

1 NRCS-CN ESTIMATION FROM ON-SITE AND REMOTE  
2 SENSING DATA FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF A RESERVOIR  
3 IN THE EASTERN PYRENEES

4  
5 Marcos Sanz-Ramos<sup>1\*</sup>, Belén Martí-Cardona<sup>2</sup>, Ernest Bladé<sup>3</sup>, Irene Seco<sup>4</sup>, Arnau  
6 Amengual<sup>5</sup>, Hélène Roux<sup>6</sup>, Romu Romero<sup>7</sup>

7  
8 <sup>1</sup>Institut Flumen, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya – International Center for Numerical Methods in  
9 Engineering, Barcelona, Spain – E-mail: marcos.sanz-ramos@upc.edu; ORCID: [https://orcid.org/0000-0003-](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2534-0039)  
10 2534-0039

11 <sup>2</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Surrey, U.K. – E-Mail: b.marti-  
12 cardona@surrey.ac.uk; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7519-1399>

13 <sup>3</sup>Institut Flumen, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya – International Center for Numerical Methods in  
14 Engineering, Barcelona, Spain – E-mail: ernest.blade@upc.edu; ORCID: [https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1770-](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1770-3960)  
15 3960

16 <sup>4</sup>Institut Flumen, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya – International Center for Numerical Methods in  
17 Engineering, Barcelona, Spain – E-mail: irene.seco@upc.edu; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0541-2605>

18 <sup>5</sup>Grup de Meteorologia, Departament de Física, Universitat de les Illes Balears, Palma, Mallorca, Spain – E-  
19 mail: arnau.amengual@uib.es; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6108-2850>

20 <sup>6</sup>Université de Toulouse, CNRS - Toulouse, France – E-mail: helene.roux@imft.fr; ORCID:  
21 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7076-5015>

22 <sup>7</sup>Grup de Meteorologia, Departament de Física, Universitat de les Illes Balears, Palma, Mallorca, Spain – E-  
23 mail: romu.romero@uib.es; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9091-8688>

24  
25 \*Corresponding author: marcos.sanz-ramos@upc.edu

26  
27 **ABSTRACT**

28 On-site and Earth observation (EO) data are used for the calibration of the Natural  
29 Resources Conservation Service-Curve Number (NRCS-CN) value in a hydrological simulation  
30 model. The model was developed for La Muga catchment (Eastern Pyrenees) highly vulnerable  
31 to flood and drought episodes. It is an integral part of a regional reservoir management tool,  
32 which aims at minimizing the flood risk, while maximizing the preservation of water storage. The  
33 CN values were optimized for five recorded events for the model to match the observed  
34 hydrographs at the reservoir, when supported with the measured rainfall intensities. This study  
35 also investigates the possibilities of using antecedent moisture conditions (AMC) retrieved from  
36 satellite data to inform the selection of the NRCS-CN losses parameter. A good correlation was  
37 found between the calibrated CN values and the AMC obtained from satellite data. This  
38 correlation highlights the interest in using EO data to update NRCS-CN estimates. This advances  
39 in hydrologic-hydraulic coupled modelling combined with new remote sensing datasets present  
40 valuable opportunities and potential benefits for flood risk management and water resources  
41 preservation.

42  
43  
44 **Key words:** NRCS-CN, remote sensing, flood risk, reservoir management, hydrological  
45 distributed modelling, antecedent moisture condition (AMC), Mediterranean region.

47 1. INTRODUCTION

48 Droughts and floods are recurrent situations in Mediterranean catchments. In this semi-  
49 arid region, streams are characterized by intermittent flows due to the irregularity of rainfall and  
50 to the seasonal temperature variability. In a large portion of the Mediterranean region, the  
51 highly-urbanized areas and the population seasonality due to tourism, increase the water  
52 demands and at the same time the flood risk. Periods of water scarcity alternate with periods of  
53 frequent flooding that are becoming more severe under the influence of climate change (Arnell  
54 1999; IPCC 2014a; Lehner et al. 2006). The management of water resources in these water-  
55 stressed areas is therefore complex.

56 Floods are the most catastrophic natural hazard around the world (Fonseca et al. 2018;  
57 ISDR 2009; Kron 2005). In the Mediterranean region, according to the EM-DAT (2019) Disaster  
58 Database, floods are around 30 % of the natural disasters that occurred in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. On  
59 the other hand, droughts are a cyclic phenomenon in the Mediterranean region. Their  
60 management is a challenge for water administrations, especially during the summer season with  
61 its higher demand for water resources. The vulnerability of the Mediterranean area to droughts  
62 and floods is continually increasing due to the high economic dependency on water resources  
63 and to the possible consequences of climate change (GECCC 2016; IPCC 2014b).

64 In this context, dams and reservoirs are essential elements for providing protection  
65 against flooding and ensuring the water supply year-round. The complexity of water resources  
66 and dam management requires the integration of several disciplines (meteorology, hydrology,  
67 hydraulics, etc.) and a deep knowledge of the system characteristics (catchment), inputs  
68 (rainfall) and outputs (demands). The use of realistic modelling that considers all these factors  
69 can lead to more effective predictions and more effective hazard mitigation.

70 At present, several modelling tools integrate two-dimensional hydraulic modelling with  
71 distributed hydrological modelling (Anees et al. 2017; Caro 2016; Cea et al. 2010; Kim et al. 2012;

72 Roux et al. 2011; Viero et al. 2014; Yu and Duan 2017). Integrated or coupled modelling can  
73 better represent the real hydrologic and hydraulic processes than using these models  
74 independently. Nevertheless, models depend on a large number of parameters (e.g. soil and  
75 land characteristics, underground fluxes, etc.) as well as on expertise in their implementation  
76 for risk and water resources management applications. The calibration and use of these tools  
77 can be complex, as the number of the required parameters depends often on limited data or on  
78 data with inadequate quality, and are not always directly physically measurable.

79 In this context, this paper first presents the results of the implementation and calibration  
80 of a coupled hydrological and hydraulic model. This model was used as a tool to define and  
81 implement management strategies for the Boadella Dam, located in the upper part of La Muga  
82 catchment (NE of Spain). This model belongs to a series of methods developed under the PGRI-  
83 EPM project (*Forecasting and management of flood risk in the Pyrenees-Mediterranean*  
84 *Euroregion*) for the operational management of reservoirs in the region (Roux et al. 2020; Sanz-  
85 Ramos et al. 2018). The designed management method is mainly based on modelling in a  
86 cascade of the involved processes (short-term precipitation forecast and coupled hydrologic and  
87 hydraulic processes). The objective is to minimize the flood risk and, at the same time, to  
88 maximize the preservation of water resources during the management of extreme events.

89 The main factors that influence flood generation are related with the rainfall  
90 characteristics and the physical and hydrological characteristics of the catchment. The losses,  
91 mainly by infiltration and interception, are a determining factor in the rainfall-runoff  
92 transformation process. One of the most extended methods for losses estimation is the Soil  
93 Conservation Service Curve Number method (SCS-CN; NRCS 2004), also referred as the NRCS-  
94 CN method after the Agency was renamed as the Natural Resources Conservation Service. The  
95 fact that requires only one parameter for modelling losses has contributed to its success. In the  
96 NRCS-CN method, the Curve Number parameter (CN), although not physically-based, is a

97 quantitative descriptor which embodies the complex physical characteristics of the soil type,  
98 antecedent soil moisture conditions (AMC), and land use and cover (LULC) in a catchment.  
99 Hence, a proper choice of the CN value is essential to achieve realistic rainfall-runoff simulations.

