

DTIC FILE COPY

4

AD-A225 777



US Army Corps of Engineers
Hydrologic Engineering Center

Hydrologic Aspects of Flood Warning - Preparedness Programs

DTIC
ELECTE
AUG 27 1990
S B D
Co

Technical Paper No. 131
August 1990

Papers in this series have resulted from technical activities of the Hydrologic Engineering Center. Versions of some of these have been published in technical journals or in conference proceedings. The purpose of this series is to make the information available for use in the Center's training program and for distribution within the Corps of Engineers.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products.

Hydrologic Aspects of Flood Warning - Preparedness Programs

Harry W. Dotson*, M.ASCE and John C. Peters*, M.ASCE

Abstract

> A reliable flood-threat recognition system is a vital component of a sound flood warning-preparedness program. Fundamental questions associated with the development of a flood-threat recognition system are: what warning times can be achieved, and how reliable will the warnings be? Answers to these questions depend on watershed and storm characteristics, and the flood-threat recognition method being considered. The tradeoff between warning time and warning reliability is illustrated, and methods for estimating warning time are discussed.

Introduction

Flood warning and preparedness programs involve flood-threat recognition, warning dissemination, emergency response and post-flood recovery. The design and implementation of a sound, cost-effective program and the determination of the scope of the program depend substantially on the supporting hydrologic analyses. An important aspect of the hydrologic analyses is the development of a flood-threat recognition system. The analysis includes the evaluation of flood warning times, warning criteria, and the reliability of the warning.

Warning Time and Reliability

The concept of warning time is illustrated in Figure 1 (FIACWD, 1989). As indicated, maximum potential warning time (T_{wp}) is the time from the first indication of precipitation to the time flooding begins. Use of time (T_{wp}) as the actual warning time (T_w) would be totally unreliable because it would indicate that it floods every time it rains. There must be a flood recognition time (T_r) which is the time required for specific warning criteria to indicate flooding is imminent. The criteria could be that a specific amount of precipitation has occurred or that a stream has reached a specified stage. The longer the flood recognition time, the

*Hydraulic Engineer, US Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center, 609 Second Street, Davis, CA 95616. Presented at the ASCE Hydraulics Division 1990 National Conference on Hydraulic Engineering, August 1990, San Diego, CA.

warning time. However, one must be aware of the tradeoffs between warning time and warning reliability.




Figure 1. Illustration of Flood Warning Time

Consider Figure 2, which illustrates aspects of reliability. Sets of storm events are labeled {A}, {B}, {C} and {D}, where:

- {A} = storm events that cause flooding
- {B} = storm events that do not cause flooding
- {C} = storm events that cause flooding but for which warnings are not issued
- {D} = storm events that do not cause flooding but for which warnings are issued




Figure 2. Reliability of Flood Warnings

The goal of a warning system is to minimize both {C} and {D}. Events from {C} can cause damage and loss of life that could possibly be prevented; events from {D} increase the likelihood that future warnings will be ignored. Alternative warning systems will be reflected by different configurations of {C} and {D}. The basis for a warning can range from measured stage at an index gage to results of a rainfall-runoff model that incorporate recent rain data and possibly estimates of future rainfall. Although the more sophisticated warning systems will tend to provide longer lead times, their reliability may not necessarily be greater than that associated with simpler systems. Both warning time and reliability should be evaluated when analyzing alternative warning systems.

The tradeoff between lead time (warning time) and warning reliability can be illustrated by considering a simple threshold-stage method of warning, as illustrated in Figure 3. The warning stage is sensed at location A. The primary flood threat is downstream at location B. The problem is to choose a threshold (index) stage for location A such that when that stage is exceeded, a warning for flooding at location B is to be issued. It is desired that the lead time to prepare for the flood threat be as long as possible. The lower the index stage at A, presumably the more lead time will be afforded. However, if the threshold stage is too low, there will be too many false warnings, so that genuine warnings will not be heeded. In terms of Figure 2, as {C} is made smaller, {D} becomes larger.




Figure 3. Lead Time Versus Warning Reliability

Illustration of Flood Warning and Reliability

To illustrate the tradeoff between warning time and reliability that is implicit in a flood warning system, consider a situation like that in Figure 3 in which a threshold stage at an index gage is to be used to trigger an alarm that warns of the impending exceedance of flood stage at a damage center. Although most flood warning systems are more sophisticated than this, analysis of a simple system can provide insights that have broader implications.



