139.31 |
| Width of <br> overflow(m) | 66.04 | 52.88 | 77.47 | 171.25 | 92.86 | 86.13 | 50.04 |
| Highest <br> Elevation (m) | 142.5 | 143.9 | 139.6 | 132 | 140.1 | 142 | 135.9 |
| Lowest <br> Elevation (m) | 137.4 | 133.3 | 131.1 | 118.2 | 92 | 115.2 | 132.4 |
| Distance <br> between highest <br> and lowest <br> points (m) | 248.7 | 775.1 | 518.3 | 219.2 | 1286.4 | 770.5 | 150 |
| Percent slope <br> (\%) | 2.05 | 1.37 | 1.64 | 6.30 | 3.74 | 3.48 | 2.33 |
| Drying time <br> (days) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |

Table 5.5. Daily rainfall data (mm) of days 1 to 10 in each month of 1978

| Day | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 28.7 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 2.1 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.5 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 21.5 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 4.2 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 2.2 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 23.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.6 |

Table 5.6. Hourly rainfall (mm) data for the first ten days of January 1978

| Time Day | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.09 | 1.91 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 1.54 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.09 | 1.91 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 1.54 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.09 | 1.91 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 1.54 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.09 | 1.91 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 1.54 |
| $\mathbf{4 : 0 0 - 5 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.09 | 1.91 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 1.54 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.09 | 1.91 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 1.54 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.07 | 1.63 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 1.31 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.07 | 1.63 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 1.31 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.07 | 1.63 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 1.31 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.07 | 1.63 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 1.31 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.07 | 1.63 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 1.31 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.07 | 1.63 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 1.31 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.04 | 0.86 | 0.06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.69 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.04 | 0.86 | 0.06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.69 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.04 | 0.86 | 0.06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.69 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.04 | 0.86 | 0.06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.69 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.04 | 0.86 | 0.06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.69 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.04 | 0.86 | 0.06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.69 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.31 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.31 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.31 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.31 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.31 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 0 : 0 0}$ | 0 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.31 |
| Total | 0 | 1.30 | 28.70 | 2.10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.20 | 0.80 | 23.10 |

In order to obtain monthly results from the SWMM software the dates of simulation should be manipulated from the Options tab. By clicking on the summary report, the runoff depth, infiltration depth and runoff volumes from each sub-catchment can be viewed in the form of a table. Similar to the traditional SCS results, the $5^{\text {th }}$ sub-catchment showed the highest runoff volume while the $7^{\text {th }}$ sub-catchment showed the least volume. But the values of the runoff volume are found to be different in both methods, this is due to the fact that the SWMM model uses the starting point as the traditional SCS method but then computes the infiltration differently since infiltration is changing during rainfall ("Hydrology comparison", 2009). On the other hand, in the traditional SCS method the infiltration is included in the initial abstraction which is considered to be constant for a sub-catchment.

Table 5.7. SWMM monthly runoff volume ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) from each sub-catchment.

| 1978 | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 104.7 | 27.5 | 56.2 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 8.0 | 91.1 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 1 | 1402 | 330 | 716 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 362 | 95 | 1213 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 2 | 4023 | 916 | 2028 | 944 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1002 | 265 | 3473 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 3 | 3031 | 682 | 1523 | 711 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 761 | 197 | 2615 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 4 | 4465 | 1021 | 2252 | 1045 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1137 | 294 | 3853 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 5 | 11053 | 2426 | 5476 | 2570 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2673 | 699 | 9515 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 6 | 6464 | 1463 | 3254 | 1518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1606 | 423 | 5581 |
| Sub- <br> catchment 7 | 696 | 172 | 363 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 50 | 604 |

### 5.2.3 Sensitivity Analysis

The difference between the two approaches is that the SWMM model uses CN to compute the infiltration as a starting point and then SWMM utilizes the runoff methodology to simulate the surface runoff hydrograph as stated by Lewis A. Rossman, the author of the SWMM user manual (Rossman, 2009). Some parameters included in the SWMM model but not in the spreadsheet SCS are the percent of impervious layer, depression storage, the pervious roughness coefficient and the soil drying time. The exact value of the soil drying time parameter can be determined through experimental analysis and the information regarding this parameter is not available, therefore a sensitivity analysis is performed to assess the effect of this parameter on the runoff. The range of this parameter on SWMM is between 2 days and 14 days.

The sensitivity analysis was performed on the two years with the highest annual precipitation which were 1988 and 1994 with 470.1 mm and 484.8 mm respectively. The monthly runoff was found for different values of the saturated soil drying time. The saturated soil drying time ranges from 2 days to 14 days with a median of 8 days. Figures 5.1 to 5.7 show the sensitivity of each sub-catchment to changing the saturated soil drying time. In Figures 5.1 to 5.7 the curves of April to October appear as one curve since during these months there is no or little rainfall so the change in the runoff due to the change in the saturated soil drying time is negligible. Moreover, the highest monthly rainfall through all the data such as 2003 February, 2010 January and 1986 November, with $159 \mathrm{~mm}, 154.7$
mm and 131.2 mm respectively, were analyzed individually with respect to changing saturated soil drying time. In this analysis a major effect is indicated when the parameter was varied and the runoff change is greater than $\pm 5 \%$, as shown in Figure 5.8. Both sensitivity tests illustrated the runoff is not sensitive to the change in soil saturated drying time. The main reason for the runoff not being sensitive to the change in the soil saturated drying time is that the sub-catchment areas are mainly consisting of impervious layers as seen from Table 5.4 the percent of impervious layer range from $57.9 \%$ to $71.1 \%$, therefore, there is little effect on the runoff from the soil surface.


Figure 5.1. The effect of change in saturated soil drying time on runoff in sub-catchment 1.

## Sub-catchment 2



Figure 5.2. The effect of change in saturated soil drying time on runoff in sub-catchment 2.


Figure 5.3. The effect of change in saturated soil drying time on runoff in sub-catchment 3 .


Figure 5.4. The effect of change in saturated soil drying time on runoff in sub-catchment 4.


Figure 5.5. The effect of change in saturated soil drying time on runoff in sub-catchment 5.


Figure 5.6. The effect of change in saturated soil drying time on runoff in sub-catchment 6.


Figure 5.7. The effect of change in saturated soil drying time on runoff in sub-catchment 7.


Figure 5.8. The effect of change in saturated soil drying time on runoff in all sub-catchments during the peak monthly rainfall.

### 5.3 Irrigation Requirements

The monthly irrigation requirements of each sub-catchment are calculated by multiplying the monthly water demand of each vegetation type shown in Table 4.2 by the corresponding areas of the vegetation in each sub-catchment from Table 5.9. Moreover, Table 5.8 shows that Sub-catchments 1 and 2 do not contain any lawn areas. Due to that reason, the monthly water consumption of Sub-catchments 1 and 2 are the same throughout all the months of the year as presented in Table 5.9. Consequently, the monthly demand of each reservoir should be summed, this is shown in Table 5.10.

Table 5.8. The areas occupied of each crop type in the seven sub-catchments.

|  |  | Trees and bushes |  | Sub- catchment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ground cover $\left(\mathbf{m}^{2}\right)$ | $\mathbf{m}^{2}$ | Number of <br> trees and <br> bushes |  |
| Sub-catchment 1 | 2324 | 1976 | 1149 | 0 |
| Sub- catchment 2 | 6938 | 8919 | 5185 | 0 |
| Sub- catchment 3 | 2779 | 6286 | 3653 | 3540 |
| Sub- catchment 4 | 4714 | 1876 | 1091 | 3095 |
| Sub- catchment 5 | 5211 | 1922 | 1117 | 13099 |
| Sub- catchment 6 | 15263 | 9286 | 5399 | 1082 |
| Sub- catchment 7 | 162 | 480 | 279 | 1259 |
| Total Area | 37390 | 30745 | 17873 | 22074 |

Table 5.9. The monthly water consumption ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) of each sub-catchment.

| Sub-catchment | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan | 174 | 762 | 1230 | 802 | 2810 | 1065 | 291 |
| Mar | 174 | 762 | 1230 | 802 | 2810 | 1065 | 291 |
| Apr | 174 | 762 | 1230 | 802 | 2810 | 1065 | 291 |
| May | 174 | 762 | 1230 | 802 | 2810 | 1065 | 291 |
| Jun | 174 | 762 | 1542 | 1074 | 3963 | 1161 | 402 |
| Jul | 174 | 762 | 1542 | 1074 | 3963 | 1161 | 402 |
| Aug | 174 | 762 | 1542 | 1074 | 3963 | 1161 | 402 |
| Sep | 174 | 762 | 1542 | 1074 | 3963 | 1161 | 402 |
| Oct | 174 | 762 | 1542 | 1074 | 3963 | 1161 | 402 |
| Nov | 174 | 762 | 1230 | 802 | 2810 | 1065 | 291 |
| Dec | 174 | 762 | 1230 | 802 | 2810 | 1065 | 291 |

Table 5.10. The monthly water consumption $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of the three irrigation areas.

| Month | Reservoir 1 | Reservoir 2 | Reservoir 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jan | 3406 | 3728 | 0 |  |
| Feb | 3406 | 3728 | 0 |  |
| Mar | 3406 | 3728 | 369 |  |
| Apr | 3406 | 3728 | 369 |  |
| May | 4078 | 4999 | 369 |  |
| Jun | 4078 | 4999 | 369 |  |
| Jul | 4078 | 4999 | 369 |  |
| Aug | 4078 | 4999 | 369 |  |
| Sep | 4078 | 4999 | 369 |  |
| Oct | 4078 | 4999 | 369 |  |
| Nov | 3406 | 3728 | 0 |  |
| Dec | 3406 | 3728 | 0 |  |
| Annual Consumption | 44906 | 52365 | 2950 |  |
| Total Annual <br> Consumption of <br> campus |  |  |  |  |

### 5.4 Rainwater Tank Sizing Results

Before calculating the reservoir volumes, the runoff from one of two methods used should be chosen to be utilized in the reservoir sizing calculations. The traditional SCS method has some drawbacks when compared to the SWMM model. The traditional SCS is considered to be a combined loss method since the initial abstraction includes infiltration, interception and depression storage, the losses caused by these processes are calculated simultaneously. Moreover, in the traditional SCS method the infiltration in the initial abstraction does not vary with changing rainfall events on a sub-catchment, on the contrary it would stay the same before and during the rainfall event. On the other hand, in the SWMM model, the infiltration changes with changing rainfall events and therefore the SWMM model simulates infiltration better than the traditional SCS. Therefore, the runoff results from the SWMM model were chosen to be utilized in the tank sizing calculations. After applying Equations 4.6 to 4.11, the annual reservoir volume is computed such as in Table 5.12. The volumes of the three water reservoirs were taken as the average of all the years without the years that showed zero as the volume of the water tanks. Since rainwater will not be collected in those years, they will not be included in the reservoir sizing calculations. Furthermore, Reservoir 1 was computed to be $2305 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, Reservoir 2 was calculated as $3490 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ while Reservoir 3 was computed to be $1071 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. The percentage of
demand met according to Reservoir 1 is $37.8 \%$ in the annual balance and $32.4 \%$ in the monthly balance. Reservoir 2 shows $41.3 \%$ and $34.1 \%$ for the percentage of demand met in the annual balance and monthly balance respectively, while Reservoir 3 shows $90.5 \%$ and $66.8 \%$ for the percentage of demand met in the annual balance and monthly balance respectively, as shown in Table 5.11. In other words, the annual balance approach (with carryover) shows better results in meeting the demand and therefore such an approach should be selected. Figures 5.9, 5.10 and 5.11 show the annual reservoir volume and the average reservoir volume throughout the 31 years on rainfall data.

Table 5.11. Reservoir volumes and corresponding percent demand met.

| Reservoir | Volume ( $\mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ ) | Annual balance demand <br> met (carryover) (\%) | Monthly balance demand <br> met (no carryover) (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reservoir 1 | 2305 | 37.8 | 32.4 |
| Reservoir 2 | 3490 | 41.3 | 34.1 |
| Reservoir 3 | 1071 | 90.5 | 66.8 |



Figure 5.9. The annual and average water tank volume of Reservoir 1.


| 1986-1987 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall (mm) | 0.2 | 11.6 | 131.1 | 26.8 | 57.8 | 17.0 | 89.3 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff ( $\mathrm{m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ ) | 6 | 562 | 8219 | 1456 | 3192 | 870 | 5311 | 101 | 131 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand ( ${ }^{3}$ ) | 4078 | 4078 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 4078 | 4078 | 4078 | 4078 |
| CS (m ${ }^{3}$ ) | 0 | 0 | 4812.6 | 2862.2 | 2647.7 | 111.3 | 2015.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS ( $\mathrm{m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ ) | 0 | 0 | 4812.6 | 2862.2 | 2647.7 | 111.3 | 2015.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 ( $\mathrm{m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 6 | 562 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 3406.4 | 2116.9 | 131 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 6 | 562 | 3406.4 | 1456 | 3192 | 870 | 3406.4 | 101 | 131 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{S P 2}\left(\mathrm{m}^{\mathbf{3}}\right)$ | 0 | 0 | 4812.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1904.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0.15 | 13.8 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 62.1 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0.15 | 13.8 | 100 | 42.7 | 93.7 | 25.5 | 100 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{S C}\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 4812.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 5.10. The annual and average water tank volume of Reservoir 2.