100 The determination of the AMC and thus of the CN value can be improved with the use of  
101 remote sensing techniques. These techniques provide spatially distributed retrievals for a wide  
102 variety of hydrological parameters (Estévez et al. 2014; Marti-Cardona et al. 2013; Martí-  
103 Cardona et al. 2010; Ramos-Fuertes et al. 2013; Torres-Batló et al. 2019; Wu et al. 2018),  
104 including surface soil moisture (SM). Also, remote sensing is a powerful tool for the observation  
105 of the hydrological processes and a relevant source of information for the calibration of  
106 numerical models describing such processes (Li et al. 2019; Ramos-Fuertes et al. 2013). The  
107 hydrological modelling community is progressively benefiting from the incorporation of spatial  
108 soil moisture measurements, with a varied degree of success (Brocca et al. 2017). Remote  
109 sensing has been used for indirect estimation of the CN value by obtaining land use information  
110 from satellite images (Tirkey et al. 2014), but also for the adjustment of loss parameters  
111 (Silvestro et al. 2015). Rajib et al. (2016) explored the usage of spatially distributed remotely  
112 sensed soil moisture in the calibration of a hydrological model.

113 Against this background, this work aims at showing the relevance of remote sensed soil  
114 moisture data for the CN estimation within a coupled distributed hydrologic-hydraulic model  
115 procedure oriented at water reservoir management. This main objective is achieved through  
116 three secondary goals applied on a case study: (i) set up and calibration of the hydrological  
117 model; (ii) analysis of the variability of the CN within several registered events and (iii)  
118 identification of a relationship between the calibrated CN values and the estimated SM data  
119 from EO. The application of this technique in the study case is intended to provide better  
120 information for integrated flood risk and water resources management in continuous modelling.

121 2. STUDY AREA

122 2.1. SITE AND CATCHMENT CHARACTERISTICS

123 La Muga is a cross-border basin of 961 km<sup>2</sup> located at the northeast of Catalonia  
124 (northeast Spain) that drains from the south-east Pyrenees to the Mediterranean Sea (Fig. 1a).  
125 The basin is partially regulated by the Boadella Dam (182 km<sup>2</sup>), at the upper-part of the  
126 catchment, with 62 hm<sup>3</sup> of storage and a regulating capacity of 15 hm<sup>3</sup>. The basin, which includes  
127 some highly developed tourist areas at its lower part (Costa Brava), is highly vulnerable to  
128 drought due to excessive water demand (agriculture and human consumption) and to flooding  
129 (ACA 2007).

130 The topography of the study area ranges from mountains to lowlands (Fig. 1a) and the  
131 rainfall regime in the catchment is significantly influenced by the Mediterranean Sea. The  
132 average annual rainfall ranges from 550 mm near the coast to 1200 mm in the upper part. Heavy  
133 rainfall episodes tend to concentrate in late summer, autumn and spring, lasting from several  
134 hours up to a few days. The variable rainfall frequency and long dry periods cause the area to  
135 suffer from severe water scarcity (Llasat and Rodriguez 1992; Martín-Vide 1994).

136 This work focuses on the upper part of La Muga basin, upstream of the Boadella Dam,  
137 where there is a single rainfall gauge and one water level gauge (Fig. 1a). The study area has an  
138 extension of 181 km<sup>2</sup> and is mainly characterized by large-forest coverage (above 90 %, Fig. 1b),  
139 low permeability and low ground storage capacity (ACA 2007). The reservoir is included in the  
140 hydrological analysis and modelling, and it has been calibrated with the measures of water level  
141 and their variations during extreme rainfall events.

142 2.2. DATA SET

143 Rainfall and water level

144 A detailed analysis of extreme rainfall events was performed within the PGRI-EPM project  
145 (Sanz-Ramos et al. 2018) through which more than 60 significant rainfall episodes registered  
146 during the last 100 years were evaluated. From the results of that analysis, five extreme rainfall

147 events were selected for calibration of the proposed model (Table 1). The selected events,  
148 occurred between March 2011 and March 2015, are labelled with the starting date and the  
149 duration in days. The selected episodes have all mean rainfall intensities above 20 mm/h in  
150 5 minutes, and total precipitation volumes over 120 mm in periods between 2 and 4 days.

151 The data of precipitation and water level in the reservoir were provided by the Servei  
152 Meteorològic de Catalunya (SMC) and the Agència Catalana de l'Aigua (ACA) respectively. They  
153 consisted of 5-minute hyetographs recorded at the Boadella dam station; rasters of 1x1 km  
154 spatially distributed hourly rainfall derived from radar (Bech et al. 2005; Corral et al. 2009); and  
155 the evolution of the water level in the reservoir (5-minute resolution).

156 Digital terrain model (DTM) and land uses

157 Topographical data were derived from a high-resolution 2x2 m DTM provided by the  
158 Institut Cartogràfic i Geològic de Catalunya (ICGC). The DTM includes the bathymetry of the  
159 reservoir above 145.0 m.a.s.l. (below the minimum water level during the events).

160 Land use data, obtained from the CORINE project (EEA 2007), was used for the  
161 implementation of the surface roughness coefficient ( $n$  Manning coefficient). Additional details  
162 regarding these data can be found in Table 2.

163 Soil Moisture Data

164 Soil moisture data were obtained from the European Space Agency Climate Change  
165 Initiative for Soil Moisture (ESA CCI SM) (Liu et al. 2011, 2012; Wagner et al. 2012). The combined  
166 product version 4.2 (ESA et al. 2018) was obtained for the periods covering the selected rainfall  
167 events and for some days prior to their onset, with a maximum of 50 days. The product consists  
168 of daily rasters of volumetric soil moisture for the soil's top 20 mm. The rasters are provided  
169 with a spatial resolution of 0.25° degrees, which for the study area corresponds to  
170 approximately 27.5 km.

171 La Muga catchment is encompassed by two resolution cells of the ESA CCI SM product.  
172 85 % of the catchment area overlays a raster cell entirely located on the southern Pyrenees,  
173 while the remaining 15 % falls within a cell mainly covering the northern Pyrenean side. Moisture  
174 data from both cells exhibit a markedly distinctive behavior, as expected from the different  
175 precipitation regimes on either side of the mountain range. Since the study catchment belongs  
176 to the southern Pyrenees, only the ESA CCI SM moisture records from the southern cell were  
177 used, assuming that they would better represent the catchment moisture status than a  
178 weighted average of both cells.

### 179 3. METHODS

180 The cascade workflow presented herein is as follows: 1) building-up a coupled  
181 hydrological-hydraulic numerical model balancing the computational cost and the results  
182 accuracy; 2) calibrating the numerical model (CN and  $n$ ) with on-site data, first with rain gauges  
183 and then fine-tuning with radar data; and 3) relating the CN values with EO data (SM) aiming to  
184 obtain the information needed to continuously support the numerical model for the reservoir  
185 management in future events.

