PHASE I

REVISED REPORT ON GREAT LAKES OPEN-COAST FLOOD E C E I V E LEVELS



Prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the Federal Emergency Management Agency

Detroit, Michigan April 1988

PHASE I REVISED REPORT ON GREAT LAKES OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS

PREPARED BY THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DETROIT, MICHIGAN APRIL 1988

PHASE I

•

.

.

REVISED REPORT ON GREAT LAKES OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>Title</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | j | Page |
|------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | | ٠ | • | • | • | ••• | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | • | • | • | • | • | iii |
| INTRODUCTION | • • | • | • | • | • | ••• | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | . 1 |
| DATA | • • | • | • | • | • | ••• | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | . 4 |
| METHOD | • • | • | • | • | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | 10 |
| RESULTS | • • | • | • | • | • | ••• | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | ٠ | 14 |
| GLOSSARY | • • | • | • | • | | ••• | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | • | • | • | • | • | 23 |
| REFERENCES | | • | • | • | • | | ٠ | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | • | • | • | ٠ | • | 26 |

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Number</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | J | Pag | <u>(e</u> |
|---------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----------|
| 1 | WATER LEVEL STATIONS | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | • | • | • | ٠ | • | 5 |
| 2 | COMPARISON OF RESULTS | | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | 1 | 6 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Number | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |] | Pag | ζe |
|--------|------|---------|----|------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|
| 1 | WIND | EFFECTS | ON | LAKE | LEVELS | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | 8 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

LIST OF PLATES

| <u>Number</u> | | Page |
|---------------|---|------|
| 1 | LAKE SUPERIOR REVISED OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS . | . 18 |
| 2 | LAKE MICHIGAN REVISED OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS . | • 19 |
| 3 | LAKE HURON REVISED OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS | . 20 |
| 4 | LAKE ERIE AND LAKE ST. CLAIR REVISED OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS | . 21 |
| 5 | LAKE ONTARIO REVISED OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS | . 22 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The people involved in the preparation of the Revised Report on Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels as of December, 1987 were:

N. Schwartz, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region V
S. Tamulionis, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NCD
M. Todd, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NCD
C. Johnson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NCD
J. Wanielista, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit
R. Wilshaw, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit
E. Megerian, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit
R. Thomas, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit
D. H. Lee, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit
T. Pieczynski, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Buffalo
A. Coniglio, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Buffalo
C. Hessel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, HEC
E. Thompson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, WES

PHASE I

REVISED REPORT

ON

GREAT LAKES OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has adopted the 100-year flood level as the standard for identification of flood hazard areas in conjunction with the National Flood Insurance Program. Often the 10, 50, and 500-year flood levels are also of concern in dealing with flood control and sound flood plain management strategies. A study was performed using water level information through 1974 to develop these flood levels for the Great Lakes. It was published in three booklets in 1977 and 1978; Phase I, Phase II, and Appendices A and B of the "Report on the Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels". In 1987, due to the additional data collected since the original study was completed, and the extreme high water levels experienced in the Great Lakes since that time, FEMA requested an update of the previous study. The basic tenet of this update effort was to retain the approach utilized in the 1977 report. The original study methodology was

followed, except where analysis of the data indicated variations were appropriate.

The results of the updated study have been published as three reports with the same format as used in the original Phase I, Phase II, and Appendices. The updated reports are entitled "Revised Report on Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels". The Phase I report documents the statistical technique employed in determining the frequency curves, and details where the updated study methodology varies from the original report. The Phase I report also presents on Plates 1 through 5 the open-coast flood levels determined for each reach of the United States shoreline of the Great Lakes. Open-coast flood levels are defined in this report as the flood levels occurring along a lake shoreline which is unprotected by the presence of islands and which is uninterrupted by bays subject to additional wind setup. The areas excluded from the open-coast study are also indicated on Plates 1 through 5. Comparison of the results of the revised study from the 1977 study are also indicated on Table 2.

In the Phase II report, methods for determining the frequency of flood levels are presented for locations not included in the Phase I report. An analysis of the gage data on the connecting channels is given, along with general guidelines for the application and interpolation of the results. Methods are also

included for simulating or deriving flood level data for gages with a short period of record, and for developing flood level frequencies at locations where records of water level data are not available.

