



Middle Cedar River Watershed Hydrologic Assessment Report



IIHR Report
No. 530
October, 2019

Prepared by:
Iowa Flood Center / IIHR — Hydrosience & Engineering

Sponsored by:
Middle Cedar River Watershed Management Coalition



Iowa Watershed Approach
Phase I Report



IIHR — Hydrosience & Engineering
The University of Iowa
C. Maxwell Stanley Hydraulics Laboratory
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Hydrologic Assessment of the Middle Cedar Watershed

October 2019

IIHR Technical Report No. 530

Prepared by:

Iowa Flood Center | IIHR—Hydroscience & Engineering
The University of Iowa
C. Maxwell Stanley Hydraulics Laboratory
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Acknowledgements

The Iowa Flood Center and IIHR—Hydroscience & Engineering would like to thank the following agencies and organizations for providing data and engaging in discussions that contributed to this assessment:

Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Members of the Middle Cedar Watershed Management Coalition
East Central Iowa Council of Governments
Benton County

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	xi
Introduction	1
1. Iowa’s Hydrology and Water Quality	6
a. Land Surface and Use.....	6
b. Climate and Water Cycle.....	11
i. Statewide Precipitation	11
ii. The Water Cycle in Iowa.....	13
iii. Shallow Groundwater and Soil Moisture Trends.....	14
iv. Floods.....	15
v. Droughts	19
c. Hydrological Alterations in Iowa and the Iowa Watershed Approach Study Areas	20
i. Hydrological Alterations from Agricultural-Related Land Use Changes.....	20
ii. Hydrological Alterations Induced by Climate Change.....	22
iii. Hydrological Alterations Induced by Urban Development.....	23
d. Assessment of Iowa’s Water Quality.....	24
i. Iowa Water-Quality History.....	24
ii. Water Quality in the Post-Clean Water Act Era.....	24
e. Web-Based Information Systems of Flood and Water-Quality Data.....	27
i. The Iowa Flood Information System (IFIS).....	27
ii. The Iowa Water-Quality Information System.....	31
iii. The Iowa Watershed Approach Information System (IWAIS)	32
2. Conditions in the Middle Cedar Watershed	33
a. Hydrology.....	33
b. Geology and Soils	36
c. Topography.....	38
d. Land Use.....	39
e. BMP Mapping.....	40
f. Potential BMPs - Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework.....	41
g. Instrumentation/Data Records.....	42
h. Floods of Record	43
3. Middle Cedar Hydrologic Model Development	45

a. Model Development	46
b. Attributing the Model.....	47
Surface	47
Subsurface	47
Forcing Data	47
c. Calibration and Validation	49
Monthly Water Cycle.....	52
Annual Maximum Peak Discharge and Flow Duration Curves.....	53
4. Analysis of Watershed Scenarios	56
a. Increased Precipitation and Index Points.....	56
b. High Runoff Potential Areas	57
c. Mitigating the Effects of High Runoff with Increased Infiltration.....	58
i. Mitigating the Effects of High Runoff with Native Vegetation	59
ii. Mitigating the Effects of High Runoff with Cover Crops/Soil Health/No-Till	64
d. Mitigating the Effects of High Runoff with Distributed Storage	69
5. Summary and Conclusions	77
a. Middle Cedar Water Cycle and Watershed Conditions.....	77
b. Middle Cedar Hydrologic Model.....	77
c. Watershed Scenarios for the Middle Cedar Watershed	78
d. Watershed Scenarios for the Middle Cedar Watershed.....	83
Appendix A – References	83

List of Figures

Figure 1. Cedar River Flood of 2008 in Cedar Rapids.....	1
Figure 2. Tour of a flood mitigation project in the Soap Creek Watershed, which was one of the basins that participated in the Iowa Watersheds Project (2010–16).	2
Figure 3. Flood mitigation structure in the Soap Creek Watershed.....	3
Figure 4. Current IWA watersheds in blue and completed IWP watershed in red.	5
Figure 1.1. Iowa Watershed Approach study areas.....	6
Figure 1.2. Landform regions of Iowa.....	8
Figure 1.3. Historic vegetation of Iowa 1832–59. Raw data downloaded from the Iowa Geographic Map Server (https://ortho.gis.iastate.edu/).....	9
Figure 1.4. Land use composition in the state of Iowa 2016. Cropland Data Layer.....	10
Figure 1.5. Percent of Iowa’s total area planted with row crops between 2001 and 2016. Cropland Data Layer.....	10
Figure 1.6. Soils requiring tile drainage for full productivity and drainage districts. Raw data source: DNR's NRGIS Library.	11
Figure 1.7. Average precipitation (inches): (a) annual; and (b) growing season (April–October). Precipitation estimates are based on the 30-year annual average (1981–2010). (Raw data downloaded from: http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu/).....	12
Figure 1.8. Statewide average monthly precipitation. Precipitation estimates are based on the 30-year annual average (1981–2010). (Raw data downloaded from: http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu/).....	13
Figure 1.9. Iowa water cycle for the IWA watersheds. This shows the partitioning of average precipitation into evapotranspiration, surface flow, and baseflow components.	14
Figure 1.10. Shallow groundwater data (USGS wells).	15
Figure 1.11. The extent of the flooding during the 1993 and 2008 floods (Bradley, 2010).	16
Figure 1.12. Number of flood-related federally declared disasters in Iowa counties (1988–2016). Data source: https://www.fema.gov/	18
Figure 1.13. The number of flood-related federally declared disasters in Iowa (1988–2016). Data source: https://www.fema.gov/	18
Figure 1.14. Drought conditions, October 09, 2012. (Source: http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/).	19
Figure 1.15. Observed change in heavy precipitation (the heaviest 1%) between 1958 and 2016. Figure taken from The Climate Science Special Report (Easterling et al. 2017) (https://science2017.globalchange.gov/).....	22
Figure 1.16. Projected change in heavy precipitation. Twenty-year return period amount for daily precipitation for mid- (left maps) and late-21 st century (right maps). Results are shown for a lower emissions scenario (top maps; RCP4.5) and for a higher emissions scenario (bottom maps, RCP8.5). Figure taken from The Climate Science Special Report (Easterling et al. 2017) (https://science2017.globalchange.gov/).....	23
Figure 1.17. Causes of impairments in Iowa’s impaired waters. (Iowa Department of Natural Resources, 2018).....	26
Figure 1.18. Numbers of impaired Iowa waters, 1998–2016. (Iowa Department of Natural Resources, 2018).....	26
Figure 1.19. Statewide floodplain map data showing different levels of annual flood risk.	28

Figure 1.20. Flood inundation map library for the Des Moines and Raccoon rivers in the city of Des Moines.....	29
Figure 1.21. USGS (green) and Iowa Flood Center (blue) stream-stage monitoring locations displayed in the Iowa Flood Information System (IFIS).....	30
Figure 1.22. IIHR—Hydroscience & Engineering and USGS surface water-quality monitoring locations as displayed in the Iowa Water Quality Information System (IWQIS).	31
Figure 1.23. Example IWAIS interface view showing the number of existing ponds within each HUC 12 in the Middle Cedar River Watershed.....	32
Figure 2.1. The Middle Cedar Watershed (HUC8 07080205).	33
Figure 2.2. Average annual precipitation (inches). Estimates are based on the 30-year annual average (1981-2010).....	34
Figure 2.3. Bar graph of annual precipitation.	35
Figure 2.4. Annual ratio of streamflow to precipitation.....	35
Figure 2.5. Annual ratio of baseflow to streamflow.....	36
Figure 2.6. Distribution of Hydrologic Soil Groups in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Hydrologic Soil Groups reflect the degree of runoff potential a particular soil has, with Type A representing the lowest runoff potential and Type D representing the highest runoff potential.....	38
Figure 2.7. Topography of the Middle Cedar Watershed.	39
Figure 2.8. Land use composition in the Middle Cedar Watershed, per the 2017 USDA Cropland Data Layer.....	39
Figure 2.9. Iowa Best Management Practices Mapping Project.....	41
Figure 2.10. Potential BMPs. Ponds Dams represent nutrient removal wetlands.	42
Figure 2.11. Hydrologic and meteorologic instrumentation in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Stage/discharge gages are shown in yellow or green while precipitation and soil moisture gages are shown in red.....	43
Figure 3.1. Hydrologic processes modeled in GHOST.....	45
Figure 3.2. The three coupled flow domains representing a watershed in GHOST.....	46
Figure 3.3. USGS Gauges used to account for runoff generation outside of the Middle Cedar watershed.....	48
Figure 3.4. Computational mesh and rainfall pixels.	49
Figure 3.5. Observed and simulated daily flow time series. Calibration period. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart. Measured flows were obtained from USGS gauge stations USGS 05464500, USGS 05464220.	51
Figure 3.6. Observed and simulated daily flow time series. Validation period. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart. Measured flows were obtained from USGS gauge stations USGS 05464500, USGS 05464220.....	51
Figure 3.7. Observed and simulated average monthly runoff depth (in inches) for the Middle watershed. Results are shown for both the calibration and validation periods (2002-2016). Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart.....	52
Figure 3.8. Simulated versus observed annual maximum peak daily discharges (cfs) for the Middle Cedar. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart.....	54
Figure 3.9. Daily flow duration curves for The Middle Cedar. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids. Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart. Results are shown for both the calibration (2002-2010) and validation (2011-2016) periods.....	55