#### 186 3.1. NUMERICAL MODEL

187 The coupled distributed hydrological and hydraulic numerical tool Iber (Bladé et al. 2014b;  
188 Cea and Bladé 2015) was used for both rainfall-runoff transformation and flow characterization.  
189 Iber is based on the dynamic wave solution of the Shallow Water Equations (SWE) with the finite  
190 volume method (Cea et al. 2016; Toro 2009), and it includes a specific numerical scheme for  
191 overland flow named Decoupled Hydrologic Discretization, DHD (Cea and Bladé 2015). After it  
192 was released in 2010, Iber has undergone several improvements. These enhancements allow  
193 the model to consider precipitation and losses varying in time and space and improved mesh  
194 definition for very shallow flows (i.e. a *fill-sinks*-option) (Bladé et al. 2014a; Caro 2016; Cea et al.  
195 2015; Cea and Bladé 2015; Juárez D. et al. 2014).

196           Additionally, Iber implements a specific drying method for hydrological computations,  
197 which handling the transition from wet to dry conditions, and vice versa. Briefly, a wet-dry limit  
198 ( $\epsilon_{wd}$ ) is used to define the water depth threshold below which a cell is considered to be dry. For  
199 drying cells, the scheme uses an adaptation to finite volume numerical schemes of the method  
200 used in LISFLOOD (Bates and De Roo 2000), in order to guarantee mass conservation. This  
201 method reduces numerical instabilities during simulation and ensures that all mesh cells have a  
202 zero or positive depth.

### 203           3.2. MODEL SETUP

204           The study area was spatially discretized using an irregular triangular mesh of  
205 approximately 50,000 elements of area from 150 m<sup>2</sup> (in rivers) up to 200,000 m<sup>2</sup> (in hillslopes)  
206 (Fig. 2). This discretization is a compromise between accuracy of the results and computational  
207 time. The DTM was treated using a *Fill sinks* algorithm, based on the algorithm proposed by  
208 Wang and Liu (2006) to ensure a good definition of the flow path removing unreal depressions  
209 (Fig. 2). The DHD scheme was used with a wet-dry limit threshold of 10<sup>-4</sup> m.

210           The current set-up configuration allowed the simulation of events that last from 2 to 4  
211 days with a computational time between 1 and 3 hours using 1 CPU core (i7 fourth generation  
212 to 3.5 GHz). It is worth mentioning that after the end of the project there have been substantial  
213 improvements in the computational time of Iber by using Graphics Processing Unit (GPU)  
214 computing techniques (García-Feal et al. 2018). With this novelty, the presented simulations  
215 would run in about 1 minute, achieving speed-up up to 100.

216           There is only one initial condition imposed to the model which is the water level in the  
217 reservoir at the beginning of the simulation events. The river was assumed to be dry at the  
218 beginning of the simulations, which is an acceptable assumption as normal discharges are  
219 negligible when compared with flood discharges. No boundary conditions were imposed as  
220 there are no streams flowing into the study area. Rainfall intensities were applied on the



221 corresponding mesh element. Manning coefficients ( $n$ ) were associated with each element,  
222 based on their land use according to the CORINE map (EEA 2007) (Fig. 1b).

223 The NRCS-CN method was used to evaluate the losses in the rainfall-runoff process. For  
224 its application, the initial abstraction ( $I_a$ ) was linked to the soil potential retention ( $S$ ) through a  
225 0.2 factor ( $I_a = 0.2 \cdot S$ ) as proposed by USDA (1986) and Ponce and Hawkins (1996). Due to the  
226 homogeneity of the land uses, soil type and AMC conditions in the study site, where over 90 %  
227 of the area corresponds to forest coverage (Fig. 1b), a single value of CN was used for the whole  
228 basin. The value of CN was later adjusted within the calibration process.

### 229 3.3. RELATING CN TO EARTH OBSERVATION SOIL MOISTURE DATA

230 ESA CCI SM data provide information of the soil moisture in the top 20 mm layer of the  
231 soil. These measurements are well-correlated with previous rainfall days but might not be  
232 representative of the AMC, which have a relevant influence on the CN value. In this study, it was  
233 assumed that the evolution of daily surface moisture over several days before the onset of the  
234 rainfall event could inform of the water content in deeper soil layers, and hence it could be used  
235 as a proxy of the AMC and CN. In order to explore this relationship, daily SM values were  
236 averaged for periods ranging from 2 to 40 days before the beginning of the analyzed rainfall  
237 event. Then, a correlation between the averaged SM and the calibrated CN values was  
238 established.

## 239 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 240 4.1. HYDROLOGICAL MODELLING AND CALIBRATION STRATEGY

241 The purpose of the calibration process is the adjustment of the values of CN and the  
242 terrain roughness ( $n$ ). The CN mainly influences on the mass balance of the whole event, while  
243 the  $n$  coefficient is expected to have an effect on the water front propagation and the water  
244 elevation evolution.

245 A sensitivity analysis of the Manning's roughness coefficient was carried out. The  
246 reference values for the  $n$  coefficients were determined following the recommendations from

247 the USGS Guide (Arcement and Schneider 1989). A 0.11 value of  $n$  was assumed for the dense  
248 forest land use that represents around 75 % of the study area (Fig. 1b). As a result of the analysis,  
249 no significant influence on the model response in terms of water front and water elevation in  
250 the reservoir was observed under  $n$  variations in a range of  $\pm 20$  %. Hence, it is assumed that CN  
251 is the main calibration parameter. Results obtained by using the dense forest land use data for  
252 the  $n$  sensitivity analysis are shown in Fig. 3.

253 The CN was adjusted during calibration process to properly represent the evolution of the  
254 water stored in the reservoir during the events. For events 20110313\_4d and 20130304\_3d, rain  
255 data were available only from the rain gauge source. For events 20131116\_3d, 20141129\_2d  
256 and 20150320\_3d, both data from rain gauges and radar were available and used in the  
257 calibration process. For these last three events, the gauge data are used for a first estimation of  
258 the CN value and what we called  $CN_{rg}$ . This value of CN was later fine-tuned with the radar  
259 information calling it  $CN_r$ .

260 Table 3 shows the CN value that best fit for all five events taking into account each data  
261 source. A seasonal trend could be inferred from these values, with higher values of CN during  
262 spring and moderate during autumn, though the number of events is not large enough to take  
263 more quantitative conclusions of seasonal variations.

264 In the study area, there are two alternative sources of information for the CN values:  
265 CEDEX (2003) and ACA (2019). Both are georeferenced databases available online and provide  
266 values of the initial abstraction from which the value of CN can be derived. According to CEDEX  
267 the mean CN value for the study area is  $64.9 \pm 7.6$  (standard deviation) while according to ACA  
268 it is  $62.0 \pm 12.8$  under so-called normal catchment conditions (neither *wet* nor *dry*). If possible  
269 variations due to AMC are considered according to NRCS (2004), the CN values can be updated  
270 and varies in a range from 44.5 to 81.1 (initial CN from CEDEX database) and from 41.5 to 79.1  
271 from ACA information. Thus, the CN values obtained from the calibration process for this study

272 area and rainfall events are within the limits of values that would be obtained from these data  
273 provided by the public administration. However, it should be noted that the CN values provided  
274 by the mentioned public entities may be based on an outdated topographic base (Campón et al.  
275 2015). Thus, the values that can be obtained by an ad-hoc calibration using hydrological models  
276 and real rainfall data should generally provide more representative values of CN.

