

**INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF EL-SALAM
CANAL PROJECT BY USING DIFFERENT WATER
QUALITY MODELS**

Submitted By

Dalia Shaban Mohamed Abu Salama

B.Sc. Sciences (Physics), Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University,
1995

Master in Environmental Sciences, Institute of Environmental Studies
and Research, Ain Shams University, 2011

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of
The Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree
In
Environmental Science**

**Department of Environmental Basic Sciences
Institute of Environmental Studies & Research
Ain Shams University**

2019

APPROVAL SHEET

**INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF EL-SALAM
CANAL PROJECT BY USING DIFFERENT WATER
QUALITY MODELS**

Submitted By

Dalia Shaban Mohamed Abu Salama

B.Sc. Sciences (Physics), Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University, 1995

Master in Environmental Sciences, Institute of Environmental Studies and
Research, Ain Shams University, 2011

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of

The Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree

In

Environmental Science

Department of Environmental Basic Sciences

This Thesis Towards a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in
Environmental Science Has Been Approved by:

Name

Signature

1. Prof. Dr. Anas Mohamed Abol Ela El Molla

Prof. of Irrigation and Hydraulics
Civil Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering
Al - Azhar University

2. Prof. Dr. Tarek Ali Aggour

Prof. of Hydrogeology
Desert Research Center

3. Prof. Dr. Ezzat Ali Korany

Emeritus Prof. of Hydrogeology
Faculty of Science
Ain Shams University

2019

**INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF EL-SALAM
CANAL PROJECT BY USING DIFFERENT WATER
QUALITY MODELS**

Submitted By

Dalia Shaban Mohamed Abu Salama

B.Sc. Sciences (Physics), Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University,
1995

Master in Environmental Sciences, Institute of Environmental Studies
and Research, Ain Shams University, 2011

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of
The Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree
In
Environmental Science
Department of Environmental Basic Sciences

Under The Supervision of:

- 1. Prof. Dr. Ezzat Ali Korany**
Emeritus Prof. of Hydrogeology
Faculty of Science
Ain Shams University
- 2. Prof. Dr. Aiman Mohamed Khalil Elsaady**
Professor of Irrigation and Hydraulics
National Water Research Center
Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation

2019

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisors Prof. Dr. **Ezzat Korany** and **Dr. Aiman Mohamed Khalil El Saadi** for their continuous encouragement, support, advice and skillful guidance to make the completion of this study possible.

Grateful thanks and appreciation are due to **Dr. Alaa Abd El-Motaleb**, the ex- director of the Drainage Research Institute (DRI), National Water Research Center, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, for his continuous valuable guidance throughout the work in this study.

Particular mention must be made to Dr. Mohamed Shaban Mohamed, Head of Experimental Field Studies and Pilot Areas department, (DRI), whose sincere efforts, endless support and encouragement, have continued since the author started her professional career.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Ahmed Morsy, (DRI) for his valuable comments and support. Also, I would like to extend my appreciation to all the staff of (DRI).

Last but not least; I am very grateful to my husband Hany and my daughter Dina for being by my side all the time in this study.

Abstract

Egypt suffers from rapid population and urbanization which puts increasing stress on its limited water resources. This is directly seen in terms of increasing the efforts required for ensuring food security for the Egyptian public.

As an example of these efforts, the Egyptian Government started El-Salam Canal Project (**ESCP**) for the reclamation of an estimated 620,000 feddans of desert situated extended to Mediterranean coast of Sinai. The main sources of the project water are the Damietta Branch of the River Nile and the agricultural drains; Lower Serw, Farsqur and Bahr Hadus.

Therefore, the water quality of these sources are monitored regularly to check its compliance with the national quality standards. However, recent debates were raising questions about the status of the project water quality (now and in the future) especially with the increasing pollution risks.

Therefore, the main objective of this study is to review the terms of reference associated with ESCP and develop numerical/data driven models to simulate the project working conditions using real field data. Then, the study proposed alternative working scenarios that are acceptable from the environmental perspective.

