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HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSES OF THE HENNEPIN CANAL
FROM LOCK 27 TO THE ROCK RIVER

by Misganaw Demissie and Nani G. Bhowmik

INTRODUCTION

The Illinois Department of Conservation (DOC) has been responsible for the operation and maintenance of the Hennepin Canal, also known as the Illinois-Mississippi Canal, since 1970, when the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers transferred jurisdiction of the canal to the State of Illinois. Since acquiring the canal, the Department of Conservation has been faced with numerous water-related problems along the canal, with some of the problems resulting in court cases in which the state was asked to provide compensation for flood damages. Many of the problems are associated with canal levee breaks and siltation of culverts designed to carry drainage water underneath the canal to nearby streams at the time of canal construction.

The canal segment under investigation in this report starts from Lock 27, where flow in the canal is controlled by a siphon which passes under the Green River channel, and ends at the Rock River, where the canal terminates. The major problems in this segment of the canal are located on both sides of Interstate 80. During the construction of I-80, the Department of Transportation (DOT) lowered the elevation of the south side levee of the canal at the I-80 crossing. This action allowed flood waters from the Green River to enter the canal.

At the same time, DOT built a drainage ditch to carry storm water from the I-80 interchange and the surrounding areas into an existing culvert (Culvert 40), which used to carry natural drainage from the north under the canal to the Green River. When excessive sediment coming down from the I-80 interchange drainage ditch completely filled Culvert 40, the discharge from the drainage ditch broke the north canal levee. DOT and DOC then placed a 36-inch corrugated metal pipe through the north levee of the canal so that DOC could travel the north bank and so that drainage water from the I-80 interchange area could flow into the canal even though...
the canal was not designed to carry any drainage water from the surrounding areas.

At present, the north and south levees of the canal are completely broken and the 36-inch corrugated metal pipe is out of use. This permits water from the drainage ditch and flood waters from the Green River to enter the canal freely. This excess water in the canal could possibly cause flooding problems to the areas both east and west of I-80 and threaten the stability of the canal levees further downstream. The canal just west of I-80 is also filled with excessive amounts of sediment from the I-80 interchange area, resulting in the rerouting of the flow of water from the canal to the Green River through the breach in the south levee during low canal flows.

Further downstream from the I-80 crossing, just to the east of the Burlington Northern Railroad crossing, there is a break in the south levee of the canal. It is the contention of the adjacent private property owner that this break has allowed the canal water to enter his property to repeatedly flood it. If this adjacent property is flooded by water from the canal, the Green River and the I-80 interchange water have to enter the canal at the breaks just west of I-80 and over the canal banks lowered by DOT.

The problems are interconnected, since fixing the levee break at the Burlington Northern location might not prevent future Green River flooding or further levee breaks at other locations unless the Green River water and surface runoff from the I-80 interchange area entering the canal just west of I-80 are controlled.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to make a hydrologic and hydraulic investigation of the Hennepin Canal from Lock 27 to the canal's termination point at the Rock River. The two specific objectives were:

1) To make a recommendation as to the proper levee elevations to prevent Green River flood flows from entering the canal if it is found to be desirable to do so.

2) To make recommendations for the proper handling of the water from the I-80 interchange so that the canal levees will not be damaged by the water. As part of this effort the study attempted to:
a) Determine the feasibility of reactivating Culvert 40.

b) Evaluate the flow requirements of the pipes under a sewer crossing at Colona and the Route 84 bridge to determine if the drainage from the I-80 area can be accommodated by the canal under existing conditions.

c) Evaluate other options such as routing the drainage under the canal.

Plan of the Report

The report is organized into five main sections: 1) a background section with a general discussion of the Hennepin Canal; 2) a section on flood flow analyses, which discusses hydrologic and hydraulic analyses of the Green River in the study area, flood elevations in the Rock River, and flood and levee elevations along the Hennepin Canal; 3) a capacity analysis of Culvert 40, including surface runoff calculations around the I-80 interchange and a hydraulic analysis of Culvert 40; 4) a presentation of alternative solutions to the flooding problem in the study area; and 5) recommendations to solve the problems in the study area. A brief final section presents an investigation of drainage from the private property east of I-80.
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BACKGROUND

This section presents brief background information about the Hennepin Canal. Two publications, one by Yeater (1978) and another by Scruggs and Hammond (1959), discuss the historical and recreational aspects of the Hennepin Canal in much more detail.

The Hennepin Canal was built by the United States Army Corps of Engineers as a navigation canal to link the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers. It was conceived as a continuation of the Illinois and Michigan Canal for providing water navigation from Lake Michigan all the way to the Mississippi River in the Rock Island area. Because of the topography of the area for which it was proposed, a feeder canal from Lake Sinnissippi on the Rock River had to be built to provide water to the canal. The resulting canal system is shaped like an inverted T, as shown in figure 1.

The main canal from the Illinois River to the Mississippi River is 75 miles long. The canal ascends 196 feet going northwest from the Illinois River to the summit level in a distance of 18 miles. The summit level, which is 11 miles long, passes through level land. The canal then descends 93 feet going southwest from the summit level to the Mississippi River in a distance of 46 miles. The feeder canal from Lake Sinnissippi to the main canal is 29.3 miles long. To control the water levels for navigation, 33 locks were built, one of which is at the head of the feeder canal. All the locks are 170 feet long and 35 feet wide. The canal was designed to have a bottom width of 52 feet and a width of 80 feet at the water surface, which was maintained 7 feet above the canal bottom.

The important dates in the development of the Hennepin Canal were:

1834 - The idea of the Hennepin Canal as an extension of the Illinois and Michigan Canal was initiated.

1860 - The Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific Railroad was constructed over the proposed canal route.
Figure 1. Location of the Hennepin Canal
1866 - The first survey for a new canal route was made and a preliminary design was proposed by a local citizens group.
1870 - COE made the first federal survey.
1881 - The Hennepin Canal Commission was established.
1882 - Another survey of the canal route was authorized.
1889 - The name of the canal was changed from the Hennepin Canal to the Illinois-Mississippi Canal.
1890 - Detailed plans were submitted to Congress by the COE for an estimated total cost of $6,925,960. Congress appropriated $500,000 for purchase of the right-of-way and for construction of the first five miles of the canal just above the mouth of the Rock River.
1907 - The canal was completed and opened for navigation. The final cost for the construction of the canal was $7,319,563.
1951 - Commercial navigation was terminated in the canal because of declining commercial use.
1970 - The COE gave the canal to the State of Illinois as a "gift."