277 Table 4 shows the total cumulated rainfall and the effective rainfall for each event from  
278 rain gauge data and radar data. For the events 20131116\_3d, 20141129\_2d and 20150320\_3d,  
279 with radar dataset available, significant differences between the effective rainfall derived from  
280 gauge data and from radar were observed. The gauge station registered higher cumulative  
281 rainfall than values obtained from the radar source. Thus, in general, the estimated  $CN_{rg}$  is  
282 smaller than the  $CN_r$  in order to reach the same water level in the reservoir. For events  
283 20131116\_3d and 20141129\_2d, the differences between this two CN values can be considered  
284 reasonable. However, for the event 20150320\_3d, this difference is significant (Table 3).  
285 Regarding this, it can be hypothesized that there may have been a highly non-uniformly  
286 distributed rainfall. The gauge station probably registered high intensities locally concentrated  
287 around the gage's location, which were not representative of the global rain pattern in the  
288 catchment during the event. This situation can be corroborated from radar data which are  
289 analyzed below.

290 The total rainfall cumulated at the end of the events 20131116\_3d, 20141129\_2d and  
291 20150320\_3d is also represented in Fig. 4. The non-uniformity is easily observable in the rainfall  
292 spatial distribution recorded by the radar. For the event 20131116\_3d, the maximum cumulated  
293 precipitation registered by the gage (123 mm) is close to the radar maximum (120 mm).  
294 However, this value is observed only locally at the south of the study area, and the average rain  
295 depth is lower for the radar source than from the gauge source. For this reason, the  $CN_r$  is higher  
296 than the  $CN_{rg}$ . For the event 20141129\_2d, the distribution of radar rainfall shows high

297 accumulations at the east part of the study area (205 mm). However, the average values from  
298 gauge and radar are very similar (slightly higher for the rain gauge). Thus, the  $CN_r$  for this event  
299 is also slightly higher than  $CN_{rg}$ . Finally, for the event 20150320\_3d the differences are the  
300 largest. In this case, the cumulated rainfall from the raingauge source is 200 mm while the radar  
301 does not exceed 80 mm (average value). As mentioned before, a high local rainfall was  
302 registered by the rainfall station, which is not representative of the rainfall pattern in the basin,  
303 which in turn could explain the large differences between the  $CN_{rg}$  and the  $CN_r$ .

304 Based on what has been observed so far, the calibration process therefore focused on the  
305 adjustment of the CN value. The CNs finally selected by event showed in Table 3 were a  
306 combination of the calibration process according to the best statistical fitting (Table 5). Thus,  
307 the CNs value derived from the calibration process ( $CN_{selected}$ ) range between 55 and 94 (Table  
308 3).

309 For the assessment of the fitting between observed and simulated results (water level at  
310 the dam) several indicators were used: mean absolute error (MAE); root mean square error  
311 (RMSE); and Nash-Sutcliffe model efficiency coefficient (NSE) (Nash and Sutcliffe 1970). Table 5  
312 summarizes the performance of the model for both rainfall data sources by event. In general,  
313 the simulations performed from radar (r) source data produce a better fit than those obtained  
314 with the gauge (rg) data in terms of water front evolution. This statement can be seen in Table  
315 5 through the smallest mean differences (MAE and RMSE) and highest values of NSE.

316 Fig. 5 shows the performance of the model for both rain sources with the selected CN  
317 value. Events 20110313\_4d and 20130304\_3d, calibrated with rain gauge data, shown in general  
318 a good performance. The modelled water level rise in the reservoir is slightly delayed with  
319 respect to the observed data, and the water level at the end of the event was slightly higher  
320 than the observed one. A slightly overestimation of the water level was observed at the end of  
321 events 20131116\_3d and 20141129\_2d. For the event 20150320\_3d instead, the water level

322 obtained from the rain gauge data rapidly increase exceeding the capacity of the reservoir  
323 (160 m.a.s.l), far from the prediction made with radar data. Regarding the inconsistencies using  
324 gage data in this last analyzed event, we refer to the non-uniform spatial distribution of the  
325 rainfall that may explain this result as was previously explained.

326 It can be seen then that the availability of radar rainfall data can help to improve the  
327 hydrological model results since timely rainfall measurements, provided by a rainfall station,  
328 might be not enough representative of the complex spatial rainfall variation at the catchment  
329 scale. Moreover, rainfall data obtained from radar have a much higher spatial resolution (1 km<sup>2</sup>  
330 in this case) which allow a better spatial representation when modelling.

331 Table 6 shows the results of the mass balance in the reservoir through the differences  
332 between observed data and simulation results. The differences in water level ( $WL_{start}$  and  $WL_{end}$ )  
333 and stored volume ( $V_{start}$  and  $V_{end}$ ) at the start and end of the simulation period are shown for  
334 all the events. In general, good agreement between both observed and simulated results for the  
335 simulations performed with either data from the station or radar sources are observed.  
336 However, a significant difference is predicted for the event 20150320\_3d. For this last event a  
337 252 % difference in stored volume can be observed from the simulations carried out using gauge  
338 data. As previously hypothesized, significant differences observed using raingauge data could be  
339 generated due to high localized rainfall near the gauge location.

340 For event 20110313\_4d, the obtained CN value is close to the highest value of the  
341 parameter, which would imply that the losses are minimal. This unusually high value can be  
342 explained by two possible reasons: 1) the limitations of working with only one gauge and 2)  
343 possible errors in the water level records in the reservoir (the water evolution during the days  
344 before the event or the lack of data). With respect to the first cause suggested, from the Fig. 5  
345 (Event 20110313\_4d, dotted line) the water level in the reservoir increases during the first  
346 period while there is no rainfall registered by the gauge. This means that either it could have

347 rained heavily during the previous days, or there was rain in some parts of the basin that was  
348 not registered by the gauge. Additionally, some errors (lack of data and sudden steps) were  
349 detected on the water level records registered in the reservoir. It should be noted that the initial  
350 water level was 151 m (constant value during the firsts 3 hours of the simulation period) while  
351 after 10 min it increased to 152 m. This difference means 2.67 hm<sup>3</sup> in terms of water volume in  
352 the reservoir, which is around 12 % of the volume stored during the event. These considerations  
353 are presented here as possible reasons that explain the high value for the CN calibrated for this  
354 episode.

355 On the other hand, the estimated CN for the event 20130304\_3d is 81 also using rain  
356 gauge data. As shown in Fig. 5, the delay in the arrival time of the water front into the reservoir  
357 is approximately 10 h, but there is a good adjustment in terms of water levels after that. For the  
358 mentioned episode, the difference in water level in the reservoir at the end of the episode is  
359 lower than 0.03 m.

#### 360 4.2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EARTH OBSERVATION BASED SOIL MOISTURE DATA AND 361 CURVE NUMBER

362 Fig. 6 illustrates the relationship between the five calibrated CNs and the daily EO surface  
363 moisture values averaged for different periods prior to the five rainfall events. For clarity, not all  
364 analyzed periods are represented in Fig. 6. As the number of averaged days approaches 16, the  
365 relationship between CN and the averaged SM converges to a clear linear trend.

