ABSTRACT. In this study, we tested the prediction ability of the Dynamic Watershed Simulation Model (DWSM), an event-based watershed model, on an agricultural watershed in central New York State and its ability for use as a management tool. Using five different storm events, we identified a set of key parameters that allowed DWSM to best predict hydrographs and sedigraphs of the events for both the curve number and interception-infiltration rainfall-runoff methods. Subsequent sensitivity analyses revealed that modeling outcomes (i.e., peak water and sediment discharges, total event runoff volume, and event sediment yield) were most sensitive for the first method to CNAF, a factor adjusting runoff CN values, and most sensitive for the second method to HYCND and VOG, parameters reflecting soil hydraulic conductivity and interception loss. These analyses led to benchmark values of the key parameters and empirical relationships between precipitation and the three most sensitive parameters, which were validated using two additional storm events. Based on these results, we propose a general modeling procedure that can best predict event hydrographs and sedigraphs for watershed management planning.
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Transactions of the ASABE
sippi for watersheds that have significantly diverse sizes and physiographic conditions (Borah, et al., 2007; Borah et al., 2002) and applied to both artificial and natural watersheds in China (Van Liew, 1998; Zhang et al., 2012; Zheng et al., 2008). In our preliminary study (Gao et al., 2013), we showed that DWSM can also successfully characterize event-based hydrological and sediment transport processes in an agricultural watershed in central New York State, which is our current study watershed.

However, our preliminary study only tested DWSM for two large rainfall events, which is insufficient to guarantee its predictability for small events because rainfall-runoff processes in small events are difficult to capture. An even more important issue that was beyond the scope of the preliminary study concerns whether the validated parameters for large events may lead to good predictions for small events. Additionally, the preliminary study was incapable of addressing how model parameters change over a group of events and whether DWSM may be used as a robust management tool.

Therefore, the objectives of this study are to (1) test DWSM in the study watershed using observed data from seven storm events with variable intensities and durations, and (2) provide a general procedure for using DWSM with specific values of key parameters to estimate event-based water and sediment discharges for watershed management planning. We accomplished the first objective by testing the two different rainfall-runoff methods adopted in DWSM for describing rainfall excess processes, examining the variability of adjustable parameters among five storm events, and performing sensitivity analyses for the adjustable parameters to reveal the impact of the associated hydrological and erosion processes on the predicted hydrographs and sedigraphs. We achieved the second objective by developing benchmark values for the key parameters, verifying their usage with two additional storm events, and providing a general procedure for modeling event-based hydrological and sediment transport processes in the study watershed.

STUDY AREA AND MODEL STRUCTURE

Oneida Creek watershed is one of the seven watersheds discharging to Oneida Lake in central New York State. It has a typical continental climate with moderate temperatures and rainfalls in summer and cold, intensive snowfalls in winter. The mean annual precipitation is more than 1270 mm. Topographically, the downstream part of the watershed is quite flat, while the middle and upstream parts vary in elevation from 120 to 570 m. The study area is the middle and upper sections of the Oneida Creek watershed with an area of 311 km² and thus is a medium-sized watershed (Singh, 1995). The main land use and land cover types are crop lands (23%), pasture (17%), forest (23%), urban (20%), and wetland/open water (7%), with agricultural and urban lands dispersed throughout the entire watershed (fig. 1). The Oneida Creek watershed supplies significantly higher sediment loads than other watersheds draining to Oneida Lake and serves as the main source of sediment pollution to the lake. The variability in soils in the watershed is a function of the topography and parent material. Approximately 64% of the soils in the watershed developed from glacial till. The till is generally high in calcareous material, and soil textures are loam and silt loam. Soils closer to the lake, which belongs to the Erie Ontario Lake Plain, formed in glacioluvial parent material (23% of the watershed). The texture of this material is largely a function of the speed of receding glacial melt water and ranges from sands and gravels deposited by rapidly flowing water to silts and clays that accumulated as water evaporated from glacial lakes. Organic soils comprise approximately 3% of the soils in the watershed. The dominant soil hydrological group is group B (fig. 1).

For DWSM modeling, the study watershed was divided into 42 overland elements (numbers 1 to 42) and 21 stream segments (numbers 43 to 63) (fig. 1) using the ArcHydro technique (Maidment, 2002). This spatial structure was generated based on DEM data of 10 m resolution and a rectified stream network shapefile. The delineated overland elements range in size from 1.13 to 16.12 km². This spatial arrangement ensures that each overland element is not so small that the connection structure among elements is over-complicated.

METHODS

RAINFALL INFORMATION

Although we measured precipitation using a tipping-bucket rain gauge installed at the outlet of the study watershed, these data were not usable because of malfunction of the equipment and unexpected bird disturbances. Instead, we used hourly precipitation data recorded at the nearest NOAA weather site (Rome, N.Y.). Additionally, we obtained daily cumulative precipitation at three sites around the study watershed from the Community Collaborative Rain, Hail, and Snow (CoCoRaHS) network (www.cocorahs.org) to verify the NOAA data. Based on annual precipitation records and the associated peak discharges, we divided the selected storm events into (relatively) large and small events in terms of a threshold value of 40 mm.

