



**SCS METHOD RELIABILITY ANALYSIS IN
ESTIMATING RUNOFF DISCHARGES AND VOLUMES
IN ARID REGIONS**

By

Mohamed Ahmed Abdel Fatah El Sayed Wahdan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Irrigation and Hydraulics Engineering

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

**SCS METHOD RELIABILITY ANALYSIS IN
ESTIMATING RUNOFF DISCHARGES AND VOLUMES
IN ARID REGIONS**

By
Mohamed Ahmed Abdel Fatah El Sayed Wahdan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Irrigation and Hydraulics Engineering

Under the Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Abdallah Sadik Bazaraa

Prof. Dr. Ayman Georges Awadallah

.....

.....

Professor of Irrigation and Drainage
Irrigation and Hydraulics Department
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Professor of Irrigation and Hydraulics
Civil Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering, Fayoum University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

**SCS METHOD RELIABILITY ANALYSIS IN
ESTIMATING RUNOFF DISCHARGES AND VOLUMES
IN ARID REGIONS**

By
Mohamed Ahmed Abdel Fatah El Sayed Wahdan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Irrigation and Hydraulics Engineering

Approved by the
Examining Committee

_____ Thesis Main Advisor
Prof. Dr. Abdallah Sadik Bazaraa, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

_____ Thesis Co- Advisor
Prof. Dr. Ayman Georges Awadallah, Faculty of Engineering, Fayoum
University

_____ Internal Examiner
Prof. Dr. Khaled Hussein Hamed, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

_____ External Examiner
Prof. Dr. Ahmed Ali Hassan, - Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

Engineer's Name: Mohamed Ahmed Abdel Fatah El Sayed Wahdan
Date of Birth: 3/ 5/ 1988
Nationality: Egyptian
E-mail: Mohamedwahdan1234@gmail.com
Phone: 01006921446
Address: Mohawelat street, Haram – Giza, Egypt
Registration Date: 1/ 3/ 2011
Awarding Date: 2016
Degree: Master of Science
Department: Irrigation and Hydraulics Engineering



Supervisors:

Prof. Dr. Abdallah Sadik Bazaraa
Prof. Dr. Ayman Georges Awadallah
(Faculty of Engineering Fayoum University)

Examiners:

Prof. Dr. Abdallah Sadik Bazaraa (Thesis main advisor)
Prof. Dr. Ayman Georges Awadallah (Thesis Co-advisor)
Prof. Dr. Khaled Hussein Hamed (Internal examiner)
Prof. Dr. Ahmed Ali Hassan (External examiner)
(Faculty of Engineering Ain Shams University)

Title of Thesis:

SCS method reliability analysis in estimating runoff discharges and volumes in arid regions.

Key Words:

SCS method ; arid regions; reliability analysis; runoff;

Summary:

Reliability analysis was applied to evaluate the uncertainty of SCS method in estimation of peak discharge and runoff volume at various return periods if the SCS input parameters (CN and T_{lag}) were considered as random variables in arid regions. The study main conclusions are: 1) The SCS method should be used with caution when the rainfall coefficient of variation is smaller than 0.5. 2) Design of water structures should consider the peak discharge and runoff volume in arid regions. 3) Application of SCS method in arid regions is more reliable when the return period is small.

Acknowledgments

In this At the beginning and the end, thanks to Allah. It is a delight to acknowledge those who have supported me over years to finalize the thesis. I would like to thank my supervisors, Prof. Dr. Abdallah Bazaraa and Prof. Dr. Ayman Awadallah, for continuous guidance and support. I appreciated the constant help, advice, and support while conducting my research.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Khaled Hamed and Prof. Dr. Ahmed Ali Hassan for their great effort in review and valuable comments. Special thanks to all my friends and my colleagues in work specially Dr. Abdel Rahman Abdel Raouf who supported me to finish this work.