Appendices A, B, C, D, and E contain documentation of the updated study which is too detailed to include in the Phase I or Phase II report. Appendix A includes tables of adjustment factors which were applied to recorded water levels to establish a common base which reflects a fixed regimen in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River system. The frequency curves from which the various return period flood levels were derived are included in Appendix B. Summary tables of the revised study results, in comparison to the 1977 report, and the water levels for the 10, 50, 100, and 500-year return period at each gage, are presented in Appendix C. Appendix D contains copies of all correspondence pertaining to the development and review of the various drafts of the Phase I and Phase II reports. Examples of flood level frequency determination using short period gage records for Phase II areas are contained in Appendix E.

The various State and Federal agencies concerned with flood insurance studies on the Great Lakes were provided copies of the Phase I and Phase II draft reports in mid-January, 1988 and the

end of January, 1988, respectively. The comments that were received have been considered and where appropriate have been incorporated in the updated study.

DATA

RECORDED WATER LEVELS

Official monthly mean and hourly instantaneous water level data, published by the National Ocean Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and the Canadian Hydrographic Service of the Canadian Department of Environment, as recorded at 65 stations throughout the Great Lakes and their connecting channels, were used to derive the maximum annual flood levels. The stations and their periods of record are listed in Table 1. Recording gages were continuously operated at these stations for periods ranging from 22 to 86 years, as of 1986. Four additional gages, not included in the original report, were incorporated. They were Port Inland on Lake Michigan, Little Current and Point Edward on Lake Huron, and Port Lambton on the St. Clair River. The Black Rock Canal gage on the Niagara River is no longer functional and was excluded from the new study. The American Falls gage was also excluded from the new study. In 1976, the gage was relocated 400 feet upstream of the original site. Because of the steep slope of the Niagara River between these locations, the data from the two locations could not be used as

TABLE 1 - WATER LEVEL STATIONS

•

| Water Level | | Period of |
|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Gaging</u> Station | Gage <u>No</u> . | Record |
| | | |
| Lake Superior | | |
| Point Iroquois | 9004 | 1933-1986 |
| Marquette | 9016 | 1903-1986 |
| Ontonagon | 9044 | 1960-1986 |
| Duluth | 9064 | 1950-1986 |
| Two Harbors | 9070 | 1942-1986 |
| Thunder B ay (C) | 02AB018 | 1915-1986 |
| Michipicoten (C) | 02BD004 | 1915-1986 |
| Lake Huron | | |
| Fort Gratiot | 4098 | 1938-1986 |
| Lakeport | 5002 | 1956–1986 |
| Harbor Beach | 5014 | 1902-1986 |
| Essexville | 5035 | 1953–1986 |
| Harrisville | 5059 | 1963-1986 |
| Detour | 5098 | 1955 - 1986 |
| Thessalon (C) | 02CA006 | 1926-1986 |
| Tobermory (C) | 02FA003 | 1962-1986 |
| Parrysound (C) | 02EA014 | 1960-1986 |
| Collingwood (C) | 02ED012 | 1915-1986 |
| Goderich (C) | 02FE012 | 1915-1986 |
| Little Current (C) | 02CG002 | 1959–1986 |
| Point Edward (C) | 0266010 | 1927-1986 |
| Lake Michigan | | |
| Ludington | 7023 | 1951-1986 |
| Holland | 7031 | 1960–1986 |
| Calumet Harbor | 7044 | 1903-1986 |
| Milwaukee | 7057 | 1906–1986 |
| Green Bay | 7079 | 1954-1986 |
| Sturgeon Bay | 7072 | 1946 - 1986 |
| Mackinaw City | 5080 | 1900–1986 |
| Port Inland | 7096 | 1965–1986 |
| Lake Ontario | | |
| Oswego | 2030 | 1935-1986 |
| Rochester | 2058 | 1956-1986 |
| Cape Vincent | 2000 | 1916-1986 |
| Port Weller (C) | 02HA018 | 1930–1986 |
| Toronto (C) | 02HC048 | 1915-1986 |
| Cobourg (C) | 02HD015 | 1956 - 1986 |
| Kingston (C) | 0 2HMO 08 | 196 3-1986 |

(C) indicates a Canadian station

5

.