DETERMINATION OF WATER AND SEDIMENT DISCHARGES DURING STORM EVENTS

Stages were recorded and water samples were collected at a monitoring station established at the outlet of the study watershed (fig. 1). The monitoring station used an ISCO automatic pumping sampler for obtaining sediment concentrations (C). Water discharges (Q) of storm events were determined from measured stages and a regression between measured Q at the outlet and the associated Q recorded at a USGS gauging station located slightly upstream. Sediment discharge (Qs) was determined using the established Q-Q relationship. The medium size of sediment fraction (D₅₀), determined by averaging the results obtained from particle size analysis of three samples collected from three different events, was between 0.014 and 0.02 mm. More details are provided by Gao and Josefson (2012). The total runoff volume and sediment load for each event were calculated based on the storm flow of the event.
DWSM INPUT DATA PREPARATION

Various input parameters representing watershed morphological structure, topography, vegetation, soil, rainfall, and sediment need to be determined before simulation. These parameters can be conveniently divided into two categories: lumped and distributed parameters (table 1). Lumped parameters are single values for the entire watershed, while distributed parameters have different values for different overland elements and stream segments. CNAF, FAFO, and FAFC (table 1) are three key lumped and adjustable parameters whose changes affect the same rate the values of curve number (CN) and friction factor (i.e., Manning’s “n”) for each overland element and stream segment. HLR, VIN, VOG, VOR, SRG, and EVP (table 1) are lumped vegetation parameters. Our preliminary study (Gao et al., 2013) showed that VOG is the most sensitive parameter among the five and hence is treated as an adjustable parameter. The initial values of these five parameters were adopted from those used in Illinois watersheds (Borah et al., 2004). The value of the lumped rainfall parameter (GMAX) used in earlier applications by Borah et al. (2002) was adopted here. TEMP was assigned as 20°C in this study. The values of GAMA and SNU were the same as those used by Borah et al. (2002). RDC does not have a significant impact on modeling results, and hence its value was kept at 1.0 as in our preliminary study (Gao et al., 2013; Borah et al., 2002).

Figure 1. Study watershed (upper right), model structure (upper left), distribution of soil hydraulic groups (lower right), and land use and land cover (lower left). Land use and land cover (LULC) types: 0 = wetland/open water, 1 = crop lands, 2 = pasture, 3 = forest, and 4 = urban lands. Soil hydrological groups: 0 = no value, 1 = group A, 2 = group A/D, 3 = group B, 4 = group B/D, 5 = group C, 6 = group C/D, 7 = group D.
The distributed topographic parameters (OVA, SLEN, and SLOPE) for overland elements and stream segments were determined using 10 m DEM data and stream network data in ArcGIS. Manning’s “n” for each overland element and stream segment (i.e., FRICO and FRICC in Table 1) was determined following a commonly used guide (Arcement and Schneider, 1984) and the observations of our field survey. Runoff curve numbers for all overland elements (i.e., CN in Table 1) were determined using GIS techniques based on the land use and land cover (LULC) and soil maps shown in Figure 1. Values of CPER and EPER for stream segments (i.e., FRICO and FRICC in Table 1) were determined using 10 m DEM data and stream network segments determined using our survey data at multiple channel sections and the reference reach spreadsheet (v4.2 level) developed for channel survey management (Mecklenburg, 2006). CANO was assumed to be proportional to forest cover, and its values for overland elements were determined based on the area-weighted percentage of forest (Figure 1). GCOV was assumed to be proportional to impervious surface, and its values for overland elements were determined based on the area-weighted percentage of urban (Figure 1). Hydrologically, CONT is related to soil precedent condition, which is affected by the time interval between two storm events. It is very hard to quantify in practice. Fortunately, the value of CONT did not have a significant impact on modeling results. Therefore, we assumed that its variation among overland elements was proportional to the area-weighted percentage of forest. The final values were subsequently adjusted to the same range as those used in our previous study. HYCND, SORPTY, and COND are three different, but relevant, distributed parameters, so we used the calculated area-weighted soil $K$ factor ($K_i$) for each overland element to reflect the differences among all elements. These values served as initial values and were adjusted during model simulation. The spatially distributed values of FDCI over all elements were quantitatively represented as an inverse function of the percentages of forest and shrub because soils in elements with higher percentages of forest and shrub are more difficult to detach by flow than soils in elements with lower percentages of forest and shrub. This parameter was adjusted during simulation to achieve the best predicted sedigraphs.