FLOOD FLOW ANALYSES

This portion of the report analyzes the sources of flooding in the vicinity of the Hennepin Canal and makes recommendations regarding the proper canal levee elevations that will prevent future flood waters from entering the canal. In the study area (from Lock 27 to the Rock River), the major sources of flooding are the Rock and Green Rivers. The Rock River primarily affects the Hennepin Canal through its backwater. The Green River, however, runs almost parallel to the canal, and when it overtops its banks there is always a possibility of floodwater entering the canal. It should also be pointed out that in the study area the Hennepin Canal is within the floodplains of both the Green and Rock Rivers. Therefore, any extreme flooding in either of the rivers will in some way impact the Hennepin Canal.

A detailed flood routing was done on the Green River from its confluence with the Rock River to Lock 27 where the Green River crosses the Hennepin Canal. Flood elevations on the Rock River were obtained from
previous studies conducted for flood insurance purposes (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1982).

Hydrologic Analyses

To determine the water surface elevations for floods of variable recurrence intervals, an analysis of the flood records of the streams affecting the area is required. As mentioned earlier, the major flooding sources are the Green and Rock Rivers. For the Green River the streamflow records at the Geneseo gage (USGS Gage No. 0544750) were utilized to determine the discharges for the 10-, 50-, and 100-year floods, which are expected to be equalled or exceeded once during any 10-, 50-, and 100-year period, respectively, on a long-term average. Their respective chances of being equalled or exceeded during any particular year are 10, 2 and 1 percent. It should always be emphasized that the recurrence intervals and their corresponding chances of being equalled or exceeded are based on long-term averages. It is conceivable to have two or more rare floods in any particular year or for rare floods not to occur for an extended period of time.

There are 46 years of streamflow data (1936 to 1981) for the Geneseo gage, which is about 8 miles upstream of the study area. The drainage area of the Green River upstream of the Geneseo gage is 1003 square miles, while its drainage area at its confluence with the Rock River is 1073 square miles. The Geneseo gage therefore represents 93 percent of the whole drainage basin of the Green River. The flood frequency analysis for the Green River was done according to the Guidelines for Determining Flood Frequency of the U.S. Water Resources Council. The flood frequency curve based on the 46 years of record is shown in figure 2, and the data used to develop the frequency curve are given in table 1. Also shown in figure 2 are the magnitudes of the floods of 1978, 1979, and 1981. The 1979 flood was the 2nd largest flood on record while the 1978 and 1981 floods were the 8th and 11th largest floods, respectively. Within the 4-year period from 1978 to 1981, the Green River had 3 of the largest 11 floods on record. It is therefore understandable that the flooding problems in the area have been acute in recent years.
Figure 2. Flood frequency curve for the Green River near Geneseo
Table 1. Ranked Streamflow Record for Flood Frequency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Discharge (cfs)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Discharge (cfs)</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>1974*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5,910</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1979*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,890</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5,590</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,820</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>1978*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,050</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>1981*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* High floods since 1978
The 10-, 50-, and 100-year flood discharges of the Green River near Geneseo, determined from the frequency curve shown in figure 2, are given in table 2.

Table 2. Flood Discharges for the Green River near Geneseo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurrence Interval (years)</th>
<th>Discharges (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>13,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated previously, detailed hydrologic analyses of the Rock River were done by the COE, Rock Island District, for a flood insurance study of the unincorporated areas of Rock Island County, Illinois (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1982). Since the study was completed in 1982, the Rock River flood elevations were taken from that report without further analysis.

Hydraulic Analyses

The hydraulic analyses in this section of the report concern the flood water elevations along the Green and Rock Rivers. Initially a brief background on the hydraulics of open channel flow is presented, in which the basic equations and the assumptions involved in deriving the equations are discussed. The calculation techniques used in the HEC-2 computer program, which is used to calculate water surface profiles, are discussed next.

The water surface elevations in the Green and Rock Rivers for the 10-, 50-, and 100-year floods are presented, and the flood water elevations along the Hennepin Canal are then determined by investigating the flood elevations along both the Green and Rock Rivers. On the basis of the flood elevations, recommendations are made as to the proper levee elevations along the Hennepin Canal to prevent Green River flood water from entering the canal.
Hydraulics of Open Channel Flow

The basic equation used in hydraulic analysis is the one-dimensional energy balance equation. The energy equation for open channel flow (see figure 3 for an illustration of the terms) is given as follows (Chow, 1959):

\[
z_1 + y_1 + a_1 \frac{y_1^2}{2g} = z_2 + y_2 + a_2 \frac{y_2^2}{2g} + h_L
\]

where

- \( z \) = the elevation of the channel bottom above the datum
- \( y \) = the depth of water
- \( a \) = the energy correction coefficient for non-uniform velocity distribution across a cross section
- \( V = \frac{Q}{A} \), the average velocity, where \( Q \) = total discharge and \( A \) = cross-sectional area
- \( g \) = gravitational acceleration
- \( h_L \) = energy loss between cross sections 1 and 2

The subscripts 1 and 2 refer to cross sections 1 and 2, respectively.

The energy loss, \( h_L \), is calculated by:

\[
h_L = \overline{S_f}(Ax)
\]

\( \overline{S_f} \), as shown in figure 3, is the average friction slope for the reach, and \( Ax \) is the distance between the two cross sections.

The friction slope, \( \overline{S_f} \), at a cross section is computed from Manning's equation for uniform flow as follows:

\[
\overline{S_f} = \left( \frac{C}{nAR^{2/3}} \right)^2
\]

where

- \( C = 1.486 \) for English units and 1.0 for metric units
- \( R \) = hydraulic radius
- \( n \) = Manning's roughness coefficient
- \( Q \) and \( A \) are as defined before

The roughness coefficient, \( n \), includes effects of cross-sectional size and shape, bed form and roughness, and river planform or horizontal alignment. Ideally, discharge, area, wetted perimeter, and energy slope are measured directly and \( n \) is computed from the data. Practically, the data are rarely sufficient to compute \( n \), so hydraulic computations and engineering judgment are generally used to determine \( n \) values. Guides based on experience and measurement have been compiled to assist in the selection of Manning's \( n \). Typically these guides include photographs and verbal descriptions of channels with \( n \) values of certain magnitudes. A
Figure 3. Schematics of open channel flow
classic text (Chow, 1959) contains such a guide. More recently the U.S. Geological Survey has published a manual, Roughness Characteristics of Natural Streams (Barnes, 1967), which includes similar information for streams in all parts of the United States.