TABLE 1 - WATER LEVEL STATIONS (Cont'd)

| Water Level | | Period of |
|----------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Gaging Station | Gage No. | Record |
| | | |
| Lake Erie | | |
| Buffalo | 3020 | 19001986 |
| Barcelona | 3032 | 196 1 - 1986 |
| Erie | 3038 | 1959-1986 |
| Cleveland | 3063 | 1904-1986 |
| Marblehead | 3079 | 19601986 |
| Toledo | 3085 | 1941–1986 |
| Fermi | 3090 | 1964-1986 |
| Gibraltar | 4020 | 1941–1986 |
| Kingsville (C) | 02GH070 | 1962-1986 |
| Erieau (C) | 02FG002 | 1957-1986 |
| Port Stanley (C) | 02GC027 | 1926-1986 |
| Port Dover (C) | 02GC028 | 1958-1986 |
| Port Colborne (C) | 02HA017 | 1911-1986 |
| · · · · · · | | |
| Lake St. Clair | | |
| St. Clair Shores | 4052 | 1953-1986 |
| Belle River (C) | 020M005 | 1961-1986 |
| | | |
| St. Marys River | | |
| Southwest Pier | 6070 | 1934-1986 |
| U.S. Slip | 6060 | 1934-1986 |
| - | | |
| St. Clair River | | |
| Dunn Paper | 4096 | 1955-1986 |
| Mouth of Black River | 4090 | 1955-1986 |
| Dry Dock | 4087 | 1928-1986 |
| Marysville | 4084 | 1955-1986 |
| St. Clair | 4080 | 1953-1986 |
| Port Lambton (C) | 02GG011 | 1931-1986 |
| Algonac | 4070 | 1953-1986 |
| | | |
| Detroit River | | |
| Windmill Point | 4049 | 1952-1986 |
| Fort Wayne | 4036 | 1915-1986 |
| Wyandotte | 4030 | 1960-1986 |
| | | |
| Niagara River | | |
| Niagara Intake | 3012 | 1963-1986 |
| Ashland Avenue | 3007 | 1958–1986 |
| | | |
| St. Lawrence River | | |
| Ogdensburg | 1030 | 1935-1986 |

a continuous record. Ten years of record are available at the new location, however, this is too short of a period to develop a frequency curve. The American Falls gage can be included in future studies when the period of record is greater.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL FLOOD LEVELS

The maximum annual flood level at a station is considered to be the highest instantaneous level recorded by a gage during the year at that station. This level is comparable to the storm water level which results from a wind setup superimposed on the undisturbed water level of the lake. Figure 1 illustrates wind effects on lake levels. Short-period fluctuations of water levels, such as created by wave action, are almost completely dampened by the stilling wells in which the gage floats operate. Consequently, flood levels in this report do not include wave runup caused by the waves rushing up a beach or a structure.

There are two types of gages, digital and analog. An analog gage makes a continuous graph of water levels over time. The maximum instantaneous level is readily discernible on analog gage records. A digital gage records water levels at prescribed time intervals, for example, the water level may be measured every hour. Since a maximum instantaneous level cannot be measured by a digital gage, the maximum hourly water level is used. This is usually acceptable, as maximum hourly data published from



FIGURE 1. WIND EFFECTS ON LAKE LEVELS

digital gages are not significantly different from the maximum instantaneous levels derived from analog gages. However, there are exceptions, as for example at Buffalo, New York, where the water level during storms may rise or fall more than five feet in an hour. In such cases, instantaneous water levels are derived from the recorder of a second analog gage operating in the same well along with the digital gage.

ADJUSTMENT FACTORS

Over the period of record, the levels of the lakes have been significantly affected by changes in the amount of diversions into and out of the Great Lakes Basin, changes in the outflow conditions resulting from regulation of Lakes Superior and Ontario, and dredging within the connecting channels. To account for the effects of these changes on historical levels, the recorded levels were adjusted to present conditions. Adjustments were derived from monthly mean lake levels obtained by routing the 1900-1986 net basin supplies through the Great Lakes under present diversion and outlet conditions. Since the previous study, a revised Lake Erie outlet rating equation has been incorporated, the Long Lac and Ogoki Diversions have been increased from 5,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 5,600 cfs, and the Welland Canal Diversion increased from 7,000 cfs to 9,200 The regulation of Lake Superior has also changed from the cfs. 1955 Modified Rule of 1949 to the current plan of operation,

known as Plan 1977. The differences each month between the derived levels and the recorded monthly mean levels at the Master Gage sites (Marquette, Harbor Beach, St. Clair Shores, Cleveland and Oswego) were mathematically smoothed and tables of monthly adjustments were generated for 1900 to 1986. These tables are included in Appendix A. The adjustments to be applied to the annual maximum recorded levels at all sites on each lake were obtained from these tables.