366 Fig. 7 depicts the squared linear correlation coefficient between CN and the averaged  
367 surface moisture for all analyzed averaging periods and rainfall events. The best fit is achieved  
368 when 16 days prior to the rainfall onset are averaged, yielding a high R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.96. The clear  
369 consistency in the correlation coefficient changes as the antecedent period is varied reinforces  
370 the validity of this result.

371 The presented relationship between CN and EO based on surface moisture has been  
372 obtained for five rainfall events modelled in the small Boadella reservoir catchment. Despite the

373 limited representativeness of the presented case, the quality and consistency of the relationship  
374 strongly suggests the potential of EO data to provide updated estimates of the CN value. The  
375 accuracy in the estimation of this parameter has crucial implications in the volumes of runoff  
376 predicted by hydrological models and, hence, in the flood prevention measures taken by water  
377 resources managers.

#### 378 4.3. DISCUSSION: IMPACT OF FLOODING AND POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF MERGING REMOTE 379 SENSING DATA IN WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS

380 Among the five events presented herein, the events 20110313\_4d and 20130304\_3d  
381 were the ones that caused more flood damages from an economic point of view. The economic  
382 evaluation of the flood risk associated to the released discharges, and of the water resources  
383 lost or preserved after the extreme rainfall episodes, are part of the outputs of the system  
384 developed under the PGRI-EPM project for the operational management of reservoirs in the  
385 region (Sanz-Ramos et al. 2018). The application of management measures obtained as outputs  
386 from the system for the aforementioned events, would have significant benefits in minimizing  
387 the flood risk and maximizing the preservation of water resources. For 20110313\_4d for  
388 instance, the damages to property would have been reduced by 15 %, expected injury by 62 %  
389 and expected fatalities by 48 %, while a volume of 0.9 hm<sup>3</sup> of water released from the reservoir  
390 would have been preserved. These values represent a reduction of the episode impact of  
391 approximately 3.3 M€. For 20130304\_3d, material damages would have been reduced by 28 %,  
392 injury by 81%, expected fatalities by 58 % and 0.2 hm<sup>3</sup> of preserved water volume. In this last  
393 case, the reduction of the impact would have been around 2.9 M€ (Bladé et al. 2018).

394 EO data represent a valuable source of information for hydrologic purposes and for water  
395 resources management, in general, through mapping water resources and monitoring  
396 hydrological parameters. Remote sensing techniques contribute to management systems  
397 modelling providing updated estimates of different parameters which can significantly improve  
398 the efficiency of such models and their robustness for forecasting. In this case, we focus

399 attention on the benefits that can be obtained in water management modelling through the  
400 updated assessment of the CN value after the consideration of remotely sensed soil moisture  
401 information as described in previous section 4.2.

402         Once the numerical model is calibrated, the final system is supported up with only two  
403 sets of data: quantitative precipitation forecasts and soil moisture from EO. The model is  
404 executed continuously, updating the inputs with the last available ESA CCI SM data and  
405 precipitation forecasts (Roux et al. 2020). Threshold alerts and pre-established dam operation  
406 protocols are included in the model, though the protocols can also be manually adjusted for the  
407 assessment of different operations of the dam outflow systems.

## 408 5. CONCLUSIONS

409         On-site and Earth observation (EO) data were used for the calibration of the NRCS-CN  
410 parameter of an Eastern Pyrenees basin, as it is the most important parameter of the  
411 hydrological model when correctly assessing water balance so as to evaluate the basin  
412 hydrologic response. The model developed for this purpose consists of a coupled fully-  
413 distributed hydrological and hydraulic model, which constitutes the central core of an  
414 operational system for the Boadella reservoir management. The main aim of the operational  
415 system is the prediction of flood risk and final water resources estimates associated to a  
416 forecasted extreme rainfall. The use of a distributed model integrating hydraulics and hydrology  
417 has been proven to be a robust tool so as to obtain in a single simulation, results of water  
418 resources (discharges, reservoir volumes) and flood hazard (depths, velocities).

419         Solid correlations were found between the estimated moisture data and the CN value  
420 obtained through numerical modelling forced by ground data, suggesting the potential of  
421 available remote sensing data for the updating of the CN values in continuous hydrological  
422 models. The optimal averaging period for the SM was, for the present case, 16 days. It would be  
423 valuable to check the validity of this period in other basins, which is proposed for future work.



424 The relationship between CN and EO based on surface moisture has been obtained for  
425 five rainfall events modelled in the small Boadella reservoir catchment. The accuracy in the  
426 estimation of the CN parameter strongly affects the volumes of runoff simulated by the  
427 hydrological model and, consequently, the flood mitigation measures informed by those.

428 Thanks to the SM-CN relationship, the information needed to continuously support the  
429 operational system for the reservoir management has been reduced to two sets of data:  
430 observed meteorological data in raster format, and the observed soil moisture. The consistency  
431 of the achieved SM-CN relationship strongly suggests the potential of EO data to provide  
432 updated estimates of the CN.

433 The present results of the application to the case study suggest the usefulness of  
434 incorporating remotely sensed proxies. This work is a step towards physical descriptors of soils  
435 based on remote sensing and its integration in water resources management and flood  
436 forecasting systems, thus providing a beneficial direction for future work on optimized  
437 management strategies.

## 438 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

439 This work was carried out in the framework of the PGRI-EPM project (Prévision et gestion  
440 du risque d'inondation en Eurorégion Pyrénées Méditerranée) funded by the call for projects  
441 "Water Resources – Risk Management (Floods, Droughts, Submersion)" of the Pyrenees-  
442 Mediterranean Euroregion. The authors also thank to the Agència Catalana de l'Aigua and Servei  
443 Meteorològic de Catalunya that provided the "Rainfall and water level" data, as well as its  
444 advisement during the project.

## 445 7. DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

446 The data used during the study, and provided by a third party are listed below:

- 447           • Precipitation data (Table 2), generated by Servei Meteorològic de Catalunya  
448           (<https://meteo.cat>), was provided by Agència Catalana de l'Aigua  
449           (<http://aca.gencat.cat/ca/inici>) within the PGRI-EPM project.
- 450           • Dam outlet and water level data (Table 2) was provided by Agència Catalana de  
451           l'Aigua (<http://aca.gencat.cat/ca/inici>) within the PGRI-EPM project.