HEC-2 Water Surface Profile Calculation Technique

The water surface elevations along the Green River for different discharges were computed using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Water Surface Profile computer program (HEC-2) (Hydrologic Engineering Center, 1979). The HEC-2 program in its present form was developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at the Hydrologic Engineering Center at Davis, California (Thomas, 1975). The HEC-2 program calculates water surface elevations along a stream channel for given discharges, cross-sectional areas, and Manning's roughness coefficients. The flow along the river is assumed to be steady; therefore the program does not deal with changes of depth, discharge, and velocity in time. A flood wave, which changes rapidly in time, cannot be simulated by HEC-2. The other basic assumptions are that the flow is one-dimensional and gradually varies in space and that the channel slope is very mild. By assuming gradually varied flow, it is possible to use uniform flow equations to compute energy losses between successive sections (Chow, 1959; Feldman, 1981).

The HEC-2 program computes water surface elevations along a stream channel by using equations 1, 2, and 3. The solution technique is the standard step method as outlined by Chow (1959). The standard step method is a trial and error technique for determining the water surface elevation at a cross section, provided that all the variables are known for the preceding cross section. It starts the computation with known water surface elevation, discharge, and cross-sectional area at the first cross section, defined as the control point. The total energy at the first cross section, represented by the left-hand side of equation 1, is then calculated from the known values. The depth of water at the next cross section, \( y_2 \) in equation 1, is given a trial value. From the given cross-sectional data and the assumed \( y_2 \), the variables A and R for the next cross section are then computed.

From the computed values of A and R and the given values of \( Q \) and \( n \), the friction slope at that cross section is computed by equation 3. The
average friction slope for the reach, \( S_f \), can be calculated in several different ways, but the arithmetic mean of the slopes for the preceding cross section and the one computed for the present cross section usually provide an adequate approximation. The energy head loss due to friction is then computed with equation 2. Additional energy losses due to contraction and expansion of the channel are also added to the friction head loss.

The computed water surface elevation at the present cross section is then found by adding the difference in velocity head between the two cross sections and the total frictional and other head losses to the water surface elevation at the preceding cross section. From equation 1, the water surface elevation at the present cross section, \( Z_2 + y_2 \), is given by:

\[
(z_2 + y_2) = (z_1 + y_1) + \left( \frac{v_1^2}{2g} - \frac{v_2^2}{2g} \right) - h_L 
\]  

(4)

If this computed water surface elevation is different from the estimated value, another estimate is made and the same procedure repeated until the difference between the computed and estimated water surface elevations is reduced to an acceptable value. Once the water surface elevation at that cross section is computed, the computation proceeds to the next reach. The newly computed values will now serve as the known values on the left-hand side of equation 1 for the next series of calculations.

The direction of the water surface profile calculations depends on the nature of the flow. If the flow in the channel is subcritical, the control point is located at the downstream end of the study reach and the calculation proceeds in the upstream direction. On the other hand, if the flow is supercritical, the control point is on the upstream end and the computation proceeds in the downstream direction.

In most natural streams the flow is generally subcritical. Thus the water surface profile computation starts at a downstream control point, such as a dam, a constricted cross section, or any gaging station where the water surface elevation for a given discharge is known, and then proceeds in the upstream direction.

The data required to run the HEC-2 program include channel geometry such as cross-sectional profiles and distance between cross sections,
bridge profiles, and hydraulic characteristics such as Manning's roughness coefficients. A rating curve at the control point is also desirable.

The HEC-2 program has a number of options and capabilities to deal with different kinds of flow problems encountered in water surface profile computations. It has different methods to simulate flow under and over bridges, it can map areas inundated by different frequency floods, and it can simulate floodplain encroachments and channel improvements. Detailed descriptions of these capabilities and options are found in several publications (Feldman, 1981; HEC, 1979; Thomas, 1975).

Flood Elevations in the Green and Rock Rivers

The HEC-2 program was used to calculate the water surface elevations in the Green River from its confluence with the Rock River to Lock 27 on the Hennepin Canal, where the Green River crosses the canal. The stream length of the Green River in the study reach is 6.3 miles. A topographic map of the study area is shown in figure 4. A total of 34 cross sections were used to run the HEC-2 program. Most of the cross-sectional data were obtained from the Rock Island District of the Corps of Engineers. Additional cross sections were surveyed by the Water Survey staff for use in this project. Values of Manning's roughness coefficient, n, were estimated from field inspections and aerial photos. Manning's n for the main channel ranged from 0.03 to 0.04, while for the floodplain it varied from 0.01 to 0.10.

To calculate the water surface elevations in the Green River it is necessary to know the stage of the Rock River at the mouth of the Green River. The stages in the Rock River around the vicinity of the mouth of the Green River for the 10-, 50-, and 100-year floods are shown in figure 5.

For the 100-year flood calculations in the Green River, the Rock River was assumed to be at the 50-year flood stage, while for 50- and 10-year flood calculations the Rock River was assumed to be at the 10-year flood stage. Since there is no reliable way of determining at which flood stages the Rock River will be when the Green River discharge is at the 10-, 50-, or 100-year-flood magnitude, the rationale used in making the above selections is the difference in the drainage areas between the Rock and Green Rivers. Since the drainage area of the Rock River upstream of
Figure 4. Location of study area
Figure 5. Flood elevations in the Rock River
the Green River mouth is about ten times greater than the drainage area of the Green River, it is reasonable not to expect floods of the same frequency to take place in both streams at the same time, except on extremely-rare occasions. Figure 6 illustrates the influence of 10-, 50-, and 100-year flood stages in the Rock River on the 100-year flood elevations in the Green River. As shown in the figure, the assumed stages in the Rock River affect the flood elevations in the lower 2-1/2 miles of the Green River, while the influence is almost unnoticeable further upstream.

The water surface elevations for the 10-, 50-, and 100-year floods along the Green River calculated under the aforementioned assumptions are shown in figure 7. Also shown in the figure are the channel bed and bank elevations.

As shown in figure 7, the Green River overtops its banks for the floods considered here. The areas flooded by the 100-year floods in the Green and Rock Rivers are shown in figure 8. Since most of the Hennepin Canal is within the Green River floodplain, it will be impacted whenever the Green River overtops its banks. If it is desired to keep the flood waters of the Green River from entering the canal, then the south canal levee has to be built up above the flood elevation in the Green River.

Flood Elevations along the Hennepin Canal

The water surface elevations along the Hennepin Canal during a 100-year flood in the Green River are shown in figure 9. Also shown in the figure are the present canal bottom and levee elevations, as well as a design levee elevation for the canal used by the COE in 1935 to build up the canal levees upstream of Lock 28. The design elevation of 585.7 ft was most probably used for the north levee, which is generally higher than the south levee.