**Two Different Runoff Simulation Methods**

DWSM has two different methods for simulating rainfall excess. The first method is an extension of the SCS runoff curve number (CN) procedure (the CN method) in which the rainfall excess rate (direct runoff rate) is calculated from CN values of the overland elements and breakpoint cumulative precipitation data (Borah, 1989a):

$$Q_r = \frac{(P-0.2S_x)^2}{P + 0.8S_x}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

$$S_x = \frac{254.000}{CN} - 254$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

$$I_{e,i} = \frac{Q_{r,i} - Q_{r,i-1}}{\Delta t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $P$ is the accumulated rainfall (mm), $i$ is the time step (the total number of time intervals from the beginning of simulation), $\Delta t$ is the time interval between time steps $i-1$ and $i$ (h), $I_{e,i}$ is the rainfall excess rate during time interval $\Delta t$ (mm h$^{-1}$), and $Q_{r,i}$ is the accumulated direct runoff or
rainfall excess at time step $i$ (mm). The CN method calculates the volume of surface runoff based on the values of $P$ and CN; it is relatively simple and has only one adjustable parameter (CNAF), whose change accounts for variations in the antecedent moisture conditions and estimation errors in $P$ and CN.

The second method, the interception-infiltration method, is a procedure in which the rate of rainfall excess is calculated by subtracting rainfall losses to interception (by both tree canopies and ground cover) and infiltration from rainfall intensity (Borah et al., 2002):

$$I_e = I - D_c I_c - D_x I_x - f$$ (4)

where $I_e$ is the rate of rainfall excess, $I$ is the rainfall intensity, $D_c$ is the canopy cover density, $I_c$ is the rate of canopy interception, $D_x$ is the ground cover density, $I_x$ is the rate of ground cover interception, and $f$ is the rate of infiltration. Values of $I_e$ and $I_c$ are determined based on the interception storage capacities and associated evaporation rates for canopies and ground cover, whose values are predetermined in the input file. The ponding time ($t_p$), which is the time period during which all rainfall on the ground infiltrates into the soil, and $f$ are determined using the 1-D diffusion equation for water under gravity (Smith and Parlange, 1978). Further descriptions of the Smith and Parlange (1978) solutions and their adoption in DWSM are provided by Borah et al. (1981), Borah et al. (2002), and Borah (2011). Values of $t_p$ and $f$ are dependent on soil hydraulic conductivity and sorptivity. Losses in depressive storage are indirectly accounted for in the interception as initial losses. Selecting this method means that CN and CNAF are replaced by three adjustable parameters (VOG, HYCND, and SORPTY) to simulate rainfall-runoff processes. Both methods were used in this study to test the prediction ability of DWSM.

**Surface Runoff Routing**

The excess rainfall over the overland elements and through the stream segments is routed using the kinematic wave approximations (Lighthill and Whitham, 1955) of the Saint-Venant or shallow water wave equations, as described by Borah (1989a) and Borah et al. (2002). The routing scheme is based on the analytical and approximate shock-fitting solutions (Borah et al., 1980) of the continuity and approximate momentum equations. The scheme is robust because of the closed-form solutions. FAFO and FAF are the relevant adjustable parameters used in the scheme.

**Subsurface Flow Routing**

A portion of the infiltrated water in an overland element flows downstream as subsurface flow and ultimately discharges laterally into the contributing channel. This flow can be accelerated due to the presence of tile drains. The kinematic storage equation used in SWAT (Arnold et al., 1998) was adopted in DWSM for subsurface flow simulations, as discussed by Borah et al. (2002, 2004). The two adjustable parameters used in these calculations are COND, representing the effective lateral saturated hydraulic conductivity, and CONT, reflecting the uniform initial moisture content of each overland element, although the latter was not significantly sensitive, as indicated earlier. Conservation of subsurface water mass is maintained by continuously updating the water volume via solution of the spatially uniform and temporally varying continuity equation (Borah et al., 2004).

**Erosion and Sediment Simulations**

The eroded soil or sediment in the study watershed was divided into four particle size classes. The erosion, deposition, and transport of each size class were simulated individually, and total responses in the form of sediment concentration, sediment discharge, and bed elevation change were obtained through integration of the responses from all size classes. The sediment transport capacity of the flow for a size class was computed using selected formulas from the literature, as discussed by Borah (1989b) and Borah et al. (2002).

DWSM maintains a loose soil depth in each overland element and channel bed to keep track of loose soil accumulated from bed materials detached by raindrop impact and/or from deposited sediment. Sediment entrainment takes place from this loose soil layer as long as the sediment transport capacity of the flow is higher than the sediment load, or all the materials from the layer are entrained and become part of the sediment load. If the transport capacity continues to exceed the load, the flow erodes additional soil from the parent bed material, and the potential erosion is the difference between the transport capacity and the load. Actual erosion is computed simply by multiplying the potential erosion by the only adjustable parameter, the flow detachment coefficient (FDCI) (table 1), for overland elements and stream segments (Borah, 1989b; Borah et al., 2002).