452           Direct requests for these materials may be made to the provider.

## 453 8. REFERENCES

- 454 ACA. (2007). "Planificació de l'Espai Fluvial. Estudis d'inundabilitat en l'àmbit del projecte  
455 PEFCAT - Memòria específica Conca de La Muga." Agència Catalana de l'Aigua. Generalitat  
456 de Catalunya. Febrer 2007.
- 457 ACA. (2019). "Descàrrega cartogràfica." <[http://aca.gencat.cat/ca/laigua/consulta-de-](http://aca.gencat.cat/ca/laigua/consulta-de-dades/descarrega-cartografica/)  
458           dades/descarrega-cartografica/> (Jul. 31, 2019).
- 459 Anees, M. T., Abdullah, K., Nordin, M. N. M., Rahman, N. N. N. A., Syakir, M. I., and Kadir, M. O.  
460 A. (2017). "One- and Two-Dimensional Hydrological Modelling and Their Uncertainties."  
461 *Flood Risk Management*, InTech.
- 462 Arcement, G. J. J., and Schneider, V. R. (1989). "Guide for selecting Manning's roughness  
463 coefficients for natural channels and flood plains." *USGS Water-Supply*, Paper(2339), 44.
- 464 Arnell, N. W. (1999). "The effect of climate change on hydrological regimes in Europe: a  
465 continental perspective." *Global Environmental Change*, 9(1), 5–23.
- 466 Bates, P. ., and De Roo, A. P. . (2000). "A simple raster-based model for flood inundation  
467 simulation." *Journal of Hydrology*, 236(1–2), 54–77.
- 468 Bech, J. T., Rigo, N., Pineda, S., Segalà, E., Vilaclara, R., Sámchez-Diezma, and Sempere-Torres,  
469 D. (2005). "Implementation of the EHIMI Software Package in the Weather Radar  
470 Operational Chain of the Catalan Meteorological Service." *11th Conference on Mesoscale*  
471 *Processes and the 32nd Conference on Radar Meteorology*, Albuquerque, NM. October

472 2005.

473 Bladé, E., Cea, L., and Corestein, G. (2014a). "Numerical modelling of river inundations."  
474 *Ingeniería del agua*, 18(1), 68.

475 Bladé, E., Cea, L., Corestein, G., Escolano, E., Puertas, J., Vázquez-Cendón, E., Dolz, J., and Coll,  
476 A. (2014b). "Iber: herramienta de simulación numérica del flujo en ríos." *Revista*  
477 *Internacional de Métodos Numéricos para Cálculo y Diseño en Ingeniería*, CIMNE  
478 (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya), 30(1), 1–10.

479 Bladé, E., Sanz-ramos, M., Amengual, A., Romero, R., Roux, H., Savatier, J., and Cherriere, M.  
480 (2018). "Gestión integrada del riesgo de inundación y de los recursos hídricos empleando  
481 modelización integrada meteorológica, hidrológica e hidráulica." *XI Jornadas Españolas de*  
482 *Presas*, León, Spain.

483 Brocca, L., Crow, W. T., Ciabatta, L., Massari, C., de Rosnay, P., Enenkel, M., Hahn, S., Amarnath,  
484 G., Camici, S., Tarpanelli, A., and Wagner, W. (2017). "A Review of the Applications of  
485 ASCAT Soil Moisture Products." *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth*  
486 *Observations and Remote Sensing*, 10(5), 2285–2306.

487 Campón, L., Quirós, E., and Durán-Barroso, P. (2015). "Análisis de la variabilidad en la estimación  
488 del umbral de escorrentía en función de las distintas fuentes de información disponibles."  
489 *IV Jornadas de Ingeniería del Agua*, Córdoba, Spain, 10.

490 Caro, C. A. (2016). "Modelación hidrológica distribuida basada en esquemas de volúmenes  
491 finitos." PhD Thesis. School of Civil Engineering, UPC. Barcelona, Spain.

492 Cea, L., Bermudez, M., Puertas, J., Bladé, E., Corestein, G., Escolano, E., Conde, A., Bockelmann-  
493 Evans, B., and Ahmadian, R. (2016). "IberWQ: new simulation tool for 2D water quality  
494 modelling in rivers and shallow estuaries." *Journal of Hydroinformatics*, 18(5), 816–830.

495 Cea, L., and Bladé, E. (2015). "A simple and efficient unstructured finite volume scheme for  
496 solving the shallow water equations in overland flow applications." *Water Resources*

497           *Research*, 51(7), 5464–5486.

498   Cea, L., Fraga, I., Puertas, J., Álvarez, M., Bermúdez, M., Coquerez, S., Salsón, S., and Pettazzi, A.  
499           (2015). “Influencia de la densidad espacial de estaciones pluviométricas y de la  
500           disponibilidad de datos radar en los hidrogramas de tormenta calculados con un modelo  
501           hidrológico distribuido: Aplicación a una cuenca de 24 Km<sup>2</sup> en el Noroeste de España.”  
502           *Actas de las IV Jornadas de Ingeniería del Agua. Precipitación y procesos erosivos. Córdoba,*  
503           *21 y 22 de Octubre.*

504   Cea, L., Garrido, M., and Puertas, J. (2010). “Experimental validation of two-dimensional depth-  
505           averaged models for forecasting rainfall–runoff from precipitation data in urban areas.”  
506           *Journal of Hydrology*, 382(1–4), 88–102.

507   CEDEX. (2003). *Análisis de nuevas fuentes de datos para la estimación del parámetro número de*  
508           *curva: perfiles de suelos y teledetección.* Madrid, Centro de Estudios y Experimentación de  
509           Obras Públicas, 2003.

510   Corral, C., Velasco, D., Forcadell, D., Sempere-Torres, D., and Velasco, E. (2009). “Advances in  
511           radar-based flood warning systems . The EHIMI system and the experience in the Besòs  
512           flash-flood pilot basin.” *Flood Risk Management Research and Practice Extended Abstracts*  
513           *Volume 332 Pages Full Paper CDROM 1772 Pages*, 1295–1303.

514   EEA. (2007). *CORINE Land Cover 2006 technical guidelines.* European Environmental Agency  
515           Technical report No 17/2007.

516   EM-DAT. (2019). “Database | EM-DAT.” *EM-DAT.*

517   ESA, Chung, D., Dorigo, W., De Jeu, R., Kidd, R., and Wagner, W. (2018). “ESA CCI SM Product  
518           Specification Document (PSD), D1.2.1 Version 4.2, 09 January 2018.”

519   Estévez, J., Moreno-Pérez, F., Roldán-Cañas, J., Serrat-Capdevila, A., González, J., Francés, F.,  
520           Olivera, F., and Giráldez, J. V. (2014). “Hydrology and its role in water engineering.”  
521           *Ingeniería del agua*, 18(1), 1.

522 Fonseca, A. R., Santos, M., and Santos, J. A. (2018). "Hydrological and flood hazard assessment  
523 using a coupled modelling approach for a mountainous catchment in Portugal." *Stochastic  
524 Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1.

525 García-Feal, O., González-Cao, J., Gómez-Gesteira, M., Cea, L., Domínguez, J. M., and Formella,  
526 A. (2018). "An Accelerated Tool for Flood Modelling Based on Iber." *Water*, 10(1459), 1–  
527 23.

528 GECCC. (2016). *Tercer informe sobre Canvi Climàtic a Catalunya*. Generalitat de Catalunya i  
529 Insittut d'Estudis Catalans. Barcelona, setembre de 2016.

530 IPCC. (2014a). *Climate change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Volume II: Global  
531 and Sectoral Aspects*.