There are breaks in the canal at two locations just downstream of I-80 and the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge, as shown by the low levee elevations in figure 9. At the present time, if the Green River overtops its banks, the flood waters can enter the canal through the canal breaks. Furthermore, if the water level rises in the canal from a storm runoff around the I-80 interchange, some of the water will flow into the Green River through the break west of I-80 and some will flood the area east of the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge through the break at that
Figure 6. Influence of Rock River flood stages on Green River flood elevations
Figure 7. Flood elevations in the Green River
Figure 8. Areas flooded by the 100-year floods in the Green and Book Rivers
Figure 9. Flood elevations along the Hennepin Canal during a 100-year flood in the Green River
site. Under the present levee conditions the Green River and Hennepin Canal are interconnected during high flows for all practical purposes.

Levee Elevations along the Hennepin Canal

The existing levee elevations on the south side of the Hennepin Canal from Lock 27 to the Rock River are shown in figure 9. The locations of the two levee breaks, one just west of I-80 and one at the Burlington Northern Railroad, are also indicated in the figure. If it is desired to keep Green River flood water from entering the Hennepin Canal, the levee breaks at the two sites have to be repaired and the south levee elevations raised above the flood water levels in the Green River. For example, if it is decided to keep the 100-year flood in the Green River out of the canal, the south levee has to be raised 2 to 3 feet above the 100-year flood elevations along the Hennepin Canal shown in figure 9. However, the decision on the levee elevation should depend on the choice of the alternatives concerning Culvert 40. If no water from the watershed around the I-80 interchange is allowed to enter the canal, it might not be necessary to raise the levee elevations above the Rock River backwater elevations. If drainage water from the I-80 interchange is allowed to enter the canal, it might be advisable to raise the south levee so the canal is isolated from the Green River. The different alternatives will be discussed in more detail later in this report.

CAPACITY ANALYSIS OF CULVERT 40

Location and Present Condition of Culvert 40

Culvert 40 is located approximately 500 feet west of I-80 under the Hennepin Canal, as shown in figure 10. The original design of Culvert 40 is shown in figure 11. The culvert is an inverted siphon under the canal and is totally below ground level. Since this kind of culvert design is highly susceptible to sedimentation, a flushing mechanism was built on the north side of the canal, which allowed water from the canal to flow through the culvert and clean the sediment in the pipe. During the early periods of the canal, the water elevation was maintained at 577 ft MSL for navigation, so enough velocities may have been generated to clean the culvert.
Figure 10. Location of Culvert 40 and its watershed
Figure 11. Design drawing of Culvert 40
At the present time, the culvert is totally silted up. The inlet and outlet are also covered with sediment and totally invisible from the surface, and the flushing mechanism is silted up and missing some parts. The culvert will require major cleaning and repair to become operational again and will require continuous maintenance to remain operative. Since the culvert is only 400 feet from the Green River, it will experience sedimentation whenever the Green River overtops its banks. The profiles of both Culvert 40 and the Green River are shown in figure 12 to illustrate that flood waters from the Green River will freely enter Culvert 40. As a matter of fact, the invert of Culvert 40 is below the Green River's channel bed. All factors considered, Culvert 40 is in very poor shape and even if it is repaired and placed in operation it will continue to have excessive sedimentation problems.

Surface Runoff Calculations for the Culvert 40 Watershed

The location of the Culvert 40 watershed is shown in figure 10. It consists of the area north of the Hennepin Canal on both the west and east side of I-80. Drainage channels and culverts along the I-80 interchange and Cleveland Road drain the watershed towards Culvert 40. The total area of the watershed is 200 acres.

The surface runoff to Culvert 40 from this watershed was calculated using the Rational Equation (Rouse, 1950). Since the drainage area is only 200 acres, it was felt that the Rational Equation was adequate and that it was unnecessary to use the more elaborate runoff computation methods.

The Rational Equation is given as

\[ Q = C \times i \times A \]  

where

- \( Q \) = the rate of runoff in acre-inches per hour or cubic feet per second (1 acre-inch per hour = 1.008 cubic feet per second)
- \( C \) = the runoff coefficient, which is the ratio of peak runoff to average rainfall
- \( i \) = the average rainfall intensity in inches per hour
- \( A \) = the drainage area in acres

The basic assumption in the Rational Method (based on the Rational Equation) is that, for small drainage basins, the maximum rate of surface runoff at a point of interest occurs when the entire drainage basin upstream of that point is contributing to the runoff measured at that point.
Figure 12. Relative elevations of Culvert 40 and the Green River
point. The maximum rate of runoff, usually known as the peak discharge, is then equal to a percentage, C, of the average rate of rainfall.

The drainage area of the basin, A, is generally determined from topographic maps or any other maps available. The runoff coefficient, C, is estimated on the basis of the surface cover, soil type, and topographic features of the drainage basin, especially the slope. The rainfall intensity, i, for different frequencies is determined from frequency analyses of rainfall records from nearby rain gages. Before the rainfall intensity is selected, however, the duration of the rainfall has to be selected. For the same frequency, the rainfall intensities are different for different durations.

In the Rational Method of peak discharge calculations, it is generally assumed that the duration of the rainfall producing the peak discharge is equal to the time of concentration. The time of concentration, \( T_c \), is defined as the time required for water to flow from the most remote part of the watershed to the point of interest. In certain cases the time of concentration might be defined differently if it is felt that the peak flow occurs due to runoff from a portion of the watershed close to the point of interest. In this case, assuming a shorter time of concentration might provide the appropriate peak discharges. One method of determining the time of concentration for non-urban areas is to use the following relationship between the time of concentration and a watershed factor based on the length and slope of the watershed (Rouse, 1950):

\[
T_c = 0.0078 \times K^{0.770}
\]

where

- \( T_c \) = time of concentration in minutes
- \( K = L/\sqrt{s} \) = watershed factor
- \( L \) = the maximum length of travel in feet
- \( s \) = the slope of the watershed
- \( = H/L \)
- \( H \) = the difference in elevation between the most remote point and the point of interest in feet

For the watershed draining to Culvert 40, the following parameters were measured or selected for calculating the peak discharge at the culvert following the discussion above:

- Drainage area, \( A = 200 \text{ acres} \)
- Runoff coefficient, \( C = 0.45 \)
- Time of concentration, \( T_c = 20 \text{ minutes} \)
The 20-minute rainfall intensities for various frequencies are shown in table 3. The rainfall intensities were calculated from Illinois rainfall frequencies prepared by the Illinois State Water Survey (1970). The assumption was that the duration of the rainfall was equal to the time of concentration, which is 20 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurrence interval (years)</th>
<th>Rainfall intensity, $i$ (inches/hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is now possible to use the Rational Equation to calculate the different peak discharges generated by rainstorms of different frequencies for the Culvert 40 watershed. It should be pointed out that the frequencies of the runoff calculated by the Rational Equation do not necessarily equal those of the storms. This has been one of the major shortcomings of the Rational Method. However, the rainfall frequencies should provide a very good estimate of the runoff frequencies. Furthermore, if it is understood that the frequencies are for the rainfall and not for the runoff, the differences between the rainfall and runoff frequencies become unimportant.

