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I. INTRODUCTION

1-01. REFERENCES.

a. Circular Letter No. 4262 (Civil Works No. 65), dated 20 November 1946, subject, Standard Project Flood Estimates, wherein original instructions concerning the preparation of standard project flood estimates were issued.

b. Orders & Regulations, paragraph 4208.11 (Revised Mar. 1951) wherein the preparation of standard project flood estimates for certain classes of projects is directed, and instructions are presented regarding the submission of certain estimates for approval of the Chief of Engineers prior to incorporation in project reports. (See quotation in para 4-02 herein).


1-02. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS BULLETIN.

a. This bulletin reviews briefly principal classes of flood analyses and estimates involved in the planning and design of flood control and multiple-purpose projects, with the primary objective of indicating the general application and purposes of Standard Project Flood Estimates.

b. Generalized rainfall criteria and recommended procedures for the computation of standard project storm rainfall and rainfall-excess quantities for small drainage basins (classified herein as approximately 1,000 square miles and less) located east of 105° longitude, are presented, with a concise explanation of their derivation.

c. Procedures for derivation of SPS and SPF estimates for large drainage basins (exceeding approximately 1000 sq.mi.) are discussed and illustrated.

d. This bulletin is sub-divided into four Sections, as follows:
1-03. SPECIFICATIONS OF A STANDARD PROJECT STORM (Abbrev. "SFS").

a. The "standard project storm" estimate for a particular drainage area and season of year in which snow-melt is not a major consideration should represent the most severe flood-producing rainfall depth-area-duration relationship and isohyetal pattern of any storm that is considered reasonably characteristic of the region in which the drainage basin is located, giving consideration to the runoff characteristics and existence of water regulation structures in the basin. In deriving standard project storm rainfall estimates applicable to seasons and areas in which melting snow may contribute a substantial volume of runoff to the standard project flood hydrograph, appropriate allowances for snow melt are included with and considered as a part of the standard project storm rainfall quantities in computing the SPF hydrograph. Where floods are predominantly the result of melting snow, the SPF estimate is based on estimates of the most critical combinations of snow, temperature and water losses considered reasonably characteristic of the region.

b. The term "storm" is used in a broad sense to mean any period or sequence of rainfall events that may contribute to critical flood events in the particular drainage basin under study.

c. The term "region" as used above is construed to include the area surrounding the given basin in which storm producing factors are substantially comparable; i.e., the general area within which meteorological influences and topography are sufficiently alike to permit adjustment of storm data to a common basis of comparison with practical degree of reliability. Such a "region" includes a very large area in the eastern half of the United States where relief is generally moderate, and relatively small areas in certain sections of the western United States where extreme topography is encountered.

d. A general comparison of maximum storms of record in the region, supplemented by meteorological investigations, serve as a basis in selecting rainfall criteria to represent the most severe storm that is considered "reasonably characteristic" of a region. Certain storms of extraordinary severity may be eliminated as too unusual and extreme to warrant adoption as the standard project storm.

1-04. STANDARD PROJECT FLOOD (Abbrev. "SPF")

a. In general terms, the standard project flood may be defined as a hydrograph representing runoff from the standard project storm (and/or snow melt) as defined in paragraph 1-03 a. The SPF may have more than a single peak if these are the result of runoff from the SPS.
b. Infiltration losses assumed in computing runoff from the SPS should correspond to those considered reasonably likely to occur during storms of such magnitude, estimated on the basis of data obtained from the analysis of rainfall-runoff relations in major floods of record.

c. The same principles referred to above should be followed in the selection of unit hydrographs, in flood routing computations, and in other calculations related to the development of the SFF hydrographs.

d. Appropriate allowances should be made for variations in the areal distribution and sequence of rainfall over the basin during the SPS. The SPS rainfall estimate should be prepared in suitable form to permit significant variations in areal distribution, sequence, and intensities to be taken into consideration in computing runoff hydrographs.

e. In some cases, particularly with respect to very large drainage basins, the Standard Project Flood hydrograph estimate may, of necessity, be based on a study of actual hydrographs or stages of record, or on other procedures not involving directly a SPS estimate. In such cases, the general principles and objectives presented for the development of SFF estimates from rainfall and run-off criteria should serve as a guide.

f. It is apparent from a study of depth-area-duration data for major storms, and general consideration of the relative opportunities for drainage basins of various sizes, shapes and locations to be subjected to rainfall occurrences of SPS category, that the statistical probability of SFF occurrence would vary with size of drainage area and other hydrometeorological factors. For these, and a number of other reasons that might be listed, it is not considered feasible to assign specific frequency estimates to SFF determinations in general.

g. Where only the highest peak discharge of a SFF hydrograph is pertinent to specific project studies, the SFF may be referred to by that peak discharge as a matter of convenience.

1-05. STANDARD PROJECT FLOOD SERIES

Practically all detailed studies of unusual storms completed to date have been limited to durations of 120 hours or less. In the development of standard project flood criteria for very large drainage basins or those in which reservoirs serve to modulate runoff rates to a substantial extent, it is necessary to consider runoff resulting from rainfall over a substantially longer period than 120 hours. In some cases, runoff for a period of weeks or months prior to the occurrence of an extraordinary 120-hour storm must be taken into account in studies related to specific projects. It is apparent that the computation of hypothetical hydrographs covering such an extended length of time, following procedures involving storm rainfall data and application of the unit hydrograph technique, would be very laborious and subject to many uncertainties as to proper basic assumptions and criteria. These difficulties can be circumvented satisfactorily in most cases by developing a "standard project flood series" in
which hydrographs for periods antecedent to and subsequent to a standard project storm of 120-hours duration are represented by flows actually observed in the basin, with such adjustments as may be deemed appropriate after a general study of flood and storm characteristics in the region involved.