532 IPCC. (2014b). *Climate Change 2013 - The Physical Science Basis*. (Intergovernmental Panel on  
533 Climate Change, ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

534 ISDR. (2009). *Global assessment report on disaster risk reduction*. United Nations, Geneva,  
535 Switzerland.

536 Juárez D., J. I., Arganis J., M. L., Dominguez, R., Esquivel G., G., Bladé, E., Dolz, J., Sánchez-Tueros,  
537 H., and Corestein, G. (2014). "Comparación del hidrograma de salida de una cuenca con un  
538 modelo hidráulico y un modelo distribuido." *XXIII Congreso Nacional de Hidráulica*,  
539 Resúmenes extendidos. Congreso Nacional de Hidráulica, Puerto Vallarta, Jalisco, México.

540 Kim, J., Warnock, A., Ivanov, V. Y., and Katopodes, N. D. (2012). "Coupled modeling of hydrologic  
541 and hydrodynamic processes including overland and channel flow." *Advances in Water  
542 Resources*, 37, 104–126.

543 Kron, W. (2005). "Flood Risk = Hazard · Values · Vulnerability." *Water International*, 30(1), 58–  
544 68.

545 Lehner, B., Döll, P., Alcamo, J., Henrichs, T., and Kaspar, F. (2006). "Estimating the Impact of  
546 Global Change on Flood and Drought Risks in Europe: A Continental, Integrated Analysis."

547           *Climatic Change*, 75(3), 273–299.

548   Li, H., Mao, D., Li, X., Wang, Z., and Wang, C. (2019). “Monitoring 40-Year Lake Area Changes of  
549           the Qaidam Basin, Tibetan Plateau, Using Landsat Time Series.” *Remote Sensing*, 11(3),  
550           343.

551   Liu, Y. Y., Dorigo, W. A., Parinussa, R. M., de Jeu, R. A. M., Wagner, W., McCabe, M. F., Evans, J.  
552           P., and van Dijk, A. I. J. M. (2012). “Trend-preserving blending of passive and active  
553           microwave soil moisture retrievals.” *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 123, 280–297.

554   Liu, Y. Y., Parinussa, R. M., Dorigo, W. A., De Jeu, R. A. M., Wagner, W., van Dijk, A. I. J. M.,  
555           McCabe, M. F., and Evans, J. P. (2011). “Developing an improved soil moisture dataset by  
556           blending passive and active microwave satellite-based retrievals.” *Hydrology and Earth  
557           System Sciences*, 15(2), 425–436.

558   Llasat, M. C., and Rodriguez, R. (1992). “Extreme rainfall events in Catalonia. The case of 12  
559           November 1988.” *Natural Hazards*, 5(2), 133–151.

560   Marti-Cardona, B., Dolz-Ripolles, J., and Lopez-Martinez, C. (2013). “Wetland inundation  
561           monitoring by the synergistic use of ENVISAT/ASAR imagery and ancilliary spatial data.”  
562           *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 139, 171–184.

563   Martí-Cardona, B., Lopez-Martinez, C., Dolz-Ripolles, J., and Bladé, E. (2010). “ASAR polarimetric,  
564           multi-incidence angle and multitemporal characterization of Doñana wetlands for flood  
565           extent monitoring.” *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 114(11), 2802–2815.

566   Martí-Cardona, B., Prats, J., and Niclòs, R. (2019). “Enhancing the retrieval of stream surface  
567           temperature from Landsat data.” *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 224, 182–191.

568   Martín-Vide, J. (1994). “Geographical Factors in the Pluviometry of Mediterranean Spain:  
569           Drought and Torrential Rainfall.” *U.S.- Spain Workshop on Natural Hazards*, The University  
570           of Iowa, Iowa Institute of Hydraulic Research, 1994, 9–25.

571   Nash, J. E., and Sutcliffe, J. V. (1970). “River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I

572 — A discussion of principles.” *Journal of Hydrology*, 10(3), 282–290.

573 NRCS, U. (2004). “Part 630 Hydrology - Chapter 10.” *National Engineering Handbook*, USDA, Soil  
574 Conservation Service: Washington, DC, USA, 79.

575 Ponce, V. M., and Hawkins, R. H. (1996). “Runoff Curve Number: Has It Reached Maturity?”  
576 *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 1(1), 11–19.

577 Rajib, M. A., Merwade, V., and Yu, Z. (2016). “Multi-objective calibration of a hydrologic model  
578 using spatially distributed remotely sensed/in-situ soil moisture.” *Journal of Hydrology*,  
579 536, 192–207.

580 Ramos-Fuertes, A., Marti-Cardona, B., Bladé, E., and Dolz, J. (2013). “Envisat/ASAR Images for  
581 the Calibration of Wind Drag Action in the Doñana Wetlands 2D Hydrodynamic Model.”  
582 *Remote Sensing*, 6(1), 379–406.

583 Roux, H., Amengual, A., Romero, R., Bladé, E., and Sanz-Ramos, M. (2020). “Evaluation of two  
584 hydrometeorological ensemble strategies for flash-flood forecasting over a catchment of  
585 the eastern Pyrenees.” *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 20(2), 425–450.

586 Roux, H., Labat, D., Garambois, P.-A., Maubourguet, M.-M., Chorda, J., and Dartus, D. (2011). “A  
587 physically-based parsimonious hydrological model for flash floods in Mediterranean  
588 catchments.” *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 11(9), 2567–2582.

589 Sanz-Ramos, M., Amengual, A., Bladé, E., Romero, R., and Roux, H. (2018). “Flood forecasting  
590 using a coupled hydrological and hydraulic model (based on FVM) and highresolution  
591 meteorological model.” *E3S Web of Conferences*.

592 Silvestro, F., Gabellani, S., Rudari, R., Delogu, F., Laiolo, P., and Boni, G. (2015). “Uncertainty  
593 reduction and parameter estimation of a distributed hydrological model with ground and  
594 remote-sensing data.” *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19(4), 1727–1751.

595 Tirkey, A. S., Pandey, A. C., and Nathawat, M. S. (2014). “Use of high-resolution satellite data,  
596 GIS and NRCS-CN technique for the estimation of rainfall-induced run-off in small

597 catchment of Jharkhand India." *Geocarto International*, 29(7), 778–791.

598 Toro, E. F. (2009). *Riemann Solvers and Numerical Methods for Fluid Dynamics*. Springer, Berlin  
599 (Heidelberg).

600 Torres-Batló, J., Martí-Cardona, B., and Pillco-Zolá, R. (2019). "Mapping Evapotranspiration,  
601 Vegetation and Precipitation Trends in the Catchment of the Shrinking Lake Poopó."  
602 *Remote Sensing*, 12(1), 73.

603 USDA. (1986). *Urban hydrology for small watersheds*. Technical Release 55 (TR-55) (Second ed.).  
604 Natural Resources Conservation Service, Conservation Engineering Division. 210-VI-TR-55,  
605 Second Ed., June 1986.

606 Viero, D. P., Peruzzo, P., Carniello, L., and Defina, A. (2014). "Integrated mathematical modeling  
607 of hydrological and hydrodynamic response to rainfall events in rural lowland catchments."  
608 *Water Resources Research*, 50(7), 5941–5957.

609 Wagner, W., Dorigo, W., de Jeu, R. A. M., Fernandez, D., Benveniste, J., Haas, E., and Ertl, M.  
610 (2012). "Fusion of active and passive microwave observations to create an Essential  
611 Climate Variable data record on soil moisture." *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry,  
612 Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, (1–7), 315–321.