Lastly, but by no means least, I wish to thank my parents, my wife and daughter for their love and encouragement, without whom I would never have enjoyed so many opportunities.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	II
LIST OF TABLES	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	V
NOMENCLATURE	VIII
ABSTRACT	IX
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. BACKGROUND	1
1.2. PROBLEM DEFINITION	2
1.3. STUDY OBJECTIVES	2
1.4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	3
1.5. ORGANIZATION OF WORK	3
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
2.1. INFILTRATION AND RUNOFF PROCESS	4
2.2. ESTIMATION OF DESIGN RUNOFF VOLUME	5
2.3. ESTIMATION OF DESIGN RUNOFF PEAK DISCHARGES	6
2.4. INTRODUCTION TO SCS METHOD	7
2.5. DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCS EQUATION	7
2.6. CURVE NUMBER AND LAND USES	11
2.7. SOIL MOISTURE REPRESENTATION AMC AND ARC	16
2.8. UNIT HYDROGRAPH AND PEAK DISCHARGE CALCULATION:	19
2.9. VALIDITY / UNCERTAINTY OF SCS METHOD	22
2.10. ARID REGIONS	23
CHAPTER 3 : RELIABILITY ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY.....	25
3.1. INTRODUCTION	25
3.2. SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	25
3.3. RELIABILITY ANALYSIS AND COMMON RELIABILITY METHODS	27
3.4. APPLICATIONS OF RELIABILITY ANALYSIS	28
3.5. PRINCIPLES OF FORM	29
3.6. COMPARISON BETWEEN FORM, SORM AND MCS	31
3.7. COMPUTER-BASED CODE FERUM:	32
CHAPTER 4 : RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	34
4.1. INTRODUCTION	34
4.2. SIMULATION METHODOLOGY	34
4.3. STUDY FRAMEWORK AND ASSUMPTIONS:	35
4.4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	37
4.5. 100-YEAR RETURN PERIOD	39
4.5.1. Impact of rainfall P and P_{cov}	39
4.5.2. Impact of CN and T_{lag} variation	45
4.6. SCS METHOD RELIABILITY AT VARIOUS RETURN PERIODS	51
4.6.1. Impact of rainfall P and P_{cov}	51

4.6.2.	Impact of the CN and T_{lag} variation	52
4.7.	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	52
CHAPTER 5 :CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:.....		57
5.1.	SUMMARY	57
5.2.	CONCLUSIONS	57
5.3.	RECOMMENDATIONS:	58
REFERENCES		60
APPENDIX A: 50-YEAR RETURN PERIOD RESULTS.....		65
APPENDIX B: 10-YEAR RETURN PERIOD RESULTS.....		75

List of Tables

Table 2-1: Runoff Curve Number for hydrologic soil cover complexes for Fully developed urban areas (vegetation established). Source (NRCS, 2004).....	12
Table 2-2: Runoff Curve Number for hydrologic soil cover complexes for agricultural lands. Source (NRCS, 2004).....	13
Table 2-3: Runoff Curve Number for hydrologic soil cover complexes for agricultural lands (continue). Source (NRCS, 2004)	14
Table 2-4: Runoff Curve Number for hydrologic soil cover complexes for developing urban areas. Source (NRCS, 2004).....	14
Table 2-5: Runoff Curve Number for arid and semi arid-regions, source: (NRCS, 2004).....	15
Table 2-6: Hydrologic soil groups (HSG) according to texture. Source (SCS 1975, 1986), after (Hawkins et. al., 2009):.....	16
Table 2-7: Antecedent moisture condition, source: (Mishra and Singh, 2003)	17
Table 2-8: Curve Number (CN) corresponding to antecedent moisture condition (AMC) where S (II) and I_a in inches. Source: NEH4 Table 10.1	17
Table 2-9: Ratios for dimensionless unit hydrograph and mass curve. Source (NRCS, 2007).....	20
Table 4-1: Summary of FORM input parameters.....	37
Table 4-2: SCS method application zones for the 100-year return period for CN 85	54
Table 4-3: SCS method application zones for the 50-year return period and CN 85.....	54
Table 4-4: SCS method application zones for the 10-year return period and CN 85.....	55
Table 4-5: SCS method application zones for 100-year return period and CN 65.....	55
Table 4-6: SCS method application zones for 50-year return period and CN 65.....	56
Table 4-7: SCS method application zones for 10-year return period and CN 65.....	56