Figure 4.1. Runoff coefficient analysis for the Middle Cedar Watershed. This figure shows the runoff coefficients for the simulation period (2002-2016).	58
Figure 4.2. Native vegetation scenario. Daily flow duration curves for Cedar River at Cedar Rapids (top) and Wolf Creek near Dysart (bottom). Results are shown for the 2002-2016 period. Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	60
Figure 4.3. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, native vegetation, and native vegetation plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 1 to 6 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	62
Figure 4.4. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, native vegetation, and native vegetation plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 7 to 12 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	63
Figure 4.5. Average peak discharge reduction (%) for index points in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Baseline vs. Native Vegetation (historic precipitation).	64
Figure 4.6. Cover Crops/Soil Health/No-Till scenario. Daily flow duration curves for Cedar River at Cedar Rapids (top) and Wolf Creek near Dysart (bottom). Results are shown for the 2002-2016 period. Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	65
Figure 4.7. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, cover crops/no-till, and cover crops/no-till plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 1 to 6 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	67
Figure 4.8. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, cover crops/no-till, and cover crops/no-till plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 7 to 12 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	68
Figure 4.9. Average peak discharge reduction (%) for index points in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Baseline vs. Cover Crop/No-Till (historic precipitation).	69
Figure 4.10. Schematic of a pond constructed to provide flood storage.	70
Figure 4.11. Ponds (684) placement in the Middle Cedar	71
Figure 4.12. Distributed Storage scenario. Daily flow duration curves for Cedar River at Cedar Rapids (top) and Wolf Creek near Dysart (bottom). Results are shown for the 2002-2016 period. Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	72
Figure 4.13. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, distributed storage, and distributed storage plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 1 to 6 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	74
Figure 4.14. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, distributed storage, and distributed storage plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 7 to 12 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.	75
Figure 4.15. Average peak discharge reduction (%) for index points in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Baseline vs. Distributed Storage (historic precipitation).	76
Figure 5.1. Average peak flow reductions for all the simulations at two different index points. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids and bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart. IP stands for increased precipitation. Peak flow reduction were estimated in reference to the baseline conditions with historic precipitation.	80
Figure 5.2. Peak flow stage reductions. Cedar River at Cedar Rapids. IP stands for increased precipitation. Peak flow stage reductions were estimated in reference to the baseline conditions with historic precipitation.	81

Figure 5.3. Peak flow stage reductions. Wolf Creek near Dysart. IP stands for increased precipitation. Peak flow stage reductions were estimated in reference to the baseline conditions with historic precipitation. 82

List of Tables

Table 1.1. FEMA disaster declarations in Iowa Counties (1988–2016). Data source: https://www.fema.gov/	17
Table 1.2. Agricultural-Related Alterations and Hydrologic Impacts.	21
Table 2.1. Approximate Hydrologic Soil Group Percentages by Area for the Middle Cedar Watershed.	38
Table 2.2. Discharge from the Six Largest Flooding Events at USGS Gaging Stations in the Middle Cedar Watershed including: the Cedar River at Waterloo, Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Black Hawk Creek at Hudson, Beaver Creek at New Hartford, and Wolf Creek near Dysart.....	44
Table 3.1. Hydrologic model evaluation metrics for both the calibration and validation periods. Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE), Percent bias (PBIAS), and coefficient of determination (R^2)...	50
Table 4.1. Index Points.....	57
Table 4.2. Average peak flow reduction at the index points.....	73

Introduction

From 2011–13, Iowa suffered eight Presidential Disaster Declarations encompassing 73 counties and more than 70% of the state. As devastating as these events were, this period is but a small portion of Iowa’s long history of enduring and recovering from major floods. Figure 1 shows just one example of devastation caused by the historic floods of 2008. Long-term data shows that heavy precipitation and flood events are increasing in frequency across the Midwest, and Iowans need to be prepared for the economic, social, and environmental impacts of these changing trends.

In January 2016, the state of Iowa received a \$97 million award for the Iowa Watershed Approach (IWA). The grant was part of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) National Disaster Resilience Competition, which funds cutting-edge projects to address unmet needs from past natural disasters and reduce Americans’ vulnerability to future disasters. The project will end in September 2021.



Figure 1. Cedar River Flood of 2008 in Cedar Rapids

The Iowa Watershed Approach (IWA) program takes a holistic approach to address flooding at the watershed scale, recognizing that upstream and downstream communities need to voluntarily work together to increase community flood resilience.

The IWA will accomplish six specific goals:

- 1) Reduce flood risk;
- 2) Improve water quality;
- 3) Increase community flood resilience;
- 4) Engage stakeholders through collaboration, outreach, and education;
- 5) Improve quality of life and health for Iowans, especially for vulnerable populations; and
- 6) Develop a program that is scalable and replicable throughout the Midwest and United States.

The IWA brings Iowans together to address factors that contribute to floods. Nine distinct watersheds are involved in the project, including the Upper Iowa River, Upper Wapsipinicon River, Middle Cedar River, Clear Creek, English River, North Raccoon River, East Nishnabotna River, West Nishnabotna River, and Bee Branch Creek. In addition, urban projects in the cities of Dubuque, Coralville, and Storm Lake will focus on infrastructure improvements to mitigate flood risk.



Figure 2. Tour of a flood mitigation project in the Soap Creek Watershed, which was one of the basins that participated in the Iowa Watersheds Project (2010–16).

Each watershed has formed a Watershed Management Authority (WMA) that brings local stakeholders together to prioritize their watershed improvement needs, share resources, and foster new partnerships and collaborations. IIHR—Hydroscience & Engineering (IIHR) and the Iowa Flood Center (IFC) are developing a hydrologic assessment of each watershed that will

provide WMAs, local leaders, landowners, and residents with an understanding of the hydrology – the movement of water – within their watershed. This assessment will deliver valuable information to stakeholders to help guide strategic decision-making to efficiently address flooding and water-quality concerns.

IIHR and IFC have developed this report for the Middle Cedar Watershed. Information in this report will be integrated into a comprehensive watershed resiliency plan. The watershed resiliency plan will guide long-term watershed management initiatives and planning efforts, as well as identify goals and objectives to meet the current and future needs of local stakeholders and community members.

WMAs in the IWA watersheds have identified eligible sub-watersheds (e.g., HUC 12s) for practice implementation efforts. This report will help guide the implementation of small-scale flood mitigation projects. Through the IWA, volunteer landowners will be eligible to receive 90% cost-share assistance to implement best management practices (BMPs) such as ponds, wetlands, and water and sediment control basins (WASCOBS) to reduce the magnitude of downstream flooding and improve water quality during and after flood events. The implementation of BMPs is an essential step toward the long-term recovery and to improve Iowa's future flood resiliency.



Figure 3. Flood mitigation structure in the Soap Creek Watershed.

The success of the IWA depends on collaborative partnerships among many statewide organizations and local stakeholders who together will carry out the work necessary to achieve the goals of the IWA. Partnerships include, but are not limited to:

- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Iowa Silver Jackets Flood Risk Management Team
- Iowa Economic Development Authority
- Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management
- University of Iowa (IIHR—Hydroscience & Engineering, Iowa Flood Center, Center for Evaluation and Assessment)
- Iowa State University (Iowa Nutrient Research Center, Iowa Water Center, Daily Erosion Project, ISU Extension & Outreach)
- University of Northern Iowa (Tallgrass Prairie Center)
- Watershed Management Authorities and their member entities
- Iowa Department of Natural Resources
- Iowa Department of Transportation
- Iowa Association of Counties
- Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship
- Iowa Soybean Association
- Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation
- Iowa Corn Growers Association
- Iowa Farm Bureau
- Iowa Agricultural Water Alliance
- Cities of Dubuque, Coralville, and Storm Lake
- Local Resource Conservation and Development Offices
- Benton, Buena Vista, Fremont, Iowa, Johnson, Mills, Winneshiek, and Howard counties




Figure 4. Current IWA watersheds in blue and completed IWP watershed in red.

The IWA project is an expansion of the Iowa Watersheds Project (IWP) (Weber et al. 2018), a similar effort in the five Iowa watersheds (Upper Cedar River, Turkey River, Soap Creek, Middle Raccoon, and Chequest Creek) shown in Figure 4. HUD funded the IWP in the aftermath of the devastating 2008 floods; and the project was active from 2010–16. The success of the IWP (see Figures 2 and 3) served as a significant source of leverage for the state of Iowa to receive funding for the IWA, providing a framework to build upon, continuing Iowa’s leadership and commitment to working together and improving flood resiliency. For more information on the Iowa Watersheds Project, visit <http://iowafloodcenter.org/projects/watershed-projects/>. For more information about the Iowa Watershed Approach, visit www.iowawatershedapproach.org.