1-06. BASIC FLOOD ESTIMATES IN PLANNING AND DESIGN OF PROJECTS.

a. General. Flood magnitudes in a particular drainage basin are governed by combinations of many variable factors, the most important being the quantity, intensity, sequence and areal distribution of precipitation, the infiltration capacity of the soil, and natural and artificial storage effects during floods. Compensating variations in these several factors usually serve to reduce flood runoff rates and volumes to values far below those that would result from critical combinations of such factors. Where relatively long-period records of stream flow are available, statistical analyses of the record provide a valuable means of estimating the magnitude of flood flows that may be expected with frequencies bearing a reasonable relationship to the period of observation. Statistical studies involving consideration of flow records of numerous streams in a region of reasonably comparable hydrologic and meteorological influences provide more reliable estimates of maximum flood potentialities and average frequencies of commonly observed flood magnitudes than can be obtained from studies of individual station records. However, because of the number and range of variation in independent variables involved and the wide range between flood magnitudes that would result from optimum combinations of critical flood-producing factors as compared with combinations generally observed, statistical analyses of actual stream flow records seldom, if ever, provide a reliable indication of extraordinary flood potentialities of a specific drainage basin. Accordingly, in the planning and design of major engineering projects for the regulation of stream flow, statistical analyses of stream flow records must be supplemented by hypothetical flood estimates based on scientific studies of principal flood-producing factors individually and in various combinations.

b. In accordance with the preceding discussion, three classes of basic flood estimates are required in general flood control planning and design investigations:

(1) Statistical Analyses of Stream Flow Records, including flood-frequency estimates (preferably on a regionalized basis) and various correlations of flood characteristics and hydrologic features of the drainage basin.

(2) Standard Project Flood (Abbrev. SPF) Estimates representing flood discharges that may be expected from the most severe combination of meteorologic and hydrologic conditions that are considered reasonably characteristic of the geographical region involved, excluding extremely rare combinations.
(3) **Maximum Probable (or "Maximum Possible") Flood Estimates** representing flood discharge that may be expected from the most severe combination of critical meteorologic and hydrologic conditions that are reasonably possible in the region.

c. Statistical Flood Studies of several types have proven useful in engineering investigations, the most prevalent consisting of flood-frequency estimates. Flood-frequency determinations are used primarily as a basis for estimating the mean annual benefits that may be expected from the control or reduction of floods of relatively common occurrence.

d. Standard Project Flood estimate serves the following primary purposes:

(1) Represents a "standard" against which the degree of protection finally selected for a project may be judged and compared with protection provided at similar projects in other localities. The SPF estimate must reflect a generalized analysis of flood potentialities in a region, as contrasted to an analysis of flood records at the specific locality that may be misleading because of the inadequacies of records or abnormal sequences of hydrologic events during the period of stream flow observation.

(2) Represent the flood discharge that should be selected as the design flood for the project, or approached as nearly as practicable in consideration of economic or other governing limitations, where some small degree of risk can be accepted but an unusually high degree of protection is justified by hazards to life and high property values within the area to be protected. Estimates completed to date indicate that SPF flood discharges are generally equal to 40 to 60 percent of "maximum probable" floods for the same basins.

e. **Maximum Probable (or Maximum Possible) Flood estimates** are applicable to projects where consideration is to be given to virtually complete security against potential floods. Applications of such estimates are usually confined to the determination of spillway requirements for high dams, but in unusual cases may constitute the design flood for local protection works where an exceptionally high degree of protection is advisable and economically obtainable.

1-07. **DESIGN FLOOD**

a. The term "design flood" refers to the flood hydrograph or peak discharge value finally adopted as the basis for design of a particular project or section thereof after full consideration has been given to flood characteristics, frequencies, and potentialities, and the economic and other practical considerations entering into selection of the design discharge criteria. The term "design flood" is synonymous with "project design flood", although use of the latter term has been generally discontinued in order to avoid possible confusion with the term "standard project flood". For convenience in reference, such terms as "spillway design flood", "levee design flood", "channel design flood", etc., are used where appropriate.
b. The term "design flood" or "reservoir design flood" may be applied to the most severe flood that a particular reservoir may be capable of controlling under an adopted plan of operation but such usage has little value except where the reservoir is provided primarily for protection of damage centers near the dam. Usually selection of the flood control allocation in a reservoir is governed by consideration of flood control effects at several locations downstream, involving the analysis of a number of flood situations. Accordingly, application of the term "design flood" or "reservoir design flood" should be limited to those cases in which the term is actually indicative of the basis for a flood control storage allocation, more detailed criteria being specified for other cases.

1-08. RELATION OF SPF TO DESIGN FLOOD

a. In the design of flood control projects it would of course be desirable to provide protection against the maximum probable flood, if this were feasible within acceptable limits of cost. However, it is seldom practicable to provide absolute flood protection by means of local protection projects or reservoirs: usually the costs are too high, and in many cases the acquisition of adequate rights-of-way for the purpose would involve unreasonably destruction or modifications of properties along the floodway. As a rule, some risk must be accepted in the selection of design flood discharges. A decision as to how much risk should be accepted in each case is of utmost importance and should be based on careful consideration of flood characteristics and potentialities in the basin, the class of area to be protected, and economic limitations.

b. The "design flood" for a particular project may be either greater or less than the standard project flood, depending to an important extent upon economic factors and other practical considerations governing the selection of design capacity in a specific case. However, selections should not be governed by estimates of average annual benefits of a tangible nature alone, nor should construction difficulties that may prove troublesome but not insurmountable be allowed to dictate the design flood selection, particularly where protection of high class urban or agricultural areas is involved. Intangible benefits, resulting from provision of a high degree of security against floods of a disastrous magnitude, including the protection of human life, must be considered in addition to tangible benefits that may be estimated in monetary terms.

c. The Standard Project Flood is intended as a practicable expression of the degree of protection that should be sought as a general rule in the design of flood control works for communities where protection of human life and unusually high-valued property is involved. Inasmuch as SPF estimates are to be based on generalized studies of meteorologic and hydrologic conditions in a region, the SPF estimates provides a basis for comparing the degree of protection provided by flood control projects in different localities, thus promoting a more consistent policy with respect to selection of design flood giving a comparable degree of protection for similar classes of property.
II. GENERALIZED SPS ESTIMATES FOR SMALL DRAINAGE BASINS

