# **Modified Green-Ampt Method** Tom Nye, P.E., in EPA SWMM Ph.D. Mitch Heineman, P.E., D.WRE EWRI 2016 October 15-16, 2015 CDM Smith

#### Overview

- History
  - Implementation in SWMM
  - Examples
  - Formulation
- Algorithm improvement
  - Anomalies
  - Identifying the error
  - Resolution
- Example

Green-Ampt equation (1911)

$$f_p = K_s \left( 1 + \frac{\psi_s \theta_d}{F} \right)$$

Eqn. 4-27

- f<sub>p</sub> = infiltration capacity, (in/hr)
- k<sub>s</sub> = saturated hydraulic conductivity (in/hr)
- $\psi_{\theta}$  = capillary suction (in)
- $\theta_{d}$  = initial moisture deficit
- F = cumulative infiltration volume (in)

#### Green-Ampt-Mein-Larsen (GAML)

• 1973: Mein-Larson formulation for steady rainfall Prior to saturation  $F < F_s$ , f = i. Saturation occurs when

$$F_s = \frac{K_s \psi_s \theta_d}{i - K_s} > \mathsf{F}$$

- 1978: Chu adaptation for unsteady rainfall
- 1979: Coded into SWMM 3 by R. Mein
- 1993-2002: Minor refactoring by W. Huber
- 2004: Re-coded in C by L. Rossman

#### Tweaks 2005-2010

- Corrections to the way water volume in the upper soil zone is depleted during dry periods. 5.0.06 (2005)
- The point at which the time to drain the upper soil zone is first calculated was moved from time 0 to the time of first rainfall. 5.0.12 (2008)
- Infiltration rate corrected for the case when surface becomes saturated part way through current time step. 5.0.14 (2009)
- Explicitly include effect of ponded water depth on infiltration rate. 5.0.015 (2009)
- Infiltration rate no longer allowed to be less than smaller of saturated hydraulic conductivity and available surface moisture. 5.0.21 (2010)

# **Model Comparison**

- Project technical memo
  - XPSWMM vs. EPA SWMM
  - Hydrology matches for Horton and NRCS infiltration, but not for Green-Ampt
  - XP Solutions noted that under certain conditions, EPA SWMM does not vary for changing capillary suction; CDM Smith independently confirmed this result

Identical subbasins

- 50 acres
- 1000 ft width
- 1% slope
- Zero imperviousness
- 0.25 pervious N \_\_\_\_\_
- 6 inch NRCS Type II hyetograph
- Vary Ks, IMD, Su to pinpoint anomaly



#### Test model SWMM 5.1.006

Subcatchment Ksat35 Precipitation (in/hr)



#### Sensitivity Analysis



# Infiltration rate

Subcatchment Ksat15 Infiltration (in/hr)
 Subcatchment Ksat25 Infiltration (in/hr)
 Subcatchment Ksat35 Infiltration (in/hr)



# Sensitivity Analysis



#### Sensitivity analysis



#### Sensitivity Analysis



#### SWMM 5.1.010 vs SWMM 4.4

- Differences in the code between earlier and current versions of SWMM
  - Event separation time initialization
  - Solver convergence limits
- Base Green-Ampt infiltration in SWMM 5.1.010 revises the methodology to match SWMM 4



# Were there issues in SWMM 4? SWMM 3?

- At this point Lew and others considered the problem solved. But...
- Our concerns were with the higher K<sub>s</sub> values producing too little infiltration
- Now all K<sub>s</sub> values in this range match the infiltration rate



# Were there issues in SWMM 4? SWMM 3?

- Sensitivity test with three simple catchments, but varying rainfall
  - K<sub>s</sub> = 0.15 in/hr, IMD = 0.25, Su = 8 in
  - "low" rainfall: 0.1 in/hr
     for 5 hours, then 0.3
     in/hr
  - "15" i = K<sub>s</sub> = 0.15 in/hr
     for 5 hours, then 0.3 in
     /hr
  - "high" rainfall: 0.3 in/hr for the entire run



# Were there issues in SWMM 4? SWMM 3?



### The Issue

- The algorithm has two parts:
  - Mein-Larson estimate of infiltration
  - Soil moisture accounting
- In continuous simulation, soil moisture accounting drives estimate moisture deficit
- In NRCS design storm, moisture deficit driven to zero by low intensity rainfall well before peak

# The Solution

infil - F = 0.0;

return ia;

 Code revised so initial time remaining until next wet period set to large value

//(5.1.008)

//(5.1.010)

- At first time period where  $i > K_s$ , TR set as usual
- Since original method had been used for 30 years, we needed to research it more:
  - Followed up with Wayne Huber

```
- Wayne Huber contacted Russell Mein
// --- rainfall does not exceed Ksat
if ( ia <= ks )
{
    dF = ia * tstep;
    infil->F += dF;
    infil->Fu += dF;
    infil->Fu = MIN(infil->Fu, Fumax);
    if ( modelType == GREEN_AMPT && infil->T <= 0.0 )
    {
        infil->IMD = (Fumax - infil->Fu) / infil->Lu;
    }
}
```

#### Same test case – Modified GAML



#### Test Case: Memphis South Cypress Creek

13 mi<sup>2</sup> with 179 subcatchments from 6.5 to 187.7 acres, averaging 46 acres

- 24% impervious
- Elev: 190 ft to 380 ft
- Soils from sandy loams to clay;
   88% classified as B (Memphis Silt Loam)



# September 2014 Storm

- 4.8-inch storm
- Precipitation Peak Intensity ~ 1 inch in 15-1 0.9 mintes 0.8 0.7 Dry Depth (in) 0.5 0.4 antecedent condition 0.3 0.2 0.1 0 4.00 6.00 8.00 10.00 12.00 14.00 16.00 18.00 Time (hrs)

#### September 2014 Storm

#### - Stream Gage at Neely Road



#### 100-Year Storm

- 8-inch storm



# 100-Year Storm

Without infiltration cutoff at Ksat, infiltration increases 15% to 20% within the subbasins



#### **Code revisions**

Build 5.1.007 (9/15/2014)

Engine Updates:

- 7. The initial cumulative infiltration into the upper soil zone for Green-Ampt infiltration had been incorrectly set to the maximum value instead of zero.
- All of the Green-Ampt infiltration functions were re-factored to make the code easier to follow.

Build 5.1.010 (08/05/15)

Engine Updates:

 A modified version of Green-Ampt infiltration (MODIFIED GREEN AMPT) was added that no longer redistributes upper zone moisture deficit during low rainfall events. The original authors of SWMM's Green-Ampt model have endorsed this modified version. It will produce more infiltration for storm events that begin with low rainfall intensities, such as the SCS design storm distributions.

#### Conclusions

"I am impressed and pleased that there are people out there who keep checking model output. Unfortunately most model results are accepted by users without question" - Russel Mein