Presented to the
Skagit County Board of Commissioners

Re-evaluation of Historical Floods on the Skagit R. nr. Concrete, WA

Presented on August 13, 2007, by

Mark Mastin, Surface-Water Specialist
USGS Washington Water Science Center
http://wa.water.usgs.gov

USGS
science for a changing world

Topics Covered

- Why is the 1921 peak discharge at the Skagit River near Concrete important?
- How flood discharges are calculated
- History of flood calculations at this site
- Slope-Area Results
- Stage-Discharge Rating-Curve Analysis
- Final Evaluation

USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River Basin Gaging Stations

USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete

Looking downstream. Streamgage* (sta. no. 12194000) on left bank.

USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)

- 1815 flood* at 69.3 ft gage height
- 1856 flood* at 57.3 ft gage height
- 1921 flood at 47.6 ft gage height
- 2003 flood at 42.2 ft gage height (166,000 ft^3/s, highest since 1921)

- The 1921 peak discharge was used with rating extension to estimate the discharge for the other historic peaks (1897, 1909, and 1917).

* estimates in the USGS peak-flow data file

USGS
science for a changing world



Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)

Left bank across from gage--Note scour line of October 2003 flood.

USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)



USGS science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete
(cont'd)



USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)



USGS
science for a changing world

Determining Flood Discharges

- Directly—Current-meter measurement (rare)
- Stage-Discharge Relation or Rating Curve (most common)
  - Defined by current-meter measurements
  - Peak-flow discharges determined by extension



USGS
science for a changing world

Determining Flood Discharges (cont'd)

- **Indirectly**
  - Slope Area
  - Width Contractions
- **Post-flood Survey**
  - Channel geometry
  - Water-surface profile or High-Water Marks (HWMs)
  - Channel Roughness (*n* value)

USGS science for a changing world

Slope-Area Calculations

- **Manning's Equation:** $Q = 1.486/n\ AR^{2/3}S^{1/2}$
  - *where* Q = *discharge in* ft^3/s
    - n = *roughness coefficient*
    - A = *cross section area*
    - R = *hydraulic radius (A/wetted perimeter)*
    - S = *friction or energy slope*
  - *Assume uniform, steady-state conditions*
- **Energy Equation:**
  $(h+h_v)_1 = (h+h_v)_2 + (h_f)_{1-2} + k(\Delta h_v)_{1-2}$

USGS science for a changing world

Energy Equation for a reach is: $(h+h_v)_1 = (h+h_v)_2 + (h_f)_{1-2} + k(\Delta h_v)_{1-2}$ where

h = elevation of the water surface at the respective sections above a common datum;

h_v= velocity head at the respective section; hf = energy loss due to boundary friction in the reach; Δh_v= upstream velocity head minus the downstream velocity head;

$K(\Delta h_v)$ = energy loss due to acceleration of deceleration in a contracting or expanding reach,

and k = a coefficient, 0.5 for expanding reach and zero for contracting reaches.

Slope-Area Reach



USGS
science for a changing world

USGS Assigns Flow Computations an Accuracy Rating

For Indirect Measurements:

- **Good—within 10% of the real value**
- **Fair—within 15% of the real value**
- **Poor—25% or greater of the real value**

- **A difference of 36,000 cfs in a flood peak that is estimated at 240,000 cfs is 15%**

USGS
science for a changing world

Flood Hydrology Is Not an Exact Science





USGS
science for a changing world

History of Calculating the 1921 Peak Discharge

- **Winter 1922-23** Stewart surveys HWMs for the December 1921 peak, and computes a width-contraction and slope-area indirect measurement (average discharge= 240,000 ft^3/s).
  - "…floodmarks still were so clear that the profile of the flood could be determined within one or two tenths of a foot."
  - Uses the 1921 indirect measurement with the then current rating to estimate all known historic floods
  - Used channel roughness coefficient (*n* value) 0.033
  - Water-surface slope used instead of friction (or energy) slope
  - No subdivisions of the cross sections
- **1950's** Flynn and Benson use 1949 peak flow data for an *n* verification study and recalculate Stewart's slope area. They computed a peak flow of 225,000 ft^3/s. Bodhaine (1954) approves Flynn and Benson's analysis, but does not revise Stewart's estimate because it is a change of less than 10 percent.
  - No subdivision of the cross sections
  - *n* value = 0.0305