METHOD

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The statistical analyses of the data addressed the concerns of appropriate frequency distribution, autocorrelation of the data, and regional skew values. The Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC), and the Waterways Experiment Station (WES) were consulted, and provided comments to the Detroit District's analysis. HEC's report and WES's summary of conclusions are provided in Appendix D.

In the 1977 study, a log-Pearson Type III frequency distribution was used to analyze the data. For this study update, both the log-Pearson Type III and the Pearson Type III distributions were investigated. Comparison of the two methods, when applied to the adjusted data, showed that the skew

coefficients were almost identical. HEC concluded that the long record gages gave the same flood levels for given return periods using either method. Therefore, the logarithmic transformation was deemed unnecessary, and the Pearson Type III frequency distribution was adopted for this analysis.

In this study, as well as in the previous study, coincident frequency analysis had been suggested by HEC as the procedure to use. Coincident frequency analysis involves generating two separate frequency curves, one for short duration water level rises (wind induced setup), and one for the maximum undisturbed lake levels. These curves are then statistically combined to produce the final frequency curve. The maximum undisturbed lake levels are not directly measured, but estimated by maximum monthly mean lake levels. The short duration water level rises are calculated by subtracting the monthly mean water levels from the recorded instantaneous maximum water levels. However, since the basic tenet of this update was to.retain the approach utilized in the 1977 report, the more complex procedure of coincident frequency analysis was not used.

Two other significant concerns had to be addressed during the course of the statistical analysis of the data. These concerns were the autocorrelation of lake levels, and the different skew values exhibited by frequency distributions among gage sites.

Autocorrelation, as related to lake levels, measures the tendency of a lake level to be similar to the previous year's (or following year's) level. Skew measures the distribution of the magnitude of water levels. Skew gives an indication if high levels occur more frequently than low levels, or vice versa. A zero skew indicates that on the average, high levels occur as often as low levels.

Lakes Michigan-Huron showed the greatest autocorrelation in the yearly data. The other Great Lakes exhibited autocorrelation to a lesser degree. The question of whether autocorrelation was significant was answered by constructing two separate frequencies, based on even year data and odd year data from the Harbor Beach gage. This eliminated the strong yearly dependence present in the data. The overall impact of reducing the dependence and re-introducing it in the form of total data did not significantly alter the frequency relationship. Since Lakes Michigan-Huron exhibited the strongest autocorrelation and this dependence did not create significant differences, the effect of autocorrelation on the other lakes was considered insignificant.

The second concern involved different skew values among gages on the same lake and from lake to lake, and required study to arrive at a satisfactory solution. The Hydrologic Engineering

Center (HEC) performed an extensive analysis on the regional skew characteristics of the data and recommended the following:

| | | <u>Skew</u> |
|------|----------------|-------------|
| Lake | Superior | 0.2 |
| Lake | Michigan-Huron | 0.2 |
| Lake | Erie | 0.2 |
| Lake | Ontario | 0.4 |

The Waterways Experiment Station (WES) was also consulted and their general findings supported the analysis of HEC. Both reports found that the length of the data record consistently influences computed skews. Gages with longer records gave skews which were less variable and closer to zero. Both reports found regional skew variations between the Lakes, with Lake Ontario being significantly different from the rest. To determine the effect on the frequency curves of using a zero skew or a regional skew, a comparison was made. With the use of HEC's regional skew values, the generated water levels were 0.1 foot to 0.2 foot higher for all of the Lakes, in comparison to the use of zero skew. Based on HEC's extensive review, and WES's recommendation for using a regional skew for Lake Ontario, the regional skew values provided by the Hydrologic Engineering Center were adopted.