1. Iowa's Hydrology and Water Quality

This chapter summarizes Iowa's water cycle, geology, land use, hydrology, and water quality across the state. The authors examined precipitation, streamflow, and shallow groundwater records to describe how much precipitation falls, how that water moves through the landscape, when storms typically produce river flooding, and how Iowa's hydrology, land use, and water quality have changed over the past decades and century. In addition, this chapter includes an overview of two novel web-based platforms that allow access to Iowa's flood and water-quality data. The information presented in this chapter is valid for the entire state, but some sub-sections place emphasis on the eight IWA watersheds shown in Figure 1.1.



Figure 1.1. Iowa Watershed Approach study areas.

a. Land Surface and Use

Iowa has a unique and diverse landscape that is the culmination of geologic processes occurring over millennia. Iowa has been subdivided into seven distinct landform regions, shown in Figure 1.2 (Prior, 1991). The Iowa Watershed Approach projects are primarily contained within four of these regions: the Paleozoic Plateau, the Iowan Surface, the Southern Iowa Drift Plain, and the Des Moines Lobe landform regions. Surficial materials are underlain by a host of sedimentary bedrock formations including carbonate (limestone and dolomite), sandstone, and shale. Most of these rocks were deposited during the Paleozoic Era (541–299 million years ago), with others being deposited during the earlier Mesozoic Era (201–66 million years ago).

Following an extensive period of non-deposition and erosion, Iowa was glaciated numerous times during the Quaternary Period. At least seven episodes of glaciation occurred between 2.6 and 0.5 million years ago. These are collectively known as the Pre-Illinoian glacial advances. More recently, the Des Moines Lobe glacier advanced into north-central Iowa, reaching its maximum extent approximately 14,000 years ago. Subsequent loess (wind-blown silt) deposition occurred during and after this time, mantling much of the state. These glacial processes and erosional periods shaped the landform regions of Iowa.

The Southern Iowa Drift Plain encompasses the southern portion of the state and consists of several layers of Pre-Illinoian till deposits mantled by loess. Landscape development following the ice retreat eroded most of the features typically associated with glaciers and created the well-developed drainage network we see today. The Loess Hills landform region in the western part of the state has the same stratigraphic units as the Southern Iowa Drift Plain, but with thicker loess deposits because of its proximity to the source – the Missouri River alluvial plains.

In contrast, northeastern Iowa experienced a period of extreme cold (21,000 to 16,500 years ago) during the last glacial maximum, resulting in extensive erosion of the landscape and the formation of the Iowan Surface landform region. Characteristic features include gently rolling topography, common glacial “erratics” (rocks and boulders not native to Iowa transported here by glaciers), and loess-mantled paha (northwest to southeast trending uneroded upland remnants of the former landscape). The depth to bedrock is often shallow on this landform region. Surficial materials consist of poorly consolidated glacial deposits with the potential for extensive local sand bodies. In areas where the depth to bedrock is shallow, these materials provide limited protection from surface water infiltrating into bedrock.

The Paleozoic Plateau borders the Iowan Surface and experienced many of the same processes. The primary difference is that shallow bedrock dominates the Paleozoic Plateau. Characteristic features include steep sided, deeply entrenched valleys; abundant rock exposures; and common karst features. The unconsolidated materials consist of relatively thin glacial deposits with a loess mantle. Carbonate bedrock is susceptible to the formation of karst features, and numerous caves, springs, and sinkholes are identified throughout this landform region.

The younger Des Moines Lobe landform region is in north-central Iowa. This region was glaciated between approximately 15,000 and 12,000 years ago, with several advances and retreats before the glacier finally receded. Because of the relative youth of this region, erosional processes have not erased the surficial features typical of glacial landscapes. Characteristic features include glacial moraines (arcuate ridges associated with stationary periods), ice contact features (knobs,

kettles, and hummocky terrain), fine-grained lake and pond deposits, and outwash (coarse sand and gravel carried by rivers draining glaciers). Natural drainage on the Des Moines Lobe is typically very poor.




Figure 1.2. Landform regions of Iowa.

Prairies covered Iowa before the arrival of European settlers, as depicted in historical vegetation shown in Figure 1.3. Forests and wetlands created a diverse set of habitats for animals, and prairies contained up to 300 species of grasses and flowers. As settlers tilled the prairie and planted crops such as wheat, corn, and buckwheat, the land cover of Iowa shifted to a majority agricultural state (Schilling et al., 2008).




Figure 1.3. Historic vegetation of Iowa 1832–59. Raw data downloaded from the Iowa Geographic Map Server (<https://ortho.gis.iastate.edu/>).

Today, corn and soybeans cover 64% of Iowa (see Figure 1.4), with only small prairie remnants remaining. Several factors make Iowa an excellent place to sustain agricultural activities, including the rich topsoil left behind by the prairies; advances in farming technology including fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides; and rainfall patterns, among others. Over the past 15 years, the percentage of Iowa’s land used for growing corn and soybeans has stayed relatively stable at near 60%. The percentage of Iowa land area devoted to growing corn or soybeans is shown in Figure 1.5.




Figure 1.4. Land use composition in the state of Iowa 2016. Cropland Data Layer.




Figure 1.5. Percent of Iowa's total area planted with row crops between 2001 and 2016. Cropland Data Layer.

A significant portion of Iowa soils require sub-surface drainage to achieve optimal yields for row crops. Areas that likely require tile drainage are shown in Figure 1.6. It is estimated that installation of tile drainage peaked between the late 1800s and the mid-1900s, but today landowners continue to expand and upgrade drainage systems. In some areas (mostly in the Des Moines Lobe), public drainage districts were created to facilitate drainage over large areas. Drainage districts, also shown in Figure 1.6, have the power to tax and bond and are governed by trustees.




Figure 1.6. Soils requiring tile drainage for full productivity and drainage districts. Raw data source: DNR's NRGIS Library.

b. Climate and Water Cycle

Iowa is characterized by a humid continental climate with marked seasonal temperature variations, typically experiencing hot summers and cold winters. Annual average temperatures range between approximately 40°F and 60°F. The coldest and warmest months of the year are January and June, respectively. In January, the normal daily minimum temperatures range between 6°F and 17°F. In June, the normal daily maximum temperatures are in the 78 - 84°F range. Severe weather can impact regions of the state between the spring and fall; heavy rains and tornados are the most common of these events. Precipitation records show that Iowa typically receives the bulk of its annual precipitation in the spring and the summer.

i. Statewide Precipitation

Iowa's precipitation spatial patterns are marked by a smooth transition of annual precipitation across its landscape from the southeast to the northwest, as shown in Figure 1.7. The average

annual precipitation reaches 40 inches in the southeast corner and decreases to 26 inches in the northwest corner.




Figure 1.7. Average precipitation (inches): (a) annual; and (b) growing season (April–October). Precipitation estimates are based on the 30-year annual average (1981–2010). (Raw data downloaded from: <http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu/>).

Records show small variations in average annual precipitation among the eight IWA watersheds; the North Raccoon receives the least (33.8 inches), and the English River the most (36.6 inches). Historically, the quantity of annual precipitation presented in Figure 1.7b has been ideal for agricultural needs, such that Iowa has not required irrigation systems like other parts of the country. The state average precipitation between April and October is approximately 27 inches, and the months with highest precipitation accumulations (May, June, and July) occur during the

peak of the growing season. These climatological characteristics make Iowa an ideal place for agriculture.




Figure 1.8. Statewide average monthly precipitation. Precipitation estimates are based on the 30-year annual average (1981–2010). (Raw data downloaded from: <http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu/>).

ii. The Water Cycle in Iowa

A large portion of Iowa’s precipitation evaporates into the atmosphere — either directly from lakes and streams, or by transpiration from crops and vegetation. What doesn’t evaporate drains into streams and rivers. The average annual partitioning of precipitation into evapotranspiration, surface flow, or base flow in each IWA watershed is shown in Figure 1.9.

Evapotranspiration

In Iowa, most precipitation leaves by evapotranspiration; for the IWA watersheds, evapotranspiration accounts for between 66% and 79% of precipitation. Moving westward in the state, a larger fraction of the precipitation evaporates.

Surface Flow

The precipitation that drains into streams and rivers can take two different paths. During rainy periods, some water quickly drains across the land surface, causing streams and rivers to rise in the hours and days following the storm. This portion of the flow is often called “surface flow,” even though some of the water may soak into the ground and discharge later (e.g., through a tile drainage system).

Baseflow

The rest of the water that drains into streams and rivers takes a longer, slower path; first it infiltrates into the ground, percolates down to the groundwater, and then slowly moves toward a stream. The groundwater eventually reaches the stream, maintaining flows in a river even during extended dry periods. This portion of the flow is often called “baseflow.” In hydrologic analyses, sub-surface drainage flows are typically lumped with groundwater flows.