If the sediment transport capacity is lower than the sediment load, the flow is in deposition mode, and the potential rate of deposition is equal to the difference between the transport capacity and the load. The actual rate of deposition is computed by taking into account particle fall velocities (Borah, 1989b; Borah et al., 2002). From the actual erosion and deposition, the change in bed elevation during a computational time interval is computed. All these processes are interrelated and must satisfy locally the conservation principle of sediment mass expressed by the sediment continuity equation. With some approximations, the continuity equation is solved by the method of characteristics, and the solution is used to keep track of erosion, deposition, sediment discharge, and bed elevation change along the unit width of an overland element or the flow section of a stream segment (Borah, 1989b; Borah et al., 2002).

**Modeling the Study Watershed**

The first five storm events (two large and three small) in table 2 were selected to test the performance of DWSM. These events had various precipitation amounts and durations and hence represent typical events that generate significant storm flows and suspended sediment loads over rainfall-dominated periods in the study watershed. The September 26, 2010, event was the largest event of the year, while the August 22, 2010, event produced comparable $Q_{peak}$ and $Q_{peak}$. Although the October 7 and October 14,
2010, events had apparently small amounts of precipitation, they produced peak discharges ($Q_{peak}$) that were comparable to those of the June 28, 2010, event with larger precipitation. These three events are representative of small events in the study watershed. For each event, values of the adjustable parameters associated with each method were changed to find the best fits for the hydrographs and sedimentographs of each of the selected storm events, as parameter values vary due to changes in the physical conditions of a watershed during a year. Understanding this variation is critical for judging model performance (Borah and Ashraf, 1990) and for using the model as a management tool. The model performance for each event was quantified using the percent error, $E_p$ (i.e., the ratio of the difference between predicted and measured variables to the measured variable in percentage), and the coefficient of efficiency, $E_c$ (Beven, 1993):

$$E_c = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( A_P^i - \bar{A}_m^i \right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( A_P^i - A_m^i \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( A_P^i - \bar{A}_m^i \right)^2}$$

where $A$ is either $Q$ or $Q_s$, $\bar{A}_m$ is the mean of measured $A$, and $A_P^i$ and $A_m^i$ are the predicted and measured values of $A$, respectively. Values of $E_p$ describe the event-lumped goodness-of-fit, while values of $E_c$ characterize the degree of synchronization between measured and simulated values for one event. Zema et al. (2012) showed that the threshold value for an acceptable prediction should be $E_c = 0.36$. This threshold was adopted as a criterion for judging model performance.

To examine the variability of the best-fitted sets of parameters, we performed sensitivity analyses for these parameters in both runoff methods using the September 26, 2010, event, as we did not see significant changes in sensitivity among the five events. The parameters used for the CN method were CNAF, FAFO, FAFC, COND, CONT, and FDCI, while the parameters used for the infiltration-interception method were VOG, HYCND, SORPTY, FAFO, FAFC, COND, CONT, and FDCI. Based on these results, we then identified the most sensitive parameters for four modeling outcomes, i.e., peak water discharge ($Q_{peak}$), total event runoff volume ($V_{tot}$), peak sediment discharge ($Q_{peak}$), and total event sediment load ($SSYe$), and subsequently found a set of parameters that led to reasonable predictions for all five storm events. We then verified the use of these values in model prediction using two additional events, a large event (June 28, 2013) and a small event (April 17, 2010), and subsequently proposed a general modeling procedure.

### RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

#### MODEL CALIBRATION USING FIVE STORM EVENTS

Using the CN method, the values of the six adjustable parameters were changed during the simulation, which led to a set of parameters that produced the best-fitted hydrographs and sedimentographs for the first five rainfall events (table 3). For the June 28, 2010, event, predicted peak water and sediment discharges at the watershed outlet arrived at almost the same time as the measured values, with 21.6% and 25.7% underestimation in magnitudes, respectively (table 4). The predicted hydrograph and sedimentograph were generally consistent with the measured ones, which indicated 11.5% underestimation for $V_{tot}$ and 20.6% overestimation for $SSYe$. The consistency between the predicted and measured variables was further confirmed by the relatively high values of $E_p$ (table 4). Modeling outcomes for the August 22, 2010, event were good for $Q_{peak}$, $V_{tot}$, and $Q_{peak}$ but not for $SSYe$, which was caused by an overall delay of suspended sediment concentrations and confirmed by the relatively low $E_c$ value (fig. 2 and table 4). Because the measured $Q$ values were calculated using the established sediment rating curve, which was based on a limited number of measured sediment concentrations, the calculated $Q_{peak}$ and $Q_{peak}$ were not as accurate as the other parameters.