Figure 5.11. The annual and average water tank volume of reservoir 3.

Table 5.13. Annual water demand and annual saving.

| Reservoir | Annual Water <br> Demand (m³) | Percent of Water <br> Demand Met (\%) | Annual Water <br> Demand met (m³) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reservoir 1 | 44,906 | 37.8 | 16,974 |
| Reservoir 2 | 52,365 | 41.3 | 21,627 |
| Reservoir 3 | 2,950 | 90.5 | 2,670 |
| Total | 100,221 | 41.2 | 41,271 |

As shown in Table 5.13 the annual water supplied by the proposed system is 41,271 $\mathrm{m}^{3}$, which is $41.2 \%$ of the total annual irrigation demand of the campus. The proposed system can be integrated with the present irrigation system by pumping the water to a temporary tank located at the blue spots which are at higher elevations in order to for the water to move by gravity. The temporary tanks are of small volumes, when they are full the pumps at the storage tanks will switch off and the system is functional. When there is insufficient rainfall and not enough water is pumped to the small tanks then the system will not be functional and the water from the main tank will be used. By that, the rainwater harvesting system will be working in parallel with the existing system supplying rainwater for irrigation when it is available.

As shown in Figure 5.12, the first flush will remove the first $0.2-2 \mathrm{~mm}$ that is not of good quality to be used. The first flush tank operates with a trap door that closes once a certain volume of water is attained and allowing the following runoff to proceed to the sedimentation tank. The sedimentation tank will serve the purpose of removing the solid particles such as soil, sand and other particles that are large enough to sediment. In order to reduce the cleaning process of the storage tank and to protect the pump located in the tank. Moreover, screens can be used at the inlet of the system to reduce the debris from entering to the system. The system does not need heavy labor operation during operation, labor is needed mainly in the cleaning process of the system. In addition, the water tank is preferably reinforced concrete to withstand the hydrostatic pressure and underground in order to support the structure and keep the scenery clean from any large structure. Furthermore, this will ensure a good quality water that if necessary treatment processes were to be applied may be used for other purposes such as household water.


On the other hand, another option for the storage tank is the Modular tank system. The Modular tank system is sub-surface tank might be less costly than the concrete tank. There are eleven steps to install the Modular tank system (Atlantis, 2005):

1. Excavation of the location site to place the storage system. The Modular system is best employed under flat ground.
2. Placing the base material. The base material should be compactible such as sand or stone.
3. Placing the impermeable plastic lining to cover the base and the walls of the excavated area.
4. Laying the Geotextile over the plastic lining to cover the tanks.
5. Installing the Modular tanks over the Geotextile layer.
6. Installing the inspection or maintenance ports. Those ports are usually PVC pipes that offer access to the system from the ground.
7. Wrapping the tanks with the Geotextile and plastic linings to cover them completely, only keeping the inspection ports protruding.
8. Connect the inlet and outlet pipes.
9. Backfill the sides and compact it to ensure maximum stability of the system.
10. Backfill the top and compact it.
11. Placing the Geogrid to ensure the system can withstand loads.

The Modular tanks are assembled on site so their transport is easy. This method is becoming widely used. It is a cost-effective and efficient technique to store rainwater. Some advantages of using this system include (Fibromat, 2014):

- High compressive strength which allows the system to be used under urban areas (parking lots and roads).
- The Modular tanks link vertically and horizontally for maximum.
- Cost-effective versus concrete and metal storage systems.
- Low transportation cost.
- Can be modified for different volume needs.
- Easily assembled on site.

Therefore the Modular storage system can be an option to replace the concrete tank. Figure 5.13 illustrates a Modular tank system.


## CHAPTER VI

## CONCLUSION

Rainwater harvesting system, where rainfall runoff collected and utilized, is a prominent solution to address the issue of water scarcity by conserving the available water resources and the energy needed to deliver water to the water supply system. The impact of climate change on water resources can also be reduced by rainwater harvesting. Rainwater harvesting is becoming an important part of the sustainable water management around the world. The Eastern Mediterranean countries with semi-arid climate obtain low precipitation and high temperature, therefore, applying rainwater harvesting systems will be very beneficial in these areas at least to provide non-potable uses such as irrigation and household use. This study investigated the potential of rainwater harvesting in METUNCC. Two approaches for runoff calculation were adopted, the traditional SCS method and the SWMM model. Daily rainfall data from 1978 to 2009 was used to obtain the monthly and hourly rainfall. Moreover, in order to demonstrate its potential a rainwater harvesting system was proposed. The reservoir locations were chosen with their relative irrigation areas and the reservoir volumes were calculated after finding the irrigation consumption of the campus. The study was not aimed at optimizing the system, rather the system serves the purpose to show if there is a potential in rainwater harvesting on the campus. The system showed that $41.2 \%$ of the campus irrigation demand was met. The reservoir volumes were found to be about $2300 \mathrm{~m}^{3}, 3500 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ and $1100 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ with efficiencies of $37.8 \%, 41.3 \%$ and $90.5 \%$ respectively. Finally, this illustrates that there is potential for collecting rainwater as in the proposed system for irrigation purposes of the campus.

This study is preliminary to assess the potential of constructing a rainwater harvesting system, therefore there is much work that can be conducted to evaluate different aspects of the project. A cost-benefit analysis is required to implement this project as well as calibration of the models in this paper should be done in order to examine how these models are related to the actual runoff, this can be done by installing a flow meter in the rainwater pipes to measure the runoff attained. Once the models that were generated using the past data are calibrated using the present data then forecasting can be performed to estimate the future expected runoff. Furthermore, a study on the cost of different rainwater
harvesting systems and the location of the reservoirs using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) can be conducted in order to obtain a system that can lead to better saving at lower cost of construction and maintenance. Other studies that might be conducted are studies to implement this technique in other location in North Cyprus as well as awareness campaigns that can help the people of the island conserve the current water resources as well as support the dry environment by collecting rainfall to serve irrigation and household purposes.

Concerning the drainage system, investigations on the efficiency of the drainage system including modifying the system to drain more water from depression areas can be performed. In addition, ensuring that the drainage system is collecting water from parts of the campus that do not contain any gutters and studying the effect this would have on the rainwater harvesting system.

Regarding the proposed system in the previous section, further studies can be conducted to optimize the tank volumes and the efficiency of the system, in other words the percentage of demand met. Moreover, modifications to the irrigation system can be conducted to reduce water consumption, for instance, studying the effects of a dropper system on the water consumption and on the rainwater harvesting system. On the other hand, studies regarding changing crop type and introducing local crops and reducing grass areas can be examined to evaluate its effects on the water consumption. In addition, testing the quality of the water collected and perform studies on the capability of increasing the quality of water at a feasible cost for different uses of the water may be conducted.
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## APPENDIX A

## SWMM Model Runoff Results

Tables A.1, A.2, and A. 3 show the SWMM model runoff results for each reservoir discussed in Chapter V pages 56-59.

Table A.1. Reservoir 1 SWMM model runoff.

| Reservoir 1 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1978-1979 | 0 | 1550 | 409 | 5290 | 2008 | 942 | 1426 | 332 | 317 | 472 | 0 | 0 |
| 1979-1980 | 0 | 1361 | 3394 | 2979 | 2900 | 4303 | 2546 | 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1980-1981 | 0 | 1463 | 193 | 2176 | 4647 | 3675 | 1940 | 590 | 848 | 346 | 0 | 0 |
| 1981-1982 | 0 | 69 | 2136 | 1750 | 1801 | 2519 | 4507 | 560 | 6 | 3570 | 0 | 0 |
| 1982-1983 | 0 | 70 | 1306 | 1182 | 1392 | 3946 | 2075 | 765 | 1194 | 956 | 0 | 0 |
| 1983-1984 | 0 | 940 | 1583 | 2107 | 1846 | 706 | 1654 | 2774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1984-1985 | 0 | 87 | 2694 | 2328 | 4740 | 2281 | 1846 | 149 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1985-1986 | 0 | 1295 | 782 | 1045 | 1401 | 2533 | 615 | 565 | 1531 | 249 | 0 | 0 |
| 1986-1987 | 6 | 562 | 8219 | 1456 | 3192 | 870 | 5311 | 101 | 131 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| 1987-1988 | 0 | 2487 | 1202 | 4229 | 2703 | 7084 | 5098 | 379 | 44 | 0 | 494 | 0 |
| 1988-1989 | 0 | 1873 | 2601 | 7108 | 2889 | 490 | 848 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1989-1990 | 0 | 976 | 1352 | 908 | 690 | 4235 | 1401 | 22 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 |
| 1990-1991 | 0 | 630 | 168 | 1001 | 3256 | 1869 | 1625 | 489 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1991-1992 | 0 | 697 | 2003 | 7689 | 837 | 5959 | 1892 | 285 | 419 | 168 | 0 | 0 |
| 1992-1993 | 0 | 33 | 3046 | 4680 | 2110 | 2854 | 2578 | 168 | 580 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1993-1994 | 0 | 288 | 1920 | 729 | 4953 | 3665 | 2016 | 2003 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1994-1995 | 2469 | 3569 | 5871 | 2738 | 1054 | 677 | 636 | 1609 | 549 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| 1995-1996 | 14 | 327 | 2016 | 764 | 3310 | 3797 | 1885 | 1783 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2117 |
| 1996-1997 | 0 | 1079 | 260 | 3414 | 408 | 1526 | 1499 | 1476 | 481 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1997-1998 | 747 | 1141 | 4846 | 3230 | 1601 | 693 | 2361 | 242 | 372 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1998-1999 | 0 | 44 | 1643 | 4977 | 6236 | 1673 | 1711 | 2294 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1999-2000 | 61 | 44 | 958 | 1811 | 1985 | 3923 | 1463 | 1300 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2000-2001 | 316 | 437 | 4128 | 5766 | 1171 | 3341 | 437 | 1082 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 5437 |
| 2001-2002 | 0 | 583 | 1199 | 4832 | 3501 | 2191 | 2998 | 1537 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2002-2003 | 436 | 6332 | 3904 | 5854 | 2989 | 9829 | 4024 | 557 | 3 | 156 | 0 | 0 |
| 2003-2004 | 0 | 1444 | 2146 | 2146 | 8102 | 3046 | 0 | 409 | 150 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 2004-2005 | 0 | 1877 | 2577 | 2865 | 1953 | 2427 | 1665 | 1598 | 44 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| 2005-2006 | 0 | 958 | 2525 | 529 | 4059 | 1677 | 1276 | 1852 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2006-2007 | 16 | 2543 | 736 | 171 | 1839 | 4224 | 1517 | 382 | 5168 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| 2007-2008 | 0 | 0 | 1936 | 2191 | 807 | 1708 | 331 | 68 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2008-2009 | 212 | 699 | 30 | 3376 | 4431 | 4430 | 2113 | 788 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table A.2. Reservoir 2 SWMM model runoff.