Figure 1.9. Iowa water cycle for the IWA watersheds. This shows the partitioning of average precipitation into evapotranspiration, surface flow, and baseflow components.

iii. Shallow Groundwater and Soil Moisture Trends

Shallow groundwater and soil moisture conditions can play an important role in the transformation of rainfall into runoff. For example, several studies have identified the occurrence of very wet winters and springs (and the subsequent high soil moisture and groundwater levels) as contributing factors to the major floods in 1993 and 2008 (Linhart and Eash, 2010; Mutel, 2010; Bradley, 2010; Smith et al., 2013). Across the state, almost 400 sensors continuously monitor the condition (e.g., streamflow and stage) of the Iowa rivers. In contrast, long-term continuous data on groundwater levels or soil moisture are sparse. Figure 1.10 displays shallow groundwater information from two United States Geological Survey (USGS) wells located in two different Iowa counties. The location of the water table is influenced by several factors, such as

location on the landscape, land cover, soil type, etc. In Iowa, it is very common to find the water table within the first 25 feet of the soil column, except in the deep loess hills in western Iowa and incised bedrock valleys of northeast Iowa.




Figure 1.10. Shallow groundwater data (USGS wells).

iv. Floods

Rivers and streams have a finite capacity to convey water within their banks. When the amount of water surpasses that capacity, flooding occurs. Floods are typically related to large amounts of precipitation or snow melt and saturated or frozen soil. In Iowa, historic records show that the great majority (>90%) of floods occur in the spring and summer; the month of June shows the highest number of flood events. Precipitation records show that heavy rains occurred in the fall as well; however, Iowa soils have a larger capacity to infiltrate water late in the year, and therefore fall floods are less common. In Iowa's flood history, the events of 1993 and 2008 are on an entirely different scale than the others. These two events stand out from the rest when looking at the extent of the area impacted, recovery costs, precipitation amounts, and stream flows recorded (Bradley 2010; Smith et al., 2013). Figure 1.11 shows the extent of the flooding during the flood events of 1993 and 2008. In both years, flooding impacted the eight IWA watersheds.




Figure 1.11. The extent of the flooding during the 1993 and 2008 floods (Bradley, 2010).

Federal disaster declarations give impacted regions access to federal recovery assistance. Current regulation permits two kinds of disaster declarations: emergency declarations and major disaster declarations (Stafford Act). Both are granted at the discretion of the president of the United States after the governor of the impacted state makes the request. FEMA records on disaster declarations are open to the public and were used to write the text and create the figures below.

- FEMA records show 952 flood-related disaster declarations (FRDD) in Iowa between 1988 and 2016. Of these, 951 were reported for Iowa counties (see Figure 1.12) and one for the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa. All the FRDD in Iowa have been major disaster declarations except the 99 related to Hurricane Katrina evacuation (see Table 1.1), which were classified as emergency disaster declarations.

Table 1.1. FEMA disaster declarations in Iowa Counties (1988–2016). Data source: <https://www.fema.gov/>.

DISASTER TITLE	COUNT 1988-2016
SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES, AND <i>FLOODING</i>	223
SEVERE STORMS & <i>FLOODING</i>	195
SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES AND <i>FLOODING</i>	106
<i>HURRICANE</i> KATRINA EVACUATION	99
SEVERE STORMS AND <i>FLOODING</i>	98
SEVERE STORMS, <i>FLOODING</i> , AND TORNADOES	97
SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES, STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS, AND <i>FLOODING</i>	79
SEVERE WINTER STORM	62
SEVERE WINTER STORMS	48
ICE STORM	44
SEVERE STORMS, STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS, AND <i>FLOODING</i>	34
SNOW	30
SEVERE WINTER STORMS AND SNOWSTORM	27
SEVERE STORMS, AND <i>FLOODING</i>	15
SEVERE SNOWSTORMS	13
<i>FLOODING</i>	6
SEVERE STORMS, TORNADOES, AND STRAIGHT-LINE WINDS	6
RAIN, WINDS, & TORNADOES	1
SEVERE STORM	1
	1184

- In the last 30 years, every county in Iowa has experienced sufficiently large and severe flood events to warrant a presidential disaster declaration. The number of FRDDs for each Iowa county from 1988–2016 is shown in Figure 1.12.
- The eastern half of the state has received more FRDDs than the western part. In addition, most counties in Northeast Iowa have received at least 10 FRDDs in the last three decades. The two counties with the lowest and highest number of FRDDs are O’Brien (4) and Clayton (17), respectively.
- Since 1988, the longest period with no FRDDs in Iowa was two years, which can be seen in Figure 1.13. The years with the highest number of FRDDs were 1993, 2005, and 2008. Remarkably, the number of FRDDs in 1993 is higher than the number of counties in Iowa. In that year, 15 counties received two FRDDs, one in late April and the second in early July (Buchanan, Butler, Des Moines, Linn, Black Hawk, Muscatine, Benton, Cedar, Louisa, Tama, Webster, Floyd, Mitchell, Kossuth, and Scott counties).




Figure 1.12. Number of flood-related federally declared disasters in Iowa counties (1988–2016). Data source: <https://www.fema.gov/>.




Figure 1.13. The number of flood-related federally declared disasters in Iowa (1988–2016). Data source: <https://www.fema.gov/>.

v. Droughts

Like floods, droughts are a recurrent phenomenon and part of the Earth's climate. Droughts are characterized by periods with precipitation deficits; depending on their severity, these can also include very low streamflows as well as reduced soil moisture and groundwater levels.

Unlike floods, droughts tend to progress slowly, and their onset is not easily identifiable. The extremely dry period of the 1930s (known as the "Dust Bowl") is still considered the unsurpassable benchmark against which all other droughts will be measured. In Iowa's recent history, both 1988 and 2012 stand out as drought years. Overall, comparisons of these two droughts reveal some similarities. In 1988, Iowa had its 4th hottest and 14th driest summer; whereas the 2012 summer was the 14th hottest and 5th driest in the observational record (Harry Hillaker, state climatologist).

Since 1999, several federal agencies and academic institutions partnered to create the U.S. Drought Monitor (USDM, <http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/>), which releases a weekly map of drought conditions for the United States. Drought conditions are classified in five categories: Abnormally Dry (D0), Moderate Drought (D1), Severe Drought (D2), Extreme Drought (D3), and Exceptional Drought (D4). The map presented in Figure 1.14, shows the extent of 2012 drought in Iowa using data generated by the USDM.




Figure 1.14. Drought conditions, October 09, 2012. (Source: <http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/>).

c. Hydrological Alterations in Iowa and the Iowa Watershed Approach Study Areas

Although the hydrologic conditions presented for the Iowa Watershed Approach study areas illustrate the historical water cycle, the watersheds themselves are not static; historical changes have occurred that have altered the water cycle. In this section, we discuss the hydrological alterations of Iowa's watersheds.

i. Hydrological Alterations from Agricultural-Related Land Use Changes

The Midwest, with its low-relief poorly-drained landscape, is one of the most intensively managed areas in the world (Schilling et al., 2008). With European-descendent settlement, most of the land was transformed from low-runoff prairie and forest to higher-runoff farmland (see Figure 1.3 and 1.4). Within Iowa, the land cover changes in the first decades of settlement occurred at an astonishing rate (Wehmeyer et al., 2011). Using land cover information obtained from well-documented studies in 1859, 1875, and 2001, Wehmeyer et al. (2011) estimated that the increase in runoff potential in the first 30 years of settlement represents the majority of predicted change in the 1832 to 2001 study period.

Still, other transformations associated with an agricultural landscape have also impacted runoff potential (see Table 1.2). For example, the introduction of conservation practices in the second half of the 20th century tend to reduce runoff, as suggested by a recent study of an Iowa watershed (Papanicolaou et al., 2015). The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) originally began in 1950s. The federal government established many programs in the 1970s to remove lands from agricultural production and establish native or alternative permanent vegetative cover; in an effort to reduce erosion and gully formation, government agencies also encouraged practices such as terraces, conservation tillage, and contour cropping. The Farm Bill of 1985 was the first act that officially established the CRP as we know it today; the Farm Bills of 1990, 1996, 2002, and 2008 expanded these activities. The 2014 Farm Bill gradually reduced the CRP cap from 32 million acres to 24 million acres, although the 2018 Farm Bill is expected to increase the CRP cap to 29 million acres. Table 1.2 summarizes the timeline of agriculture-driven land use changes and their impacts on local hydrology.

Table 1.2. Agricultural-Related Alterations and Hydrologic Impacts.