2-01. GENERAL

a. The criteria presented in this section apply specifically to drainage areas east of 105° longitude and primarily to basins less than approximately 1000 square miles in area. The rainfall criteria are based primarily on analysis of major storms of record that have occurred in the spring, summer and fall seasons, during which convective activity is prominent. The criteria are not generally applicable to snow seasons without special adjustments. Inasmuch as records indicate that the most severe (but not necessarily the most frequent) floods in drainage areas of less than a few thousand square miles, within the area covered by the generalized charts, usually result from intense rainfall during the non-snow season, the criteria presented hereinafter are considered applicable in the computation of SFF estimates for most basins. Where this conclusion is not considered applicable by the reporting engineer, development of the SPS estimate should be based on a special study of flood producing factors affecting the particular basin. It is anticipated that such exceptions will apply only where runoff from snow melt, with or without coincident rainfall, is a major factor in the production of unusual floods.

b. Various approaches to the standardization of methods and criteria related to the computation of SPS and SFF estimates have been studied during the past two years. Because of the variability of factors involved, limitations in basic data, and the nature of the problem, certain arbitrary assumptions and simplifications of criteria have been necessary to obtain results suitable for practical use. Although any standardization of criteria must involve certain approximations, it has been concluded that adoption of generalized rainfall criteria substantially as presented herein is advisable for the purpose of assuring consistency between SFF estimates prepared by various offices, as well as to minimize work required in the preparation of estimates.

c. The development of generalized SPS rainfall criteria for drainage areas less than approximately 1000 square miles, located east of 105° longitude, is revealed generally by the explanation of plates in the following paragraph.

2-02. EXPLANATION OF PLATES

a. Plate 1. Generalized Estimates, Maximum Possible Precipitation. The isohyets on this chart represent the maximum probable 24-hour rainfall over 200 square miles area, as estimated by the Hydro-meteorological Section of the U. S. Weather Bureau and explained in AMS Report No. 23.
b. Plate 2. SPS Index Rainfall. The isohyets on Plate 2 represent the maximum average depth of rainfall in 24 hours over 200 square miles during the standard project storm, which is equal to approximately 40 to 60 percent of the maximum possible rainfall indicated on Plate 1, with a general average of about 50 percent. Plate 2 was prepared by reducing isohyets on Plate 1 to 50 percent of original values and reshaping the isohyets in certain regions by moderate amounts to conform with supplementary studies of rainfall characteristics in those regions during development studies similar charts were prepared for selected areas ranging from 10 to 20,000 square miles and storm durations from 6 to 96 hours. It was found that depth-area-duration values for these several charts bore a reasonably consistent relationship to values shown on Plate 2. Accordingly, Plate 2 was adopted as the "SPS Index Rainfall" chart, the use of which is explained hereinafter.

c. Plate 3. SPS Index Rainfall Isohyets vs Actual Storm Values. This chart shows graphically a comparison between the selected SPS Index Rainfall isohyets and rainfall values recorded during actual storms in various geographical locations for comparable durations and areas. Data from all storm studies completed to date (approx. 400) are shown on the chart.

d. Plate 4. Ratio of Actual Storm Values to SPS Index Rainfall. In Figure (a) of Plate 4 the rainfall values recorded in actual storms, as shown on Plate 3, are plotted against values indicated by SPS Index Rainfall isohyets for corresponding geographical locations. The number of actual storm values exceeding various percentages of the SPS Index Rainfall are shown graphically in Figure (a) and the percentages of actual storm values that equalled or exceeded various SPS Index Rainfall ratios are indicated in Figure (b). To demonstrate the relative consistency of relationships in different geographical areas, separate curves are plotted in Figure (b) for four areas, delineated by SPS Index Rainfall isohyets as indicated on Plate 4, as well as for the total area east of 105° longitude. It may be observed that on the average approximately 10 percent of the storms studied to date have equalled or exceeded the SPS Index Rainfall. This percentage will of course vary as additional storm studies are completed, but serves to illustrate that the standard project storm is not of unprecedented magnitude regionally, although it is definitely of a major category.

e. Plate 5. Tabulation, Precipitation During Major Storms of Record, Expressed in Percent of SPS Index Rainfall. In preparing this table the geographical location of maximum rainfall during each storm of record was determined by 2-degree latitude-longitude quadrangles, and the corresponding SPS Index Rainfall value was scaled from Plate 2; the average depths of rainfall over selected areas in various periods of time were obtained for the Corps of Engineers publications entitled "Storm Rainfall in the Eastern United States", and converted to percent of SPS Index Rainfall, as shown in Plate 5. For study purposes, the data were tabulated by geographical zones as delineated on Plate 2. Plate 5 includes 105 of the more outstanding storms of the 400 investigated in detail.
Considering all storms tabulated in Plate 5, the 24-hour values of Index Rainfall Ratios (i.e. Percent of Index Rainfall) were arranged in order of diminishing magnitude for each of the areas designated in the column headings of Plate 5. The number of Index Rainfall Ratios exceeding various values was determined and converted to percent of the total number of storms studied (approx. 100). The curve on Plate 6 designated as "Maximum Observed" was obtained by plotting the highest value of Index Rainfall Ratio for each area and drawing a smooth curve to envelope the plotted points. The set of curves number 1E, 5E, and 10E was obtained by plotting for each selected area the values of Index Rainfall Ratio equalled or exceeded by 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent, respectively, of the total number of values. For purpose of comparison, the set of curves designated as 1A, 5A, 10A, 25A and 50A were obtained by plotting the mean of the highest 1 percent, 5 percent, 10 percent, etc., of the Index Rainfall Ratios for the selected areas.

g. Plates 7 and 8. These Plates were prepared in the same manner as Plate 6, using data applicable to 48-hour and 96-hour storm periods, respectively.

h. Plates 9. SPS Depth-Area-Duration Relationships by 24-Hour Storm Increments. Following a general review of the problem and data analyzed, Curves Nos. 25A on Plates 6, 7, and 8 were selected as indices to the volume of precipitation that should be assumed as occurring in 24, 48, and 96-hour periods of Standard Project Storms. Plate 9 represents a replotting of Curves 25A from Plates 6, 7, and 8, with an interpolated curve for the 72-hour duration, for convenience in use. Applications of the curves in preparing SPS estimates for basins of various sizes are discussed hereinafter.