USGS science for a changing world

History of Calculating the 1921 Peak Discharge (cont'd)

- **December 2004** PIE report using 1-D HEC-RAS model, estimates 1921 peak at 202,000 ft^3/s. Will Thomas (FEMA) and Robert Jarrett (USGS) found errors in PIE analysis.
- **2005** Mastin and Kresch compute a range of *n* values based on 2003 peak discharge and a range of peak discharges for the 1921 peak from 215,000 to 266,000 ft^3/s.
- **February 2007** Floodmarks not found in Hamilton House—Evidence of the magnitude of historic floods found to be inconclusive by NHC.
- **April 2007** NHC report reviews 1922 [1921] flood and concludes, "the best estimate of the peak discharge for this event of 225,000 cfs as determined by Benson
- **August 2007** Mastin revises earlier estimate using 2003 data with 2006 peak water surface profile and re-evaluates the 1921 calculation with Benson and Flynn 1949 peak-flow data
  - *n* value of main channel 0.0315
  - Cross section B and C subdivided
  - 1921 peak discharge calculated to be 228,000 ft^3/s, which is 5 percent less tan the estimate by Stewart

USGS science for a changing world

Slope-Area Reach



USGS
science for a changing world

Cross Section 2 (XS2)



USGS science for a changing world

NOTE: *n* is the roughness coefficient; vertical lines indicate where the cross sections were subdivided

Results from the 2003/2006 Peak-Flow Analysis

- *n* value for the main channel is 0.033
- Recalculated 1921 peak using an *n* value of 0.033, subdivisions and the energy slope is 219,000 ft^3/s, which is 9 percent less than the estimate by Stewart
- Is this valid? Have things changed since 1921?

USGS
science for a changing world

Has the reach changed since 1921?

USGS
science for a changing world

Cross-Section Surveys from Discharge Measurements at the Cableway Skagit R. nr Concrete, 12194000



USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete

USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)

Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)



USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)

Island / bar at XS2

USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)

USGS
science for a changing world

Skagit River near Concrete (cont'd)



USGS science for a changing world

August 2004, looking downstream from Dalles Bridge

Has the reach changed since 1921?

- Yes, the reach has changed since 1921 at cross section 2 (XS2) in the form of a dense forest.
- Are the reach changes since the inception of the forest on the island/bar addressed by the addition of sub sections and increased n value at XS2? Yes, to some extent, but it is difficult to assess the accuracy of the model with these changes.
- Evidence suggests that the reach conditions in 1949 were pretty much the same as in 1921.

USGS
science for a changing world

Water-Surface Slope of 1949 Flood



USGS
science for a changing world

Results

Using this analysis, the peak discharge for the 1921 flood is 228,000 ft^3/s



Cross sections, subdivisions, and *n* values used in the re-evaluation of the Benson Flynn analysis

USGS science for a changing world

Results (cont'd)



USGS
science for a changing world

Historical Floods at Concrete

Year	Currently Published Discharge, ft^3/s	Gage Height, in feet (current gage datum)	Revised Peak Discharge	% difference
~1815	*500,000	69.3	*510,000	2.0
~1856	*350,000	57.3	*340,000	-2.9
1897	275,000	51.1	265,000	-3.6
1909	260,000	49.1	245,000	-5.8
1917	220,000	45.7	210,000	-4.5
1921	240,000	47.6	228,000	-5.0

USGS science for a changing world

*estimates in the USGS peak-flow data file

Summary

- There are three lines of evidence that all point to the fact that Stewart's 1921 indirect peak estimate is slightly high
  1. *n* verification and recalculation using 2003/2006 peak data
  2. *n* verification and recalculation using 1949 peak data
  3. Stage-discharge rating extension

- All three of the recalculations are within the error bounds of Stewart's original calculation and the 10-percent guideline for revision. Even so, USGS has decided to revise the 1921 peak-flow estimate to 228,000 ft^3/s because each of the three recalculations is less than the published estimate and the 1921 peak-flow value is critical for flood planning.

- The *n*-verification using 1949 peak data is most accurate and it is used to recalculate the 1921 peak discharge.

- Rating extension is used with the 1921 peak discharge to estimate the magnitude of the other historical peak discharges.

USGS
science for a changing world

Questions?

USGS
science for a changing world