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Land use status, change, & interventions</i>	<i>Hydrologic effect(s)</i>	<i>Source</i>
1830s–Prior	Native vegetation (tall-grass prairies and broad-leaved flowering plants) dominate the landscape	Baseflow dominated flows; slow response to precipitation events	Petersen (2010)
1830–1980	Continuous increase in agricultural production by replacement of perennial native vegetation with row crops 1940: <40% row crop (Raccoon) 1980: 75% row crop (statewide)	Elimination of water storage on the land; acceleration of the upland flow; expanded number of streams; increased stream velocity	Jones & Schilling (2011); Knox (2001)
1820–1930	Wetland drainage, stream channelization (straightening, deepening, relocation) leading to acceleration of the rate of change in channel positioning	Reduction of upland and in-stream water storage, acceleration of stream velocity	Winsor (1975); Thompson (2003); Urban & Rhoads (2003)
1890–1960 2000–present	Reduction of natural ponds, potholes, wetlands; development of large-scale artificial drainage system (tile drains)	Decrease of water storage capacity, groundwater level fluctuations, river widening	Burkart (2010); Schottler et al. (2013)
1940–1980	Construction of impoundments and levees in Upper Mississippi Valley	Increased storage upland	Sayre (2010);
1950–present	Modernization/intensification of the cropping systems	Increased streamflow, wider streams	Zhang & Schilling (2006); Schottler et al. (2013)
1970–present	Conservation practices implementation: Conservation Reserve Program (CRP); Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP); Wetland Reserve Program (WRP)	Reduction of runoff and flooding; increase of upland water storage	Castle (2010); Schilling (2000); Schilling et al. (2008);
2001–present	62% of Iowa’s land surface is intensively managed to grow crops (dominated by corn and soybeans up to 63% of total)	About 25% to 50% of precipitation converted to runoff (when tiling is present)	Burkart (2010)

ii. Hydrological Alterations Induced by Climate Change

The U.S. government recently released The Climate Science Special Report (Wuebbles et al., 2017) summarizing the state-of-the-art science on climate change and its physical effects. The CSSR writing team is comprised of three coordinating lead authors from the National Science Foundation and U.S. Global Change Research Program, NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, and NASA Headquarters. In addition, more than 50 experts from federal agencies, departments, and universities are listed as lead authors, review editors, and contributing authors. CSSR is “designed to be an authoritative assessment of the science of climate change, with a focus on the United States, to serve as the foundation for efforts to assess climate-related risks and inform decision-making about responses.” The information below presents text and figures taken from the CSSR that are relevant to the IWA watersheds, Iowa, and the Midwest.

“Heavy rainfall is increasing in intensity and frequency across the United States (see Figure 1.15) and globally and is expected to continue to increase over the next few decades (2021–2050, see Figure 1.16), annual average temperatures are expected to rise by about 2.5°F for the United States, relative to the recent past (average from 1976–2005), under all plausible future climate scenarios.”




Figure 1.15. Observed change in heavy precipitation (the heaviest 1%) between 1958 and 2016. Figure taken from The Climate Science Special Report (Easterling et al. 2017) (<https://science2017.globalchange.gov/>).




Figure 1.16. Projected change in heavy precipitation. Twenty-year return period amount for daily precipitation for mid- (left maps) and late-21st century (right maps). Results are shown for a lower emissions scenario (top maps; RCP4.5) and for a higher emissions scenario (bottom maps, RCP8.5). Figure taken from The Climate Science Special Report (Easterling et al. 2017) (<https://science2017.globalchange.gov/>). RCP stands for Representative Concentration Pathway.

iii. Hydrological Alterations Induced by Urban Development

Although Iowa remains an agricultural state, a growing portion of its population resides in urban areas. The transition from agricultural to urban land uses has a profound impact on local hydrology, increasing the amount of runoff, the speed at which water moves through the landscape, and the magnitude of flood peaks. The factors that contribute to these increases (Meierdiercks et al., 2010) are the increase in the percentage of impervious areas within the drainage catchment and its location (Mejia et al., 2010), and the more efficient drainage of the landscape associated with the constructed drainage system – the surface, pipe, and roadway channels that add to the natural stream drainage system. Although traditional stormwater

management practices aim to reduce increased flood peaks, urban areas have long periods of high flows that can erode stream channels and degrade aquatic habitat.

d. Assessment of Iowa's Water Quality

i. Iowa Water-Quality History

Prior to European settlement in the 19th century, Iowa was covered with prairies, oak savannahs, wetlands, and forests (see Figure 1.3). Much of the landscape was internally drained, meaning that rainfall and snowmelt drained to small depressional areas, rather than streams. Groundwater-fed streams meandered across the landscape and likely ran shallow and clear, carrying low levels of sediment and nutrients. Rivers easily spilled out into the flood plain after heavy rains, and river banks re-vegetated during drought, reducing streambank erosion.

Over several decades, the native prairie was broken and cultivated for corn, oats, and alfalfa, as well as a few other minor crops. Soil erosion was intense in the first years following a field's cultivation. From the period of 1880 to 1920, pervious clay pipes drained many of Iowa's wettest areas. This was most common in the recently-glaciated area of north-central Iowa known as the Des Moines Lobe, shown in Figure 1.2. Many new streams were constructed in ditches to drain water externally to the river network. Many existing streams were straightened to facilitate crop production.

The post-World War II era brought new developments to agriculture. The emergence of chemical fertilizers, soybeans, and continued drainage of the landscape with plastic drainage tiles helped Iowa become a world leader in crop and livestock production.

The loss of the native ecosystems, stream straightening and incision, artificial drainage, and discharges from industries and municipalities degraded water quality. Although the decline in water quality probably subsided in the early 1980s, Iowa's streams still carry more nutrients and sediment than most people find acceptable.

ii. Water Quality in the Post-Clean Water Act Era

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was the first major U.S. law to address water pollution. Growing public awareness and concern for controlling water pollution led to sweeping amendments in 1972. The amended law became commonly known as the Clean Water Act (CWA). The 1972 Amendments achieved the following: (1) established the basic structure for regulating pollutant discharges into the waters of the United States; (2) gave EPA the authority to implement

pollution control programs, such as setting wastewater standards for industry; (3) maintained existing requirements to set water-quality standards for all contaminants in surface waters; (4) made it unlawful for any person to discharge any pollutant from a point source into navigable waters, unless a permit was obtained under its provisions; (5) funded the construction of sewage treatment plants under the construction grants program; and (6) recognized the need for planning to address the critical problems posed by nonpoint source pollution.

After passage of the CWA, construction began on many new wastewater treatment facilities in Iowa, and upgrades were implemented on many existing treatment works. Undoubtedly these efforts improved water quality in several of Iowa's major interior rivers, in addition to the Missouri and Mississippi rivers on its borders. Improvements in the levels of ammonia, oxygen demand, Kjeldahl (organic) nitrogen, and dissolved oxygen were particularly important. These improvements made river water quality much more suitable for recreation and aquatic life, especially near Iowa's larger cities. However, the CWA provisions to address non-point source pollution (i.e., pollution from diffuse areas) proved relatively ineffective in reducing levels of nutrients and sediment in Iowa streams. The main CWA program designed to address non-point source pollution was the 319 Grant Program.

The Food Security Act of 1985 (Farm Bill) required farmers participating in most programs administered by the Farm Service Agency (FSA) and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to abide by certain conditions on any highly erodible land owned or farmed, or land considered a wetland. To comply with the highly erodible land conservation and wetland conservation provisions, farmers were required to certify that they would not: (1) produce an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land without a conservation system; (2) plant an agricultural commodity on a converted wetland; and (3) convert a wetland to produce an agricultural commodity. As result of these requirements, sediment levels in Iowa streams declined and water clarity improved (Jones and Schilling, 2011). Phosphorus levels also declined in unison with the improvements in sediment transport and water quality (Wang et al., 2016). However, conservation compliance, as these requirements are known, has not had a similar beneficial effect on stream nitrate levels (Sprague et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2017).

Iowa policy-makers and watershed stakeholders look to the Impaired Waters list, Section 303(d), as a common reference point to gauge statewide water quality. According to Section 303(d) of the CWA, from "time to time" states must submit a list of waters for which effluent limits will not be sufficient to meet all state water-quality standards. The EPA has defined "time to time" to mean April 1 of even numbered years. The failure to meet water-quality standards might be due to an individual pollutant, multiple pollutants, "pollution," or an unknown cause of impairment. The 303(d) listing process includes waters impaired by point sources and non-point sources of pollution. States must also establish a priority ranking for the listed waters, considering the severity of pollution and uses. In 2016, there were 608 category 5 Iowa waterbodies with 818 impairments. In 2014, there were 571 impaired waterbodies with 754 impairments. Category 5

waterbodies are those where a Total Maximum Daily Load assessment is required. About 58% of Iowa streams are considered “impaired”; 23% are considered “potentially impaired”; and 19% are considered to have “good” water quality. Indicator bacteria (i.e., *E. coli*) are the most common cause of impairment, causing about half of all such designations. Biological impairments are next, followed by fish kills. Figure 1.17 lists the main causes. Figure 1.18 shows historical numbers of impaired Iowa waters.




Figure 1.17. Causes of impairments in Iowa’s impaired waters. (Iowa Department of Natural Resources, 2018).