For	
AI	☒
ed	☐
tion	☐
ion/	
lity Codes	
and/or	
Special	

A-1

The basin used in this illustration is part of the Central Great Plains Experimental Watershed near Hastings, Nebraska (USDA, undated). In particular, discharge data collected over a 29-year period (1939-1967) at three gages on the west branch of Beaver Creek were used. The locations are labeled W3, W8 and W11 in Figure 4a. The drainage areas at these locations are very small and warning times will be very short. However, the intent of this analysis is to illustrate concepts rather than a practical design, and the available data is well suited to this purpose.

Assume that location W11 is the damage center for which a warning is to be issued, and that flood stage at W11 corresponds to a discharge of 300 cfs. This discharge was exceeded for 16 events during the 29-year period of record. Locations W3 and W8 will be considered individually as index locations for triggering a warning. That is, when a threshold discharge is exceeded at the index location, a warning is issued. The problem is to determine the threshold discharge to be used, and to assess associated warning time and reliability.

Period-of-record discharge data at a 15-minute interval for the three locations were acquired. The data were processed to determine events that exceed the flood discharge (300 cfs) at W11, and to determine threshold discharge exceedances at W3 and W8. Table

Table 1
Warning Time Analysis for a Threshold Q of 200 cfs at W8

Flood discharge at W11 = 300 cfs.

Date & Time of Flood at W11	Peak Q at W11	Time of Peak Q W11	Thresh. Q at W8 Exceeded?	Time of Exceed. Thresh. Q	Potential Warning Time (hr:min)
12 MAY 44 0315	394	0330	yes	0115	2:00
25 AUG 44 1045	343	1515	yes	1100	:15
16 JUL 45 2045	333	2100	yes	1745	3:00
9 JUN 49 0030	374	0145	yes	2045 ²	3:45
20 SEP 50 0115	730	0300	yes	2230	2:45
1 JUL 51 2045	1147	2215	yes	1930	1:15
10 JUL 51 0815	918	0900	yes	0630	1:45
14 JUL 52 0400	1063	0430	yes	0115	2:45
7 JUN 53 1815	680	2000	yes	1745	:30
22 MAY 54 2315	999	0200 ¹	yes	2300	:15
27 MAY 54 0330	325	0345	yes	2345	3:45
15 JUN 57 1730	1459	2115	yes	1215	5:15
29 AUG 57 0045	414	0130	yes	0130	:45
3 JUL 59 2130	838	2400	yes	2115	:15
27 MAR 60 1645	365	1745	yes	1315	3:30
15 MAY 60 2230	811	0115 ¹	yes	2230	:00

¹ Next day.

² Previous day

16 flood events in 29 years

Number of events threshold discharge (200 cfs) was exceeded: 45

Reliability = $16/45 \times 100 = 36\%$

1 illustrates results for a threshold discharge of 200 cfs at W8. The first three columns pertain to the flood event at W11; the last three columns refer to the exceedance of the threshold discharge at W8. In this illustration, the threshold discharge was exceeded during all 16 flood events. The potential warning time associated with the events is shown in the last column. For two of the events, the time is negative.

As noted at the bottom of Table 1, the threshold discharge was exceeded 45 times during the 29 years of record, which means that a false warning would have been generated 29 times. The reliability of the warning mechanism, that is, the percent of true warnings to total warnings, is $16/45 \times 100$, or 36 percent. As may be noted from the table, a warning time ≥ 1 hour would have been provided for 10 of the 16, or 63 percent of the flood events. A warning time ≥ 30 minutes would have been provided for 69 percent of the events. The analysis illustrated in Table 1 was also applied with threshold discharges




Figure 4. Beaver Creek Watershed

at W8 of 100, 300 and 400 cfs. Figure 4b shows forecast reliability and occurrence of at least a 30-minute warning time, both as a function of threshold discharge at W8. Figure 4c shows results for W3.

The inverse relationship between warning reliability and warning occurrence is readily apparent in Figures 4b and 4c. Suppose that it were desired to have a warning reliability of 70 percent, meaning that 7 out of 10 warnings would be for actual flood events. From Figure 4b, the corresponding threshold discharge at W8 is about 350 cfs and the percent

of flood events for which a warning time ≥ 30 minutes is provided is 53 percent. That is, a warning time ≥ 30 minutes would be provided for only about half the flood events, and 3 out of 10 warnings would be erroneous. These are not very impressive figures, and such a warning system would obviously be far less than adequate.

By comparison, Figure 4c indicates that a 70 percent reliability could be achieved with a threshold discharge of 400 cfs at W3, for which a warning time ≥ 30 minutes would be provided for only 31 percent of the flood events. For this level of reliability, index location W8 is the better of the two locations.