613 Wang, L., and Liu, H. (2006). "An efficient method for identifying and filling surface depressions  
614 in digital elevation models for hydrologic analysis and modelling." *International Journal of  
615 Geographical Information Science*, 20(2), 193–213.

616 Wu, Z., Xu, Z., Wang, F., He, H., Zhou, J., Wu, X., and Liu, Z. (2018). "Hydrologic Evaluation of  
617 Multi-Source Satellite Precipitation Products for the Upper Huaihe River Basin, China."  
618 *Remote Sensing*, 10(6), 840.

619 Yu, C., and Duan, J. (2017). "Simulation of Surface Runoff Using Hydrodynamic Model." *Journal  
620 of Hydrologic Engineering*, 22(6), 04017006.

621



622 FIGURES & TABLES

623 **Fig. 1.** Location and characteristics of the study area. (a) Topography of La Muga basin, extension  
 624 of the study area and location of the Boadella Dam and rain gauge station. (b) Land use map of the study  
 625 area. Source: Institut Geològic i Cartogràfic de Catalunya (a), CORINE (b) and own elaboration.

626 **Fig. 2.** Computational mesh of the study area.

627 **Fig. 3.** Sensibility analysis for the Manning coefficient ( $n$ ) associated with forest-dense land use.  
 628 Water level evolution for the events 20130304\_3d and 20150320\_3d.

629 **Fig. 4.** Representation of a non-distributed (top: rain gauge registrations, triangle: rain gauge  
 630 localization) and distributed (bottom: radar observations) rainfall records for events 20131116\_3d,  
 631 20141129\_2d and 20150320\_3d.

632 **Fig. 5.** Evolution of the water level in the Boadella reservoir (dam point-check) for the observed  
 633 data (dotted line) and the simulations (rain gauge: dashed line; radar: continuous line) using the selected  
 634 CN.

635 **Fig. 6.** Scatter plot of CNs calibrated for five events versus Earth observation based soil moisture  
 636 measurements averaged for different antecedent number of days.

637 **Fig. 7.**  $R^2$  coefficient of the linear correlation between the calibrated CNs and the Earth observation  
 638 based soil moisture averaged for different antecedent periods.

639

640 **Table 1.** Extreme rainfall events registered in the study area used for the model calibration. Rainfall  
 641 information sources are identified as: (rg) for rain gauge, (r) for radar images.

Event ID	Date	season	Source of data	Total rainfall depth		Maximum intensity	
				[mm]		[mm/5-min]	[mm/h]
				(rg)	(r)*	(rg)**	(r)***
20110313_4d	March 2011	spring	(rg)	127	-	62	-
20130304_3d	March 2013	spring	(rg)	181	-	30	-
20131116_3d	Nov 2013	autumn	(rg), (r)	123	98	54	9
20141129_2d	Nov 2014	autumn	(rg), (r)	151	132	61	13
20150320_3d	March 2015	spring	(rg), (r)	197	77	67	9

\*Cumulated rainfall for the study area  
 \*\*Intensity registered in 5 minutes at the raingauge  
 \*\*\*Intensity registered in the study area

642

643 **Table 2.** Summary of the data used for the upper La Muga sub-catchment study case.

Data type	Characteristics	Source	Data description
Digital Terrain Model (DTM)	2x2 m ASCII raster file	Institut Cartogràfic i Geològic de Catalunya (ICGC)	Elevation data based on LIDAR (RMSE of 0.15 m)
Land uses	Shapefile converted into 2x2 m ASCII raster file	CORINE Land Cover project (EEA 2007)	Land uses classification and spatial representation for the year 2012
Soil moisture (SM)	0.25° degrees spatial resolution	European Space Agency Climate Change Initiative for Soil Moisture (ESA CCI SM)	ESA CCI SM
Precipitation	Rainfall intensities	Agència Catalana de l'Aigua (ACA) and Servei Meteorològic de Catalunya (SMC)	Rainfall intensities from 5-minutal raingauge (hyetograph) and 1-hour radar (1x1 km ASCII raster file)
Dam outlet / water level	Discharges and water level	Agència Catalana de l'Aigua (ACA)	5-minutal series of the outlet hydrograph and the water level in the reservoir

644

645 **Table 3.** CN values resulting from the calibration process.

Event	season	CN <sub>rg</sub>	CN <sub>r</sub>	CN <sub>selected</sub>
20110313_4d	spring	94	*	<b>94</b>
20130304_3d	spring	81	*	<b>81</b>
20131116_3d	autumn	50	55	<b>55</b>
20141129_2d	autumn	60	65	<b>65</b>
20150320_3d	spring	50	85	<b>85</b>

*\*No data available on this format*

646

647 **Table 4.** Cumulated and effective rainfall using the selected CN (Table 3) at the end of the event.

Event	Total rainfall [mm]		Effective rainfall [mm]	
	(rg)	(r)	(rg)	(r)
20110313_4d	127	*	109	*
20130304_3d	181	*	125	*
20131116_3d	123	98.3	16	12
20141129_2d	151	132.3	59	49
20150320_3d	197	76.7	152	41

*\*No data available on this format*

648

649 **Table 5.** Model performance between observed and simulated flow and water balance using the

650 corresponding CN for each rain source.

Event	MAE (m)		RMSE (m)		NSE	
	gauge	radar	gauge	radar	gauge	radar
20110313_4d	0.735	*	0.873	*	**	*
20130304_3d	0.261	*	0.389	*	0.987	*
20131116_3d	0.193	0.152	0.209	0.172	0.637	0.754
20141129_2d	0.770	0.371	0.948	0.532	0.518	0.848
20150320_3d	0.383	0.242	0.432	0.260	0.861	0.941

\*No data available on this format

\*\*Statistic not applicable due to lack of data

651

652 **Table 6.** Mass balance at the end of the rainfall event using the selected CN (Table 3).

GAUGE								
Event	WL <sub>start</sub>	WL <sub>end</sub>	V <sub>start</sub>	V <sub>end</sub>	ΔV	ΔV	Difference	Difference
	[m]	[m]	[hm <sup>3</sup> ]	[hm <sup>3</sup> ]	(sim)	(obs)		
20110313_4d	151	158	36.9	60.2	23.3	22.2	1.1	4.9
20130304_3d	147	156	26.7	51.8	25.1	25.2	0.1	0.4
20131116_3d	151	152	37.0	40.2	3.23	3.07	0.16	5.2
20141129_2d	149	152	31.1	41.2	10.1	10.0	0.1	1.0
20150320_3d	155	163	48.5	80.2	31.7	9.0	22.7	252

  

RADAR								
Event	WL <sub>start</sub>	WL <sub>end</sub>	V <sub>start</sub>	V <sub>end</sub>	ΔV	ΔV	Difference	Difference
	[m]	[m]	[hm <sup>3</sup> ]	[hm <sup>3</sup> ]	(sim)	(obs)		
20131116_3d	151	152	37.0	40.2	3.23	3.07	0.16	5.2
20141129_2d	149	152	31.1	41.0	9.87	10.0	-0.14	-1.4
20150320_3d	155	157	48.5	56.8	8.24	8.95	-0.71	-7.9

653