Figure 1.18. Numbers of impaired Iowa waters, 1998–2016. (Iowa Department of Natural Resources, 2018).

e. Web-Based Information Systems of Flood and Water-Quality Data

IIHR—Hydroscience & Engineering and the IFC at the University of Iowa have pioneered the creation of user-friendly, interactive, web-based information systems (WBIS) to communicate environmental information in Iowa and the United States. These two institutions also have expertise in the installation of real-time environmental monitoring systems and currently administer and maintain extensive networks that record flood and water-quality data in Iowa. WBIS displays this information, along with data collected by other federal institutions.

i. The Iowa Flood Information System (IFIS)

The Iowa Flood Information System (IFIS) is a one-stop web-platform to access community-based flood conditions, forecasts, visualizations, inundation maps, and flood-related information, visualizations, and applications. IFIS can be accessed using this URL: <http://ifis.iowafloodcenter.org/ifis/>. Below is an overview on some of the information available on IFIS.

Floodplain inundation maps

In partnership with the IDNR, the IFC has created statewide floodplain maps that estimate flood hazard extents and depths for every stream in the state of Iowa draining greater than one square mile. The maps depict flood boundaries and depths for eight different annual probabilities of occurrence: 50-, 20-, 10-, 4-, 2-, 1-, 0.5-, and 0.2-%, allowing Iowans to better understand their flood risks and make informed land management decisions. The statewide floodplain maps can be accessed through IFIS or at <http://www.iowafloodmaps.org/>. Figure 1.19 shows an example of statewide floodplain map data.

Community-based inundation maps

The IFC has also developed online inundation map libraries for more than 20 Iowa communities that relate forecasted or observed flow conditions to flood extents and depths. These inundation map libraries use detailed computer models that consider small-scale floodplain and channel features, bridges, and dams to better simulate the physics of flowing water. The maps allow a user to “translate” a forecasted river stage at a USGS gauge to flood extents and depths in the community, to better anticipate and respond to immediate flood hazards, and to consider “what-if” scenarios for long-term planning. Community inundation map libraries can be accessed on IFIS. Figure 1.20 shows the inundation map library interface for the city of Des Moines.




Figure 1.19. Statewide floodplain map data showing different levels of annual flood risk.




Figure 1.20. Flood inundation map library for the Des Moines and Raccoon rivers in the city of Des Moines.

Observed stream conditions

IFIS displays data from more than 400 sensors continuously monitoring Iowa stream conditions in real-time, which is shown in Figure 1.21. Currently, the USGS collects streamflow data at approximately 200 locations, and the IFC administers and maintains a growing network of more than 250 stream-stage sensors that record stage conditions.




Figure 1.21. USGS (green) and Iowa Flood Center (blue) stream-stage monitoring locations displayed in the Iowa Flood Information System (IFIS).

Flood alerts, warnings, and forecasts

IFIS provides flood alerts for stream sensors with stage values higher than the threshold values for the four flood levels defined by National Weather Service (NWS) and the IFC. Different colors represent the four flood stage levels (action, flood, moderate flood, and major flood). The flood forecast products included in IFIS are the NWS six-hourly forecast for 48 hours and the NWS seasonal forecast for 90 days. IFIS integrates short-term NWS forecasts into real-time data series and more-info views. The NWS shares a seasonal forecast probability for minor, moderate, and major flooding for a three-month period. The Iowa Flood Center has developed a real-time, high-performance computing-based flood forecasting model that provides quantitative stage and discharge forecasts and a five-day flood risk outlook in IFIS for more than 1,500 locations (e.g., communities and stream gauges) in Iowa.

The IFC system complements the operational forecasts issued by the NWS and is based on sound scientific principles of flood genesis and spatial organization. At its core is a continuous rainfall-runoff model based on landscape decomposition into hillslopes and channel links. The input to the system comes from a radar-rainfall algorithm, developed in-house, that maps rainfall every 5 min with high spatial resolution.

ii. The Iowa Water-Quality Information System

The Iowa Water-Quality Information System (IWQIS) integrates real-time water-quality data collected by IIHR and the USGS, along with a variety of watershed-related information such as precipitation, stream flow and stage, soil moisture, and land use. IWQIS (<https://iwqis.iowawis.org/>) provides useful information for researchers, agencies, landowners, and other watershed stakeholders as they study, analyze, and work to better understand the fate and transport of nutrients in Iowa's waterways. Iowa WQIS also helps Iowa monitor progress toward achieving the goals of the Iowa Nutrient Reduction Strategy. Iowa has the largest concentration of continuous nutrient and water-quality sensors in the United States; as of 2018, the state has a water-quality network comprised of:

- 74 nitrate sensors (14 operated by USGS)
- 27 hydrolabs (pH, SC, DO, temp)
- 26 turbidimeters
- 4 ortho-P sensors
- 4 ISCOs

This network generates data for science and policy-making, facilitates individual BMP performance assessments, and allows Iowa to quantify the nutrient loads leaving the state. Figure 1.22 is a screenshot of IWQIS displaying the WQ network (2018).




Figure 1.22. IIHR—Hydroscience & Engineering and USGS surface water-quality monitoring locations as displayed in the Iowa Water Quality Information System (IWQIS).

iii. The Iowa Watershed Approach Information System (IWAIS)

IIHR and IFC are developing a web-based information system to provide public access to general information and updates on the IWA project, existing and potential BMPs in IWA watersheds, hydrologic and water-quality data collected in the IWA watersheds, and resources to improve flood resiliency. The website can be accessed at: <http://iowawatershedapproach.org>. Figure 1.23 shows an example view of the IWAIS interface showing the number of existing ponds within each HUC 12 in the Middle Cedar River Watershed.




Figure 1.23. Example IWAIS interface view showing the number of existing ponds within each HUC 12 in the Middle Cedar River Watershed.

2. Conditions in the Middle Cedar Watershed

This chapter provides an overview of the current Middle Cedar Watershed conditions including hydrology, geology, topography, land use, hydrologic/meteorologic instrumentation, as well as a summary of previous floods of record.

a. Hydrology

The Middle Cedar River Watershed as defined by the boundary of eight-digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC8) 07080205 and is located in East-Central Iowa and encompasses approximately 2400 square miles (mi²). The watershed is part of the Cedar River Basin that expands from Minnesota to Southeast Iowa, where it joins the Iowa River at Columbus Junction. The total drainage area of the Cedar River basin at Cedar Rapids is approximately 6710 mi². The Middle Cedar River watershed boundary falls within several counties, however, the majority of the watershed area lies within Grundy, Black Hawk, Benton and Linn Counties (Figure 2.1).




Figure 2.1. The Middle Cedar Watershed (HUC8 07080205).

For the region of East-Central Iowa, the annual precipitation ranges from roughly 19 to 54 inches (Figures 2.2 and 2.3). About 70% of the annual precipitation falls as rain during the months of April - September. During this period, thunderstorms capable of producing torrential rains are possible with the peak frequency of such storms occurring in June. The region has experienced increased variability in annual precipitation since 1975, along with a general increase in the amount of spring rainfall. Analyses of streamflow records at the USGS stations Cedar River at Cedar Rapids and Wolf Creek near Dysart show that on an annual basis approximately 30% of the precipitation is transformed into streamflow (Figure 2.4) and 60% of the streamflow is derived from groundwater (Figure 2.5).




Figure 2.2. Average annual precipitation (inches). Estimates are based on the 30-year annual average (1981-2010).




Figure 2.3. Bar graph of annual precipitation.




Figure 2.4. Annual ratio of streamflow to precipitation.




Figure 2.5. Annual ratio of baseflow to streamflow.

b. Geology and Soils

The Middle Cedar River Watershed is located almost entirely within the Iowan Surface landform region (Figure 1.2). There is a small area of the Des Moines Lobe landform region on the upstream end and another small area of Southern Iowa Drift Plain on the downstream edge. The characteristics of each landform region have an influence on the rainfall-runoff potential and hydrologic properties of the watershed.

The Iowan Surface encompasses much of northeast Iowa and formed as a result of this region being subjected to a period of intense cold between 21,000 to 16,500 years ago during the last glacial advance into Iowa. The close proximity to the Des Moines Lobe ice margin resulted in tundra and permafrost conditions, and as a result wind and water action significantly eroded the landscape. Characteristic features include gently rolling topography, common glacial ‘erratics’ (rocks and boulders not native to Iowa that have been transported here by glaciers), and loess-mantled paha (northwest to southeast trending uneroded upland remnants of the former landscape). Glacial materials at the surface consist of poorly consolidated glacial deposits with the potential for extensive local sand bodies. In areas where the depth to bedrock is shallow, these materials provide limited protection from surface water infiltrating into bedrock. A limited number of sinkholes have been identified in the watershed.

Soils are classified into four Hydrologic Soil Groups (HSG) by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) based on the soil’s runoff potential. The four HSG’s are A, B, C, and D, where A-type soils have the lowest runoff potential and D-type have the highest. In addition, there are dual code soil classes A/D, B/D, and C/D that are assigned to certain wet soils.