Estimation of Flood Warning Time

Flood-threat recognition essentially involves real-time sampling of characteristics of a storm event and forecasting the probable near-term runoff response. The more variability associated with the event being sampled, the more difficulty there is in obtaining an adequate sample and the more uncertain the forecast.

Key variables upon which warning time depends include: (1) spatial variability of precipitation, (2) temporal variability of precipitation, (3) rainfall-runoff response characteristics of the watershed and (4) antecedent soil moisture conditions. Storm rainfall, and consequently warning time, typically exhibit substantial variability. To properly evaluate the potential warning time for a watershed, a set of storms should be analyzed that reflects such variability. Warning time can then be defined in terms of a median value and a standard deviation or some other measure of variability.

Warning time for a specific historical storm event can be estimated using a rainfall-runoff forecast model such as HEC-IF (Peters, 1985). The model accounts for precipitation and streamflow that has occurred up to the specified time-of-forecast and simulates streamflow into the future. Successive times-of-forecast can be evaluated until the simulated future runoff exceeds flood stage. The time between the time-of-forecast and the time when flooding begins represents an estimate of the gross warning time for the event being analyzed. An estimated time for collecting and analyzing real-time data during an actual storm would need to be estimated and subtracted from the gross warning time. If climatological forecasts had indicated a significant probability of future rainfall, such rainfall could be incorporated in the forecast and a longer warning time achieved. However, quantitative estimates of future precipitation are notoriously uncertain.

Ideally the analysis as described would be made for a number of historical events, and the median value and variability of warning determined. If there were no historical precipitation data for the basin, it would be reasonable to transpose rainfall information from within a hydrometeorologically homogeneous region. If no concurrent precipitation and streamflow data were available for a basin, there would, of course, be additional uncertainty associated with lack of data with which to calibrate the rainfall-runoff model.

References

1. USDA, Agricultural Research Service, The Central Great Plains Experimental Watershed, A Summary Report of 30 Years of Hydrologic Research, (undated report).
2. Federal Interagency Advisory Committee on Water Data (FIACWD), Hydrology Subcommittee, Guidelines on Community Local Flood Warning and Response Systems, 1985.
3. Peters, J., and P. Ely, Flood-Runoff Forecasting with HEC1F, Water Resources Bulletin, 21 (1), 1985.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT		
2b DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) Technical Paper No. 131			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Hydrologic Engineering Center		6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) CEWRC-HEC	7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Water Resources Support Center		
6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 609 Second St. Davis, CA 95616			7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Casey Building, 2594 Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060		
8a NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	PROJECT NO	TASK NO
					WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) Hydrologic Aspects of Flood Warning - Preparedness Programs					
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Harry W. Dotson and John C. Peters					
13a TYPE OF REPORT Technical Paper		13b TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) August 1990	
15 PAGE COUNT 7					
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17 COSATI CODES			18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Flood threat recognition, flood warning time, warning reliability, historical storm events, forecasting, rainfall-runoff modeling, HEC-1F program.		
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) A reliable flood-threat recognition system is a vital component of a sound flood warning-preparedness program. Fundamental questions associated with the development of a flood-threat recognition system are: what warning times can be achieved, and how reliable will the warnings be? Answers to these questions depend on watershed and storm characteristics, and the flood-threat recognition method being considered. The tradeoff between warning time and warning reliability is illustrated, and methods for estimating warning time are discussed.					
20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS			21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Darryl W. Davis, Director, HEC			22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (916) 756-1104		22c OFFICE SYMBOL CEWRC-HEC