### Table 2. Properties of storm events selected for DWSM modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Event</th>
<th>Precipitation (mm)</th>
<th>Duration (h)</th>
<th>$Q_{peak}$ (m$^3$/s)</th>
<th>$Q_{peak}$ (kg/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 2010</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 22, 2010</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26, 2010</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2010</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14, 2010</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2010</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 2013</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Parameter values for the best-fitted model results for the first five storm events (parameters are defined in table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Event</th>
<th>CNAF</th>
<th>FAFO</th>
<th>FAFC</th>
<th>COND</th>
<th>CONT</th>
<th>FDCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 2010</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 22, 2010</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 2010</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7, 2010</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 14, 2010</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Quantitative evaluation of model results for the first five storm events.[a]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Event</th>
<th>$V_{tot}$</th>
<th>$SSYe$</th>
<th>$Q_{peak}$ (m$^3$/s)</th>
<th>$Q_{peak}$ (kg/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 2010</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-26.0</td>
<td>-21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 22, 2010</td>
<td>-20.4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 2010</td>
<td>-21.8</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7, 2010</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 14, 2010</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] $V_{tot}$ = total event runoff volume, $SSYe$ = total event sediment load, $Q_{peak}$ = peak water discharge, $Q_{peak}$ = peak sediment discharge, $E_p$ = percent error of prediction, and $E_c$ = coefficient of efficiency (defined in eq. 5).
other $Q_s$ values along the sedigraph may not be accurate, leading to the difference between the modeled and measured sedigraphs. For the largest storm event (September 26, 2010), the predicted shapes of the hydrograph and sedigraph and the four associated quantities were similar to their measured counterparts, although $V_{tot}$ was underpredicted by 21.8% (table 4). For the two October events, the measured hydrographs were fitted better than the measured sedigraphs, which was consistent with their higher $E_c$ values (table 4). Values of $Q_{peak}$ were underestimated by 19.7% and 33.5%, respectively, while those of $SSY_e$ were overestimated by 22.5% and 36.7%, respectively. Because only the $E_c$ value for $SSY_e$ prediction for the August 22, 2010, event was less than the threshold value, we believed that DWSM performed well for the five events. Overall, the goodness-of-fit for the five events increased as precipitation increased (tables 2 and 4). It appears that DWSM can better predict the hydrographs and sedigraphs of large storm events, which is consistent with the modeling results for other watersheds (Borah et al., 2007).

We also simulated the five events using the infiltration-interception (I-I) method. The parameters common to both methods did not necessarily have the same values (table 3). For the June 28, 2010, event, the $E_v$ values for $Q_{peak}$, $V_{tot}$, and $SSY_e$ were all lower than those based on the CN method, whereas the $E_v$ value for $Q_{peak}$ was slightly higher than that based on the CN method (table 4), indicating that predictions of hydrographs and sedigraphs based on the I-I method were generally better than those based on the CN method. The predicted shape was better for sedigraphs and about the same for hydrographs compared to those based on the CN method (table 4). For the August 22, 2010, event, the I-I method led to an improved prediction for $SSY_e$ but slightly worse predictions for $Q_{peak}$, $V_{tot}$, and $Q_{peak}$ (fig. 3 and table 4). The predicted shapes of the hydrograph and sedigraph were closer to those of the measured ones as compared to those created using the CN method (table 4). For the September 26, 2010, event, the predictions of $Q_{peak}$, $V_{tot}$, and $SSY_e$ were obviously improved, while the prediction of $Q_{peak}$ remained similar to that based on the CN method. The predicted shapes of the hydrograph and sedigraph were similar to the measured ones, akin to those based on the CN method (table 4). The predictions of $Q_{peak}$ and $SSY_e$ were noticeably improved (table 4). The hydrograph and sedigraph for the October 7, 2010, event as predicted by the I-I method were also closer to the measured ones with respect to those predicted by the CN method (table 4). For the October 14, 2010, event, the I-I method led to significantly improved prediction for $SSY_e$, while the predictions for $Q_{peak}$, $Q_{peak}$, and $V_{tot}$ were similar to those based on the CN method (table 4). Overall, the modeling results based on the I-I method were better than those based on the CN method. However, the CN method still provided reasonable predictions for all five events despite its relative simplicity. These results indicate that DWSM is capable of characterizing event-based hydrological and sediment transport processes in the study watershed.
Model Sensitivity to Adjustable Parameters

Although the modeling results showed that DWSM is an appropriate model for reproducing the observed behavior of water movement and sediment transport during a given storm event in the study watershed, the model still cannot be applied for estimating the hydrograph and sedigraph of a future event with known precipitation because the sets of parameters used for the five selected events and two rainfall-runoff methods were different.