| Reservoir 2 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1978-1979 | 0 | 1913 | 496 | 6512 | 2454 | 1152 | 1737 | 400 | 383 | 569 | 0 | 0 |
| 1979-1980 | 0 | 1660 | 4192 | 3639 | 3525 | 5278 | 3106 | 726 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1980-1981 | 0 | 1810 | 237 | 2658 | 5709 | 4506 | 2372 | 718 | 1030 | 419 | 0 | 0 |
| 1981-1982 | 0 | 82 | 2612 | 2127 | 2206 | 3094 | 5526 | 679 | 7 | 4417 | 0 | 0 |
| 1982-1983 | 0 | 83 | 1596 | 1449 | 1692 | 4853 | 2533 | 923 | 1460 | 1170 | 0 | 0 |
| 1983-1984 | 0 | 1151 | 1934 | 2561 | 2242 | 858 | 2029 | 3402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1984-1985 | 0 | 104 | 3294 | 2847 | 5826 | 2775 | 2262 | 178 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1985-1986 | 0 | 1579 | 948 | 1271 | 1692 | 3104 | 744 | 682 | 1873 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| 1986-1987 | 7 | 682 | 10193 | 1779 | 3909 | 1053 | 6545 | 123 | 157 | 86 | 0 | 0 |
| 1987-1988 | 0 | 3060 | 1462 | 5190 | 3311 | 8767 | 6266 | 459 | 53 | 0 | 602 | 0 |
| 1988-1989 | 0 | 2304 | 3180 | 8792 | 3552 | 595 | 1026 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1989-1990 | 0 | 1176 | 1646 | 1095 | 833 | 5232 | 1715 | 26 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 |
| 1990-1991 | 0 | 763 | 202 | 1209 | 3989 | 2276 | 1976 | 593 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1991-1992 | 0 | 844 | 2464 | 9519 | 1016 | 7357 | 2304 | 343 | 505 | 202 | 0 | 0 |
| 1992-1993 | 0 | 39 | 3758 | 5765 | 2582 | 3492 | 3161 | 201 | 697 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1993-1994 | 0 | 350 | 2353 | 882 | 6091 | 4481 | 2472 | 2477 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1994-1995 | 3047 | 4397 | 7258 | 3342 | 1274 | 821 | 767 | 1959 | 667 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| 1995-1996 | 18 | 392 | 2461 | 922 | 4065 | 4673 | 2290 | 2187 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2611 |
| 1996-1997 | 0 | 1307 | 314 | 4185 | 494 | 1866 | 1820 | 1805 | 584 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1997-1998 | 912 | 1382 | 5973 | 3959 | 1939 | 840 | 2893 | 290 | 446 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1998-1999 | 0 | 52 | 1999 | 6139 | 7710 | 2046 | 2091 | 2824 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1999-2000 | 72 | 52 | 1165 | 2214 | 2410 | 4814 | 1773 | 1576 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2000-2001 | 382 | 524 | 5112 | 7103 | 1418 | 4094 | 529 | 1311 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 6744 |
| 2001-2002 | 0 | 710 | 1451 | 5949 | 4299 | 2696 | 3688 | 1874 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2002-2003 | 529 | 767 | 4810 | 7208 | 3665 | 12192 | 4938 | 673 | 4 | 187 | 0 | 0 |
| 2003-2004 | 0 | 1767 | 2636 | 2636 | 10023 | 3727 | 0 | 496 | 179 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 2004-2005 | 0 | 2312 | 3153 | 3511 | 2385 | 2993 | 2048 | 1964 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| 2005-2006 | 0 | 1166 | 3086 | 637 | 4993 | 2059 | 1548 | 2275 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2006-2007 | 20 | 3148 | 889 | 204 | 2242 | 5203 | 1859 | 459 | 6396 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| 2007-2008 | 0 | 0 | 2381 | 2677 | 982 | 2092 | 399 | 81 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2008-2009 | 256 | 846 | 36 | 4166 | 5467 | 5461 | 2572 | 951 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table A.3. Reservoir 3 SWMM model runoff.

| Reservoir 3 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1978-1979 | 0 | 4314 | 1132 | 15190 | 5664 | 2664 | 3997 | 908 | 870 | 1291 | 0 | 0 |
| 1979-1980 | 0 | 3823 | 9777 | 8398 | 8071 | 12194 | 7155 | 1655 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1980-1981 | 0 | 4054 | 502 | 6121 | 13226 | 10404 | 5480 | 1647 | 2357 | 954 | 0 | 0 |
| 1981-1982 | 0 | 183 | 6030 | 4867 | 5034 | 7001 | 12824 | 1550 | 15 | 10366 | 0 | 0 |
| 1982-1983 | 0 | 185 | 3685 | 3273 | 3877 | 11291 | 5840 | 2098 | 3375 | 2703 | 0 | 0 |
| 1983-1984 | 0 | 2653 | 4453 | 5869 | 5133 | 1970 | 4713 | 7889 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1984-1985 | 0 | 232 | 7614 | 6579 | 13474 | 6368 | 5231 | 399 | 449 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1985-1986 | 0 | 3634 | 2115 | 2914 | 3821 | 7185 | 1678 | 1549 | 4329 | 681 | 0 | 0 |
| 1986-1987 | 15 | 1527 | 24074 | 4098 | 9046 | 2396 | 15286 | 262 | 352 | 193 | 0 | 0 |
| 1987-1988 | 0 | 7021 | 3356 | 12066 | 7655 | 20583 | 14587 | 1000 | 117 | 0 | 1362 | 0 |
| 1988-1989 | 0 | 5362 | 7341 | 20669 | 8273 | 1362 | 2342 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1989-1990 | 0 | 2658 | 3770 | 2484 | 1889 | 12269 | 3962 | 59 | 0 | 331 | 0 | 0 |
| 1990-1991 | 0 | 1737 | 455 | 2753 | 9154 | 5226 | 4528 | 1353 | 434 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1991-1992 | 0 | 1907 | 5634 | 22286 | 2272 | 17244 | 5296 | 774 | 1147 | 455 | 0 | 0 |
| 1992-1993 | 0 | 87 | 8788 | 13456 | 5959 | 8080 | 7335 | 452 | 1575 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1993-1994 | 0 | 781 | 5435 | 2011 | 14035 | 10334 | 5738 | 5599 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1994-1995 | 7105 | 10262 | 17023 | 7625 | 2903 | 1878 | 1739 | 4501 | 1526 | 0 | 44 | 0 |
| 1995-1996 | 35 | 879 | 5679 | 2094 | 9456 | 10898 | 5247 | 5079 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 6094 |
| 1996-1997 | 0 | 2979 | 699 | 9691 | 1106 | 4312 | 4164 | 4177 | 1337 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1997-1998 | 2095 | 3155 | 13968 | 9171 | 4415 | 1905 | 6700 | 649 | 1004 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1998-1999 | 0 | 116 | 4554 | 14237 | 18114 | 4728 | 4804 | 6577 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1999-2000 | 161 | 116 | 2672 | 5113 | 5468 | 11137 | 4051 | 3602 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2000-2001 | 863 | 1181 | 11972 | 16527 | 3234 | 9476 | 1205 | 2982 | 572 | 0 | 0 | 15904 |
| 2001-2002 | 0 | 1623 | 3283 | 13891 | 9989 | 6284 | 8499 | 4316 | 345 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2002-2003 | 1209 | 1757 | 11168 | 16792 | 8502 | 28782 | 11468 | 1528 | 8 | 421 | 0 | 0 |
| 2003-2004 | 0 | 4078 | 6128 | 6128 | 23440 | 8623 | 0 | 1131 | 404 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| 2004-2005 | 0 | 5389 | 7281 | 8135 | 5453 | 7008 | 4776 | 4572 | 116 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| 2005-2006 | 0 | 2658 | 7123 | 1439 | 11629 | 4789 | 3539 | 5284 | 468 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2006-2007 | 43 | 7163 | 2022 | 456 | 5137 | 11989 | 4308 | 1035 | 15055 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| 2007-2008 | 0 | 0 | 5548 | 6182 | 2245 | 4839 | 886 | 181 | 455 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2008-2009 | 565 | 1915 | 80 | 9700 | 12688 | 12746 | 5903 | 2164 | 901 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## APPENDIX B

## TANK VOLUME CALCULATION TABLES

Tables B. 1 to B. 31 show the tank volume calculations for Reservoir 1 previously discussed in Chapter V, pages 66-67.
Table B.1.

| 1978-1979 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 29.0 | 8.0 | 91.1 | 36.6 | 23.0 | 26.6 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1550 | 409 | 5290 | 2008 | 942 | 1426 | 332 | 317 | 472 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1883.58 | 485.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1883.58 | 485.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1550 | 409 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 1427.16 | 1426 | 332 | 317 | 472 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1550 | 409 | 3406.42 | 2008 | 942 | 1426 | 332 | 317 | 472 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1883.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 38.00911 | 12.00674 | 100 | 100 | 41.89618 | 41.86213 | 9.746303 | 7.773476 | 11.57439 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 38.00911 | 12.00674 | 100 | 58.94752 | 27.65367 | 41.86213 | 9.746303 | 7.773476 | 11.57439 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1883.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.2.

| 1979-1980 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 25.3 | 57.4 | 54.7 | 55.3 | 76.6 | 47.4 | 11.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1361 | 3394 | 2979 | 2900 | 4303 | 2546 | 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 896.58 | 36.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 896.58 | 36.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1361 | 3394 | 2979 | 2900 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 636.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1361 | 3394 | 2979 | 2900 | 3406.42 | 2546 | 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 896.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 33.37445 | 99.63539 | 87.45252 | 85.13337 | 100 | 100 | 18.67532 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 33.37445 | 99.63539 | 87.45252 | 85.13337 | 100 | 74.74122 | 17.6138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 896.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.3.

| 1980-1981 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 27.6 | 4.3 | 40.1 | 82.7 | 66.3 | 35.4 | 11.3 | 16.3 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1463 | 193 | 2176 | 4647 | 3675 | 1940 | 590 | 848 | 346 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1240.58 | 1509.16 | 42.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1240.58 | 1509.16 | 42.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1463 | 193 | 2176 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 632.74 | 848 | 346 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1463 | 193 | 2176 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 1940 | 590 | 848 | 346 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1240.58 | 268.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 35.87569 | 5.665772 | 63.87938 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 18.57493 | 20.79466 | 8.484614 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 35.87569 | 5.665772 | 63.87938 | 100 | 100 | 56.95129 | 17.32024 | 20.79466 | 8.484614 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1509.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 4.

| 1981-1982 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.5 | 38.8 | 33.4 | 33.6 | 47.7 | 80.2 | 10.9 | 0.2 | 58.8 | 0.01 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 69 | 2136 | 1750 | 1801 | 2519 | 4507 | 560 | 6 | 3570 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1100.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1100.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 69 | 2136 | 1750 | 1801 | 2519 | 3406.42 | 1660.58 | 6 | 3570 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 69 | 2136 | 1750 | 1801 | 2519 | 3406.42 | 560 | 6 | 3570 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1100.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 1.692018 | 62.70513 | 51.37358 | 52.87076 | 73.9486 | 100 | 48.74854 | 0.147132 | 87.54356 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 1.692018 | 62.70513 | 51.37358 | 52.87076 | 73.9486 | 100 | 16.43955 | 0.147132 | 87.54356 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1100.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.5.

| 1982-1983 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.5 | 23.9 | 22.6 | 26.6 | 69.0 | 38.4 | 15.4 | 21.7 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 70 | 1306 | 1182 | 1392 | 3946 | 2075 | 765 | 1194 | 956 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 539.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 539.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 70 | 1306 | 1182 | 1392 | 3406.42 | 2614.58 | 765 | 1194 | 956 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 70 | 1306 | 1182 | 1392 | 3406.42 | 2075 | 765 | 1194 | 956 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 539.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 1.71654 | 38.33937 | 34.69919 | 40.86402 | 100 | 76.75448 | 22.45759 | 29.27927 | 23.44304 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 1.71654 | 38.33937 | 34.69919 | 40.86402 | 100 | 60.91439 | 22.45759 | 29.27927 | 23.44304 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 539.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 6.

| 1983-1984 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 17.3 | 29.1 | 40.1 | 35.6 | 13.4 | 29.3 | 49.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 940 | 1583 | 2107 | 1846 | 706 | 1654 | 2774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 940 | 1583 | 2107 | 1846 | 706 | 1654 | 2774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 940 | 1583 | 2107 | 1846 | 706 | 1654 | 2774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 23.05068 | 46.47108 | 61.85379 | 54.19179 | 20.72557 | 48.55537 | 81.43447 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 23.05068 | 46.47108 | 61.85379 | 54.19179 | 20.72557 | 48.55537 | 81.43447 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.7.

| 1984-1985 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.9 | 49.2 | 42.4 | 84.2 | 43.3 | 33.1 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 87 | 2694 | 2328 | 4740 | 2281 | 1846 | 149 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1333.58 | 208.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1333.58 | 208.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 87 | 2694 | 2328 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2054.16 | 149 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 87 | 2694 | 2328 | 3406.42 | 2281 | 1846 | 149 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1333.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 2.133414 | 79.08596 | 68.34154 | 100 | 100 | 60.30261 | 4.374094 | 4.119697 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 2.133414 | 79.08596 | 68.34154 | 100 | 66.9618 | 54.19179 | 4.374094 | 4.119697 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1333.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.8.

| 1985-1986 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 24.1 | 15.8 | 19.9 | 28.2 | 45.6 | 12.3 | 11.3 | 27.7 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1295 | 782 | 1045 | 1401 | 2533 | 615 | 565 | 1531 | 249 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1295 | 782 | 1045 | 1401 | 2533 | 615 | 565 | 1531 | 249 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1295 | 782 | 1045 | 1401 | 2533 | 615 | 565 | 1531 | 249 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 31.756 | 22.95665 | 30.67737 | 41.12822 | 74.35959 | 18.05414 | 16.58633 | 37.54319 | 6.105979 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 31.756 | 22.95665 | 30.67737 | 41.12822 | 74.35959 | 18.05414 | 16.58633 | 37.54319 | 6.105979 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.9.

| 1986-1987 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.2 | 11.6 | 131.1 | 26.8 | 57.8 | 17.0 | 89.3 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 6 | 562 | 8219 | 1456 | 3192 | 870 | 5311 | 101 | 131 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 4812.58 | 2862.16 | 2647.74 | 111.32 | 2015.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 4812.58 | 2862.16 | 2647.74 | 111.32 | 2015.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1904.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 6 | 562 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2116.9 | 131 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 6 | 562 | 3406.42 | 1456 | 3192 | 870 | 3406.42 | 101 | 131 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 4812.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1904.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0.147132 | 13.78137 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 62.14442 | 3.212383 | 1.765584 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0.147132 | 13.78137 | 100 | 42.74282 | 93.70542 | 25.54001 | 100 | 2.96499 | 3.212383 | 1.765584 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 4812.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 10.