i. Plate 10. Time-Distribution of 24-Hour SPS Rainfall.
In developing Plate 10, charts similar to Plate 2 were prepared from data recorded in actual storms to represent the maximum rainfall in 6 and 12 hours, respectively, over selected areas of less than 1000 sq. miles. Correlations of maximum 6-hour and 12-hour rainfall values with the SPS Index Rainfall values for various geographical locations resulted in curves substantially as indicated in Fig (a) of Plate 10. Supplementary studies using different methods of approach substantiated the results obtained by the first method within acceptable limits of variation. A relatively extensive study of hydrographs of actual storms showed that the maximum 6-hour rainfall may occur near the beginning, middle or end of the maximum 24-hour rainfall period of a storm. Accordingly, the sequence of 6-hour rainfall increments indicated in Fig (b) of Plate 10 was selected for SPS estimates applicable to drainage areas of approximately 1000 sq. mi. and less, on the basis that such a sequence would produce critical runoff from most basins. Procedures for estimating time-distribution of rainfall in SPS estimates for drainage basins larger than approximately 1000 sq. mi. are outlined hereinafter.
Plate 11. Time-Distribution of Maximum 6-Hour SPS Rainfall
Analyses of major storms approaching SPS intensities over areas of a few
hundred square miles or larger show that the rate of rainfall is usually fairly uniform during the maximum 6-hour period of the storm, with exception of intermittent short-period variations which usually produce only small variations in stream-flow rates at downstream points after valley storage has modulated local variations in surface runoff. Rainfall rates during less intense 6-hour periods of the storm are generally more erratic, and may follow many different sequences and rate changes in different storms. However, studies indicate that assumption of uniform rainfall intensities during successive 6-hour periods of the SPS, with exception of the maximum 6-hr. period of SPS estimates applicable to small drainage basins, would give satisfactory flood discharge estimates if reasonable conservatism is exercised in estimating infiltration losses and unit hydrographs. In order to assure safe estimates of peak discharges to be expected from SPS rainfall over drainage areas less than approximately 300 square miles on the average, the maximum 6-hour rainfall of the SPS should be broken down into shorter unit periods and higher intensities assumed for the shorter intervals according to criteria presented on Plate 11.

Plate 12. SPS Isohyetal Pattern. Studies of isohyetal patterns resulting from storms in which the maximum 6 or 12-hour rainfall is generally comparable to SPS values reveal that the patterns over a few thousand square miles or less are usually elliptical in shape and that the longer axis may be oriented in any direction, unless topographical influences are pronounced. Within these general limits, a wide variety of patterns might be selected with equal validity. To simplify SPS computations in which areal distribution of precipitation has an important influence on run-off rates and volumes, a typical isohyetal pattern is presented on Plate 12. The application of this isohyetal pattern is explained later.

Plates 13, 14 and 15. These relate to illustrative examples, as discussed hereinafter.

2-03. PREPARATION OF SPS ESTIMATES FOR SMALL DRAINAGE BASINS (LESS THAN 1000 SQ. MI.)

a. General. The preparation of a SPS estimate for a small drainage basin utilizing generalized criteria presented on Plates 2 and 9 to 12 involves the following steps:

(1) Interpolate from generalized isohyet on Plate 2 the SPS index rainfall corresponding to the location of the drainage basin under study (referred to hereinafter as "project basin").

(2) Enter Plate 9 with the SPS Index Rainfall value determined in step (1) to obtain the SPS Index Rainfall Ratios corresponding to 24, 48, 72 and 96-hour periods and an area equal to the total area of the project basin. Multiply these ratios by the SPS Index Rainfall to obtain average depths of rainfall within an isohyetal area equal to the drainage area of the project basin, and determine incremental 24-hour values by subtraction.
(3) Arrange the 24-hour SPF rainfall values determined in step (2) in a sequence favorable to production of critical runoff at project locations under consideration, based on a general appraisal of hydrologic conditions in the project basin.

(4) Prepare an overlay of the isohyetal map shown on Plate 12, converting the isohyet values to inches of 96-hour SPF rainfall by multiplying the percentage values on Plate 12 by the SPF index Rainfall value determined in step (1).

(5) Superimpose the project basin outline over the total-storm isohyetal map obtained in step (4), and planimeter to determine the average depth of total-storm rainfall over the basin and each sub-division thereof that is to be considered in estimating the SPF rainfall-excess and runoff rates.

(6) Subdivide the total-storm SPF rainfall values obtained in step (5) into 6-hour values in accordance with criteria presented on Plate 10. The same sequence and 6-hourly percentage distribution of rainfall is assumed for each day of the SPF.

(7) If the computed value of "t_p" for the drainage area under study, or important subdivisions thereof for which SPF discharges are desired, is less than 16 hours, subdivide the maximum 6-hour SPF rainfall value of the maximum 24-hour rainfall into shorter unit durations in accordance with criteria presented on Plate 11. (See p. 11 of reference cited in paragraph 1-01 for explanation of "t_p" and method of computation).

(8) Subtract estimated infiltration losses from SPF Rainfall values obtained in steps (6) and (7) to obtain rainfall-excess quantities to be used with unit hydrographs in computing SPF discharges.

b. Simplification of Procedure in Special Cases. If analyses of rainfall and runoff records in the project basin or comparable watersheds indicate that infiltration capacities over the basin are relatively uniform, and subdivision of the drainage basin for hydrologic reasons is not otherwise required for project study purposes, the general procedure outlined above may be simplified by omitting preparation of the isohyetal pattern referred to in step (4), simply using the depth-area curve values obtained in step (3), without correction for basin shape.

c. Illustrative Example: Computation of SPF rainfall for a sample drainage basin following the steps outlined in subparagraph a above is demonstrated on Plate 14. The drainage basin and isohyetal overlay (step 4) are shown on Plate 13. In this case, the existence of a flood-control reservoir in the area is assumed in order to demonstrate the centering of the storm over the uncontrolled area and the computation of rainfall for the controlled and uncontrolled areas separately. Explanation of the computation is as follows:
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(1) Lines 1 to 5 establish the index rainfall and the magnitude and time arrangement of 24-hour rainfall amounts that would be obtained for the entire basin without reduction for the fact that the storm isohyets do not conform to the shape of the basin.