RESULTS

OPEN-COAST LEVELS

The open-coast flood levels were derived from the 10, 50, 100, and 500-year flood levels computed for each station taking into consideration such factors as the number of years of record, physical environment of the gage, levels at other gages on the lake and the configuration of the adjoining shoreline. The opencoast levels between gaging stations were interpolated, taking all these factors into consideration, for a smooth transition to avoid showing sudden rises and falls in the levels. The derivation of open-coast levels at the stations and between stations in some cases is judgmental rather than mathematical in Although the flood levels at all current Canadian and nature. U. S. stations were considered in determining the open-coast flood levels, more weight was given to the levels at the stations with the longer periods of record. However, where a gage exists within a reach, the derived open-coast level for that reach is within the 5% and 95% confidence limit interval for the gage's frequency curve.

The updated open-coast flood levels are shown on Plates 1-5. These plates are produced from navigation charts, and show the U.S. shoreline divided into reaches. The delineation of the

reaches is unchanged from the 1977 report. The updated 10, 50, 100, and 500-year open-coast flood levels which apply to the reaches are shown in tables located on the Plates, with elevations in feet on both International Great Lakes Datum (1955) and Mean Sea Level Datum (Mean Sea Level Datum is equivalent to the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929).

COMPARISON OF RESULTS

A comparison between the findings of the 1977 report and the updated study generally shows higher expected flood elevations for each of the reported reaches. The higher elevations are mainly due to the fact that extreme high water levels occurred during the added period (1975-1986). A portion of the difference in elevation (0.1 to 0.2 foot) can be attributed to the use of regional skew values as discussed earlier in this report. The average and maximum differences between water levels from each study for each Lake and return period, are listed in Table 2. A detailed comparison of the 1977 study to the revised study, in tabular form, is included in Appendix C. This table compares the 1977 study's 10, 50, 100, and 500-year flood levels for each reach to the results of the updated study.

FUTURE UPDATES

Because the period of record of some stations used in this report is so short, the flood levels reported herein should be

TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF RESULTS

The Average and Maximum Differences Found in Comparing the Revised Study to the 1977 Study, (Feet)

| | | | | Return Peri | od | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | 10- | Year | 50- | Year | 100- | Year | 500- | Year |
| Lake Lake Superior | <u>Ave.</u> 0.0 | <u>Max.</u> 0.2 (C) | <u>Ave.</u> 0.1 | <u>Max.</u> 0.3 (C) | <u>Ave.</u> 0.1 | <u>Max.</u> 0.3 (C) | <u>Ave.</u> 0.2 | <u>Max.</u> 0.4 (C) |
| Lake Huron | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Lake Michigan | 0.5 | 0.9 (K) | 0.7 | 1.1 (K) | 0.8 | 1.2 (K) | 1.1 | 1.5 (K) |
| Lake St. Clair | 0.7 | 0.7 (AA) | 1.0 | 1.0 (AA) | 1.1 | 1.1 (AA) | 1.5 | 1.5 (AA) |
| Lake Erie | 0.2 | 0.6 (Z) | 0.3 | 0.7 (A,Z) | 0.4 | 0.9 (A) | 0.7 | 1.1 (A,Z) |
| Lake Ontario | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.6 |

The average difference was calculated by (1) subtracting the 1977 study results from the revised study results for each reach in a lake, and then (2) averaging the differences on each lake.

The maximum difference was the maximum value found on a lake at a specific reach when the 1977 study results were subtracted from the revised study results. The letter in parentheses indicates the reach at which the maximum difference occurred. If no letter follows the maximum value, this indicates that the difference was the same for all reaches on a lake.

reviewed in about 15 years (2000-2005). At that time, the longer record will provide data of greater statistical significance.