In the case of these soil groups, even though the soil properties may be favorable to allow infiltration (water passing from the surface into the ground), a shallow groundwater table (within 24 inches of the surface) typically prevents much infiltration from occurring. For example, a B/D soil will have the runoff potential of a B-type soil if the shallow water table were to be drained away, but the higher runoff potential of a D-type soil if it is not. Complete descriptions of the Hydrologic Soil Groups can be found in the USDA-NRCS National Engineering Handbook, Part 630- Hydrology, Chapter 7.

The soil distribution of the Middle Cedar River watershed per digital soils data (SSURGO) available from the USDA-NRCS Web Soil Survey (WWS) is shown in Figure 2.6. Viewing the soil distribution at this map scale is difficult, but the map does illustrate the relative consistency of the HSG on the Iowan Surface landform region. Table 2.1 shows the approximate percentages by area of each HSG for the Iowan Surface in the Middle Cedar River Watershed. The Middle Cedar River Watershed consists primarily of HSG B type soils (65.6%), which have a moderate runoff potential when saturated. Smaller components of type B/D (27.1%) and type A (3.7%) soils are present. The remaining soil types comprise one percent or less of the total.




Figure 2.6. Distribution of Hydrologic Soil Groups in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Hydrologic Soil Groups reflect the degree of runoff potential a particular soil has, with Type A representing the lowest runoff potential and Type D representing the highest runoff potential.

Table 2.1. Approximate Hydrologic Soil Group Percentages by Area for the Middle Cedar Watershed.

Hydrologic Soil Group	Iowan Surface Approximate %
A	3.7
A/D	0.1
B	65.64
B/D	27.1
C	0.9
C/D	0.1
D	0.2

c. Topography

Figure 2.7 shows the topography of the Middle Cedar Watershed. Elevations range from approximately 1300 feet above sea level in the upstream and western part of the watershed to 550 feet above sea level in the downstream portion of the watershed in Cedar Rapids.




Figure 2.7. Topography of the Middle Cedar Watershed.

d. Land Use

Land use in the Middle Cedar Watershed is predominantly agricultural, dominated by cultivated crops (corn/soybeans) at approximately 74% of the acreage, followed by developed land at approximately 11%. The remaining acreage in the watershed is about 9% grassland and pasture, 3% forest, 1% crops other than corn/soy and 3% open water and/or wetlands, per the 2017 USDA/NASS Cropland Data Layer.




Figure 2.8. Land use composition in the Middle Cedar Watershed, per the 2017 USDA Cropland Data Layer.

e. BMP Mapping

Identifying existing conservation practices within a watershed serves as a benchmark for future implementation and provide information where more practices are needed. The Iowa Best Management Practices Mapping project (IBMP) identified existing conservation practices throughout the state of Iowa using data from the 2007 to 2010 timeframe. For the Middle Cedar watershed the total number of existing practices are 9921 acres of agricultural fields with contour buffer strips, 1809 acres of agricultural fields with strip cropping, 232 acres of grassed waterways, 5080 terraces, 668 pond dams, and 2858 water and sediment control basins. The spatial distribution of the conservation practices within the watershed is shown in **Error! Reference source not found.** Grassed waterways, contour buffer strips, and terraces are most prominent in the south central portion of the watershed. Pond dams are most prominent in the northeastern portion of the watershed while WASCOBs are more prominent in the western portion of the watershed. Fields using strip cropping methods are not common throughout the majority of the watershed (**Error! Reference source not found.**).




Figure 2.9. Iowa Best Management Practices Mapping Project.

f. Potential BMPs - Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework

Development of an effective watershed planning document will require identification of potential conservation practices and viable locations to implement them. One cutting-edge tool available for practical conservation planning is the Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework (ACPF) watershed planning toolbox, developed by Mark Tomer and his research team at the USDA-ARS in Ames, Iowa (Tomer et al., 2013). ACPF is a watershed approach to conservation planning

facilitated with a set of semi-automated tools within ArcGIS software. Freely available and prepackaged GIS data can be used for terrain analyses to determine which fields within the watershed are most prone to runoff into streams. Users can apply the ACPF toolbox to identify locations where field-scale and edge-of-field practices could be installed based on general design criteria. These practices include controlled drainage, surface intake filters or restored wetlands, grassed waterways, contour buffer strips, WASCObS, nutrient removal wetlands (NRWs), or edge-of-field bioreactors (North Central Region Water Network 2018). Using the ACPF toolbox, IFC has generated potential BMPs for each of the HUC 12s in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Potential BMPs aggregations based on HUC 12 area are presented in Figure 2.10.




Figure 2.10. Potential BMPs. Ponds Dams represent nutrient removal wetlands.

g. Instrumentation/Data Records

The Middle Cedar Watershed has instrumentation installed to collect and record stream stage, discharge, and precipitation. There are eight United States Geological Survey (USGS) operated stage & discharge gages and twenty Iowa Flood Center stream stage sensors located within the watershed. There are also six Rain Gage/ Soil Moisture Sensors administered by IFC.




Figure 2.11. Hydrologic and meteorologic instrumentation in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Stage/discharge gages are shown in yellow or green while precipitation and soil moisture gages are shown in red.

h. Floods of Record

Six large flood events (discharge greater than 65,000 cfs) are recorded at the USGS Cedar River gaging station at Cedar Rapids since 1903. Three of these events have occurred since 1993 including: June 13, 2008 with 140,000 cfs, September 27, 2016 with 81,600 cfs, and April 4, 1993 with 71,000 cfs (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Prior to 1993, there were two large flood events: March 31, 1961 with 73,000 cfs and April 10, 1965 with 66,800 cfs (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Historically in June of 1851, there was one discharge measured at 65,000 cfs (**Error! Reference source not found.**). These flood events may have been caused by heavy precipitation throughout the Cedar River watershed such as, the 2008 event where all five USGS gaging stations had record discharges or flooding could be caused by heavy precipitation upstream of the Middle Cedar watershed in tributaries of the Cedar River including: the West Fork Cedar

River watershed, the Winnebago River watershed, Shell Rock River watershed, and the Little Cedar River watershed. The 2016 flood event was one such event where record discharges occurred on the Cedar River at Cedar Rapids and at the inlet to the Middle Cedar watershed at Waterloo but, not in the tributaries located within the Middle Cedar watershed (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Ultimately, the discharge from the Cedar River flows downstream, merging with the Iowa River, before entering the Mississippi River.

Table 2.2. Discharge from the Six Largest Flooding Events at USGS Gaging Stations in the Middle Cedar Watershed including; the Cedar River at Waterloo, Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Black Hawk Creek at Hudson, Beaver Creek at New Hartford, and Wolf Creek near Dysart.

Cedar River at Waterloo USGS 05464000 (1929-Present)	6/11/2008 112,000 cfs	9/24/2016 83,700 cfs	3/29/1961 76,700 cfs	4/8/1965 69,500 cfs	7/23/1999 69,300 cfs	4/2/1993 68,100 cfs
Cedar River at Cedar Rapids USGS 05464000 (1851, 1903-Present)	6/13/2008 140,000 cfs	9/27/2016 81,600 cfs	3/31/1961 73,000 cfs	4/4/1993 71,000 cfs	4/10/1965 66,800 cfs	6/1851 65,000 cfs
Black Hawk Creek at Hudson USGS 05463500 (1952-Present)	4/25/2008 22,500 cfs	7/9/1969 19,300 cfs	5/30/2013 19,100 cfs	7/1/2014 16,900 cfs	6/17/1990 13,800 cfs	6/22/1974 10,500 cfs
Beaver Creek at New Hartford USGS 05463000 (1946-Present)	6/8/2008 25,900 cfs	6/25/2013 19,400 cfs	6/13/1947 18,000 cfs	7/9/1969 14,900 cfs	3/31/1993 14,700 cfs	6/1/1991 13,400 cfs
Wolf Creek near Dysart USGS 05464220 (1996-Present)	5/30/2008 15,700 cfs	5/23/2004 14,500 cfs	5/27/2013 10,300 cfs	4/27/2009 7,300 cfs	7/1/2014 7,290 cfs	6/12/1998 5,800 cfs

3. Middle Cedar Hydrologic Model Development

The modeling activities described in this report were performed using the physically-based integrated model GHOST developed at IIHR to simulate the hydrologic response at watersheds ranging in area from 100 to 2,500 square miles over time periods on the order of decades. GHOST stands for Generic Hydrologic Overland-Subsurface Toolkit. The model takes into account Iowa's varied topography, soils, and land use. GHOST is based on the open source hydrologic code MM-pihm (Qu and Duffy 2007, Yu et al. 2013), which fully couples surface and subsurface water systems to predict streamflow and groundwater movement for normal and extreme rainfall and snowmelt events. Specific models were developed at IIHR and incorporated into the code to properly predict water budgets for the long-term simulations required for the large-scale IWA watersheds. The main advantage of a physically-based model is that the model can be used for a wide range of applications and beyond the window of calibration. Best management practices (BMPs) are resolved or modeled in GHOST depending on the structure scale.




Figure 3.1. Hydrologic processes modeled in GHOST.