(2) Lines 6 to 12 incorporate the adjustment required for basin shape and the subdivision of rainfall among sub-basins. These lines can be eliminated where these refinements are not required. Values given in lines 6 to 8 were obtained by planimetering isohyets on Plate 13. Values of line 9 are those of line 5 divided by the total-storm rainfall (15.7 inches). Values of lines 10 to 12 are obtained by multiplying values of line 5 by those of lines 6 to 8 respectively.

(3) Lines 13 to 21 establish the hyetographs for each area. Six-hour percentage of maximum 24-hour rainfall obtained from Plate 10, are applied to each successive 24-hour period of rainfall. These are multiplied by respective values in lines 10-12 to obtain 6-hour rainfall amounts in lines 14 to 16. The tabulation on Plate 13 indicates that tR is 3 hours in this case (see Plate 11). Appropriate percentages of maximum 6-hour rainfall in 3-hour intervals shown on Plate 11 are entered in line 18, Plate 14. These are multiplied by the respective values of the 66-hour column, lines 14 to 16, to obtain 3-hour amounts on lines 19 to 21.

(4) Lines 22 to 29 establish rainfall excess amounts. Infiltration losses (lines 22 and 23) are subtracted from rainfall amounts for the sub-areas A and B to obtain rainfall excess amounts for those sub-areas (lines 24 and 25). These are converted to volumes (lines 26 and 27, and are added to obtain rainfall-excess volumes for the total area (line 29). These volumes divided by the total area yield average rainfall-excess depths for the total area (line 29). Values of line 24 and 25 would be used in conjunction with unit hydrographs for the sub-areas in this case because of the existence of a flood-control reservoir at the lower end of area A. In cases where subdivision of the area is made only to account for areal differences in loss rates, values of line 29 can be used in conjunction with a unit hydrograph for the entire area.

2-04. APPROXIMATION OF SPP AS PERCENTAGE OF MAXIMUM PROBABLE FLOOD. As stated in sub-paragraph 1-06 d (2), estimates completed to date indicate that SPP discharges based on detailed studies usually equal 40 to 60 percent of the maximum probable (or "maximum possible") flood for the same basin; a ratio of 50 percent is considered representative of average conditions. Inasmuch as computation of maximum probable flood estimates are normally required as the basis of design of spillways for high dams, it is convenient to estimate the SPP for reservoir projects as equal to 50 percent of the maximum probable flood hydrograph to avoid the preparation of a separate SPP estimate (see paragraph 1-05 and 3-02 d regarding SPP series). Accordingly, this convention is acceptable for reservoir projects in general. The rule may also be applied in estimating SPP hydrographs for basins outside of the region and range of areas covered by generalized charts presented herein where maximum probable flood estimates based on detailed hydrometeorological investigations have been completed. Where snow melt or extreme
ranges in topography are major factors to be taken into consideration, it is appropriate to estimate the maximum probable flood hydrograph for the basin by considering optimum combinations of critical flood-producing factors and assuming the SF7 hydrographs is equal to 90 percent of the maximum probable discharges. This approximation is based on the conclusion that critical conditions can be determined from analyses of meteorological and topographic influences, whereas a substantial period of hydrometeorological records are required to determine appropriate combinations of flood producing factors meeting SF7 specifications.
III. SPS ESTIMATES FOR LARGE DRAINAGE BASINS

3-01. GENERAL. The basic principles involved in the preparation of SPS and SPF estimates for large drainage basins are the same as those applicable to basins less than 1,000 square miles in area, which have been discussed in Section II. However, generalizations of criteria become more difficult as the size of area increases. Whereas SPF discharge estimates for small areas are usually governed largely by the maximum 6 or 12-hour rainfall associated with a severe thunderstorm situation, floods of SPF category on large drainage basins are generally the result of a succession of relatively distinct rainfall events. Although the intensity and quantities of rainfall are important factors in the production of a flood in a large drainage basin, the location of successive increments of rainfall in the basin, and the synchronization of intense bursts of rainfall with progression of runoff, are of equal or greater importance in many cases than quantity of total precipitation. For example, the total rainfall over the Kansas River basin during the period 25-31 May 1903, which produced an estimated peak discharge of 260,000 cfs on the Kansas River at Kansas City, was almost identical with the total precipitation that occurred over the basin 9-12 July 1951 to produce a peak discharge of 510,000 cfs. Other examples of a similar nature might be cited. Accordingly, selection of a SPF for a large basin cannot be predicated on a statistical analysis of precipitation quantities alone, but must be based on a review of hydrometeorological data for several outstanding storms of record in the basin and adjacent regions in relation to hydrologic characteristics of the basin under study. Consideration of major floods of record and historical account should also play an important part in the selection of SPF criteria and final estimate.

3-02. EXAMPLE: SPS ESTIMATE FOR CUMBERLAND RIVER ABOVE OLD HICKORY DAM SITE (11,700 SQ. MI.).

a. Selection of Model Storm for SPS Estimate. Following is a chronological outline of the procedure used:

(1) Using the Corps of Engineers publication "Storm Rainfall in the United States, Depth-Area-Duration Data", approximately 30 storms of record within a few hundred miles of the Cumberland basin were tentatively listed for transposition. To limit the number, only those storms that produced rainfall exceeding an average of 6 inches over 5,000 sq. mi. were included. The average depth of rainfall over 5,000 and 10,000 sq. mi. was listed for purpose of comparison.

(2) Following a preliminary inspection of data referred to above, it was evident that winter-season storms were predominantly the most severe for the area involved, and that ground conditions would be most favorable for flood runoff during the winter. Accordingly, the list of storms cited in sub-paragraph a was reduced by eliminating the less important Summer and Fall Storms, and also certain winter storms that did not show isohyetal patterns oriented favorably for transposition to the Cumberland basin. The final list of 19 storms considered for transposition is shown in table A of Plate 15.
(3) The list of 19 storms was referred to the Hydrometeorological Section of the Weather Bureau for an opinion regarding transposition and for an estimate of adjustment required. Two transpositions of the 5,000 sq. mi. center area of each storm were considered, one transposition being made to the lower Cumberland basin (center at Clarksville, Tenn.) and the other to the Upper basin (center at Burnside, Ky.). The transposition adjustment factors furnished by the Weather Bureau are listed in the 5th and 6th columns of Table A, Plate 15.