The analysis started by developing three models for water quality data collected monthly during the period from 2003 to 2015. They include; **Model I** simulates the canal reach from its intake at Damietta Branch until the point just before the outfall of Lower

Serw drain, **Model II** simulates the canal reach from its intake from Damietta Branch until the point just before the outfall of Hadus drain and **Model III** simulates the canal reach from its intake from Damietta Branch until the point just before the Suez Canal Syphon. These models were then used to forecast the water quality of project water under different working scenarios.

The developed models are working well in predicting different quality parameters of water (i.e. TDS, BOD, COD, DO and Fe).

Two water management scenarios are presented for the future operation of the project. They include; **Scenario A** which investigated the case of increasing the water quality variables for each water source by 15%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 85%, respectively from its mean (2003 - 2013) and **Scenario B** which investigated the case of decreasing the water quality variables for each water source by 15%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 85%, respectively from the mean (2003 - 2013).

The results indicate that in months of high demand, it is possible to increase the discharges to ESCP from Farsqur drain up to 75%(189.27m.m³/month) or increasing from Lower Serw or Hadus drains up to 85% (508.5 , 381.8 m.m³/month) respectively (if needed/available) assuming their current levels of concentrations are maintained. This will not significantly deteriorate the canal water in relation to the water quality parameters: TDS, BOD, DO, Fe and COD.

Contents

	Page
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures	xv
List of Appendices.....	xvi
List of Abbreviations	xxi
CHAPTER 1	25
Introduction.....	25
1.1 Problem Definition.....	26
1.2 Objectives	26
CHAPTER 2	28
Review of Literature	28
2.1 Water Resources Management.....	28
2.1.1 Water Resources of Egypt.....	28
2.1.2 Water Quality Management.....	29
2.1.3 Water Policy for El-Salam Canal Project	30
2.1.4 El-Salam Canal Project	31
2.2 Review of Previous Work.....	34
2.3 Data Driven Modeling	46
2.4 Model Development.....	48
2.5 Regression-Based Models	49
2.6 Linear Regression Models	51

2.6.1 Simple Linear Regression	53
2.6.2 Multiple Linear Regression	55
2.6.2.1 Variance of the Error	56
2.6.2.2 Regression Significance Test	57
2.6.2.3 Coefficient of Multiple Determination	59
2.6.2.4 Residual Analysis	60
2.6.2.5 Selection of Variables and Model Building	61
2.6.2.6 Multicollinearity	63
2.6.2.7 Abuses of Regression	64
CHAPTER 3	66
Material and Methods	66
3.1 General Description.....	66
3.2 Project Water Sources.....	67
3.3 El-Salam Canal Water Quality Monitoring Network	67
3.3.1 Sampling sites	67
3.4 Methodology	70
3.5 Water Quantity Measurements	71
3.5.1 Collection and handling of samples	71
3.5.2 Water Quality Measurements	72
3.6 Water Quality Parameters	74
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS).....	74
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD)	74
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	75
DO (Dissolved Oxygen).....	76

Iron (Fe).....	77
3.7 Water Quality Data Driven Models	77
3.8 Modeling Scenarios.....	79
CHAPTER 4	80
Results and Discussions	80
Predicting Water Quality Parameters.....	80
4.1 Model I	82
4.1.1 TDS Model.....	82
4.1.2 BOD Model	94
4.1.3 DO Model I	102
4.1.4 Fe Model I.....	108
4.1.5 COD Model I.....	114
4.1.6 Validating Model I	120
4.2 Model II	125
4.2.1 TDS Model II.....	125
4.2.2 BOD Model II	127
4.2.3 DO Model II	130
4.2.4 Fe Model II.....	132
4.2.5 COD Model II.....	133
4.2.6 Calibrating Model II.....	135
4.3 Model III	137
4.3.1 TDS Model III.....	137
4.3.2 BOD Model III	138
4.3.3 DO Model III	140