| 1987-1988 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 45.1 | 23.1 | 74.5 | 49.0 | 116.3 | 89.1 | 8.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 2487 | 1202 | 4229 | 2703 | 7084 | 5098 | 379 | 44 | 0 | 494 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 822.58 | 119.16 | 3796.74 | 5488.32 | 2460.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 822.58 | 119.16 | 3796.74 | 5488.32 | 2460.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3677.58 | 1691.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 2487 | 1202 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 0 | 494 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 2487 | 1202 | 3406.42 | 2703 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 379 | 44 | 0 | 494 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 822.58 | 0 | 3677.58 | 1691.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 60.98623 | 35.28631 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 12.11387 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 60.98623 | 35.28631 | 100 | 79.35017 | 100 | 100 | 11.12605 | 1.078968 | 0 | 12.11387 | 0 |
| SC | 5488.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 11.

| 1988-1989 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 32.6 | 47.6 | 116.5 | 50.3 | 9.5 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1873 | 2601 | 7108 | 2889 | 490 | 848 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3701.58 | 3184.16 | 267.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3701.58 | 3184.16 | 267.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1873 | 2601 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1873 | 2601 | 3406.42 | 2889 | 490 | 848 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3701.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 45.92972 | 76.35582 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0.73566 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 45.92972 | 76.35582 | 100 | 84.81045 | 14.3846 | 24.89417 | 0 | 0.73566 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 3701.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 12.

| 1989-1990 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 20.0 | 25.5 | 18.3 | 13.6 | 70.5 | 25.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 976 | 1352 | 908 | 690 | 4235 | 1401 | 22 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 828.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 828.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 976 | 1352 | 908 | 690 | 3406.42 | 2229.58 | 22 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 976 | 1352 | 908 | 690 | 3406.42 | 1401 | 22 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 828.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 23.93348 | 39.68976 | 26.65555 | 20.25587 | 100 | 65.45229 | 0.645839 | 0 | 3.016207 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 23.93348 | 39.68976 | 26.65555 | 20.25587 | 100 | 41.12822 | 0.645839 | 0 | 3.016207 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 828.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.13.

| 1990-1991 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 12.5 | 3.5 | 19.9 | 60.0 | 34.8 | 31.0 | 9.6 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 630 | 168 | 1001 | 3256 | 1869 | 1625 | 489 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 630 | 168 | 1001 | 3256 | 1869 | 1625 | 489 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 630 | 168 | 1001 | 3256 | 1869 | 1625 | 489 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 15.44886 | 4.931864 | 29.38569 | 95.58422 | 54.86699 | 47.70404 | 14.35525 | 3.997087 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 15.44886 | 4.931864 | 29.38569 | 95.58422 | 54.86699 | 47.70404 | 14.35525 | 3.997087 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 14.

| 1991-1992 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 14.0 | 36.6 | 128.3 | 17.2 | 99.8 | 35.5 | 5.9 | 8.4 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 697 | 2003 | 7689 | 837 | 5959 | 1892 | 285 | 419 | 168 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4282.58 | 1713.16 | 4265.74 | 2751.32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4282.58 | 1713.16 | 4265.74 | 2751.32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 697 | 2003 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3036.32 | 419 | 168 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 697 | 2003 | 3406.42 | 837 | 3406.42 | 1892 | 285 | 419 | 168 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4282.58 | 0 | 2552.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 17.09184 | 58.80074 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 89.13522 | 10.27472 | 4.119697 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 17.09184 | 58.80074 | 100 | 24.57125 | 100 | 55.54218 | 8.366555 | 10.27472 | 4.119697 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 4282.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 15.

| 1992-1993 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 0.8 | 51.4 | 80.3 | 38.6 | 51.8 | 45.9 | 3.6 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 33 | 3046 | 4680 | 2110 | 2854 | 2578 | 168 | 580 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1273.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1273.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 33 | 3046 | 3406.42 | 3383.58 | 2854 | 2578 | 168 | 580 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 33 | 3046 | 3406.42 | 2110 | 2854 | 2578 | 168 | 580 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1273.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 0.809226 | 89.41939 | 100 | 99.3295 | 83.78297 | 75.68063 | 4.931864 | 14.22276 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 0.809226 | 89.41939 | 100 | 61.94186 | 83.78297 | 75.68063 | 4.931864 | 14.22276 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1273.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.16.

| 1993-1994 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 5.9 | 34.6 | 14.4 | 88.6 | 67.1 | 35.8 | 37.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 288 | 1920 | 729 | 4953 | 3665 | 2016 | 2003 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1546.58 | 1805.16 | 414.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1546.58 | 1805.16 | 414.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 288 | 1920 | 729 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2417.74 | 1953.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 288 | 1920 | 729 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2016 | 2003 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1546.58 | 258.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 7.062337 | 56.36416 | 21.40077 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 70.97598 | 3.629257 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 7.062337 | 56.36416 | 21.40077 | 100 | 100 | 59.18237 | 58.80074 | 3.629257 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1805.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 17.

| 1994-1995 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 42.0 | 61.2 | 99.3 | 50.5 | 20.8 | 13.1 | 13.0 | 30.4 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 2469 | 3569 | 5871 | 2738 | 1054 | 677 | 636 | 1609 | 549 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 2464.58 | 1796.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 2464.58 | 1796.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 2469 | 3569 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2850.16 | 677 | 636 | 1609 | 549 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| DM2 | 2469 | 3569 | 3406.42 | 2738 | 1054 | 677 | 636 | 1609 | 549 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 2464.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 60.54483 | 87.51904 | 100 | 100 | 83.67025 | 19.87424 | 18.67063 | 47.23434 | 13.46258 | 0 | 0.416874 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 60.54483 | 87.51904 | 100 | 80.37764 | 30.94158 | 19.87424 | 18.67063 | 47.23434 | 13.46258 | 0 | 0.416874 | 0 |
| SC | 2464.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 18.

| 1995-1996 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.4 | 6.9 | 37.0 | 15.4 | 57.9 | 65.4 | 36.1 | 31.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 |
| Runoff | 14 | 327 | 2016 | 764 | 3310 | 3797 | 1885 | 1783 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2117 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 390.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 390.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 14 | 327 | 2016 | 764 | 3310 | 3406.42 | 2275.58 | 1783 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2117 |
| DM2 | 14 | 327 | 2016 | 764 | 3310 | 3406.42 | 1885 | 1783 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2117 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 390.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0.343308 | 8.018696 | 59.18237 | 22.42824 | 97.16946 | 100 | 66.80268 | 52.34234 | 0.147132 | 0 | 0 | 51.91308 |
| \%DM2 | 0.343308 | 8.018696 | 59.18237 | 22.42824 | 97.16946 | 100 | 55.33669 | 52.34234 | 0.147132 | 0 | 0 | 51.91308 |
| SC | 390.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 19.

| 1996-1997 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 21.3 | 5.3 | 61.3 | 8.3 | 27.8 | 29.1 | 26.8 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1079 | 260 | 3414 | 408 | 1526 | 1499 | 1476 | 481 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1079 | 260 | 3406.42 | 415.58 | 1526 | 1499 | 1476 | 481 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1079 | 260 | 3406.42 | 408 | 1526 | 1499 | 1476 | 481 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 26.45924 | 7.632647 | 100 | 12.1999 | 44.79776 | 44.00514 | 43.32995 | 11.79508 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 26.45924 | 7.632647 | 100 | 11.97738 | 44.79776 | 44.00514 | 43.32995 | 11.79508 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 7.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 20 .

| 1997-1998 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 14.0 | 22.3 | 82.5 | 57.9 | 31.5 | 13.9 | 42.2 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 747 | 1141 | 4846 | 3230 | 1601 | 693 | 2361 | 242 | 372 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 1439.58 | 1263.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 1439.58 | 1263.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 747 | 1141 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2864.16 | 693 | 2361 | 242 | 372 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 747 | 1141 | 3406.42 | 3230 | 1601 | 693 | 2361 | 242 | 372 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 1439.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 18.31794 | 27.97961 | 100 | 100 | 84.08123 | 20.34394 | 69.3103 | 7.104233 | 9.122186 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 18.31794 | 27.97961 | 100 | 94.82096 | 46.99949 | 20.34394 | 69.3103 | 7.104233 | 9.122186 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1439.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.21.

| 1998-1999 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.0 | 31.7 | 86.4 | 102.9 | 30.7 | 31.8 | 39.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 44 | 1643 | 4977 | 6236 | 1673 | 1711 | 2294 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1570.58 | 4400.16 | 2666.74 | 971.32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1570.58 | 4400.16 | 2666.74 | 971.32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2829.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 44 | 1643 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3265.32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 44 | 1643 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 1673 | 1711 | 2294 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1570.58 | 2829.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 1.078968 | 48.23246 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 95.86782 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 1.078968 | 48.23246 | 100 | 100 | 49.11315 | 50.22869 | 67.34343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 4400.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 22.

| 1999-2000 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 1.4 | 1.0 | 18.2 | 33.1 | 39.0 | 70.1 | 28.6 | 25.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 61 | 44 | 958 | 1811 | 1985 | 3923 | 1463 | 1300 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 516.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 516.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 61 | 44 | 958 | 1811 | 1985 | 3406.42 | 1979.58 | 1300 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 61 | 44 | 958 | 1811 | 1985 | 3406.42 | 1463 | 1300 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 516.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 1.495842 | 1.078968 | 28.12337 | 53.16432 | 58.27232 | 100 | 58.11321 | 38.16323 | 4.757269 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 1.495842 | 1.078968 | 28.12337 | 53.16432 | 58.27232 | 100 | 42.94832 | 38.16323 | 4.757269 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 516.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.23.

| 2000-2001 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 6.4 | 9.1 | 68.2 | 99.8 | 22.9 | 60.3 | 8.5 | 21.2 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 87.0 |
| Runoff | 316 | 437 | 4128 | 5766 | 1171 | 3341 | 437 | 1082 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 5437 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 721.58 | 3081.16 | 845.74 | 780.32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1359.03 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 721.58 | 1722.13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1722.13 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2359.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 316 | 437 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2893.13 | 3341 | 437 | 1082 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 4077.97 |
| DM2 | 316 | 437 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 1171 | 3341 | 437 | 1082 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 4077.97 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 721.58 | 2359.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1359.03 |
| \%DM1 | 7.748954 | 10.71612 | 100 | 100 | 84.93169 | 98.07951 | 12.82872 | 31.76355 | 5.223187 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 7.748954 | 10.71612 | 100 | 100 | 34.37627 | 98.07951 | 12.82872 | 31.76355 | 5.223187 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| SC | 1722.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 24.

| 2001-2002 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 11.1 | 24.2 | 83.2 | 61.5 | 37.9 | 53.4 | 28.8 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 583 | 1199 | 4832 | 3501 | 2191 | 2998 | 1537 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1425.58 | 1520.16 | 304.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1425.58 | 1520.16 | 304.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 1359.03 | 583 | 1199 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3302.74 | 1537 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 583 | 1199 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2191 | 2998 | 1537 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1425.58 | 94.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 33.32614 | 14.29633 | 35.19824 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 96.95634 | 45.12068 | 3.187861 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 14.29633 | 35.19824 | 100 | 100 | 64.31973 | 88.01029 | 45.12068 | 3.187861 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1520.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 25 .

| 2002-2003 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 8.5 | 12.2 | 67.9 | 107.1 | 53.2 | 159.0 | 71.4 | 11.1 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 436 | 6332 | 3904 | 5854 | 2989 | 9829 | 4024 | 557 | 3 | 156 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 2254.03 | 2751.61 | 5199.19 | 4781.77 | 11204.35 | 11821.9 | 8972.51 | 4897.54 | 975.57 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 2254.03 | 2751.61 | 5199.19 | 4781.77 | 11204.35 | 11821.9 | 8972.51 | 4897.54 | 975.57 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 497.58 | 2447.58 | 0 | 6422.58 | 617.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 436 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 975.57 | 0 |
| DM2 | 436 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2989 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 557 | 3 | 156 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 2254.03 | 497.58 | 2447.58 | 0 | 6422.58 | 617.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 10.69159 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 23.92293 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 10.69159 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 87.74608 | 100 | 100 | 16.35148 | 0.073566 | 3.825433 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 11821.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 26.

| 2003-2004 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 26.2 | 37.8 | 37.1 | 135.3 | 55.2 | 0.01 | 8.1 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1444 | 2146 | 2146 | 8102 | 3046 | 0 | 409 | 150 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4695.58 | 4335.16 | 928.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4695.58 | 4335.16 | 928.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1444 | 2146 | 2146 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 1337.74 | 150 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1444 | 2146 | 2146 | 3406.42 | 3046 | 0 | 409 | 150 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4695.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 35.40977 | 62.99869 | 62.99869 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 39.27114 | 3.678301 | 0.416874 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 35.40977 | 62.99869 | 62.99869 | 100 | 89.41939 | 0 | 12.00674 | 3.678301 | 0.416874 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 4695.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 27.