The Rational Equation (equation 5) reduces to the following after the numerical values for $C$ and $A$ are substituted:

$$Q = (0.45 \times 200) \times i \text{ cfs}$$

$$= (90) \times i \text{ cfs}$$

The peak discharges generated by the rainfall intensities given in table 3 are shown in table 4.
Table 4. Peak Discharges Generated by 20 Minute Rainfall of Different Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainfall recurrence interval (years)</th>
<th>Peak discharges (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydraulic Analysis of Culvert 40

After determination of the peak discharges given in table 4, the next analysis is to determine if Culvert 40 has the capacity to carry these discharges from the north side to the south side of the canal. It is probably inappropriate to consider recurrence intervals greater than 25 years, since the failure to carry very rare discharges from the 50- and 100-year storms will not result in major economic losses or endanger the lives of people in the surrounding areas. Therefore, Culvert 40 will be evaluated only with regard to whether it can carry the runoff from the 2-, 5-, 10-, and 25-year storms.

In calculating the flow through Culvert 40, the limiting factor is the available energy head from the entrance to the outlet of the pipe. Therefore, the calculations are carried out by assuming reasonable energy head differences between the entrance and the outlet. Because of the close proximity of the Green River, the water elevation in the river will have a strong influence on the flow through the culvert. Unless a new control mechanism is established on the south side of the culvert, Green River water will back up through the culvert to the north side of the canal when the Green River overtops its banks.

The maximum available head across the canal occurs when the water elevation on the north side of the canal is near the top of the north levee and the Green River is within its banks. The elevation of the low points on the north levee around Culvert 40 is about 580 ft MSL. The elevation of the small ditch from the south side of the canal to the Green River is about 575 ft MSL. Therefore the maximum head available from the inlet to the outlet of Culvert 40 without overtopping the north levee is 5 ft (580-575), as shown in figure 13. The total head loss through
Figure 13. Flow capacity of Culvert 40
Culvert 40 cannot be greater than 5 ft if the north levee is not to be overtopped.

The discharge through Culvert 40 can be calculated by using the one-dimensional energy equation (equation 1). Assuming the energy correction coefficient \( a = 1 \), equation 1 can be rewritten as follows:

\[
\left( z + y + \frac{v^2}{2g} \right)_1 = \left( z + y + \frac{v^2}{2g} \right)_2 + h_L
\]  

(7)

All the terms are as defined previously. The energy head loss, \( h_L \) of culvert flow is comprised of three components:

1) \( h_e \) = energy loss at the entrance of the pipe
2) \( h_f \) = energy loss due to friction in the pipe
3) \( h_o \) = energy loss at the outlet

Therefore, the total energy loss, \( h_L \), is calculated as follows:

\[
h_L = h_e + h_f + h_o
\]  

(8)

The energy losses at the entrance and outlet are generally expressed in terms of kinetic energy head as follows:

\[
h_e = K_e \frac{v^2}{2g}
\]  

(9)

\[
h_o = K_o \frac{v^2}{2g}
\]  

(10)

where \( V \) is the average velocity in the pipe and \( K_e \) and \( K_o \) are dimensionless energy head loss coefficients. \( K_e \) and \( K_o \) are determined from experimental results. \( K_e \) for square cornered entrances set flush with a wall is generally taken as 0.5. If the pipe is projecting out of the wall it will be higher. The outlet energy coefficient, \( K_o \), is taken as 1.0 for most cases, since all the kinetic energy of the water from the pipe is dissipated around the pipe outlet.

The energy loss due to friction, \( h_f \), is determined by using either the Manning formula or the Darcy-Weisbach equation (Chow, 1959) for energy loss due to friction, which is given as:

\[
h_f = \frac{f}{D} \frac{L v^2}{2g}
\]  

(11)

where

- \( f \) = the coefficient of friction
- \( L \) = the length of the pipe
- \( D \) = the diameter of the pipe
All other terms are as defined previously. The coefficient of friction, $f$, depends on the shape and roughness of the pipe and on the Reynolds number $R$. The Reynolds number is defined as follows:

$$ R = \frac{VD}{v} \quad (12) $$

where $v$ is the kinematic viscosity of the water. The Reynolds number indicates the relative strength of the viscous and inertial forces. When the flow is highly turbulent the Reynolds number is large, indicating that viscous forces are not dominant in the flow. In this case the friction factor is almost independent of the Reynolds number. On the other hand, when the Reynolds number is small the flow is not turbulent (i.e., it is laminar flow), indicating that the viscous forces are dominant in the flow field. In this case the friction factor is inversely proportional to the Reynolds number.

In the analysis for Culvert 40, the flow through the culvert will be assumed to be fully turbulent, and thus the friction factor will depend only on the type and roughness of the pipe. Since the pipe for Culvert 40 is made of cast iron, the friction factor would be 0.019 if it were new. However, since the pipe is very old and has not been maintained properly, the friction factor will be higher than 0.019. The range of Manning's $n$ values for dirty or tuberculated cast iron pipes is given as 0.015 to 0.035 (King and Brater, 1963). This range in $n$ corresponds to a range of 0.026 to 0.14 in the friction factor, $f$, for a 4-foot diameter pipe. Since there is no accurate method of determining the friction factor for old pipes without field measurements, a value of 0.05 is selected on the basis of engineering judgment.

The total energy loss from the entrance to the outlet of Culvert 40 can then be calculated using the following equation:

$$ h_L = 0.5 \frac{y^2}{2g} + 0.05 \frac{L y^2}{D} + 1.0 \frac{y^2}{2g} \quad (13) $$

For Culvert 40, the length of the pipe, $L$, is 137 ft and the diameter, $D$, is 4 ft. Equation 13 then reduces to:

$$ h_L = 3.21 \frac{y^2}{2g} \quad (14) $$

For a 5-ft head loss, the velocity through Culvert 40 can be calculated from equation 14 as follows:
The discharge through the culvert is then calculated from the relationship:

\[
V = \left(\frac{5}{3.21} \times 2g\right)^{1/2}
\]

\[
= 10.0 \text{ ft/sec}
\]

The maximum flow through Culvert 40 without overtopping the north levee is, therefore, 126 cfs. This flow is much less than 216 cfs, which is the overland flow generated by the 2-year storm. This means that if Culvert 40 is the only structure carrying water from the north side to the south side of the canal, the north canal levee will most probably be overtopped every year.