TECHNICAL PAPER SERIES **(\$2.00 per paper)**

- | | | | |
|-------|---|-------|---|
| TP-1 | Use of Interrelated Records to Simulate Streamflow | TP-37 | Downstream Effects of the Levee Overtopping at Wilkes-Barre, PA, During Tropical Storm Agnes |
| TP-2 | Optimization Techniques for Hydrologic Engineering | TP-38 | Water Quality Evaluation of Aquatic Systems |
| TP-3 | Methods of Determination of Safe Yield and Compensation Water from Storage Reservoirs | TP-39 | A Method for Analyzing Effects of Dam Failures in Design Studies |
| TP-4 | Functional Evaluation of a Water Resources System | TP-40 | Storm Drainage and Urban Region Flood Control Planning |
| TP-5 | Streamflow Synthesis for Ungaged Rivers | TP-41 | HEC-5C, A Simulation Model for System Formulation and Evaluation |
| TP-6 | Simulation of Daily Streamflow | TP-42 | Optimal Sizing of Urban Flood Control Systems |
| TP-7 | Pilot Study for Storage Requirements for Low Flow Augmentation | TP-43 | Hydrologic and Economic Simulation of Flood Control Aspects of Water Resources Systems |
| TP-8 | Worth of Streamflow Data for Project Design - A Pilot Study | TP-44 | Sizing Flood Control Reservoir Systems by Systems Analysis |
| TP-9 | Economic Evaluation of Reservoir System Accomplishments | TP-45 | Techniques for Real-Time Operation of Flood Control Reservoirs in the Merrimack River Basin |
| TP-10 | Hydrologic Simulation in Water-Yield Analysis | TP-46 | Spatial Data Analysis of Nonstructural Measures |
| TP-11 | Survey of Programs for Water Surface Profiles | TP-47 | Comprehensive Flood Plain Studies Using Spatial Data Management Techniques |
| TP-12 | Hypothetical Flood Computation for a Stream System | TP-48 | Direct Runoff Hydrograph Parameters Versus Urbanization |
| TP-13 | Maximum Utilization of Scarce Data in Hydrologic Design | TP-49 | Experience of HEC in Disseminating Information on Hydrological Models |
| TP-14 | Techniques for Evaluating Long-Term Reservoir Yields | TP-50 | Effects of Dam Removal: An Approach to Sedimentation |
| TP-15 | Hydrostatistics - Principles of Application | TP-51 | Design of Flood Control Improvements by Systems Analysis: A Case Study |
| TP-16 | A Hydrologic Water Resource System Modeling Techniques | TP-52 | Potential Use of Digital Computer Ground Water Models |
| TP-17 | Hydrologic Engineering Techniques for Regional Water Resources Planning | TP-53 | Development of Generalized Free Surface Flow Models Using Finite Element Techniques |
| TP-18 | Estimating Monthly Streamflows Within a Region | TP-54 | Adjustment of Peak Discharge Rates for Urbanization |
| TP-19 | Suspended Sediment Discharge in Streams | TP-55 | The Development and Servicing of Spatial Data Management Techniques in the Corps of Engineers |
| TP-20 | Computer Determination of Flow Through Bridges | TP-56 | Experiences of the Hydrologic Engineering Center in Maintaining Widely Used Hydrologic and Water Resource Computer Models |
| TP-21 | An Approach to Reservoir Temperature Analysis | TP-57 | Flood Damage Assessments Using Spatial Data Management Techniques |
| TP-22 | A Finite Difference Method for Analyzing Liquid Flow in Variably Saturated Porous Media | TP-58 | A Model for Evaluating Runoff-Quality in Metropolitan Master Planning |
| TP-23 | Uses of Simulation in River Basin Planning | TP-59 | Testing of Several Runoff Models on an Urban Watershed |
| TP-24 | Hydroelectric Power Analysis in Reservoir Systems | TP-60 | Operational Simulation of a Reservoir System with Pumped Storage |
| TP-25 | Status of Water Resource Systems Analysis | TP-61 | Technical Factors in Small Hydropower Planning |
| TP-26 | System Relationships for Panama Canal Water Supply | TP-62 | Flood Hydrograph and Peak Flow Frequency Analysis |
| TP-27 | System Analysis of the Panama Canal Water Supply | TP-63 | HEC Contribution to Reservoir System Operation |
| TP-28 | Digital Simulation of an Existing Water Resources System | TP-64 | Determining Peak-Discharge Frequencies in an Urbanizing Watershed: A Case Study |
| TP-29 | Computer Applications in Continuing Education | TP-65 | Feasibility Analysis in Small Hydropower Planning |
| TP-30 | Drought Severity and Water Supply Dependability | TP-66 | Precipitation Storage Determination by Computer Simulation of Flood Control and Conservation Systems |
| TP-31 | Development of System Operation Rules for an Existing System by Simulation | TP-67 | Hydrologic Land Use Classification Using LANDSAT |
| TP-32 | Alternative Approaches to Water Resource System Simulation | TP-68 | Interactive Nonstructural Flood-Control Planning |
| TP-33 | System Simulation for Integrated Use of Hydroelectric and Thermal Power Generation | TP-69 | Critical Water Surface by Minimum Specific Energy Using the Parabolic Method |
| TP-34 | Optimizing Flood Control Allocation for a Multipurpose Reservoir | TP-70 | Corps of Engineers Experience with Automatic Calibration of a Precipitation-Runoff Model |
| TP-35 | Computer Models for Rainfall-Runoff and River Hydraulic Analysis | | |
| TP-36 | Evaluation of Drought Effects at Lake Atitlan | | |