| 2004-2005 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 32.2 | 46.9 | 51.6 | 36.8 | 40.8 | 28.8 | 27.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1877 | 2577 | 2865 | 1953 | 2427 | 1665 | 1598 | 44 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1877 | 2577 | 2865 | 1953 | 2427 | 1665 | 1598 | 44 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1877 | 2577 | 2865 | 1953 | 2427 | 1665 | 1598 | 44 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 46.0278 | 75.65127 | 84.10589 | 57.33292 | 71.24782 | 48.87829 | 46.91142 | 1.078968 | 1.078968 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 46.0278 | 75.65127 | 84.10589 | 57.33292 | 71.24782 | 48.87829 | 46.91142 | 1.078968 | 1.078968 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 28.

| 2005-2006 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 18.5 | 46.3 | 10.7 | 70.6 | 29.4 | 24.6 | 32.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 958 | 2525 | 529 | 4059 | 1677 | 1276 | 1852 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 652.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 652.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 958 | 2525 | 529 | 3406.42 | 2329.58 | 1276 | 1852 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 958 | 2525 | 529 | 3406.42 | 1677 | 1276 | 1852 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 652.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 23.49208 | 74.12474 | 15.5295 | 100 | 68.38793 | 37.45868 | 54.36793 | 4.266829 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 23.49208 | 74.12474 | 15.5295 | 100 | 49.23057 | 37.45868 | 54.36793 | 4.266829 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 652.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 29 .

| 2006-2007 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.4 | 45.8 | 14.6 | 3.7 | 34.7 | 75.1 | 27.1 | 7.8 | 84.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 16 | 2543 | 736 | 171 | 1839 | 4224 | 1517 | 382 | 5168 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 817.58 | 0 | 0 | 1090.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 817.58 | 0 | 0 | 1090.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 16 | 2543 | 736 | 171 | 1839 | 3406.42 | 2334.58 | 382 | 4077.97 | 1134.03 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 16 | 2543 | 736 | 171 | 1839 | 3406.42 | 1517 | 382 | 4077.97 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 817.58 | 0 | 0 | 1090.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0.392352 | 62.35946 | 21.60626 | 5.019933 | 53.9863 | 100 | 68.53471 | 11.21412 | 100 | 27.80869 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0.392352 | 62.35946 | 21.60626 | 5.019933 | 53.9863 | 100 | 44.53356 | 11.21412 | 100 | 1.078968 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1090.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 30 .

| 2007-2008 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.5 | 40.1 | 15.4 | 31.0 | 7.1 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 0 | 1936 | 2191 | 807 | 1708 | 331 | 68 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 0 | 1936 | 2191 | 807 | 1708 | 331 | 68 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 0 | 1936 | 2191 | 807 | 1708 | 331 | 68 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 0 | 56.83386 | 64.31973 | 23.69056 | 50.14062 | 9.716946 | 1.996231 | 4.119697 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 0 | 56.83386 | 64.31973 | 23.69056 | 50.14062 | 9.716946 | 1.996231 | 4.119697 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 31.

| 2008-2009 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 4.5 | 13.9 | 0.7 | 57.7 | 76.4 | 75.6 | 39.7 | 14.9 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 212 | 699 | 30 | 3376 | 4431 | 4430 | 2113 | 788 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 | 4077.97 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1024.58 | 2048.16 | 754.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1024.58 | 2048.16 | 754.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1023.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 212 | 699 | 30 | 3376 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 1542.74 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 212 | 699 | 30 | 3376 | 3406.42 | 3406.42 | 2113 | 788 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1024.58 | 1023.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 5.198665 | 17.14088 | 0.88069 | 99.10698 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 45.28919 | 8.141306 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 5.198665 | 17.14088 | 0.88069 | 99.10698 | 100 | 100 | 62.02993 | 23.13279 | 8.141306 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 2048.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Tables B. 32 to B. 63 show the tank volume calculations for Reservoir 2 previously discussed in Chapter V, pages 66-67.
Table B. 32 .

| 1978-1979 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 29.0 | 8.0 | 91.1 | 36.6 | 23.0 | 26.6 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1913 | 496 | 6512 | 2454 | 1152 | 1737 | 400 | 383 | 569 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2783.74 | 1509.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2783.74 | 1509.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2783.74 | 1509.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1913 | 496 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2661.48 | 1737 | 400 | 383 | 569 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1913 | 496 | 3728.26 | 2454 | 1152 | 1737 | 400 | 383 | 569 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2783.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 38.265816 | 13.303793 | 100 | 100 | 71.386652 | 46.590098 | 10.728865 | 7.6611645 | 11.38173 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 38.265816 | 13.303793 | 100 | 65.82159 | 30.899133 | 46.590098 | 10.728865 | 7.6611645 | 11.38173 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 2783.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 33.

| 1979-1980 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 25.3 | 57.4 | 54.7 | 55.3 | 76.6 | 47.4 | 11.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1660 | 4192 | 3639 | 3525 | 5278 | 3106 | 726 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 463.74 | 374.48 | 171.22 | 1720.96 | 1098.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 463.74 | 374.48 | 171.22 | 1720.96 | 1098.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1660 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 1824.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1660 | 3728.26 | 3639 | 3525 | 3728.26 | 3106 | 726 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 463.74 | 0 | 0 | 1549.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 33.205047 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 48.942402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 33.205047 | 100 | 97.605854 | 94.548127 | 100 | 83.30964 | 19.472891 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1720.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 34.

| 1980-1981 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 27.6 | 4.3 | 40.1 | 82.7 | 66.3 | 35.4 | 11.3 | 16.3 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1810 | 237 | 2658 | 5709 | 4506 | 2372 | 718 | 1030 | 419 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1980.74 | 2758.48 | 1402.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1980.74 | 2758.48 | 1402.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1810 | 237 | 2658 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2120.22 | 1030 | 419 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1810 | 237 | 2658 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2372 | 718 | 1030 | 419 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1980.74 | 777.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 36.205503 | 6.3568528 | 71.293311 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 56.868888 | 20.603132 | 8.381274 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 36.205503 | 6.3568528 | 71.293311 | 100 | 100 | 63.622172 | 19.258314 | 20.603132 | 8.381274 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 2758.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 35 .

| 1981-1982 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.5 | 38.8 | 33.4 | 33.6 | 47.7 | 80.2 | 10.9 | 0.2 | 58.8 | 0.01 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 82 | 2612 | 2127 | 2206 | 3094 | 5526 | 679 | 7 | 4417 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1797.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1797.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 82 | 2612 | 2127 | 2206 | 3094 | 3728.26 | 2476.74 | 7 | 4417 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 82 | 2612 | 2127 | 2206 | 3094 | 3728.26 | 679 | 7 | 4417 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1797.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 1.6402493 | 70.059492 | 57.050742 | 59.169693 | 82.987774 | 100 | 66.431526 | 0.1400213 | 88.35343 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 1.6402493 | 70.059492 | 57.050742 | 59.169693 | 82.987774 | 100 | 18.212249 | 0.1400213 | 88.35343 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1797.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 36.

| 1982-1983 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.5 | 23.9 | 22.6 | 26.6 | 69.0 | 38.4 | 15.4 | 21.7 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 83 | 1596 | 1449 | 1692 | 4853 | 2533 | 923 | 1460 | 1170 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1124.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1124.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 83 | 1596 | 1449 | 1692 | 3728.26 | 3657.74 | 923 | 1460 | 1170 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 83 | 1596 | 1449 | 1692 | 3728.26 | 2533 | 923 | 1460 | 1170 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1124.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 1.6602524 | 42.808173 | 38.865315 | 45.383101 | 100 | 98.108501 | 24.756857 | 29.204439 | 23.403557 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 1.6602524 | 42.808173 | 38.865315 | 45.383101 | 100 | 67.940541 | 24.756857 | 29.204439 | 23.403557 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1124.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 37.

| 1983-1984 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 17.3 | 29.1 | 40.1 | 35.6 | 13.4 | 29.3 | 49.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1151 | 1934 | 2561 | 2242 | 858 | 2029 | 3402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1151 | 1934 | 2561 | 2242 | 858 | 2029 | 3402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1151 | 1934 | 2561 | 2242 | 858 | 2029 | 3402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 23.0235 | 51.874065 | 68.691561 | 60.135291 | 23.013416 | 54.42217 | 91.249001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 23.0235 | 51.874065 | 68.691561 | 60.135291 | 23.013416 | 54.42217 | 91.249001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 38.

| 1984-1985 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.9 | 49.2 | 42.4 | 84.2 | 43.3 | 33.1 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 104 | 3294 | 2847 | 5826 | 2775 | 2262 | 178 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2097.74 | 1144.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2097.74 | 1144.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 104 | 3294 | 2847 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3406.48 | 178 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 104 | 3294 | 2847 | 3728.26 | 2775 | 2262 | 178 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2097.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 2.0803162 | 88.352207 | 76.3627 | 100 | 100 | 91.369164 | 4.7743451 | 4.0406142 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 2.0803162 | 88.352207 | 76.3627 | 100 | 74.431504 | 60.671734 | 4.7743451 | 4.0406142 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 2097.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 39.

| 1985-1986 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 24.1 | 15.8 | 19.9 | 28.2 | 45.6 | 12.3 | 11.3 | 27.7 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1579 | 948 | 1271 | 1692 | 3104 | 744 | 682 | 1873 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1579 | 948 | 1271 | 1692 | 3104 | 744 | 682 | 1873 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1579 | 948 | 1271 | 1692 | 3104 | 744 | 682 | 1873 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 31.584801 | 25.427411 | 34.09097 | 45.383101 | 83.255996 | 19.95569 | 18.292716 | 37.465695 | 6.0009121 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 31.584801 | 25.427411 | 34.09097 | 45.383101 | 83.255996 | 19.95569 | 18.292716 | 37.465695 | 6.0009121 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 40.

| 1986-1987 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.2 | 11.6 | 131.1 | 26.8 | 57.8 | 17.0 | 89.3 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 7 | 682 | 10193 | 1779 | 3909 | 1053 | 6545 | 123 | 157 | 86 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 6464.74 | 4515.48 | 4696.22 | 2020.96 | 4837.7 | 1232.44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 6464.74 | 4515.48 | 4696.22 | 2020.96 | 4837.7 | 1232.44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 7 | 682 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 1389.44 | 86 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 7 | 682 | 3728.26 | 1779 | 3728.26 | 1053 | 3728.26 | 123 | 157 | 86 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 6464.74 | 0 | 180.74 | 0 | 2816.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0.1400213 | 13.642074 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 27.793025 | 1.7202615 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0.1400213 | 13.642074 | 100 | 47.716629 | 100 | 28.243738 | 100 | 3.2991261 | 3.1404774 | 1.7202615 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 6464.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 41.

| 1987-1988 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 45.1 | 23.1 | 74.5 | 49.0 | 116.3 | 89.1 | 8.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 3060 | 1462 | 5190 | 3311 | 8767 | 6266 | 459 | 53 | 0 | 602 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1461.74 | 1044.48 | 6083.22 | 8620.96 | 5351.7 | 405.46 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1461.74 | 1044.48 | 6083.22 | 8620.96 | 5351.7 | 405.46 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 3060 | 1462 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 405.46 | 602 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 3060 | 1462 | 3728.26 | 3311 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 459 | 53 | 0 | 602 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1461.74 | 0 | 5038.74 | 2537.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 61.209304 | 39.214003 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 8.1104328 | 12.04183 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 61.209304 | 39.214003 | 100 | 88.808184 | 100 | 100 | 12.311373 | 1.0601611 | 0 | 12.04183 | 0 |
| SC | 8620.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 42.

| 1988-1989 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 32.6 | 47.6 | 116.5 | 50.3 | 9.5 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 2304 | 3180 | 8792 | 3552 | 595 | 1026 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5063.74 | 4887.48 | 1754.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5063.74 | 4887.48 | 1754.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 2304 | 3180 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2780.22 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 2304 | 3180 | 3728.26 | 3552 | 595 | 1026 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5063.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 46.087005 | 85.294481 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 74.571516 | 0 | 0.7201095 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 46.087005 | 85.294481 | 100 | 95.272325 | 15.959187 | 27.51954 | 0 | 0.7201095 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 5063.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 43.

| 1989-1990 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 20.0 | 25.5 | 18.3 | 13.6 | 70.5 | 25.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1176 | 1646 | 1095 | 833 | 5232 | 1715 | 26 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1503.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1503.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1176 | 1646 | 1095 | 833 | 3728.26 | 3218.74 | 26 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1176 | 1646 | 1095 | 833 | 3728.26 | 1715 | 26 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1503.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 23.523576 | 44.149281 | 29.370269 | 22.342862 | 100 | 86.333571 | 0.6973763 | 0 | 2.9404469 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 23.523576 | 44.149281 | 29.370269 | 22.342862 | 100 | 46.000011 | 0.6973763 | 0 | 2.9404469 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1503.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 44.