It should also be noted that the Green River was assumed not to overtop its banks. When the Green River overtops its banks, the available energy head from the inlet to the outlet of Culvert 40 will be less than 5 feet, resulting in discharges less than 126 cfs through the culvert. If the Green River overtops its banks by 5 feet there will be no flow through the culvert. Furthermore, when the Green River overtops its banks there will be a reverse flow through the culvert from the south side to the north side depending on the storm runoff from the I-80 interchange area.

In the above analysis it is also assumed that Culvert 40 is cleaned and maintained properly. Excessive sedimentation will take place in the pipe during moderate storms which do not generate enough velocity in the pipe to clean the sediment. Accumulation of sediment and debris in the pipe and at the inlet will reduce the flow carrying capacity of the culvert significantly.

It can thus be concluded that Culvert 40 by itself is totally inadequate to carry the overland flow from the 200 acres of drainage basin around the I-80 interchange near Colona across the canal. Assuming the maximum available head is 5 feet without overtopping the north levee, the diameter of the pipe at Culvert 40 has to be at least 5 feet to carry the 216 cfs peak discharge from a 2-year storm. Again, the Green River is assumed to be within its banks during the peak discharge through
Culvert 40. If the 5- or 10-year storms are considered, the diameter of the pipe that will carry the peak discharges will be still larger.

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

As discussed in the previous section, Culvert 40 by itself cannot handle the runoff from the drainage area around the I-80 interchange near Colona. In this section, several alternative solutions will be considered and their advantages and disadvantages discussed.

Alternative 1. Do Nothing

If this alternative is chosen, the situation will continue as it is now. The runoff from the I-80 interchange will continue to freely enter the canal, with part of it moving downstream and part of it overflowing to the Green River through the break in the south levee, as shown in figure 14. At the present time the levee break in the south canal has been fixed; however, it will break again during a major storm. This alternative will also allow flood water from the Green River to enter the canal.

There will be flooding in areas adjacent to the canal either during Green River floods or during severe storms around the I-80 interchange. The sedimentation problem in the canal west of I-80 will continue and eventually cause the culverts at the Colona sewer crossing and at Route 84 to silt up. If this alternative is chosen, there is no benefit in raising the levee elevations.

Alternative 2. Reactivate Culvert 40 with an Overflow Weir into the Canal

This alternative will involve cleaning and repairing Culvert 40 and reconstructing the north levee with an overflow weir east of the culvert, as shown in figure 15. The north levee from the I-80 embankment to Culvert 40 will have to be rebuilt with proper material so it will not be washed out when the water level on the north side is high.

With this alternative, Culvert 40 will carry the water across the canal during low flows, and the combination of the overflow weir and Culvert 40 will handle the runoff from heavy storms. As discussed in the section dealing with the capacity of Culvert 40, the maximum discharge the
Figure 14. Alternative 1 — No change
Figure 15. Alternative 2 — Reactivation of Culvert 40 with an overflow weir into the canal
The culvert can carry is 126 cfs if the Green River stays within its banks and the culvert is free of sediments. When these conditions are not met, the capacity of Culvert 40 is greatly reduced.

Assuming that the culvert is clean and the Green River is within its banks, the excess water entering the canal will be the runoff from the different storms minus the 126 cfs carried by Culvert 40. The division of water between the culvert and the canal for the 2-, 5-, 10-, and 25-year storms is given in table 5.

Table 5. Division of Storm Runoff Between Culvert 40 and Hennepin Canal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainfall recurrence interval (years)</th>
<th>Peak discharge (cfs)</th>
<th>Flow through Culvert 40 (cfs)</th>
<th>Flow into Hennepin Canal (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the water enters the canal, the next consideration is whether the culverts at the sewer crossing at Colona and at the State Route 84 bridge can carry the water downstream without creating high backwater elevation that can overtop the canal levees. There are also problems with continuing sedimentation and water quality in the canal that have to be considered when the storm runoff is allowed to enter the canal.

Capacity of Culvert at Sewer Crossing at Colona

The embankment in the canal and the location of the culvert at the Colona sewer crossing are shown in figure 16. During storm events around the I-80 interchange, the flow that should be handled by the culvert will be the same as the flow in the canal and the discharges given in table 5 for the 2-, 5-, 10-, and 25-year storms.

The maximum flow capacity of the culvert at the Colona sewer crossing without overtopping the fill in the canal is 147 cfs. This will be adequate to handle the runoff from storms with 4-year recurrence intervals or less. However, if the fill in the canal is allowed to be overtopped, and there is no obvious reason why it should not, then the total flow past the sewer crossing will consist of flow through the culvert and weir flow.
Figure 16. Culvert and canal fill at the Colona sewer crossing
over the sewer crossing. Assuming the storm runoff in the canal is backed up by the sewer crossing to an elevation of 580 ft MSL, which will still be within the canal levees, the combined flows through the culvert and over the sewer crossing are calculated as follows.

For the culvert flow,

\[ Q_p = v_p A_p \]

where the subscript \( p \) denotes pipe and \( Q_p, v_p, \) and \( A_p \) are the discharge through the culvert, velocity in the culvert, and area of the culvert, respectively. Assuming the culvert is a corrugated pipe 4 ft in diameter and 175 ft long, the head loss through the culvert can be calculated as follows:

\[ h_L = 0.9 \frac{v^2}{2g} + 0.065 \left( \frac{175}{4} \right) \frac{v^2}{2g} + 1.0 \frac{v^2}{2g} \]

\[ = 4.74 \frac{v^2}{2g} \]

The head loss coefficients \( K_e \) and \( K_o \) were selected as 0.9 and 1.0, respectively. The friction coefficient, \( f \), is assumed to be 0.065.

Assuming that the maximum available head is 11.5 ft (580-568.5), and that it is equal to the total head loss, \( h_L \), the velocity in the pipe will be 12.5 fps. The culvert flow is then calculated by equation 15:

\[ Q_p = 12.5 \times \frac{\pi (4)^2}{4} = 157 \text{ cfs} \]

The flow over a weir is given by the following equation:

\[ Q_w = C L H^{3/2} \quad (16) \]

where \( Q_w \) is the flow over the weir, \( C \) is the discharge coefficient, and \( H \) is the energy head of the weir. Assuming \( C = 3.6 \), the length of the weir \( L = 100 \text{ ft} \), and the energy head \( H = 2.5 \text{ ft} \) (580-577.5), the discharge over the weir will be

\[ Q_w = 3.6 \times 100 \times 2.5^{3/2} \text{ cfs} \]

\[ = 1,423 \text{ cfs} \]

This discharge is much above what will be expected to flow in the Hennepin Canal. Therefore, the sewer crossing at Colona will be able to handle most of the discharges from the I-80 interchange if it is allowed to be overtopped.
Capacity of Culvert under Illinois Route 84

The embankment in the canal and the location of the culvert at Route 84 are shown in figure 17. The flow in the canal that has to be handled by the culvert is the same as the flow in the canal during storm events around the I-80 interchange. The discharges for the 2-, 5-, 10-, and 25-year storms were given in table 5.