4. 3.4 Fe Model III.....	142
4. 3.5 COD Model III.....	143
4. 3.6 Calibrating Model III.....	145
4.4 Investigation of El-Salam Canal project Operating Scenarios	147
4.4.1 Modeling Scenarios.....	147
4.4.1.1 Model I.....	147
TDS Model I.....	147
BOD Model I.....	150
DO Model I.....	158
Fe Model I.....	164
COD Model I.....	168
4.4.1.2 Model II.....	176
TDS Model II.....	176
BOD Model II.....	180
DO Model II.....	185
Fe Model II.....	189
COD Model II.....	194
4.4.1.3 Model III.....	198
TDS Model III.....	198
BOD Model III.....	204
DO Model III.....	210
Fe Model III.....	216
COD Model III.....	221

CHAPTER 5	228
Summary and Conclusion	228
5.1 Conclusions	228
5.2 Recommendations.....	230
REFERENCES	233
Appendices	242

List of Tables

Table No.	Item	Page
Table (3-1)	Monitoring stations along El-Salam canal and feeding drains	68
Table (3-2)	Water quality parameters	71
Table (4-1)	The average concentration (July 2003 to August 2013) for the Water Quality Parameters (WQPs) measured at ESCP.	79
Table (4-2)	Variables introduced to the <i>TDS model I</i> and modeling method	82
Table (4-3)	<i>TDS model I</i> Summary	82
Table (4-4)	ANOVA test for the regression <i>TDS model I</i>	89
Table (4-5)	Parameters of <i>TDS model I</i>	89
Table (4-6)	Variables introduced to the <i>BOD model I</i> and modeling method	94
Table (4-7)	Summary of <i>BOD model I</i>	94
Table (4-8)	ANOVA test for the regression <i>BOD model I</i>	95
Table (4-9)	Parameters of <i>BOD model I</i>	96
Table (4-10)	Variables introduced to the <i>DO model I</i> and modeling method	102

Table (4-11)	Summary of <i>DO model I</i>	102
Table (4-12)	ANOVA test for the regression <i>DO model I</i>	103
Table (4-13)	Parameters of <i>DO model I</i>	103
Table (4-14)	Variables introduced to the <i>Fe model I</i> and modeling method	109
Table (4-15)	Summary of <i>Fe model I</i>	109
Table (4-16)	ANOVA test for the regression <i>Fe model I</i>	110
Table (4-17)	Parameters of <i>Fe model I</i>	110
Table (4-18)	Variables introduced to the <i>COD model I</i> and modeling method	115
Table (4-19)	Summary of <i>COD model I</i>	115
Table (4-20)	ANOVA test for the regression <i>COD model I</i>	116
Table (4-21)	Parameters of <i>COD model I</i>	116
Table (4-22)	Summary results for <i>model I</i>	121
Table (4-23)	Summary results for <i>model II</i>	134
Table (4-24)	Summary results for <i>model III</i>	144

Table (4-25)	Possible responses to Model I-TDS changes in ESCP system	150
Table (4-26)	Possible responses to Model I-BOD changes in ESCP system	152
Table (4-27)	Possible responses to Model I-DO changes in ESCP system	160
Table (4-28)	Possible responses to Model I-Fe changes in ESCP system	167
Table (4-29)	Possible responses to Model I-COD changes in ESCP system	172

List of Figures

Figure No.	Item	Page
Figure (2-1)	Map of El-Salam Canal Project	30
Figure (3-1)	Schematic diagram of El Salam Canal with sample locations	67
Figure (4-1)	Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual for TDS model I	91
Figure (4-2)	Plot of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values for TDS model I	91
Figure (4-3)	Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual for <i>BOD model I</i>	99
Figure (4-4)	Plot of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values for <i>BOD model I</i>	99
Figure (4-5)	Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual for <i>DO model I</i>	105
Figure (4-6)	Plot of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values for <i>DO model I</i>	105
Figure (4-7)	Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual for <i>Fe model I</i>	111
Figure (4-8)	Plot of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values for <i>Fe model I</i>	111
Figure (4-9)	Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual for <i>COD model I</i>	117
Figure (4-10)	Plot of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values for <i>COD model I</i>	117
Figure (4-11)	Simulated (field/measured) data versus the prediction of <i>Model I</i>	122