Sensitivity analyses (i.e., changing one parameter while holding the others constant) for the CN method indicated that changes in FAFO, FAFC, COND, and CONT had limited, but variable, effects on the predicted $Q_{\text{peak}}$ (fig. 4a). For example, a 10% increase in FAFO and FAFC led to a less than 10% and 3% decrease in $Q_{\text{peak}}$, respectively. However, a less than 5% change in CNAF could easily cause a change of more than one order of magnitude in $Q_{\text{peak}}$, indicating the significantly higher sensitivity of the modeling results to CNAF than to the other parameters. For $Q_{\text{peak}}$, CNAF was also the most sensitive parameter (fig. 4b). The results of the sensitivity analyses for $V_{\text{tot}}$ and $SSY_e$ also showed a distinctly high impact of CNAF on the modeling results. Clearly, among all the adjustable parameters, CNAF was the most sensitive, indicating that CN was the most sensitive physically based hydrologic parameter.

For the I-I method, sensitivity analyses showed that HYCND had the most significant impact on the predicted $Q_{\text{peak}}$ and $Q_{\text{spea}}$. An increase of more than two orders of magnitude in $Q_{\text{peak}}$ and about 30% change in $Q_{\text{spea}}$ were caused by only 10% increase in HYCND (fig. 5). Changes in VOG also significantly affected the predicted values of $Q_{\text{peak}}$. A 10% increase in VOG led to a 17% decrease in $Q_{\text{peak}}$ and about 20% change in $Q_{\text{spea}}$. A 10% change in the other parameters caused much less change in $Q_{\text{peak}}$ and $Q_{\text{spea}}$. This general pattern remained for the sensitivity analyses of $V_{\text{tot}}$ and $SSY_e$. Therefore, the modeling results were significantly sensitive to two parameters (HYCND and VOG) for the I-I method.

Simulation with Calibrated Parameters

For the CN method, we identified a set of values for FAFO, FAFC, COND, CONT, and FDCI with variable CNAF values that allowed the predicted hydrographs and sedigraphs to reasonably fit those of the first five storm events (table 5). For the June 28, 2010, event, the predictive errors for $Q_{\text{peak}}$, $Q_{\text{spea}}$, $V_{\text{tot}}$, and $SSY_e$ were the same as those based on the best-fitted set of parameters (tables 4 and 6). For the August 22, 2010, event, the errors for $Q_{\text{peak}}$ and $SSY_e$ were slightly greater than, and the errors for $Q_{\text{spea}}$ and $V_{\text{tot}}$ were slightly less than, those based on the best-fitted set.
of parameters. For the September 26, 2010, event, the $E_p$ value for $Q_{peak}$ was greater than that based on the best-fitted set of parameters, while errors for the other three variables were discernibly less than those based on the best-fitted set of parameters. For the October 7, 2010, event, only the October 14, 2010, event demonstrated the best-fitted set of parameters. Among the first five events, only the October 14, 2010, event showed less error than that based on the best-fitted set of parameters, while errors for the other three variables were discernibly less than those based on the best-fitted set of parameters. For the September 26, 2010, event, only the October 14, 2010, event demonstrated the best-fitted set of parameters. By contrast, for the October 7, 2010, event, only the October 14, 2010, event had less error than that based on the best-fitted set of parameters. Therefore, the same set of the parameters may be generally applied to relatively larger storm events in the study watershed.

The variation of CNAF values among the first five events is not surprising because an earlier study showed that CNAF varied significantly among events in a year (Bo rah and Ashraf, 1990). However, our analysis showed that a strong correlation existed between CNAF and the associated event precipitation (fig. 6):

$$CNAF = 2.90P^{-0.27}, r^2 = 0.983$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $P$ is the precipitation of the simulated storm event. Equation 6 indicates that CNAF decreases as precipitation increases. This is at odds with the hydrological principle: a higher magnitude of precipitation tends to produce more surface runoff, which implies a higher CNAF. This apparent contradiction lies in the fact that CNAF not only reflects the antecedent soil moisture condition but also accounts for errors in the input rainfall data. Given that our modeling was based on rainfall data from only one station, the spatial distribution of a rainfall event was not accurately reflected by the input rainfall data. Therefore, the decreasing trend for CNAF with the increase in precipitation mainly reflects the adjustment of CNAF to the errors in the input rainfall data. Comparison of the CNAF values estimated using equation 6 with the predicted values for the first five events (table 5) demonstrated that the percentage errors were generally less than 2.2%, with 5.6% for June 28, 2010, and 9% for October 14, 2010, suggesting that equation 6 may provide a benchmark value for CNAF. CNAF may be further adjusted in terms of other information (e.g., a known event hydrograph) to achieve the best model prediction.