| 1990-1991 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 12.5 | 3.5 | 19.9 | 60.0 | 34.8 | 31.0 | 9.6 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 763 | 202 | 1209 | 3989 | 2276 | 1976 | 593 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 260.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 260.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 763 | 202 | 1209 | 3728.26 | 2536.74 | 1976 | 593 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 763 | 202 | 1209 | 3728.26 | 2276 | 1976 | 593 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 260.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 15.26232 | 5.4180771 | 32.427996 | 100 | 68.040856 | 53.000595 | 15.905543 | 3.9005929 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 15.26232 | 5.4180771 | 32.427996 | 100 | 61.047245 | 53.000595 | 15.905543 | 3.9005929 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 260.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 45.

| 1991-1992 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 14.0 | 36.6 | 128.3 | 17.2 | 99.8 | 35.5 | 5.9 | 8.4 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 844 | 2464 | 9519 | 1016 | 7357 | 2304 | 343 | 505 | 202 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5790.74 | 3078.48 | 6707.22 | 5282.96 | 1897.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5790.74 | 3078.48 | 6707.22 | 5282.96 | 1897.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 844 | 2464 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2402.7 | 202 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 844 | 2464 | 3728.26 | 1016 | 3728.26 | 2304 | 343 | 505 | 202 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5790.74 | 0 | 3628.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 16.882566 | 66.089811 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 48.061305 | 4.0406142 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 16.882566 | 66.089811 | 100 | 27.251318 | 100 | 61.798265 | 9.2000021 | 10.101535 | 4.0406142 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 6707.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 46.

| 1992-1993 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 0.8 | 51.4 | 80.3 | 38.6 | 51.8 | 45.9 | 3.6 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 39 | 3758 | 5765 | 2582 | 3492 | 3161 | 201 | 697 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 29.74 | 2066.48 | 920.22 | 683.96 | 116.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 29.74 | 2066.48 | 920.22 | 683.96 | 116.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 39 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 317.7 | 697 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 39 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2582 | 3492 | 3161 | 201 | 697 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 29.74 | 2036.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 0.7801186 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 8.5214014 | 13.942119 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 0.7801186 | 100 | 100 | 69.254827 | 93.662996 | 84.784859 | 5.3912549 | 13.942119 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 2066.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 47.

| 1993-1994 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 5.9 | 34.6 | 14.4 | 88.6 | 67.1 | 35.8 | 37.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 350 | 2353 | 882 | 6091 | 4481 | 2472 | 2477 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2362.74 | 3115.48 | 1859.22 | 607.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2362.74 | 3115.48 | 1859.22 | 607.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 350 | 2353 | 882 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 783.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 350 | 2353 | 882 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2472 | 2477 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2362.74 | 752.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 7.0010642 | 63.112551 | 23.657148 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 15.681584 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 7.0010642 | 63.112551 | 23.657148 | 100 | 100 | 66.304389 | 66.438499 | 3.5205351 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 3115.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 48.

| 1994-1995 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 42.0 | 61.2 | 99.3 | 50.5 | 20.8 | 13.1 | 13.0 | 30.4 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 3047 | 4397 | 7258 | 3342 | 1274 | 821 | 767 | 1959 | 667 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 3529.74 | 3143.48 | 689.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 3529.74 | 3143.48 | 689.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 3047 | 4397 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 1510.22 | 767 | 1959 | 667 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| DM2 | 3047 | 4397 | 3728.26 | 3342 | 1274 | 821 | 767 | 1959 | 667 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 3529.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 60.949264 | 87.953369 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 40.507368 | 20.5726 | 52.544619 | 13.342028 | 0 | 0.4000608 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 60.949264 | 87.953369 | 100 | 89.639671 | 34.171437 | 22.020996 | 20.5726 | 52.544619 | 13.342028 | 0 | 0.4000608 | 0 |
| SC | 3529.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 49.

| 1995-1996 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.4 | 6.9 | 37.0 | 15.4 | 57.9 | 65.4 | 36.1 | 31.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 |
| Runoff | 18 | 392 | 2461 | 922 | 4065 | 4673 | 2290 | 2187 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2611 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 336.74 | 1281.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 336.74 | 1281.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 18 | 392 | 2461 | 922 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3571.48 | 2187 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2611 |
| DM2 | 18 | 392 | 2461 | 922 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2290 | 2187 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2611 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 336.74 | 944.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0.3600547 | 7.8411919 | 66.009345 | 24.730035 | 100 | 100 | 95.794821 | 58.660072 | 0.1400213 | 0 | 0 | 52.227939 |
| \%DM2 | 0.3600547 | 7.8411919 | 66.009345 | 24.730035 | 100 | 100 | 61.422755 | 58.660072 | 0.1400213 | 0 | 0 | 52.227939 |
| SC | 1281.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 50 .

| 1996-1997 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 21.3 | 5.3 | 61.3 | 8.3 | 27.8 | 29.1 | 26.8 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1307 | 314 | 4185 | 494 | 1866 | 1820 | 1805 | 584 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 456.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 456.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1307 | 314 | 3728.26 | 950.74 | 1866 | 1820 | 1805 | 584 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1307 | 314 | 3728.26 | 494 | 1866 | 1820 | 1805 | 584 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 456.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 26.143974 | 8.4221594 | 100 | 25.500904 | 50.050157 | 48.816338 | 48.414005 | 11.681776 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 26.143974 | 8.4221594 | 100 | 13.250149 | 50.050157 | 48.816338 | 48.414005 | 11.681776 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 456.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.51.

| 1997-1998 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 14.0 | 22.3 | 82.5 | 57.9 | 31.5 | 13.9 | 42.2 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 912 | 1382 | 5973 | 3959 | 1939 | 840 | 2893 | 290 | 446 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 2244.74 | 2475.48 | 686.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 2244.74 | 2475.48 | 686.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 912 | 1382 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 1526.22 | 2893 | 290 | 446 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 912 | 1382 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 1939 | 840 | 2893 | 290 | 446 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 2244.74 | 230.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 18.242773 | 27.644202 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 40.936523 | 77.59652 | 7.7784275 | 8.921356 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 18.242773 | 27.644202 | 100 | 100 | 52.008175 | 22.530617 | 77.59652 | 7.7784275 | 8.921356 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 2475.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.52.

| 1998-1999 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.0 | 31.7 | 86.4 | 102.9 | 30.7 | 31.8 | 39.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 52 | 1999 | 6139 | 7710 | 2046 | 2091 | 2824 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2410.74 | 6392.48 | 4710.22 | 3072.96 | 2168.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2410.74 | 6392.48 | 4710.22 | 3072.96 | 2168.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 52 | 1999 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2168.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 52 | 1999 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2046 | 2091 | 2824 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2410.74 | 3981.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 1.0401581 | 53.617505 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 43.380594 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 1.0401581 | 53.617505 | 100 | 100 | 54.878147 | 56.085144 | 75.74579 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 6392.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.53.

| 1999-2000 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 1.4 | 1.0 | 18.2 | 33.1 | 39.0 | 70.1 | 28.6 | 25.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 72 | 52 | 1165 | 2214 | 2410 | 4814 | 1773 | 1576 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1085.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1085.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 72 | 52 | 1165 | 2214 | 2410 | 3728.26 | 2858.74 | 1576 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 72 | 52 | 1165 | 2214 | 2410 | 3728.26 | 1773 | 1576 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1085.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 1.4402189 | 1.0401581 | 31.247821 | 59.38427 | 64.641414 | 100 | 76.677592 | 42.27173 | 4.6607084 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 1.4402189 | 1.0401581 | 31.247821 | 59.38427 | 64.641414 | 100 | 47.555696 | 42.27173 | 4.6607084 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1085.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 54.

| 2000-2001 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 6.4 | 9.1 | 68.2 | 99.8 | 22.9 | 60.3 | 8.5 | 21.2 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 87.0 |
| Runoff | 382 | 524 | 5112 | 7103 | 1418 | 4094 | 529 | 1311 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 6744 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 1383.74 | 4758.48 | 2448.22 | 2813.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1744.76 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 1383.74 | 4758.48 | 2448.22 | 2813.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1744.76 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1744.76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 382 | 524 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3342.96 | 1311 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 4999.24 |
| DM2 | 382 | 524 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 1418 | 3728.26 | 529 | 1311 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 4999.24 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 1383.74 | 3374.74 | 0 | 365.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1744.76 |
| \%DM1 | 7.6411615 | 10.481593 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 89.66542 | 35.163857 | 5.1007753 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 7.6411615 | 10.481593 | 100 | 100 | 38.033828 | 100 | 14.188925 | 35.163857 | 5.1007753 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| SC | 3013.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 55.

| 2001-2002 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 11.1 | 24.2 | 83.2 | 61.5 | 37.9 | 53.4 | 28.8 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 710 | 1451 | 5949 | 4299 | 2696 | 3688 | 1874 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2220.74 | 2791.48 | 1759.22 | 1718.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2220.74 | 2791.48 | 1759.22 | 1718.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 1744.76 | 710 | 1451 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3592.96 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 710 | 1451 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2696 | 3688 | 1874 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2220.74 | 570.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 34.900505 | 14.202159 | 38.91896 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 96.370961 | 3.0804682 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 14.202159 | 38.91896 | 100 | 100 | 72.312553 | 98.92014 | 50.264735 | 3.0804682 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 2791.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.56.

| 2002-2003 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 8.5 | 12.2 | 67.9 | 107.1 | 53.2 | 159.0 | 71.4 | 11.1 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 529 | 767 | 4810 | 7208 | 3665 | 12192 | 4938 | 673 | 4 | 187 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 1081.74 | 4561.48 | 4498.22 | 12961.96 | 14171.7 | 11116.44 | 6121.2 | 1308.96 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 1081.74 | 4561.48 | 4498.22 | 12961.96 | 14171.7 | 11116.44 | 6121.2 | 1308.96 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 529 | 767 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 1308.96 | 0 |
| DM2 | 529 | 767 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3665 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 673 | 4 | 187 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 1081.74 | 3479.74 | 0 | 8463.74 | 1209.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 10.581608 | 15.342332 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 26.18318 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 10.581608 | 15.342332 | 100 | 100 | 98.30323 | 100 | 100 | 18.051316 | 0.0800122 | 3.7405686 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 14171.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.57.

| 2003-2004 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 26.2 | 37.8 | 37.1 | 135.3 | 55.2 | 0.01 | 8.1 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1767 | 2636 | 2636 | 10023 | 3727 | 0 | 496 | 179 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6294.74 | 6293.48 | 2565.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6294.74 | 6293.48 | 2565.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1767 | 2636 | 2636 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3061.22 | 179 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1767 | 2636 | 2636 | 3728.26 | 3727 | 0 | 496 | 179 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6294.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 35.345372 | 70.703223 | 70.703223 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 82.108544 | 3.5805442 | 0.4000608 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 35.345372 | 70.703223 | 70.703223 | 100 | 99.966204 | 0 | 13.303793 | 3.5805442 | 0.4000608 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 6294.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 58.

| 2004-2005 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | $0.0$ | 32.2 | 46.9 | $51.6$ | 36.8 | 40.8 | 28.8 | 27.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 2312 | 3153 | 3511 | 2385 | 2993 | 2048 | 1964 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 2312 | $3153$ | $3511$ | 2385 | 2993 | 2048 | 1964 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 2312 | 3153 | 3511 | 2385 | 2993 | 2048 | 1964 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 46.24703 | 84.570282 | 94.172617 | 63.97086 | 80.278736 | 54.931791 | 52.678729 | 1.0401581 | 1.0401581 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 46.24703 | 84.570282 | 94.172617 | 63.97086 | 80.278736 | 54.931791 | 52.678729 | 1.0401581 | 1.0401581 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 59.

| 2005-2006 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 18.5 | 46.3 | 10.7 | 70.6 | 29.4 | 24.6 | 32.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1166 | 3086 | 637 | 4993 | 2059 | 1548 | 2275 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1264.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1264.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 1166 | 3086 | 637 | 3728.26 | 3323.74 | 1548 | 2275 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 1166 | 3086 | 637 | 3728.26 | 2059 | 1548 | 2275 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1264.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 23.323545 | 82.773197 | 17.085718 | 100 | 89.149898 | 41.520709 | 61.020422 | 4.1606324 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 23.323545 | 82.773197 | 17.085718 | 100 | 55.226835 | 41.520709 | 61.020422 | 4.1606324 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1264.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 60.

| 2006-2007 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.4 | 45.8 | 14.6 | 3.7 | 34.7 | 75.1 | 27.1 | 7.8 | 84.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 20 | 3148 | 889 | 204 | 2242 | 5203 | 1859 | 459 | 6396 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1474.74 | 0 | 0 | 1396.76 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1474.74 | 0 | 0 | 1396.76 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 20 | 3148 | 889 | 204 | 2242 | 3728.26 | 3333.74 | 459 | 4999.24 | 1448.76 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 20 | 3148 | 889 | 204 | 2242 | 3728.26 | 1859 | 459 | 4999.24 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1474.74 | 0 | 0 | 1396.76 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0.4000608 | 62.969571 | 23.844904 | 5.4717214 | 60.135291 | 100 | 89.41812 | 12.311373 | 100 | 28.979605 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0.4000608 | 62.969571 | 23.844904 | 5.4717214 | 60.135291 | 100 | 49.862402 | 12.311373 | 100 | 1.0401581 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1474.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.61.