(4) In order to facilitate a comparison of the relative magnitudes of rainfall quantities that might be expected over various size areas and in selected periods of time, the tabulation shown in Table A, Plate 15, was completed by multiplying the rainfall values observed in the respective storms by the average of the Clarksville and Burnside transposition factors.

(5) Inasmuch as rainfall values listed in Table A of Plate 15 represent average depths within isohyets that differ from the shape of the Cumberland watershed, adjustment for such differences is necessary to determine the quantity of rainfall that would fall on the watershed during the transposed storm. To minimize work, "basin shape" factors were computed only for the seven most important storms, as listed in Table B of Plate 15. The basin shape factor for each storm was determined by superimposing the basin outline over the total-storm isohyetal map prepared in the Part II Storm Study, planimetering to determine the average depth of rainfall within the basin outline, and dividing this value by the average rainfall depth for a corresponding size area as read from the maximum depth-area-curve for the storm. Results are listed in the 5th, 6th, and 7th columns of Table B, Plate 15.

(6) Depth-area-duration data for the seven most important storms included in the study, including adjustments for transposition and basin shape, are tabulated in Table B, Plate 15. Following a general comparison of data shown on Table B, consideration of seasonal characteristics of floods in the basin and the probable effects of reservoir operations on the regulation of runoff, the transposed and adjusted storm of 23-27 March 1913 (OR 1-15) was selected as the 120 hour SPS for the Cumberland basin above Old Hickory, Tenn.

(7) Average rainfall and rainfall-excess quantities for 7 sub-divisions of the drainage area were computed by 6-hour time intervals during the 120-hour SPS, as explained in paragraph 3-02 b.

(8) Criteria for the preparation of the SPS Series for the drainage area above Old Hickory, Tenn., were established in the manner explained in paragraph 3-02 d.

Footnote: Permissible rotation of isohyetal pattern was assumed as 20 degrees, but was less in the seven storms listed in Table B of Plate 15.
Example: Computation of SPS Rainfall and Rainfall Excess
for Cumberland River Basin above Old Hickory Dam Site.

(1) The outline of the Cumberland basin was superimposed over the total-storm isohyetal map of the 23-27 March 1913 (OR 1-15 storm in the same position assumed in computing the "basin shape" factor referred to in sub-paragraph 3-02 a (5). Portions of the isohyetal map within each of seven sub-divisions of the basin were planimetered to determine the average depth of total-storm rainfall before adjustment for transposition.

(2) The transposition adjustment factor for each of the seven sub-areas of the basin were interpolated on a straight line basis from values determined by the Hydrometeorological Section of the Weather Bureau, for Clarksville, Tenn., and Burnside, Ky. The total storm rainfall values computed for each of seven sub-areas were multiplied by the appropriate transposition factors to obtain the total-storm SPS precipitation for the area.

(3) Precipitation stations within the outline of the Cumberland basin as superimposed on the isohyetal map in step (1), and stations immediately adjacent thereto, were listed on Storm Study Form S-10, grouping the stations as they appeared in the sub-areas. The accumulative precipitation at each of these stations was then copied from the Form S-10 tabulations of the Part II Storm Study data.

(4) Average mass curves of unadjusted rainfall for the 23-27 March 1913 storm (OR 1-15) were computed by 6 hour intervals for each of the seven sub-areas of the basin, using data compiled in steps (1) and (3), following the same procedure used in computing average mass curves for "zones" in Part II Storm Studies (See Supplement C to Engineer Bulletin R&M No. 10, 1938 Form S-12). These average mass curve values were then adjusted to correspond to the SPS rainfall values for the respective sub-areas, and 6-hour increments of rainfall during the SPS were reduced from this curve.

(5) Rainfall-excess during successive 6-hour periods of the SPS were computed by subtracting losses corresponding to an infiltration index of 0.02 inch per hour, which conforms to values deduced from an analysis of a number of actual winter floods in the area.

c. Variation in Procedure in Computing Rainfall-Excess. In computing rainfall-excess values for the 120-hour SPS discussed in paragraph 3-02 b, 6-hour average losses over each sub-area were subtracted from 6-hour average rainfall values for the same composite area. Treatment of each sub-area as a unit was satisfactory in the particular study because of the very low infiltration index involved. However, in studies applicable to drainage basins of similar size in which infiltration losses are relatively high, rainfall-excess quantities should be computed for area sub-division corresponding to Thiessen polygons surrounding each precipitation station, in order that appropriate allowances may be made for areas not covered by rainfall exceeding losses during each period of the storm.
d. Example: SPF Series. The derivation of a "SPF Series" for the 11,700 sq. mi. drainage of the Cumberland River basin above Old Hickory, Tenn., covering a 4½ month period from 23 Dec to 7 May is outlined below:

(1) Flows for a three-month period antecedent to the SPF flood were assumed as equal to daily discharges recorded during the period from 23 Dec 1932 to 22 Mar 1933. The purpose of including the "antecedent" flows was to provide a concrete basis of determining the status in existing and anticipated reservoirs in the basin corresponding to runoff conditions considered reasonably likely to prevail prior to the SPF. Runoff during the three-month period selected was approximately 25 percent above the average observed for the months of January, February and March over a 29-year period of record from 1919 to 1947. The flows by months were also distributed fairly uniformly and variations were fairly representative of flood sequence observed during the period of record, excluding a few years of extraordinary flood occurrences. Although the general criteria adopted for selection of the "antecedent" flow data are in this case arbitrary and subject to appreciable variations on the basis of personal judgment, the procedure was adopted as an expedient in view of the necessity of taking into account the effects of antecedent conditions on routing of the SPF. It is apparent that the criteria followed will require variations in other circumstances, but it is believed that reasonable results may be obtained by exercise of judgment on the part of hydraulic engineers responsible for such studies.