Note: See the Phase II report of the Revised Report on Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels for those areas not covered in this Phase I report.





| | | L | KE MIC | CHIGAN | TABLE | | | | _ |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------------------------|---------------|----|
| OPEN | -COAST | FLOOD | LEVELS | S AT VI | ARIOUS | RETUR | N PERIC | DDS# | |
| | 10-3 | EAR | 50-1 | ÆAR | 100-3 | ÆAR | 500-1 | YEAR | |
| REACH | IGLD | MSL | IGLD | MSL | IGLD | MSL | IGLD | MSL | |
| ¥ | 581.7 | 582.9 | 582.8 | 584.0 | 583.2 | 584.4 | 584.1 | 585.3 | |
| B | 581.8 | 583.1 | 582.9 | 584.2 | 583.3 | 584.6 | 584.2 | 585.5 | |
| C | 581.9 | 583.3 | 583.0 | 584.4 | 583.4 | 584.8 | 584.3 | 585.7 | |
| D | 582.0 | 583.5 | 583.1 | 584.6 | 583.5 | 585.0 | 584.4 | 585.9 | |
| E | 581.9 | 583.3 | 583.0 | 584.4 | 583.4 | 584.8 | 584.3 | 585.7 | |
| F | 581.7 | 583.1 | 582.8 | 584.2 | 583.2 | 584.6 | 584.2 | 585.6 | |
| G | 581.5 | 582.8 | 582.6 | 5839 | 583.0 | 584.3 | 583.9 | 585.2 | |
| H | 581.6 | 582.8 | 582.7 | 583.9 | 583.1 | 584.3 | 584.0 | 585.2 | |
| J | 581.8 | 582.9 | 582.9 | 584.0 | 583.3 | 584.4 | 584.2 | 585.3 | |
| K | 582.0 | 583.0 | 583.1 | 584.1 | 583.5 | 584.5 | 584.4 | 585.4 | |
| * ELEV | ATIONS | IN FEI | ET IGLI | 0 (1959 | 5) AND | MEAN 3 | SEA LEI | VEL 192 | 29 |
| | | | | | | | -1- -1- -1- -1- | and and state | |

LAKE MICHIGAN REVISED OPEN-COAST FLOOD LEVELS Elevations shown for the indicated reaches represent the expected water levels along the open-coast that will be equalled or exceeded once per indicated time period (10-, 50-, 100-, and 500years), on the average. These levels are based on an analysis of the maximum instantaneous levels recorded each year for the period of record adjusted to present diversion and outlet conditions at federal government water level gaging stations in Canada and the United States. The water levels along shorelines situated behind islands and in bays and estuaries may vary

D

considerably from the open-coast levels.

F

PLATE 2

CALUMET HARBOR o

(1903-1986)



| i . | | LAKE | HURON | TABLE | | | • |
|-------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|-------------|
| COAST | FLOOD | LEVELS | S AT VA | ARIOUS | RETUR | V PERIC | DDS* |
| 10- | YEAR | 50-3 | ÆAR | 100-3 | YEAR | 500-1 | TEAR |
| IGLD | MSL | IGLD | MSL | IGLD | MSL | IGLD | MSL |
| 581.7 | 583.0 | 582.8 | 584.1 | 583.2 | 584.5 | 584.1 | 585.4 |
| 581.6 | 582.9 | 582.7 | 584.0 | 583.1 | 584.4 | 584.0 | 585.3 |
| 581.5 | 582.8 | 582.6 | 583.9 | 583.0 | 584.3 | 583.9 | 585.2 |
| 581.4 | 582.7 | 582.5 | 583.8 | 582.9 | 584.2 | 583.8 | 585.1 |
| 581.3 | 582.6 | 582.4 | 583.7 | 582.8 | 584.1 | 583.7 | 585.0 |
| 581.2 | 582.5 | 582.3 | 583.6 | 582.7 | 584.0 | 583.6 | 584.9 |
| 581.1 | 582.3 | 582.2 | 583.4 | 582.6 | 583.8 | 583.5 | 584.7 |
| 581.0 | 582.1 | 582.1 | 583.2 | 582.5 | 583.6 | 583.4 | 584.5 |
| ONS I | N FEET | IGLD | (1955) | AND M | EAN SE | A LEVE | L 1929 |

PLATE 3





.

PLATE 5

GLOSSARY

<u>Analog Gage</u>: A recording device where a pen scribes on a continuous graph the water levels obtained at a certain location.

<u>Annual Maximum Instantaneous Water Level</u>: The highest water level that was recorded during a year by a gage with a sampling frequency of an hour or less.

<u>Annual Maximum Monthly Mean Water Level</u>: The highest monthly average water level that occurred at a gage during a year.

<u>Autocorrelation</u>: Tests the tendency of certain numbers to be related to other numbers.