| 2007-2008 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.5 | 40.1 | 15.4 | 31.0 | 7.1 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 0 | 2381 | 2677 | 982 | 2092 | 399 | 81 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 0 | 2381 | 2677 | 982 | 2092 | 399 | 81 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 0 | 0 | 2381 | 2677 | 982 | 2092 | 399 | 81 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 0 | 63.863572 | 71.802932 | 26.339365 | 56.111966 | 10.702043 | 2.1725953 | 4.0406142 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 0 | 63.863572 | 71.802932 | 26.339365 | 56.111966 | 10.702043 | 2.1725953 | 4.0406142 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.62.

| 2008-2009 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 4.5 | 13.9 | 0.7 | 57.7 | 76.4 | 75.6 | 39.7 | 14.9 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 256 | 846 | 36 | 4166 | 5467 | 5461 | 2572 | 951 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 | 4999.24 |
| CS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 437.74 | 2176.48 | 3909.22 | 2752.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 437.74 | 2176.48 | 3909.22 | 2752.96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 256 | 846 | 36 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3703.96 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM2 | 256 | 846 | 36 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 3728.26 | 2572 | 951 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 437.74 | 1738.74 | 1732.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 5.1207784 | 16.922572 | 0.9655979 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99.348221 | 7.9812131 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM2 | 5.1207784 | 16.922572 | 0.9655979 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 68.986605 | 25.507878 | 7.9812131 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 3909.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Tables B. 63 to B. 93 show the tank volume calculations for Reservoir 3 previously discussed in Chapter V, pages 66-67.
Table B. 63.

| 1978-1979 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 29.0 | 8.0 | 91.1 | 36.6 | 23.0 | 26.6 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 4314 | 1132 | 15190 | 5664 | 2664 | 3997 | 908 | 870 | 1291 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 0 | 3945.2 | 5077.2 | 20267.2 | 25931.2 | 28595.2 | 32223.4 | 32762.6 | 33263.8 | 34186 | 33817.2 | 33448.4 |
| WS | 0 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $5.798 \mathrm{E}-12$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 3945.2 | 1869.6 | 15927.6 | 6401.6 | 3401.6 | 4365.8 | 1276.8 | 1238.8 | 1659.8 | 368.8 | $5.798 \mathrm{E}-12$ |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 3945.2 | 1132 | 15190 | 5664 | 2664 | 3628.2 | 539.2 | 501.2 | 922.2 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 737.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 64.

| 1979-1980 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 25.3 | 57.4 | 54.7 | 55.3 | 76.6 | 47.4 | 11.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 3823 | 9777 | 8398 | 8071 | 12194 | 7155 | 1655 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 33079.6 | 36533.8 | 46310.8 | 54708.8 | 62779.8 | 74973.8 | 81760 | 83046.2 | 82677.4 | 82308.6 | 81939.8 | 81571 |
| WS | 0 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.171 \mathrm{E}-11$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 1979 | 9777 | 8398 | 8071 | 12194 | 6786.2 | 1286.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $5.798 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 3454.2 | 9777 | 8398 | 8071 | 12194 | 6786.2 | 1286.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $1.572 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1475.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 65.

| 1980-1981 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 27.6 | 4.3 | 40.1 | 82.7 | 66.3 | 35.4 | 11.3 | 16.3 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 4054 | 502 | 6121 | 13226 | 10404 | 5480 | 1647 | 2357 | 954 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 81202.2 | 84887.4 | 85389.4 | 91510.4 | 104736.4 | 115140.4 | 120251.6 | 121529.8 | 123518 | 124103.2 | 123734.4 | 123365.6 |
| WS | 0 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $5.798 \mathrm{E}-12$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 2947.6 | 502 | 6121 | 13226 | 10404 | 5111.2 | 1278.2 | 1988.2 | 585.2 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $1.171 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 3685.2 | 502 | 6121 | 13226 | 10404 | 5111.2 | 1278.2 | 1988.2 | 585.2 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $3.175 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 737.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 66.

| 1981-1982 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.5 | 38.8 | 33.4 | 33.6 | 47.7 | 80.2 | 10.9 | 0.2 | 58.8 | 0.01 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 183 | 6030 | 4867 | 5034 | 7001 | 12824 | 1550 | 15 | 10366 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 122996.8 | 122811 | 128841 | 133708 | 138742 | 145743 | 158198.2 | 159379.4 | 159025.6 | 169022.8 | 168654 | 168285.2 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 383.8 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 5292.4 | 4867 | 5034 | 7001 | 12455.2 | 1181.2 | 0 | 9643.4 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $5.798 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 15 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 6030 | 4867 | 5034 | 7001 | 12455.2 | 1181.2 | 0 | 9997.2 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $1.572 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 49.62039 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 49.62039 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 4.0672451 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 737.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.67.

| 1982-1983 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.5 | 23.9 | 22.6 | 26.6 | 69.0 | 38.4 | 15.4 | 21.7 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 185 | 3685 | 3273 | 3877 | 11291 | 5840 | 2098 | 3375 | 2703 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 167916.4 | 167732.6 | 171417.6 | 174690.6 | 178567.6 | 189858.6 | 195329.8 | 197059 | 200065.2 | 202399.4 | 202030.6 | 201661.8 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 2947.4 | 3273 | 3877 | 11291 | 5471.2 | 1729.2 | 3006.2 | 2334.2 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 3685 | 3273 | 3877 | 11291 | 5471.2 | 1729.2 | 3006.2 | 2334.2 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 50.16269 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 50.16269 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 737.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 68.

| 1983-1984 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 17.3 | 29.1 | 40.1 | 35.6 | 13.4 | 29.3 | 49.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 2653 | 4453 | 5869 | 5133 | 1970 | 4713 | 7889 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 201293 | 203577.2 | 208030.2 | 213899.2 | 219032.2 | 221002.2 | 225346.4 | 232866.6 | 232497.8 | 232129 | 231760.2 | 231391.4 |
| WS | 0 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 809 | 4453 | 5869 | 5133 | 1970 | 4344.2 | 7520.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 2284.2 | 4453 | 5869 | 5133 | 1970 | 4344.2 | 7520.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1475.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 69.

| 1984-1985 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.9 | 49.2 | 42.4 | 84.2 | 43.3 | 33.1 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 232 | 7614 | 6579 | 13474 | 6368 | 5231 | 399 | 449 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 231022.6 | 230885.8 | 238499.8 | 245078.8 | 258552.8 | 264920.8 | 269783 | 269813.2 | 269893.4 | 269524.6 | 269155.8 | 268787 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 6507.6 | 6579 | 13474 | 6368 | 4862.2 | 30.2 | 80.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 7614 | 6579 | 13474 | 6368 | 4862.2 | 30.2 | 80.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 62.906725 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 62.906725 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 70.

| 1985-1986 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 24.1 | 15.8 | 19.9 | 28.2 | 45.6 | 12.3 | 11.3 | 27.7 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 3634 | 2115 | 2914 | 3821 | 7185 | 1678 | 1549 | 4329 | 681 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 268418.2 | 271683.4 | 273798.4 | 276712.4 | 280533.4 | 287718.4 | 289027.6 | 290207.8 | 294168 | 294480.2 | 294111.4 | 293742.6 |
| WS | 0 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 2527.6 | 2115 | 2914 | 3821 | 7185 | 1309.2 | 1180.2 | 3960.2 | 312.2 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 3265.2 | 2115 | 2914 | 3821 | 7185 | 1309.2 | 1180.2 | 3960.2 | 312.2 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 737.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.71.

| 1986-1987 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.2 | 11.6 | 131.1 | 26.8 | 57.8 | 17.0 | 89.3 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 15 | 1527 | 24074 | 4098 | 9046 | 2396 | 15286 | 262 | 352 | 193 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 293388.8 | 294547 | 318621 | 322719 | 331765 | 334161 | 349078.2 | 348971.4 | 348954.6 | 348778.8 | 348410 | 348041.2 |
| WS | 0 | 1037 | 1037 | 1037 | 1037 | 1037 | 1037 | 930.2 | 913.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 121.2 | 24074 | 4098 | 9046 | 2396 | 14917.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 15 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 15 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 262 | 352 | 193 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 1158.2 | 24074 | 4098 | 9046 | 2396 | 14917.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 4.0672451 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 4.0672451 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 71.041215 | 95.444685 | 52.331887 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1037 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.72.

| 1987-1988 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 45.1 | 23.1 | 74.5 | 49.0 | 116.3 | 89.1 | 8.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 7021 | 3356 | 12066 | 7655 | 20583 | 14587 | 1000 | 117 | 0 | 1362 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 347672.4 | 354324.6 | 357680.6 | 369746.6 | 377401.6 | 397984.6 | 412202.8 | 412834 | 412582.2 | 412213.4 | 413206.6 | 412837.8 |
| WS | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 117 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 6283.4 | 3356 | 12066 | 7655 | 20583 | 14218.2 | 631.2 | 0 | 0 | 624.4 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 117 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 117 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 6652.2 | 3356 | 12066 | 7655 | 20583 | 14218.2 | 631.2 | 0 | 0 | 993.2 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 31.724512 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 31.724512 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| SC | 368.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.73.

| 1988-1989 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 32.6 | 47.6 | 116.5 | 50.3 | 9.5 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 5362 | 7341 | 20669 | 8273 | 1362 | 2342 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 412469 | 417462.2 | 424803.2 | 445472.2 | 453745.2 | 455107.2 | 457080.4 | 456711.6 | 456422.8 | 456054 | 455685.2 | 455316.4 |
| WS | 0 | 1764 | 1764 | 1764 | 1764 | 1764 | 1764 | 1395.2 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 3229.2 | 7341 | 20669 | 8273 | 1362 | 1973.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 4993.2 | 7341 | 20669 | 8273 | 1362 | 1973.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 21.691974 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1764 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.74.

| 1989-1990 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 20.0 | 25.5 | 18.3 | 13.6 | 70.5 | 25.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 2658 | 3770 | 2484 | 1889 | 12269 | 3962 | 59 | 0 | 331 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 454947.6 | 457236.8 | 461006.8 | 463490.8 | 465379.8 | 477648.8 | 481242 | 480932.2 | 480563.4 | 480525.6 | 480156.8 | 479788 |
| WS | 0 | 1454 | 1454 | 1454 | 1454 | 1454 | 1454 | 1144.2 | 775.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 835.2 | 3770 | 2484 | 1889 | 12269 | 3593.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 59 | 0 | 331 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 2289.2 | 3770 | 2484 | 1889 | 12269 | 3593.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 15.997831 | 0 | 89.750542 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1454 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 75.

| 1990-1991 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 12.5 | 3.5 | 19.9 | 60.0 | 34.8 | 31.0 | 9.6 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1737 | 455 | 2753 | 9154 | 5226 | 4528 | 1353 | 434 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 479419.2 | 480787.4 | 481242.4 | 483995.4 | 493149.4 | 498375.4 | 502534.6 | 503518.8 | 503584 | 503215.2 | 502846.4 | 502477.6 |
| WS | 0 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 261.8 | 455 | 2753 | 9154 | 5226 | 4159.2 | 984.2 | 65.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 1368.2 | 455 | 2753 | 9154 | 5226 | 4159.2 | 984.2 | 65.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.76.

| 1991-1992 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 14.0 | 36.6 | 128.3 | 17.2 | 99.8 | 35.5 | 5.9 | 8.4 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1907 | 5634 | 22286 | 2272 | 17244 | 5296 | 774 | 1147 | 455 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 502108.8 | 503647 | 509281 | 531567 | 533839 | 551083 | 556010.2 | 556415.4 | 557193.6 | 557279.8 | 556911 | 556542.2 |
| WS | 0 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $9.311 \mathrm{E}-11$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 800.6 | 5634 | 22286 | 2272 | 17244 | 4927.2 | 405.2 | 778.2 | 86.2 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 1538.2 | 5634 | 22286 | 2272 | 17244 | 4927.2 | 405.2 | 778.2 | 86.2 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 737.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 77.

| 1992-1993 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 0.8 | 51.4 | 80.3 | 38.6 | 51.8 | 45.9 | 3.6 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 87 | 8788 | 13456 | 5959 | 8080 | 7335 | 452 | 1575 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 556173.4 | 555891.6 | 564679.6 | 578135.6 | 584094.6 | 592174.6 | 599140.8 | 599224 | 600430.2 | 600061.4 | 599692.6 | 599323.8 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 7681.6 | 13456 | 5959 | 8080 | 6966.2 | 83.2 | 1206.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $9.311 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 8788 | 13456 | 5959 | 8080 | 6966.2 | 83.2 | 1206.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $2.525 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 23.590022 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 23.590022 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 78.