List of Figures

Figure 2-1: The effect of watershed shape on the runoff peak discharge. Source: (NRCS, 2007)	5
Figure 2-2: Rainfall runoff plot for 482 events, the drainage area is 411 acres [data from USDA, ARS] after (Hawkins et. al., 2009).	8
Figure 2-3: plotted data for the relationship between the Initial Abstraction (Ia) and the potential retention S, Data Source is SCS, 1971, Figure after (Mishra and Singh, 2003)	10
Figure 2-4: rainfall and runoff depth for different CNs. Source NEH4/630, Figure after (Hawkins et. al., 2009).	11
Figure 2-5: The variation of potential maximum retention S and Curve Number (CN) with the antecedent base peak discharge index (ABFI). Data source: SCS, 1971 after (Mishra and Singh, 2003).	18
Figure 2-6: Dimensionless Unit Hydrograph. Source (NRCS, 2007).	20
Figure 2-7: SCS equivalent triangle hydrograph. Source (NRCS, 2007).	21
Figure 2-8: Arid zone distribution map. Source: (Meigs, 1953).	23
Figure 3-1: Simple relation between the input and the output variables in sensitivity analysis. Source: (Lenhart, 2002)	26
Figure 3-2: Comparison between the slopes of change in peak discharge due to sensitivity of SCS parameters in 100-year (left figure) and 50-years (right figure) return period. Source: (Kousari, 2010).	27
Figure 3-3: Difference between the deterministic and probabilistic model. (a) deterministic model (b) probabilistic model. Reproduced after (Wittwer, 2004)	28
Figure 3-4: Graphical representation of performance function and FORM approximation of the failure surface (Du, 2005).	30
Figure 3-5: FORM approximation of the failure surface in standard normal space, Figure after Maier (2001).	31
Figure 4-1: Sample of FORM results for peak discharge and runoff volume probability of failure. $P=30\text{mm}$, $P_{cov}=0.4$ and $CN=80$ at 100-year return period.	38
Figure 4-2: Impact of various P values on peak discharge (left side) and runoff volume (right side) probabilities of failure. $P=10$ and 70mm , $CN=70$ and $P_{cov}=0.5$ for the 100-years return period.	40
Figure 4-3: Impact of P on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. Mean rainfalls $P=10$ (upper figure) and 70mm (lower Figure), $CN=70$ and $P_{cov}=0.5$ for 100-year return period.	41
Figure 4-4: Impact of P_{cov} on peak discharge (left side) and runoff volume (right side) probabilities of failure. $P_{cov}=(0.2 \text{ and } 1.5)$, mean rainfalls $P=30\text{mm}$ and $CN=70$ for the 100-year return period.	42
Figure 4-5: Impact of P_{cov} on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. $P=30\text{mm}$, various $P_{cov}=0.2$ (upper Figure) and $P_{cov}=1.5$ (lower Figure) and $CN=70$ for the 100-year return period.	43