<u>Confidence Limits</u>: Computed values on both sides of an estimate of a parameter that show for a specified probability the range in which the true value of the parameter lies.

<u>Digital Gage</u>: A recording device that registers water levels on punch tape at a certain prescribed interval at a certain location.

Diversion: The transfer of water from one drainage basin to another.

<u>Fetch</u>: The unobstructed distance over water in which waves are generated by a wind of relatively constant direction and speed.

<u>Flood Frequency Curve</u>: A graph relating flood water elevation and the probability of occurrence in any year.

<u>Frequency Distribution</u>: A function describing the relative frequency with which events of various magnitudes occur.

<u>International Great Lakes Datum (IGLD)</u>: Common reference datum for the Great Lakes area based on mean water level in the St. Lawrence River at Father Point, Quebec and established in 1955.

<u>International Joint Commission</u>: A single unit commission between the U.S. and Canada, created by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, seeking solutions to the common problems in the joint interest of both countries.

<u>Master Gage</u>: A lake level gage situated as to give an overall representative level of a lake, and usually having a long period of record.

GLOSSARY (Cont'd.)

<u>Mean Sea Level (MSL)</u>: The datum referenced to the average height of the surface of the sea, found by averaging all stages of the tide over a 19-year period, at 26 stations along the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the Gulf of Mexico. The establishment of the National Geodetic Vertical Datum included the 26 stations, thus referencing NGVD to MSL (See National Geodetic Vertical Datum.)

National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD): The nationwide reference surface for elevations throughout the United States. It was established by the National Geodetic Survey in 1929. Mean Sea Level datum is equivalent to NGVD of 1929 (See Mean Sea Level).

<u>One Hundred Year Flood</u>: A flood level that would be equalled or exceeded once in 100 years of average.

<u>Open-Coast</u>: ShoreLine which is unprotected by the presence of islands and which is uninterrupted by bays.

Period of Record: The time interval in which data have been collected.

<u>Reach</u>: A section of a lake's shoreline with similar physical characteristics.

<u>Regional Skew</u>: A geographic area which displays similar skewing characteristics (see skew).

<u>Runup</u>: The rush of water up a beach or structure, associated with the breaking of a wave. The amount of runup is measured according to the vertical height above still water level that the rush of water reaches.

<u>Skew Coefficient</u> A numerical measure or index of the lack of symmetry in a frequency distribution. A negative skew indicates that values less than the mean occur more frequently in the sample distribution. A positive skew indicates that values greater than the mean occur more frequently in the sample distribution.

<u>Still Water Level</u>: The elevation that the surface of the water would assume if all wave action were absent.

<u>Storm Water Level:</u> A rise above normal water level on the open-coast due to the action of wind stress on the water surface (see Wind Setup).

GLOSSARY (Cont'd.)

<u>Wave Height</u>: The vertical distance between a crest and the preceeding trough.

5

<u>Wave Setup</u>: Superelevation of the water surface over normal surge elevation due to onshore mass transport of the water by wave action alone.

<u>Wind Setup</u>: Vertical rise in the stillwater level on a body of water caused by piling up of water on the shore due to wind action.

REFERENCES

1. "Report on Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels - Phase I", U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District, February 1977.

2. "Report on Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels - Phase II", U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District, June 1978.

3. "Revised Report on Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels -Phase II", U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District, April 1988.

4. "Appendix to the Report on Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels", U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District, July 1977.

5. "Appendices to the Revised Report on Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels", U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District, April 1988.

6. "Guidelines for Determining Flood Flow Frequency", Bulletin #17B, U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, Revised September 1981.

7. "Shore Protection Manual", U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Coastal Engineering Research Center, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1984.

8. "Historical Water Levels Summary, Ontario - 1985", Inland Waters/Lands Directorate, Water Resources Branch, Water Survey of Canada, Ottawa, Canada, 1987.

9. "Statistical Analysis of Time Series Data (STATS), Users Manual (Preliminary)", U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, The Hydrologic Engineering Center, Davis, California, May 1987.

10. Great Lakes Water Levels, U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA/NOS, Rockville, Maryland.

11. "Great Lakes Open-Coast Flood Levels - Review of Frequency Analysis Procedures", Project Report 88-1, H. E. Kubik, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, The Hydrologic Engineering Center, Davis, California, December 1987 (Draft).