Because sensitivity analyses showed that the modeling outcomes were most sensitive to HYCND and VOG for the I-I method, we ran DWSM for the first five events with various combinations of the adjustable parameters and found a set of parameters with variable VOG and HYCND values for the five events (table 5). The prediction errors of these events were generally higher than those based on the best-fitted parameters but were still acceptable (tables 4 and 6). Although VOG and HYCND were both variable among the five events, they were highly correlated to precipitation (fig. 6):

$$VOG = 0.022P - 0.275, r^2 = 0.996 \hspace{1cm} (7a)$$

$$HYCND = 0.0011P - 0.0001, r^2 = 0.932 \hspace{1cm} (7b)$$

For the two large events (August 22, 2010, and September 26, 2010), the percentage errors between the values estimated using equations 7a and 7b and the predicted values (table 5) were less than 2% and 3% for VOG and

---

**Table 5. Parameter values with variable CNAF, VOG, and HYCND for the first five storm events (parameters are defined in table 1).**

| Storm Event  | CNAF (%) | FAFO (%) | FAFC (%) | COND (%) | CONT (%) | FDCT (%) | FAFO (%) | FAFC (%) | COND (%) | CONT (%) | FDCT (%) | CNAF (%) | FAFO (%) | FAFC (%) | COND (%) | CONT (%) | FDCT (%) | VOG (%) | COND (%) | CONT (%) | FDCT (%) | HYCND (%) | SORPTY (%) |
|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| June 28, 2010  | 1.17     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      |
| Aug. 22, 2010  | 0.88     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      |
| Sept. 26, 2010 | 0.85     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      |
| Oct. 7, 2010   | 1.40     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      |
| Oct. 14, 2010  | 1.37     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      | 1.2      | 0.001    | 0.3      | 0.02     | 3.5      |

---

**Table 6. Quantitative evaluation of model results for the first five storm events with variable CNAF, VOG, and HYCND.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Event</th>
<th>$V_{50}$ (%)</th>
<th>$SS_{50}$ (%)</th>
<th>$Q_{speak}$ (%)</th>
<th>$Q_{peak}$ (%)</th>
<th>$V_{50}$ (%)</th>
<th>$SS_{50}$ (%)</th>
<th>$Q_{speak}$ (%)</th>
<th>$Q_{peak}$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 2010</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-21.6</td>
<td>-25.7</td>
<td>-14.3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 22, 2010</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-25.1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 2010</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>-25.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7, 2010</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-22.4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 14, 2010</td>
<td>-26.0</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>-31.4</td>
<td>-44.3</td>
<td>-41.3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 6. Empirical relationships between precipitation and the most sensitive parameters.
HYCND, respectively. Again, these two equations primarily reflect the adjustment of VOG and HYCND to the errors in the input rainfall data. Therefore, for a future event, the VOG and HYCND values estimated using equations 7a and 7b can be used as benchmark values with the other identified parameters (table 5) to produce initial predictions of the hydrograph and sedigraph. The best-fitted values need to be further determined with additional information.

VALIDATION USING TWO ADDITIONAL EVENTS

Modeling the two additional events (i.e., the last two events in table 2) by changing the adjustable parameters based on table 5 and equations 6, 7a, and 7b showed that the predicted hydrographs and sedigraphs fit the measured ones well (fig. 7). Prediction errors for Qpeak and Qspeak were less than 10% for June 26, 2013, and 30% for the April 17, 2010. Predictions of \(V_{\text{tot}}\) and \(SSY_e\) using the CN method were generally better than those of the I-I method for the first event, while the inverse held for the second event (table 7). These results show that starting with the parameter values shown in table 5 and suggested by equations 6, 7a, and 7b, we may efficiently find a set of adjustable parameters that lead to acceptable predictions for the hydrograph and sedigraph of a given event in the study watershed.

DISCUSSION

PITFALLS OF DETERMINING MODEL PARAMETERS

With the same model structure (fig. 1), we were able to identify two different sets of adjustable parameters (i.e., tables 3 and 5) for both the CN and I-I methods that are acceptable for characterizing the observed hydrological and sediment transport processes for the first five storm events, suggesting the existence of uncertainties in determining these parameters. To reduce the uncertainties, we determined the initial values of the adjustable parameters based on their physical meaning and based on the literature from values used in other watersheds.

For instance, we know that the friction factors of overland elements should be greater than those of stream segments. Therefore, we ensured that changes in the associated adjustable parameters did not violate this hydraulic characteristic. In another example, the effective lateral saturated hydraulic conductivity (COND) is difficult to accurately determine \textit{a priori}. A previous modeling study in the Court Creek watershed in Illinois (Borah et al., 2004) showed that COND = 0.01 in. h^{-1}. Compared with the Court Creek watershed, where subsurface (or lateral) flow is controlled by agricultural tile flow, lateral flow in the study watershed is dominated by soil texture and ground cover type, and hence the associated COND should be significantly less than in the Court Creek watershed. Based on this hydrological factor, values of COND for the first five events were less than 0.01 in. h^{-1} (tables 3 and 5). Following the same principle, we believe that the value of FDCI in the best-fitted set of parameters for the October 7, 2010, event (table 3) is not reasonable, although it led to relatively small predictive errors (\(E_p = 18.96\%\) for \(SSY_e\) and 0.69% for \(Q_{\text{peak}}\)) (table 4). The reason is that this value is more than one order of magnitude larger than those for the other four events. Within the same season, the nature of sediment transport in the same watershed should not change dramatically from event to event, and FDCI should be constant.