It is essential to first evaluate the maximum capacity of the culvert under the most favorable conditions. The maximum available energy head at the culvert will occur when the water in the canal is backed up to an elevation of 580 ft MSL (which is the elevation of the levees in the area), and the tailwater elevation (the water elevation at the downstream end of the culvert) is at normal water elevation in the canal. Assuming that the water elevation in the canal downstream of Route 84 is 567 ft MSL, the maximum available energy head is 13 ft (580-567).

Assuming that the maximum available head is equal to the total head loss, \( h_L \), the velocity in the culvert is calculated from the head loss equation as follows:

\[
h_L = 13 \text{ ft} = 0.9 \frac{y^2}{2g} + 0.065 \left( \frac{L}{D} \right) \frac{y^2}{2g} + 1.0 \frac{y^2}{2g}
\]

Since the culvert is a corrugated pipe 4 ft in diameter and 225 ft long, the head loss equation reduces to:

\[
13 = 4.57 \frac{y^2}{2g}
\]

The maximum velocity in the culvert is then calculated from the above equation as 13.5 fps. The maximum discharge through the culvert is then

\[
Q = V \cdot A
\]

\[
= 13.5 \times \frac{\pi D^2}{4}
\]

\[
= 170 \text{ cfs}
\]

This maximum discharge is approximately the same as the flow in the canal during a 5-year storm in the I-80 interchange. For storms with higher recurrence intervals, such as 10 and 25 years, the culvert will not be able to handle the flow. Furthermore, if the Rock River stage at the mouth of the Hennepin Canal is above 567 ft MSL, the available energy head will be reduced and as a result the flow through the culvert will be less than the 170 cfs maximum capacity.
Figure 17. Culvert and canal fill at Illinois Route 84
In general, it can be concluded that there will be flooding from the Hennepin Canal during storm events of recurrence intervals greater than 5 years because of the backwater from the Route 84 culvert. A combination of high water in the Rock River and moderate storms with less than a 5-year recurrence interval might also result in flooding around the Hennepin Canal.

If Alternative 2 is selected and flood protection is provided for storm events of recurrence intervals greater than 5 years, either the capacity of the culvert at Route 84 has to be expanded or the Hennepin Canal levees have to be raised above 580 ft MSL all the way from Route 84 to Lock 27.

Another problem with this alternative is the sedimentation in the canal and at Culvert 40. The sedimentation in the canal will continue at a moderate rate, and if the canal is not dredged occasionally it will create problems with the culverts at the Colona sewer crossing and at Route 84. The sedimentation problem at Culvert 40 will be almost continuous and cleaning may be required several times a year. Unless a good maintenance program is planned for Culvert 40, it will be useless to reactivate the culvert at all.

Alternative 3. Install a New Culvert across the Canal East of Culvert 40

This alternative will require installing a new culvert from the drainage channel to the south side of the canal, as shown in figure 18. If the culvert is installed properly and the levees around the new culvert are riprapped, the runoff from the I-80 interchange will be routed directly to the Green River. There is no need to build a channel from the outlet of the culvert to the Green River, as the flow will carve its own channel.

The transition from the drainage channel to the new culvert has to be watertight so the culvert will not be undermined by seepage and eventually get washed out, as happened to the previous culvert at the same site. The size of the culvert depends on the design storm. If the culvert is to handle the runoff from the 10- and 25-year storms, the diameter of the pipe has to be 6 feet. For storms less than the 10-year storm, a 5-ft culvert will be adequate.
Figure 18. Alternative 3 — Installation of a new culvert across the canal east of Culvert 40
The placement of the culvert at this site will isolate about 300 feet of the canal between the culvert and I-80. The canal will have to be dredged in the area of the new culvert to allow water to flow underneath the culvert. Once the culvert is installed, the south canal levee can either be raised to prevent Green River water from entering it or just reinforced and maintained to prevent levee breaks. Since the runoff from the I-80 interchange will be diverted to the Green River, there is no way adjacent areas can be flooded by the Hennepin Canal. The only source of flooding will be the Green and Rock Rivers. Once the existing levee breaks are repaired, the present levee elevations are adequate to prevent Rock River backwater from flooding some areas through the Hennepin Canal.

Alternative 4. Build a North-South Levee Upstream of Culvert 40

This alternative will require building a north-south levee from the end of the drainage channel to the south canal levee and extending the culvert under I-80 to go past the new levee, as shown in figure 19. This will allow all of the drainage water from the I-80 interchange to go directly into the Green River. Water will come into the canal only through the culvert under I-80. This will also solve the sedimentation problem in the canal and provide a manageable flow through the canal.

In conjunction with this alternative, the south canal levee can either be raised to prevent Green River water from entering it or just reinforced and maintained to prevent levee breaks. After the runoff from the I-80 interchange is diverted into the Green River and out of the canal, there is no way adjacent areas can be flooded by the Hennepin Canal. The only source of flooding will be the Green and Rock Rivers. Once the existing levee break at the Burlington Railroad bridge is repaired, the present levee elevations are adequate to contain Rock River backwater within the canal.

The major disadvantage of this alternative is that some 300 feet of the canal adjacent to I-80 will be lost. However, with proper management the area can be planted with trees to blend it with the surroundings. The loss of the canal can be reduced if the north-south levee is built closer to I-80, as shown in figure 20. This, however, will require building a concrete channel just north of the canal to direct the flow east and
Figure 19. Alternative 4 — Construction of a north-south levee upstream of Culvert 40
Figure 20. Alternative 4a — Construction of a north-south levee close to I-80
reinforcing the north levee so that it will not be washed out. This will be a more expensive project but will save about 200 feet of the canal.

Alternative 5. Allow All of the Runoff to Enter the Canal

This alternative will require fixing up the levee just south of the drainage channel and extending the drainage channel into the canal, as shown in figure 21. The south levee has to be riprapped properly so it will not be washed away by the runoff from the I-80 interchange.