Figure 4-6: Impact of P_{cov} on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. $P=15\text{mm}$, various $P_{cov}= 0.2$ (upper Figure) and $P_{cov}= 1.5$ (lower Figure), and $CN= 70$ for the 100-year return period.	44
Figure 4-7: Impact of mean CN and standard deviation of T_{lag} on peak discharge P_f at high rainfall depth. $P =100$ mm, T_{lag} standard deviation (10, 30 and 60) min for the 100-year return period.	46
Figure 4-8: Impact of mean CN and standard deviation of T_{lag} on peak discharge P_f at small rainfall depth. $P =10$ mm, T_{lag} standard deviation (10, 30 and 60) min for 100-year return period.	47
Figure 4-9: Impact of mean CN on runoff volume probability of failure at various rainfall mean depths ($P=10, 25$ and 100 mm) for the 100-year return period.	49
Figure 4-10: Impact of mean CN on the combined maximum peak discharge and volume probabilities of failure. Various ($CN =51, 55$ and 85), $P 30\text{mm}$ and $P_{cov} 0.4$ for the 100-year return period.	50
Figure A-1: Impact of various P values on peak discharge (left side) and runoff volume (right side) probabilities of failure. $P=10$ and 70mm , $CN= 70$ and $P_{cov}= 0.5$ for the 50-years return period.	66
Figure A-2: Impact of P on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. Mean rainfalls $P=15$ (upper figure) and 100mm (lower Figure), $CN= 65$ and $P_{cov}= 0.4$ for 50-year return period.	67
Figure A-3: Impact of P_{cov} on peak discharge (left side) and runoff volume (right side) probabilities of failure. $P_{cov}= (0.2$ and $1.5)$, mean rainfalls $P=30\text{mm}$ and $CN= 70$ for the 50-year return period.	68
Figure A-4: Impact of P_{cov} on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. $P=30\text{mm}$, various $P_{cov}= 0.2$ (upper Figure) and $P_{cov}= 1.5$ (lower Figure) and $CN= 70$ for the 50-year return period.	69
Figure A-5: Impact of P_{cov} on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. $P=20\text{mm}$, various $P_{cov}= 0.2$ (upper Figure) and $P_{cov}= 1.5$ (lower Figure) and $CN= 70$ for the 50-year return period.	70
Figure A-6: Impact of mean CN and standard deviation of T_{lag} on peak discharge P_f at high rainfall depth. $P =100$ mm, T_{lag} standard deviation (10, 30 and 60) min for the 50-year return period.	71
Figure A-7: Impact of mean CN and standard deviation of T_{lag} on peak discharge P_f at small rainfall depth. $P =10$ mm, T_{lag} standard deviation (10, 30 and 60) min for 50-year return period.	72
Figure A-8: Impact of mean CN on runoff volume probability of failure at various rainfall mean depths ($P=10, 25$ and 100 mm) for the 100-year return period.	73
Figure A-9: Impact of mean CN on the combined maximum peak discharge and volume probabilities of failure. Various ($CN =51, 55$ and 85), $P 30\text{mm}$ and $P_{cov} 0.4$ for the 50-year return period.	74
Figure B-1: Impact of various P values on peak discharge (left side) and runoff volume (right side) probabilities of failure. $P=15$ and 70mm , $CN= 70$ and $P_{cov}= 0.5$ for the 10-years return period.	76
Figure B-2: Impact of P on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. Mean rainfalls $P=15$ (upper figure) and 70mm (lower Figure), $CN= 70$ and $P_{cov}= 0.5$ for 10-year return period.	77

Figure B-3: Impact of P_{cov} on peak discharge (left side) and runoff volume (right side) probabilities of failure. $P_{cov} = (0.2 \text{ and } 1.5)$, mean rainfalls $P=30\text{mm}$ and $CN=70$ for the 10-year return period.	78
Figure B-4: Impact of P_{cov} on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. $P=30\text{mm}$, various $P_{cov} = 0.2$ (upper Figure) and $P_{cov} = 1.5$ (lower Figure) and $CN=70$ for the 10-year return period.	79
Figure B-5: Impact of P_{cov} on maximum P_f for peak discharge or runoff volume. $P=20\text{mm}$, various $P_{cov} = 0.2$ (upper Figure) and $P_{cov} = 1.5$ (lower Figure) and $CN=70$ for the 10-year return period.	80
Figure B-6: Impact of mean CN and standard deviation of T_{lag} on peak discharge P_f at high rainfall depth. $P = 100 \text{ mm}$, T_{lag} standard deviation (10, 30 and 60) min for the 10-year return period.	81
Figure B-7: Impact of mean CN and standard deviation of T_{lag} on peak discharge P_f at small rainfall depth. $P = 10 \text{ mm}$, T_{lag} standard deviation (10, 30 and 60) min for 10-year return period.	82
Figure B-8: Effect of CN on runoff volume probability of failure at different rainfall mean depth (10, 25 and 100 mm) for 10 year return period.	83
Figure B-9: Impact of mean CN on the combined maximum peak discharge and volume probabilities of failure. Various ($CN = 51, 55 \text{ and } 70$), $P 30\text{mm}$ and $P_{cov} 0.4$ for the 10-year return period.	84