- TP-71 Determination of Land Use from Satellite Imagery for Input to Hydrologic Models
- TP-72 Application of the Finite Element Method to Vertically Stratified Hydrodynamic Flow and Water Quality
- TP-73 Flood Mitigation Planning Using HEC-SAM
- TP-74 Hydrographs by Single Linear Reservoir Model
- TP-75 HEC Activities in Reservoir Analysis
- TP-76 Institutional Support of Water Resource Models
- TP-77 Investigation of Soil Conservation Service Urban Hydrology Techniques
- TP-78 Potential for Increasing the Output of Existing Hydroelectric Plants
- TP-79 Potential Energy and Capacity Gains from Flood Control Storage Reallocation at Existing U. S. Hydropower Reservoirs
- TP-80 Use of Non-Sequential Techniques in the Analysis of Power Potential at Storage Projects
- TP-81 Data Management Systems for Water Resources Planning
- TP-82 The New HEC-1 Flood Hydrograph Package
- TP-83 River and Reservoir Systems Water Quality Modeling Capability
- TP-84 Generalized Real-Time Flood Control System Model
- TP-85 Operation Policy Analysis: Sam Rayburn Reservoir
- TP-86 Training the Practitioner. The Hydrologic Engineering Center Program
- TP-87 Documentation Needs for Water Resources Models
- TP-88 Reservoir System Regulation for Water Quality Control
- TP-89 A Software System to Aid in Making Real-Time Water Control Decisions
- TP-90 Calibration, Verification and Application of a Two-Dimensional Flow Model
- TP-91 HEC Software Development and Support
- TP-92 Hydrologic Engineering Center Planning Model
- TP-93 Flood Routing Through a Flat, Complex Flood Plain Using a One-Dimensional Unsteady Flow Computer Program
- TP-94 Dredged-Material Disposal Management Model
- TP-95 Infiltration and Soil Moisture Redistribution in HEC-1
- TP-96 The Hydrologic Engineering Center Experience in Nonstructural Planning
- TP-97 Prediction of the Effects of a Flood Control Project on a Meandering Stream
- TP-98 Evolution in Computer Programs Causes Evolution in Training Needs: The Hydrologic Engineering Center Experience
- TP-99 Reservoir System Analysis for Water Quality
- TP-100 Probable Maximum Flood Estimation - Eastern United States
- TP-101 Use of Computer Program HEC-5 for Water Supply Analysis
- TP-102 Role of Calibration in the Application of HEC-6
- TP-103 Engineering and Economic Considerations in Formulating
- TP-104 Modeling Water Resource Systems for Water Quality
- TP-105 Use of a Two-Dimensional Flow Model to Quantify Aquatic Habitat
- TP-106 Flood-Runoff Forecasting with HEC-1F
- TP-107 Dredged-Material Disposal System Capacity Expansion
- TP-108 Role of Small Computers in Two-Dimensional Flow Modeling
- TP-109 One-Dimensional Model For Mud Flows
- TP-110 Subdivision Froude Number
- TP-111 HEC-5Q: System Water Quality Modeling
- TP-112 New Developments in HEC Programs for Flood Control
- TP-113 Modeling and Managing Water Resource Systems for Water Quality
- TP-114 Accuracy of Computed Water Surface Profiles - Executive Summary
- TP-115 Application of Spatial-Data Management Techniques in Corps Planning
- TP-116 The HEC's Activities in Watershed Modeling
- TP-117 HEC-1 and HEC-2 Applications on the MicroComputer
- TP-118 Real-Time Snow Simulation Model for the Monongahela River Basin
- TP-119 Multi-Purpose, Multi-Reservoir Simulation on PC
- TP-120 Technology Transfer of Corps' Hydrologic Models
- TP-121 Development, Calibration and Application of Runoff Forecasting Models for the Allegheny River Basin
- TP-122 The Estimation of Rainfall for Flood Forecasting Using Radar and Rain Gage Data
- TP-123 Developing and Managing a Comprehensive Reservoir Analysis Model
- TP-124 Review of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineering Involvement With Alluvial Fan Flooding Problems
- TP-125 An Integrated Software Package for Flood Damage Analysis
- TP-126 The Value and Depreciation of Existing Facilities: The Case of Reservoirs
- TP-127 Floodplain-Management Plan Enumeration
- TP-128 Two-Dimensional Floodplain Modeling
- TP-129 Status and New Capabilities of Computer Program HEC-6: "Scour and Deposition in Rivers and Reservoirs"
- TP-130 Estimating Sediment Delivery and Yield on Alluvial Fans
- TP-131 Hydrologic Aspects of Flood Warning - Preparedness Programs