

22 November 2024

## Hydrological consequences of CDSI modelled with SWAP

#### Janine de Wit (KWR & WUR)

Marjolein van Huijgevoort (KWR), Gé van den Eertwegh (KnowH2O), Dion van Deijl (KnowH2O), Jos van Dam (WUR), Coen Ritsema (WUR), Ruud Bartholomeus (KWR & WUR)

Bridging Science to Practice





# $\sim$ Weather: more extreme & more frequently





Photo: Eelco Boot

# $\sim$ Development of drainage systems in NL (1950-2020)



KWR

# $\sim$ Drainage module in SWAP

- Drainage systems (2D) = surface water module with a hierarchical system (1D-model).
- Today's focus: extended drainage in SWAP
  - Inlet + outlet (weir)
  - Primary water course: canal
  - Secondary water course: ditch
  - Tertiary water course: small ditch





### Controlled drainage with subirrigation in SWAP General set-up

- Inlet = control pit with water supply (Wsupply)
- Primary water course = ditch (WLditch)
- Secondary water course = pit level (WLpit)

- Water level in the control pit as <u>input</u>
  -> pit level = **fixed**
- <u>Simulated</u> water level in the control pit
  -> pit level = dynamic





# $\sim$ Rising groundwater level through subirrigation





## Hydrological changes due to subirrigation Varying in meteorological conditions

	Wet year	Average year	Dry year
Precipitation	1000 mm	650 mm	450 mm
Water supply	580 mm 125 days max rate 44 days not max rate 14 days no pumping	<b>700 mm</b> 112 days max rate 13 days not max rate	<b>730 mm</b> 183 days max pumping rate (= always)
Pit level	'stable'	'stable'	~ 80 cm-ss
Groundwater level	'stable'	Slightly lower	~ 100 cm-ss
Soil moisture content (20 cm)	'stable'	Slightly lower	~ 0.2
Transpiration	Little stress	Little stress	Stress, but less than no sub.

- <u>Wet & avg</u> year: subirrigation hardly contributes to an • increased crop water availability.
- **Dry** year: the crop clearly benefited from subirrigation, but there was also some stress.



Water level control pit [cm+ss]

Groundwater level [cm+ss]

Soil moisture content 20 cm-ss [

Transpiration - subirrigation [mm/d]

C -

D -

0

0

-50 -100 -150 -200

0.5

0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0

-50 -100 -150 -200



B - II

D - II

E - II

G - II

Oct

Average year



Dry year













ranspiration - no subirigation [mm/d] G -





### Hydrological changes due to subirrigation Varying in geohydrological characteristics

- 1) Controlled drainage with subirrigation requires a lot of water.
- Subirrigation alters the water balance components -> strongly depends on geohydrological characteristics.

	А	В	С	D
Ditch drainage	47 %	2 %	46 %	39 %
Downward seepage	37 %	82 %	22 %	45 %
Transpiration	2.4 % — 16.5 %	0.2 % – 5 %	0.5 % – 28 %	1 – 17 %



# $\sim$ Change the pumping strategy

Controlled drainage with subirrigation - fixed level

• Maintaining a specific (fixed) groundwater level

Controlled drainage with subirrigation – dynamic level

- Water supply automatically includes the actual needs of the crop during the growing season:
  - 1) Oxygen stress  $\rightarrow$  lower crest to discharge water,
  - 2) Unnecessary drainage  $\rightarrow$  raise crest to retain water,
  - 3) Drought stress  $\rightarrow$  maximum crest level + supply water
  - 4) No oxygen and drought stress, no drainage  $\rightarrow$  no action



**Goal:** Reduce external water supply for subirrigation by automatic control of CDSI systems. **Method:** Combine current field conditions + weather forecast (10d) + SWAP modelling procedure (incl. crop water requirements).

## Reduce external water supply for subirrigation



#### Maintaining a specific (fixed) groundwater level

- Water supply ~ 800 950 mm
- Water supply + higher ditch level ~ 600 950 mm



Water supply automatically takes into account the actual crop needs

- Water supply ~ 400 950 mm
- Water supply + accept minor crop reductions  $\sim$  150 850 mm

External water supply could be reduced via dynamic control and taking into account the actual crop water needs

### $\sim$ Take home message Controlled drainage with subirrigation

- 1) Controlled drainage with subirrigation systems could i) raise the groundwater level, ii) increase soil moisture availability for crops, iii) increase groundwater recharge.
- 2) Knowledge of geohydrological boundary conditions is key to identify effects of CDSI on components of the water balance.
- 3) Water supply could be reduced by smarter management.
- 4) Understanding what a local measure means on a regional scale is key.
- 5) SWAP could be used to simulate CDSI, both with a fixed and dynamic water level in the control pit

Think integrated !! The whole water system needs to be considered to ensure: enough water, of enough quality at the right place and time



Groningenhaven 7 3433 PE Nieuwegein The Netherlands

T +31 (0)30 60 69 511 E info@kwrwater.nl I www.kwrwater.nl





### Janine de Wit janine.de.wit@kwrwater.nl +31 6 15616926



### Ruud Bartholomeus ruud.bartholomeus@kwrwater.nl

### And colleagues



# $\sim$ Colophon

KWR | November 2024

Project number P405007 and P403006

#### **Project manager**

Edu Dorland

Quality Assurance

**Ruud Bartholomeus** 

#### **Author** Janine de Wit

#### Presented at

- Symposium ter gelegenheid van de 50ste verjaardag van SWAP
- Wageningen Universiteit
- 22 November 20024

#### Keywords

Zoetwaterbeschikbaarheid, droogte, drainage, subirrigatie

#### Copyright

This presentation is not a public document and is only provided to the client. KWR will refrain from distributing this report outside the client organisation and will therefore not provide the report to third parties, unless KWR and the client agree otherwise. The client is entitled to distribute the report subject to KWR's prior consent. KWR may attach conditions to consent to the dissemination of (parts of) the report.

**KWR**