APPROPRIATE USE OF THE TWO METHODS

The model calibration and validation (i.e., tables 4 and 7) both suggest that either the CN or I-I method may be used for prediction for large events, whereas the I-I method should be used for small events. Because the CN method is simpler than the I-I method, it should be used for large events. Two reasons may explain this result. First, large events are normally caused by large storms, which tend to be more uniformly distributed over the entire watershed.

Table 7. Model validation results using two additional storm events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Event</th>
<th>(V_{\text{tot}})</th>
<th>(SSY_e)</th>
<th>Infiltration-Interception Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 2013</td>
<td>34.1 (E_p = 34.1%) (E_c = 0.73%)</td>
<td>18.9 (E_p = 18.9%) (E_c = 0.52%)</td>
<td>12.0 (E_p = 12.0%) (E_c = 0.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14, 2010</td>
<td>-0.52 (E_p = -0.52%) (E_c = 0.64%)</td>
<td>41.2 (E_p = 41.2%) (E_c = 0.31%)</td>
<td>21.2 (E_p = 21.2%) (E_c = 0.73%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Example of model results for two additional events: (a) June 28, 2013, with the CN method and (b) April 17, 2010, with the infiltration-interception method.
Thus, the rainfall data series used in the input data file may represent the rainfall distribution more accurately. Second, the I-I method allows better prediction of infiltration capacity (i.e., $f$ in eq. 4) by adjusting HYCND and SORPTY. For large events, rainfall intensity ($I_e$) is higher than infiltration capacity ($f$). Therefore, the rainfall excess ($I_e$) in equation 4 is mainly controlled by $I_e$ and more accurate prediction of $f$ may not necessarily increase the accuracy of the prediction for $I_e$. For small events, however, the values of $f$ and $I_e$ are comparable, and thus better prediction of $f$ could lead to better prediction of $I_e$.

**PROCEDURE FOR USING DWSM TO ESTIMATE EVENT-BASED DISCHARGES**

A general modeling procedure for using DWSM to estimate the water ($Q$) and sediment ($Q_s$) discharges of a storm event or to predict those of a future event is as follows:

1. Based on the recorded or predicted precipitation, determine which method to use, i.e., the I-I method for small events or the CN method for large events.
2. For small events, values of the key parameters (i.e., FAFC, FAFO, COND, CONT, SORPTY, and FDCI) in table 5 can be adopted, and VOG and HYCND can be determined using equations 7a and 7b. Fine-tune these values in terms of the $Q$ and $Q_s$ of a previous similar event and predict the hydrograph and sediment graph for the target events.
3. For large events, values of the key parameters (i.e., FAFC, FAFO, COND, CONT, and FDCI) in table 5 can be adopted, and CNAF can be determined using equation 6. Using the values of $Q$ and $Q_s$ of a previous similar event as a reference, adjust these parameters (starting with CNAF, the most sensitive parameter) to achieve the best model prediction.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

The Dynamic Watershed Simulation Model (DWSM), a physically based watershed model, was employed to predict the water and sediment discharges of five storm events with variable intensities and sizes in the upper Oneida Creek watershed, a medium-sized watershed in central New York State. Both the CN and infiltration-interception rainfall-runoff methods were used in these predictions, which involved six and eight adjustable parameters, respectively. For each method, we successfully identified a set of adjustable parameters that allowed DWSM to predict the measured hydrographs and sediment graphs of the five events with limited errors. These successful predictions showed that DWSM was generally capable of capturing the event-based dynamic processes of water movement and sediment transport in the study watershed. We identified the most sensitive parameters using sensitivity analysis for both methods, and we then applied the same set of less-sensitive adjustable parameters and statistical equations for the most sensitive parameters: CNAF, HYCND, and VOG, with the first expressed non-linearly (eq. 6) and the other two expressed linearly (eqs. 7b and 7a, respectively) in terms of event precipitation. These results led to a general procedure for using DWSM as a management tool to estimate event-based sediment dynamics in the study watershed, which was verified using two additional storm events. The procedure may be easily extended to other watersheds in central New York State.

The CN method is easy to perform and may be used for prediction for large storm events because of the relatively uniform distribution of rainfall and the higher rainfall intensity than infiltration capacity. The I-I method has more adjustable parameters and is more flexible. It should be used for predicting small storm events due to the more important role of infiltration capacity in determining the amount of rainfall excess. For any watershed, physical conditions vary from event to event. Therefore, it is essentially impossible to find a unique set of adjustable parameters for either of the rainfall-runoff methods that lead to accurate predictions for all events. The proposed procedure provides an efficient means of identifying the most appropriate values of the key parameters for the best model prediction.

This procedure is robust and may be used as a cost-effective tool in watershed management.
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