Nomenclature

3D	Three dimension
<i>A</i>	Catchment area
AMC	Antecedent moisture condition
API	Antecedent rainfall
ARC	Antecedent moisture runoff condition
CN	Curve number
<i>F</i>	Actual losses
FERUM	Finite element Reliability Using MATLAB
FORM	First Order Reliability Method
hr	Hour
<i>I_a</i>	Initial abstraction
MCS	Monte Carlo simulation
MFOSM	Mean-value First Order Second Moment
min	Minute
mm	Millimeter
NEH-4	National Engineering Handbook
NRCS	National Resources Conservation Service
<i>P</i>	Mean value of the maximum annual 24-hr rainfall
<i>P_{cov}</i>	Rainfall coefficient of variation
PD	Peak Discharge
<i>P_f</i>	Probabilities of failure
<i>S</i>	Maximum potential retention
SCS	Soil Conservation Services
SMI	Soil moisture index
SORM	Second Order Reliability Method
STD	Standard deviation
<i>T_c</i>	Time of concentration
<i>T_{lag}</i>	Lag time
<i>T_p</i>	Time to peak
UH	Unit Hydrograph
USDA	US Department of Agriculture
V	Volume

Abstract

When runoff measurements are not available, runoff can be estimated using the relationship between rainfall and runoff. One of the most widely used methods is the SCS method with its inputs: the curve number (CN), the design rainfall, the lag time (T_{lag}) and the catchment area. Usually in the SCS method the rainfall is considered as the only random variable, however the variation of CN and T_{lag} are neglected and a single (mean) value is assigned for each parameter. This assumption considers only the uncertainty of the rainfall and neglects the uncertainty associated with the CN and T_{lag} parameters and the corresponding risk in the calculated runoff peak discharge and runoff volume.

Recently, special interest was given to multivariate design variables / parameters (e.g. peak discharge and runoff volume). This is of particular interest for retention / detention ponds or flood protection dams. This research aims to study the resulting probabilities of failure P_f for peak discharge and runoff volume if the SCS input parameters (CN and T_{lag}) were considered as variables in arid regions. It answers the following questions: What is the risk of failure for the resulting peak discharge and the runoff volume if the CN and T_{lag} are random variables and not constants? Consequently, what would be the acceptable range of application of the SCS method at different return periods (10, 50 and 100 years) to remain within the vicinity of the targeted design probability of failure? This research focuses on arid regions, where the rainfall variability is high and the mean rainfall value is usually small. It is directed to study the scenarios when the P_f for runoff volume dominates the failure and those when the P_f for peak discharge prevails.

A reliability approach using First Order Reliability Method (FORM) is used to evaluate the impact of the uncertainty of SCS parameters on the estimated probability of failure due to exceedance of the design peak discharge and/or runoff volume. A wide spectrum of the variability of the SCS parameters is tested to cover both arid and non-arid regions and compare between them.

The study concluded that the estimated runoff peak discharge using the SCS method is critical in arid regions even for a runoff depth more than 0.5 inch under the condition of small rainfall coefficient of variation (P_{cov} less than 0.5). Application of the SCS method in arid regions should be avoided when the rainfall coefficient of variation P_{cov} is smaller than 0.5. The study confirmed that design of water structures should consider the design peak discharge and the volume as in arid regions where the mean rainfall is low the runoff volume is more critical than the peak discharge. The estimated runoff using the SCS in arid regions is more reliable when the return period is small.

Chapter 1 : Introduction

1.1. Background

Estimation of the runoff volume and the peak discharge is necessary to design flood control structures. Moreover, understanding the infiltration process is important for hydrologists in water resources management studies. There are common methods to estimate the peak discharge such as the rational method, the Soil Conservation Services (SCS) Curve Number (CN) method, Horton's model for infiltration capacity and the Green Ampt infiltration model (Thomas, 2001). The choice of either method depends on the available data, catchment size, the method assumptions, limitations and suitability for the required application. The rational and the Curve Number methods depend on rainfall-runoff relationship that requires rainfall data to estimate the runoff (Kabiri et al., 2013).