Once the runoff is allowed to enter the canal, the same problems discussed in Alternative 2 will have to be dealt with, except that in this case the problems will be more severe since all of the runoff will be in the canal. Unless the capacity of the culvert under State Route 84 is increased, this alternative will have serious problems during storm events. There will be backwater from the culvert at Highway 84 during any major storms, and the levees will be overtopped occasionally. The sedimentation problem in the canal will continue and eventually cause the culverts at the Colona sewer crossing and at Route 84 to silt up. This will cause more severe problems than the present problem.

If this alternative is chosen, it will be advisable to reinforce the canal levees rather than raise their elevations. If the levees are properly riprapped at the weak areas, the occasional levee breaks which now occur will be prevented and the damage to the levees during flooding will be reduced.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations for the proper handling of the runoff from the I-80 interchange area are made on the basis of a thorough discussion of the different alternatives outlined in the preceding section with DOC and DOT personnel at a meeting on October 18, 1983. A combination of Alternative 3 and Alternative 4, with special consideration for uninterrupted travel along the tow path (north levee) for maintenance vehicles and hikers, was selected as the best alternative. The major components of the recommendation, shown in figure 22, include:
Figure 21. Alternative 5 — Allowing all of the runoff to enter the canal
Figure 22. Main components of the recommendation for proper handling of the runoff from the I-80 interchange
1) Install a culvert from the drainage channel across the canal to the south side of the south canal levee.

2) Extend the culvert under I-80 for about 300 ft so that canal water can flow past the new culvert.

3) Fill in the canal east of the new culvert in such a way that it blends with the surrounding topography. Seed the area for erosion control and aesthetics.

4) Dredge the excessive sediment in the canal west of the new culvert.

5) Build a north-south levee over the new culvert with proper riprap so it will not be washed out when the levee is overtopped.

6) Repair and reinforce the south levee from the new culvert to Lock 28.

Figure 23 has been prepared as a guideline for detailed design specifications for the construction of the new culvert. As shown in the figure, a box culvert 4 feet high and 8 feet wide has been selected. The box culvert was selected because of the limitations imposed on the culvert height by the extension of the 54-inch-diameter culvert under I-80 and the elevation of the tow path on the north levee. The new culvert will be 1.0 foot above the top of the extension culvert from under I-80. A 1.5-foot graded riprap will be placed on top of the new culvert and on the fill material which will form a north-south levee at the culvert location. This arrangement will provide an uninterrupted pathway along the north levee and will also provide access to the south levee.

One important aspect of the culvert construction is the transition from the trapezoidal drainage channel to the box culvert. It is very important that the transition be watertight so the culvert will not be undermined by leakage at the transition.

Other recommendations involve existing and impending problems within the study area. One of the existing problems is the canal levee break at the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge. In all likelihood the levee break there was caused by Green River flood waters. The best evidence of the cause of levee failure is the movement of the levee material that is washed into the canal, which indicates the direction of flow during the levee failure. The levee break has to be repaired to prevent the Rock River backwater from flooding the adjacent private property. However, the
Figure 23. Design drawing for the new culvert west of I-80
repair of the levee has to take the cause of the break into consideration. If the levee break at this location is fixed up to prevent Green River flood water from entering the canal, there will be a levee break at some other location unless the whole south levee is built up and reinforced.

The best way to repair the levee is to raise the levee elevation above the Rock River backwater (which is 574 feet MSL for a 100-year flood) but to leave it low enough for the Green River to overtop it when it is at high flood stages. The south levee will need to be riprapped on both sides so that it will not be washed out when overtopped.

Another potential problem area is Culvert 39, which might clog up with debris and sediment unless it is continuously monitored and cleaned. Of special concern is the runoff from the sand quarry just north of Cleveland Road. If excessive sediment manages to get to Culvert 39, it will definitely cause a major problem. It is therefore recommended that the area be routinely monitored and that the culvert inlet and outlet be cleaned from time to time.
The private property just east of I-80 between the Green River and the Hennepin Canal is completely surrounded by levees on all sides, as shown in figure 24. The only drainage from that property is through a 4-ft-diameter drainpipe through the levee at the end of the drainage ditch within the levee system. The drainage from the pipe is carried to the Green River by a drainage ditch which runs in between the west levee and the embankment of I-80. The drainpipe has a set of three flap gates at the pipe outlet, the purpose of which is to close the drainpipe when the Green River stage is up to the level of the drainpipe opening. This prevents Green River water from entering the farm through the drainpipe. However, if the Green River stage is up and remains up for an extended period of time, drainage water from the farm is impounded within the levees surrounding the farm for the same amount of time. The water elevation in the drainage ditch leading to the Green River is the same as that in the Green River during flood stages.

Since the flooding in water year 1979 was severe, it was decided to investigate how long the drainage pipe from the private property was closed because of high water in the Green River. The highest flooding in 1979 took place from March 16 to April 11, a period of about 27 days. The daily average discharges from March 16 to April 11 are shown in table 6. The Green River flood elevation just upstream of I-80, which is the location of the drainage ditch leading to the drainpipe, was calculated using the HEC-2 program. The Green River water surface elevation during that 1979 flooding period is shown in figure 25, along with the elevation of the drainpipe. As can be seen in the figure, the Green River stage was higher than the drainpipe's opening. Therefore, during this period of flooding, the flap gates on the drainpipe were completely closed for at least 21 days. Any rainfall and drainage water from the farm within the levees was therefore impounded on the farm for at least 21 days. Furthermore, the drainpipe was partially closed even for a longer period of time after the major flood, preventing the farm from draining very quickly.

Another period of severe flooding in water year 1979 was from August 18, 1979, to September 1, 1979. The discharges from August 17,
Table 6. Average Daily Discharges for Green River near Geneseo from March 16 to April 11, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discharge (cfs)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discharge (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 16</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>March 30</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>5,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9,150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8,080</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. Green River stages at I-80 from March 16 - April 11, 1979
1979, to September 5, 1979, are shown in table 7. The Green River flood elevation just upstream of I-80 from August 17 to September 5, 1979, is shown in figure 26. Also shown in figure 26 is the elevation of the drainpipe's opening. As shown in the figure, the drainpipe opening was completely under water from August 18 to August 26 for a period of 8 days. During this period no water was draining out of the farm area. In addition, the drainpipe was not completely open for at least 10 days from August 26 to September 5.

In general, the drainage system from the farm enclosed by the levee system east of I-80 is totally inadequate during high waters in the Green River. When there is an extended period of time during which the Green River is high, the farm will be under water unless the standing water within the levee system is pumped out.

Table 7. Average Daily Discharges for Green River near Geneseo from August 17 to September 5, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discharge (cfs)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discharge (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 17</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>August 27</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26. Green River stages at I-80 from August 17 - September 5, 1979
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