| 1993-1994 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 5.9 | 34.6 | 14.4 | 88.6 | 67.1 | 35.8 | 37.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 781 | 5435 | 2011 | 14035 | 10334 | 5738 | 5599 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 598955 | 599367.2 | 604802.2 | 606813.2 | 620848.2 | 631182.2 | 636551.4 | 641781.6 | 641807.8 | 641439 | 641070.2 | 640701.4 |
| WS | 0 | 412.2 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 4740.8 | 2011 | 14035 | 10334 | 5369.2 | 5230.2 | 26.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 412.2 | 5435 | 2011 | 14035 | 10334 | 5369.2 | 5230.2 | 26.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $3.789 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.79.

| 1994-1995 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 42.0 | 61.2 | 99.3 | 50.5 | 20.8 | 13.1 | 13.0 | 30.4 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 7105 | 10262 | 17023 | 7625 | 2903 | 1878 | 1739 | 4501 | 1526 | 0 | 44 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 647437.6 | 657330.8 | 674353.8 | 681978.8 | 684881.8 | 686759.8 | 688130 | 692262.2 | 693419.4 | 693050.6 | 692725.8 | 692357 |
| WS | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 693.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 5673.8 | 9893.2 | 17023 | 7625 | 2903 | 1878 | 1370.2 | 4132.2 | 1157.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 44 | 0 |
| SP2 | 6736.2 | 9893.2 | 17023 | 7625 | 2903 | 1878 | 1370.2 | 4132.2 | 1157.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 11.930586 | 0 |
| SC | 1062.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.80.

| 1995-1996 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.4 | 6.9 | 37.0 | 15.4 | 57.9 | 65.4 | 36.1 | 31.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 |
| Runoff | 35 | 879 | 5679 | 2094 | 9456 | 10898 | 5247 | 5079 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 6094 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 692023.2 | 692533.4 | 698212.4 | 700306.4 | 709762.4 | 720660.4 | 725538.6 | 730248.8 | 729896 | 729527.2 | 729158.4 | 734883.6 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 0 | 510.2 | 5679 | 2094 | 9456 | 10898 | 4878.2 | 4710.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5725.2 |
| DM1 | 35 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 35 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 |
| SP2 | 0 | 510.2 | 5679 | 2094 | 9456 | 10898 | 4878.2 | 4710.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5725.2 |
| \%DM1 | 9.4902386 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 4.3383948 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 9.4902386 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 4.3383948 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.81.

| 1996-1997 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 21.3 | 5.3 | 61.3 | 8.3 | 27.8 | 29.1 | 26.8 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 2979 | 699 | 9691 | 1106 | 4312 | 4164 | 4177 | 1337 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 734514.8 | 737125 | 737824 | 747515 | 748621 | 752933 | 756728.2 | 760536.4 | 761504.6 | 761135.8 | 760767 | 760398.2 |
| WS | 0 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 1503.8 | 699 | 9691 | 1106 | 4312 | 3795.2 | 3808.2 | 968.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 2610.2 | 699 | 9691 | 1106 | 4312 | 3795.2 | 3808.2 | 968.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.82.

| 1997-1998 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 14.0 | 22.3 | 82.5 | 57.9 | 31.5 | 13.9 | 42.2 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 2095 | 3155 | 13968 | 9171 | 4415 | 1905 | 6700 | 649 | 1004 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 762124.4 | 764910.6 | 778878.6 | 788049.6 | 792464.6 | 794369.6 | 800700.8 | 800981 | 801616.2 | 801247.4 | 800878.6 | 800509.8 |
| WS | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 619.8 | 2786.2 | 13968 | 9171 | 4415 | 1905 | 6331.2 | 280.2 | 635.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 1726.2 | 2786.2 | 13968 | 9171 | 4415 | 1905 | 6331.2 | 280.2 | 635.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.83.

| 1998-1999 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 1.0 | 31.7 | 86.4 | 102.9 | 30.7 | 31.8 | 39.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 116 | 4554 | 14237 | 18114 | 4728 | 4804 | 6577 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 800141 | 799888.2 | 804442.2 | 818679.2 | 836793.2 | 841521.2 | 845956.4 | 852164.6 | 851795.8 | 851427 | 851058.2 | 850689.4 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1475.2 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.863 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 3078.8 | 14237 | 18114 | 4728 | 4435.2 | 6208.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 4554 | 14237 | 18114 | 4728 | 4435.2 | 6208.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $3.789 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 31.453362 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 31.453362 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1475.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.84.

| 1999-2000 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 1.4 | 1.0 | 18.2 | 33.1 | 39.0 | 70.1 | 28.6 | 25.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 161 | 116 | 2672 | 5113 | 5468 | 11137 | 4051 | 3602 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 850481.6 | 850228.8 | 852900.8 | 858013.8 | 863481.8 | 874618.8 | 878301 | 881534.2 | 881689.4 | 881320.6 | 880951.8 | 880583 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 1565.6 | 5113 | 5468 | 11137 | 3682.2 | 3233.2 | 155.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 161 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 161 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 2672 | 5113 | 5468 | 11137 | 3682.2 | 3233.2 | 155.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 43.655098 | 31.453362 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 43.655098 | 31.453362 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 85.

| 2000-2001 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 6.4 | 9.1 | 68.2 | 99.8 | 22.9 | 60.3 | 8.5 | 21.2 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 87.0 |
| Runoff | 863 | 1181 | 11972 | 16527 | 3234 | 9476 | 1205 | 2982 | 572 | 0 | 0 | 15904 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 881077.2 | 881889.4 | 893861.4 | 910388.4 | 913622.4 | 923098.4 | 923934.6 | 926547.8 | 926751 | 926382.2 | 926013.4 | 941548.6 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP1 | 494.2 | 812.2 | 11972 | 16527 | 3234 | 9476 | 836.2 | 2613.2 | 203.2 | 0 | 0 | 15535.2 |
| DM1 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 |
| SP2 | 494.2 | 812.2 | 11972 | 16527 | 3234 | 9476 | 836.2 | 2613.2 | 203.2 | 0 | 0 | 15535.2 |
| \%DM1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| SC | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 86.

| 2001-2002 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 11.1 | 24.2 | 83.2 | 61.5 | 37.9 | 53.4 | 28.8 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 1623 | 3283 | 13891 | 9989 | 6284 | 8499 | 4316 | 345 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 941179.8 | 942434 | 945717 | 959608 | 969597 | 975881 | 984011.2 | 987958.4 | 987934.6 | 987565.8 | 987197 | 986828.2 |
| WS | 0 | 1130.2 | 1130.2 | 1130.2 | 1130.2 | 1130.2 | 1130.2 | 1130.2 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.863 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 124 | 3283 | 13891 | 9989 | 6284 | 8130.2 | 3947.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 345 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 1254.2 | 3283 | 13891 | 9989 | 6284 | 8130.2 | 3947.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 93.546638 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1130.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 87.

| 2002-2003 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 8.5 | 12.2 | 67.9 | 107.1 | 53.2 | 159.0 | 71.4 | 11.1 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 1209 | 1757 | 11168 | 16792 | 8502 | 28782 | 11468 | 1528 | 8 | 421 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 987668.4 | 989056.6 | 1000224.6 | 1017016.6 | 1025518.6 | 1054300.6 | 1065399.8 | 1066559 | 1066198.2 | 1066250.4 | 1065881.6 | 1065512.8 |
| WS | 840.2 | 1046.2 | 1046.2 | 1046.2 | 1046.2 | 1046.2 | 1046.2 | 1046.2 | 685.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.863 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 1182.2 | 11168 | 16792 | 8502 | 28782 | 11099.2 | 1159.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 840.2 | 1388.2 | 11168 | 16792 | 8502 | 28782 | 11099.2 | 1159.2 | 0 | 52.2 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 2.1691974 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1046.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.88.

| 2003-2004 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 26.2 | 37.8 | 37.1 | 135.3 | 55.2 | 0.01 | 8.1 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 4078 | 6128 | 6128 | 23440 | 8623 | 0 | 1131 | 404 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 1065144 | 1068853.2 | 1074981.2 | 1081109.2 | 1104549.2 | 1113172.2 | 1112803.4 | 1113565.6 | 1113600.8 | 1113276 | 1112907.2 | 1112538.4 |
| WS | 0 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 693.6 | 1062.4 | 1062.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 2646.8 | 6128 | 6128 | 23440 | 8623 | 0 | 393.4 | 35.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $1.863 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 3709.2 | 6128 | 6128 | 23440 | 8623 | 0 | 762.2 | 35.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $5.052 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 11.930586 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1062.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 89.

| 2004-2005 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 32.2 | 46.9 | 51.6 | 36.8 | 40.8 | 28.8 | 27.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 5389 | 7281 | 8135 | 5453 | 7008 | 4776 | 4572 | 116 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 1112169.6 | 1117189.8 | 1124470.8 | 1132605.8 | 1138058.8 | 1145066.8 | 1149474 | 1153677.2 | 1153424.4 | 1153171.6 | 1152802.8 | 1152434 |
| WS | 0 | 1243.2 | 1243.2 | 1243.2 | 1243.2 | 1243.2 | 1243.2 | 1243.2 | 990.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.863 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 3777 | 7281 | 8135 | 5453 | 7008 | 4407.2 | 4203.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 116 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 5020.2 | 7281 | 8135 | 5453 | 7008 | 4407.2 | 4203.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $3.789 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 31.453362 | 31.453362 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1243.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 90.

| 2005-2006 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 18.5 | 46.3 | 10.7 | 70.6 | 29.4 | 24.6 | 32.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 2658 | 7123 | 1439 | 11629 | 4789 | 3539 | 5284 | 468 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 1152065.2 | 1154354.4 | 1161477.4 | 1162916.4 | 1174545.4 | 1179334.4 | 1182504.6 | 1187419.8 | 1187519 | 1187150.2 | 1186781.4 | 1186412.6 |
| WS | 0 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 1182.8 | 7123 | 1439 | 11629 | 4789 | 3170.2 | 4915.2 | 99.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $1.863 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 2289.2 | 7123 | 1439 | 11629 | 4789 | 3170.2 | 4915.2 | 99.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $5.052 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 91.

| 2006-2007 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.4 | 45.8 | 14.6 | 3.7 | 34.7 | 75.1 | 27.1 | 7.8 | 84.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 43 | 7163 | 2022 | 456 | 5137 | 11989 | 4308 | 1035 | 15055 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 1186086.8 | 1192881 | 1194903 | 1195359 | 1200496 | 1212485 | 1216424.2 | 1217090.4 | 1231776.6 | 1231523.8 | 1231155 | 1230786.2 |
| WS | 0 | 990.4 | 990.4 | 990.4 | 990.4 | 990.4 | 990.4 | 990.4 | 990.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 5803.8 | 2022 | 456 | 5137 | 11989 | 3939.2 | 666.2 | 14686.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 43 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 43 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 6794.2 | 2022 | 456 | 5137 | 11989 | 3939.2 | 666.2 | 14686.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 11.659436 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 11.659436 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 31.453362 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 990.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B. 92.

| 2007-2008 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.5 | 40.1 | 15.4 | 31.0 | 7.1 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 0 | 0 | 5548 | 6182 | 2245 | 4839 | 886 | 181 | 455 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 1230417.4 | 1230048.6 | 1235596.6 | 1241778.6 | 1244023.6 | 1248862.6 | 1249379.8 | 1249192 | 1249278.2 | 1248909.4 | 1248540.6 | 1248171.8 |
| WS | 0 | 0 | 1208 | 1208 | 1208 | 1208 | 1208 | 1020.2 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $2.329 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 0 | 4340 | 6182 | 2245 | 4839 | 517.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 181 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 0 | 0 | 5548 | 6182 | 2245 | 4839 | 517.2 | 0 | 86.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | $3.789 \mathrm{E}-11$ | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 49.078091 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1208 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.93.

| 2008-2009 | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainfall | 4.5 | 13.9 | 0.7 | 57.7 | 76.4 | 75.6 | 39.7 | 14.9 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Runoff | 565 | 1915 | 80 | 9700 | 12688 | 12746 | 5903 | 2164 | 901 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| CS | 1248368 | 1249914.2 | 1249994.2 | 1259694.2 | 1272382.2 | 1285128.2 | 1290662.4 | 1292457.6 | 1292989.8 | 1292621 | 1292252.2 | 1291883.4 |
| WS | 196.2 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 1106.4 | 737.6 | 368.8 | $1.397 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| SP1 | 0 | 636 | 80 | 9700 | 12688 | 12746 | 5534.2 | 1795.2 | 532.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM1 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 |
| DM2 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 368.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SP2 | 196.2 | 1546.2 | 80 | 9700 | 12688 | 12746 | 5534.2 | 1795.2 | 532.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \%DM1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \%DM2 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SC | 1106.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX C MAPS OF METU-NCC

Figure C. 1 and Figure C. 2 are enlarged from Figure 3.4, in Chapter III, page 29 and Figure 4.4 from Chapter IV, page 37 respectively.