(2) Flows for the 15-day period from 23 Mar to 7 Apr were computed from rainfall-excess estimates derived from the selected 120-hour standard project storm which was based on a transposition of the 23-27 Mar 1913 storm (OR 1-15) as discussed in paragraph 3-02 b.

(3) Flows for a 30-day period subsequent to the SPF were assumed as equal to daily discharge recorded during the period from 8 Apr to 7 May 1933. The 30-day period of flows "subsequent" to the SPF was included to permit a calculation of the time required to draw down the reservoirs if runoff should equal approximately the average observed for corresponding period over the period of record. In general, the derivation of a SPF Series is required only when runoff before or after the SPF is likely to influence conclusions reached by routing the SPF hydrograph thru storage.

3-03. USE OF SPS GENERALIZED DEPTH-AREA CURVES IN SELECTION OF STORMS FOR COMPARISON. The generalized curves and data shown on Plates 5 to 9, may be used in the selection of storms for detailed comparison in preparing SPS estimates for drainage basins up to 20,000 square miles, in lieu of the procedure outlined in sub-paragraph 3-02 a. In this manner the number of storms requiring detailed study to determine critical flood producing capabilities may be reduced to a small number. The remainder of the procedure should be substantially as outlined in paragraphs 3-02 b to 3-02 d.
IV. PROJECTS FOR WHICH SPF ESTIMATES ARE REQUIRED

4-01. GENERAL. The purpose to be served by SPF estimates are discussed briefly in paragraphs 4-06 and 4-08. In some cases the SPF estimate may have a major bearing on selection of the design flood for a particular project, whereas in other cases the estimate may serve only as an indication of the partial degree of protection proposed for the project. SPF estimates are useful in connection with practically all flood control investigations but to reduce the work required in project studies, preparation of SPF estimates is required only for those projects in which the proposed design flood is more than one of estimated 25-year frequency. To further reduce the work involved, approximate estimates are acceptable where it is apparent that the design flood is strictly limited by economic considerations and is substantially less than the SPF. The basis of SPF estimates should be clearly stated in each case.

4-02. ORDERS & REGULATIONS. For convenience in reference paragraph 4208.11 (Revised March 1951) is quoted below:

"Describe any "standard project flood" estimate established as a criterion in analyzing flood possibilities and flood control requirements, give the basis for its derivation and compare it with floods of record and the "design flood" finally selected as a basis for the project design. Standard project flood determinations will be prepared for local flood protection projects intended to protect against floods (greater than those) having an average frequency of exceedence in the order of once in 25 years, and such estimates will be submitted to the Chief of Engineers for approval prior to incorporation into the survey report. Standard project flood estimates will be prepared for flood control and multiple-purpose reservoirs, but such estimates need not be submitted to the Chief of Engineers for advance approval unless considered advisable by the reporting officer. Estimates will be prepared substantially in accordance with technical instructions issued by the Chief of Engineers".

4-03. MAJOR DRAINAGE PROJECTS. In accordance with the O&R cited above, SPF estimates will not be required for "major drainage" projects unless such projects serve also to provide protection against floods greater than those having average frequency of approximately once in 25 years.

4-04. LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECTS. SPF determinations are required for local protection projects included in survey reports that are intended to provide protection against floods greater than those having an average frequency of occurrence of approximately one in 25 years. SPF estimates should also be included in Definite Project Reports, design memoranda, and other special reports pertaining to the selection of design flood criteria for local protection projects; in the event estimates have been submitted to OCE in reports bearing specifically on SPF determinations, inclusion of appropriate references and summaries of results will suffice for report purposes, although inclusion of details pertaining to prior SPF estimates as a matter of record is desirable where this can be accomplished without undue expense.
4-05. RESERVOIR PROJECTS. In some instances SPF estimates serve as the primary basis for selecting the storage capacity of flood control reservoirs, and in such cases the estimate should be prepared with substantially the same care and detailed study observed in connection with determinations for local protection projects of comparable importance. However, in most cases selection of storage and outlet capacities for reservoirs are governed by considerations other than the SPF estimate, in which case the SPF estimate is of secondary importance and may be approximated satisfactorily by assuming that the SPF equals 50 percent of the spillway design flood for the project. (See para 2-04.)

4-06. SUBMISSION OF SPF ESTIMATES TO OCE FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO INCORPORATION IN REPORTS.

a. All SPF estimates required for inclusion in survey reports under instructions discussed above should be submitted to OCE for approval prior to incorporation in the survey reports, with the following exceptions:

(1) SPF estimates for small drainage areas (less than approximately 1000 sq. miles) based on generalized rainfall criteria and procedures presented herein need not be submitted to OCE for advance approval unless the reporting officer considers advance approval advisable in specific cases.

(2) SPF estimates prepared for individual reservoirs need not be submitted to OCE for advance approval unless the estimate constitutes the primary basis for selection of the reservoir storage and outlet capacities.

b. With reference to SPF estimates related to Definite Project Reports and special studies, attention is invited to C&R, paragraph 4214.10 h, in which submission of appendices or portions of reports covering hydrologic features for advance approval by OCE is outlined. SPF estimates required under instructions presented above should be included in such advance submissions. In special cases, conferences should be arranged to permit review of SPF estimates and related hydrologic determinations that have a major bearing on the selection of design floods for important projects.

c. SPF estimates submitted for approval of OCE should be accompanied by supporting information, and a statement indicating the purpose of the particular estimate and the probable influence that the estimate will have on selection of the design flood for the project involved (See paragraph 4-01).