The Rational method is the simplest and widely used method to estimate peak discharge for small urban catchments from available rainfall data. Horton's model is a simple method used to estimate total runoff depth from infiltration; however the application of this method requires field measurements (Thomas, 2015). Green and Ampt method is based on a physically based model that basically assumes that water infiltrates in dry soil as a sharp water front and applied to estimate the total runoff depth from infiltration. This method is accurate in infiltration calculation; however it is complex and requires field measurements for input data needed in the model (Thomas, 2015). The CN method was developed by the Soil Conservation Services (SCS) (lately named the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)) to estimate the runoff from rainfall using an empirical parameter the Curve Number (CN) (SCS, 1993).

The SCS method is one of the most popular runoff estimation methods when the peak discharge measurement data are not available. Uncertainty associated with the SCS runoff estimation parameters has a significant impact on the calculated runoff peak discharge and runoff volume. The main parameters used in the SCS method are the catchment area (A), the Curve Number (CN), the lag time (T_{lag}), the mean rainfall value P and the design rainfall depth. The lag time (T_{lag}) is defined as the time interval from the center of rainfall excess to the peak discharge. For simplicity these parameters can be classified as watershed properties parameters and rainfall characteristics parameters. The SCS method reliability in practical application depends on the uncertainty of the used parameters.

In practical design, engineers usually consider rainfall as the only uncertain random variable in the SCS method (i.e. associated with a certain probability), while the CN and the (T_{lag}) are constants. This assumption considers only the uncertainty of the rainfall variability and neglects the uncertainties associated with the CN and T_{lag} parameters and the corresponding risk in the calculated runoff peak discharge and runoff volume. A recent reliability analysis study has been carried out to figure out the impact of the uncertainty of the CN and T_c in arid regions on the calculated runoff peak discharge for the 100-year return period. The study concluded that it is important to study the impact of the variability of the CN and T_{lag} in arid regions on the design and presented the safe range where the SCS method can be applied with reliable estimated design peak discharge (Saad, 2013).

The current study aims to evaluate the uncertainty of the SCS method application if the CN and T_c parameters are also considered as random variables to determine the risk associated with the design runoff peak discharge as well as the runoff volume in arid regions where the rainfall design value is usually small. The reliability analysis considers the uncertainty associated with input parameters and consequently the reliability of the resulting output. The uncertainty analysis method adopted in this research is the First Order Reliability Method (FORM). FORM is one of the most reliable sampling methodologies widely used in reliability analysis.

1.2. Problem Definition

Arid regions are characterized by special hydrological characteristics (e.g. rainfall) that are different from humid regions characteristics. Considering a single fixed value for each parameter (i.e. CN and T_{lag}) to estimate the runoff in deterministic models is not accurate and subject to high uncertainties in arid regions.

The point of interest in this research is the uncertainty of the peak discharge and runoff volume estimated using the SCS method for various return periods (i.e. 100, 50 and 10 year). The study has a special focus on the arid regions that are characterized with high variability in rainfall and small design rainfall values. The SCS parameters considered in uncertainty analysis are the Curve Number, the lag time, the mean value of the maximum annual 24-hr rainfall and its rainfall coefficient of variation P_{cov} .

In this work, a reliability approach using First Order Reliability Method FORM is used to evaluate the impact of the uncertainty of the CN and the time of concentration T_c in the SCS method for various return periods in arid regions to compare with previously studied uncertainties for the 100-year return period (Saad, 2013). Moreover, this work extends the previously mentioned study to assess the uncertainty of CN and T_c on the probability of failure either by exceeding the design volume or the design peak discharge in the SCS runoff model. This is of particular interest for retention ponds or flood protection dams where failure of the structure may be due to exceeding the design capacity and/or exceeding the design peak discharge of the overflow or the evacuation works.

1.3. Study Objectives

The research aims to study the probability of failure P_f for exceeding the design peak discharge and/or design runoff volume if the SCS input parameters (CN and T_c) were considered as random variables in arid regions. This study answers the following question: What is the risk of failure for the resulting peak discharge and the runoff volume if the CN and T_c are random variables and not constants? And consequently what is the acceptable range of application of the SCS method at various return periods (10, 50 and 100 years)? This research aims to study also the critical scenarios to determine where the probability of failure P_f for runoff volume exceeds the P_f for peak discharge.