BY THE ORDER OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS:

/s/ Stanley G. Reiff

/t/ STANLEY G. REIFF

Coloel, Corps of Engineers
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# Standard Project Storm Studies

## Precipitation During Major Storms of Record

**In Percent of SPF Index Rainfall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainfall Date</th>
<th>Rainfall Event</th>
<th>Rainfall Duration</th>
<th>Rainfall Total</th>
<th>Rainfall Event Type</th>
<th>Rainfall Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-08-22</td>
<td>1978-08-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1978-08-22</td>
<td>1978-08-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-08-23</td>
<td>1978-08-23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1978-08-23</td>
<td>1978-08-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-08-24</td>
<td>1978-08-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1978-08-24</td>
<td>1978-08-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-08-25</td>
<td>1978-08-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1978-08-25</td>
<td>1978-08-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-08-26</td>
<td>1978-08-26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1978-08-26</td>
<td>1978-08-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-08-28</td>
<td>1978-08-28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1978-08-28</td>
<td>1978-08-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-08-29</td>
<td>1978-08-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1978-08-29</td>
<td>1978-08-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-08-30</td>
<td>1978-08-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1978-08-30</td>
<td>1978-08-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-09-01</td>
<td>1978-09-01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1978-09-01</td>
<td>1978-09-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-09-02</td>
<td>1978-09-02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1978-09-02</td>
<td>1978-09-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-09-03</td>
<td>1978-09-03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1978-09-03</td>
<td>1978-09-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:**

- SPF: Standard Precipitation Frequency
- Rainfall Date: Date of rainfall
- Rainfall Event: Event number
- Rainfall Duration: Duration of rainfall
- Rainfall Total: Total rainfall amount
- Rainfall Event Type: Type of rainfall event
- Rainfall Explanation: Additional information about the rainfall event.
~LEGEND~

- SA — Average of largest 5 percent of storm-study values
- SE — Amounts exceeded by 3 percent of storm-study values

NOTE: Total number of storm-study values for each area size is 400

STANDARD PROJECT STORM STUDIES
GENERALIZED DEPTH-AREA CURVES
48 HOUR RAINFALL
STANDARD PROJECT STORM STUDIES
SPS DEPTH-AREA-DURATION RELATIONSHIPS
BY 24-HOUR STORM INCREMENTS
FIG. (b) TYPICAL ARRANGEMENT OF 6-HOUR RAINFALL QUANTITIES IN SPS

FIG. (c) TABULATION OF DATA FROM FIG (a)

STANDARD PROJECT STORM STUDIES
GENERALIZED ESTIMATES

TIME DISTRIBUTION OF 24-HOUR SPS RAINFALL
### TIME DISTRIBUTION OF MAXIMUM 6-HOUR SPS RAINFALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainfall Period (Sub-Division of 6-Hour Period)</th>
<th>Time Distribution of Maximum 6-Hour SPS Rainfall, Expressed in Percent of Total 6-Hour Rainfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected Unit Rainfall Duration, ( t_R )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The "selected unit rainfall duration," \( t_R \) is determined approximately from the synthetic unit hydrograph equation, \( t_R = \frac{t_p}{3.3} \)
in which "\( t_p \)" is the lag time from midpoint of unit rainfall duration, \( t_R \), to peak of unit hydrograph, in hours. (See page 11, Engineering Manual for Civil Works, Part CXIV - Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analyses, Chapter 5 - Flood-Hydrograph Analyses and Computations). The following rounded-off values are to be used in the above table:

- If \( t_p \) exceeds 16, use \( t_R = 6 \)
- If \( t_p \) is between 12 and 16, use \( t_R = 3 \)
- If \( t_p \) is between 6 and 12, use \( t_R = 2 \)
- If \( t_p \) is between 4 and 6, use \( t_R = 1 \)
1. Pattern may be oriented in any direction.
2. Pattern corresponds to depth-area relationship represented by 96-hour curve of Plate No. 9, expressed in % of index rainfall.
NOTES
1. Project location: Lat. 37°, Long. 94° (Index rainfall = 13.5").
2. Isohyets correspond to those of Plate No. 12 with percentages multiplied by index rainfall of 13.5 inches.
4. C_P and C_D based on floods observed at gaging stations 1 & 2.
5. T_P based on criteria on Plate No. 11.

STANDARD PROJECT STORM STUDIES
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE
APPLICATION OF ISOHYETAL PATTERN
(MAXIMUM 96-HOUR PERIOD OF SPS)
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Rainfall (Lat. 39°, Long. 60°)</th>
<th>Total Rainfall in Inches (From Plate 1)</th>
<th>Maximum Rainfall in Inches for Duration 72 Hours</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.30</th>
<th>0.40</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>0.60</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.80</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>1.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes
- Data in inches.
- Total rainfall in inches is the sum of rainfall for each duration.
- The maximum rainfall for duration 72 hours is the highest rainfall recorded in that duration.

---

#### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Rainfall</th>
<th>Total Rainfall in Inches (From Plate 2)</th>
<th>Average Rainfall for Each Duration (in inches)</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.30</th>
<th>0.40</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>0.60</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.80</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>1.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes
- Data in inches.
- Average rainfall for each duration is the average rainfall recorded for each duration.

---

#### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Rainfall</th>
<th>Total Rainfall in Inches (From Plate 3)</th>
<th>Maximum Rainfall Increase in Inches</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.30</th>
<th>0.40</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>0.60</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.80</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>1.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes
- Data in inches.
- Maximum rainfall increase is the maximum increase in rainfall recorded.

---

#### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Rainfall</th>
<th>Total Rainfall in Inches (From Plate 4)</th>
<th>Average Rainfall Increase in Percent (From Plate 5)</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.30</th>
<th>0.40</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>0.60</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.80</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>1.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes
- Data in percent.
- Average rainfall increase in percent is the average increase in rainfall recorded.

---

#### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Rainfall</th>
<th>Total Rainfall in Inches (From Plate 6)</th>
<th>Maximum Rainfall Increase in Percent (From Plate 7)</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.30</th>
<th>0.40</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>0.60</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.80</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>1.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes
- Data in percent.
- Maximum rainfall increase in percent is the maximum increase in rainfall recorded.

---

#### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Rainfall</th>
<th>Total Rainfall in Inches (From Plate 8)</th>
<th>Average Rainfall Increase in Percent (From Plate 9)</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.30</th>
<th>0.40</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>0.60</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.80</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>1.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes
- Data in percent.
- Average rainfall increase in percent is the average increase in rainfall recorded.

---

#### Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Rainfall</th>
<th>Total Rainfall in Inches (From Plate 10)</th>
<th>Maximum Rainfall Increase in Percent (From Plate 11)</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.30</th>
<th>0.40</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>0.60</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.80</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>1.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes
- Data in percent.
- Maximum rainfall increase in percent is the maximum increase in rainfall recorded.