Figure 3.1 presents the water cycle and the major hydrologic processes modeled in GHOST. The model uses precipitation, air temperature and solar radiation to compute evaporation and plant transpiration. The form of precipitation, rain or snow, is determined by air temperature values. At temperature values above the freezing point, accumulated snow melts contributing to net precipitation. The canopy can intercept rain, which then evaporates from the canopy or can reach the ground surface by canopy drip. At the ground surface water can infiltrate to the unsaturated region, contribute to surface runoff or be evaporated. Infiltrated water can evaporate from the soil, be transpired by plants, or drain to the saturated zone. Water stored in the saturated zone can evaporate or discharge to a stream.

a. Model Development

The watershed is conceptualized in three distinct zones: a surface region and two regions beneath the surface representing the unsaturated soil and groundwater (Kumar et al. 2009). The code uses a finite volume formulation to solve the governing equations. Surface flow is represented with a two-dimensional diffusive wave approximation of the Saint-Venant equations. Unsaturated flow is simulated considering that the dominant flow direction is vertical. Water depth at channels and streams is computed using a one-dimensional approximation to properly capture the channel geometry and the effect of flood mitigation structures without local grid refinement along the network. The water table is represented with a moving interface separating the unsaturated and saturated soil regions.




Figure 3.2. The three coupled flow domains representing a watershed in GHOST.

b. Attributing the Model

Publicly available land use, soil type, surface elevations were used to spatially describe surface and subsurface classifications.

Surface

Each triangular surface element was assigned spatially variable land use and topographic information, relating the location to overland roughness, evapotranspiration properties, and land surface slopes, respectively.

The National Land Cover Database 2016 (NLCD 2016) provided spatially variable land use. Land classifications were simplified into four groups: rowcrop, grassland, forest, and developed; these were assigned to the appropriate elemental area. The four surface land use classifications relate surface elements to overland flow resistance parameters and vegetation properties.

The landscape topography was described based on ten-meter Digital Elevation Models of bare ground surface data obtained from the National Elevation Dataset (NED). A high spatial resolution topography enabled accurate identification of streams and watershed boundaries for mesh generation. Mesh element elevation data representing the land surface were extracted from ninety-meter elevation models obtained from aggregating the ten-meter data.

Subsurface

Researchers used the Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database (Soil Survey Staff, 2014) (Figure 2.6) to describe the properties of both the saturated and unsaturated regions.

Forcing Data

Stage IV radar rainfall estimates (NCEP/EMC 4KM Gridded Data (GRIB) Stage IV Data) were used as the precipitation input for simulation. The Stage IV data set is produced by the National Center for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) by taking radar rainfall estimates produced by the 12 National Weather Service (NWS) River Forecast Centers across the Continental United States and combining them into a nationwide 4 km x 4 km (2.5 mile x 2.5 mile, see Figure 3.4) gridded hourly precipitation estimate data set. These data are available from January 1, 2002 – Current. Use of radar rainfall estimates provides increased accuracy of the spatial and time distribution of precipitation over the watershed and Stage IV estimates provide a level of manual quality control (QC) performed by the NWS that incorporates available rain gage measurements into the rainfall estimates. Other meteorological data such as air temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, shortwave/longwave radiation and surface pressure were obtained from North American Land Data Assimilation System Phase 2 (NLDAS-2) products (Xia et al., 2012). The temporal resolution of all the forcing data used was hourly. In the Middle Cedar watershed the streamflows along the Cedar River mainstem are greatly influenced by runoff generated outside of the watershed. To account for those contributions a source term was created using data collected at the three USGS stations (2002-2016) presented in Figure 3.3. Linear interpolation was used to fill data gaps and generate a continuous hourly time series of streamflows that were applied to the Cedar River mainstem upstream from Waterloo.




Figure 3.3. USGS Gauges used to account for runoff generation outside of the Middle Cedar watershed.




Figure 3.4. Computational mesh and rainfall pixels.

c. Calibration and Validation

Model calibration is a process of taking an initial set of parameters developed for the hydrologic model and making adjustments to them so that simulated results match as close as possible observed time series, typically stream discharge at a gaging station. For model validation, the intent is to use the model parameters developed during calibration process to simulate other events and evaluate how well the model is able to replicate observed watershed's response to precipitation. Model calibration was carried out for a nine-year period (2002-2010) and during the validation process the model performance was evaluated using measurements taken between 2011 and 2016. Simulated flows were compared against observed flows at two USGS stream-gage stations: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids: USGS 05464500, and Wolf Creek near Dysart: USGS 05464220.

Figure 3.5 and 3.6 show the daily flow time series for both the calibration and validation periods. Overall, model predictions match well the measurements. These figures display both periods

where the simulated values follow closely measured values, and others when it does not. Given that a hydrologic model is a simplified representation of the actual watershed some level of mismatch is to be expected. Table 3.1 presents common metrics used in hydrologic model performance evaluation. Based on Moriasi et al., (2007) model simulations can be judged as satisfactory if Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE) > 0.50, Percent bias (PBIAS) \pm 25% for streamflow, and the coefficient of determination (R^2) values are close to 1. The Middle Cedar model results for both the calibration and validation periods display metrics that meet those criteria.

Table 3.1. Hydrologic model evaluation metrics for both the calibration and validation periods. Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE), Percent bias (PBIAS), and coefficient of determination (R^2).

	NSE		PBIAS		R^2	
	Cal	Val	Cal	Val	Cal	Val
Cedar Rapids	0.91	0.88	-2.20	0.26	0.96	0.94
Wolf Creek	0.75	0.55	3.26	-15.30	0.87	0.82





Figure 3.5. Observed and simulated daily flow time series. Calibration period. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart. Measured flows were obtained from USGS gauge stations USGS 05464500, USGS 05464220.




Figure 3.6. Observed and simulated daily flow time series. Validation period. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart. Measured flows were obtained from USGS gauge stations USGS 05464500, USGS 05464220.

Monthly Water Cycle

In the Middle Cedar monthly runoff depths display a marked seasonal cycle with the window between March and July showing the highest runoff depths (Figure 3.7). Model results show a tendency to overestimate runoff at Wolf Creek for the wettest months (April-August). This trend is less apparent when making comparisons between simulated and observed flow at Cedar Rapids. Conversely, Figure 3.7 shows that simulated runoff during the winter and fall is slightly underestimated by the model. Overall, simulated monthly runoff values match observations closely with values of $R^2 > 0.97$.




Figure 3.7. Observed and simulated average monthly runoff depth (in inches) for the Middle watershed. Results are shown for both the calibration and validation periods (2002-2016). Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart.

Annual Maximum Peak Discharge and Flow Duration Curves

To assess the model ability to predict flood characteristics in the Middle Cedar simulated and observed annual peak flows were compared at the Cedar River at Cedar Rapids and Wolf Creek near Dysart (see Figure 3.8). Simulated peak flow values at Cedar Rapids follow closely the observations showing no bias with both some peaks being slightly under-predicted and over-predicted (data on both sides of the one-to-one line). The good agreement between observations and model predictions is expected since flows at Cedar Rapids are to a large extent the reflection of the runoff generated outside of the Middle Cedar watershed and in our Middle Cedar model we are using measured data to account for those streamflows (see Figure 3.3). For values below 4,000 cfs. observed and simulated annual peak flows at Wolf Creek near Dysart display small discrepancies and points in Figure 3.8 (bottom panel) are located very close to the one-to-one line. For annual peaks above this threshold some peaks are both under-predicted and over-predicted by the model.

Flow duration curves provide the means to condense long term records of hydrologic data in a simple plot and can be used to compare measured data and model predictions, study the effect of differences in geology and climate on watersheds hydrologic response, illustrate the benefits associated with different conservation scenarios and inform water resources planning. The flow duration curve shows the percent of the time that a given flow exceeded. In this report flow duration curves were used to both compare measurements and model predictions and analyze the effect of the different conservation scenarios presented in Chapter 4.

For the entire record (2002-2016) daily flows were ranked from smallest to largest and then plotted against the probability that a given flow will be equaled or exceeded (see Figure 3.9, flow duration curves). The observed and simulated flow duration curves show good agreement for flow values with exceedance probabilities lower than 80%. Model predictions for one individual flood event may be either low or high as presented in Figure 3.8. However, the Middle Cedar model captures the statistic behavior of the historic record and therefore is an appropriate tool to make flood impact reductions assessments.




Figure 3.8. Simulated versus observed annual maximum peak daily discharges (cfs) for the Middle Cedar. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids, Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart.




Figure 3.9. Daily flow duration curves for The Middle Cedar. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids. Bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart. Results are shown for both the calibration (2002-2010) and validation (2011-2016) periods.

4. Analysis of Watershed Scenarios

The GHOST model of the Middle Cedar Watershed was used to identify areas in the watershed with high runoff potential and run simulations to help understand the potential impact of alternative flood mitigation strategies in the watershed as well as the consequences of projected increases in heavy downpours in Iowa and the Midwest for the mid and late 21st century described in the latest Climate Science Special report (see Figure 1.16). Focus for the scenarios was placed on understanding the impacts of (1) increasing infiltration in the watershed and (2) implementing a system of distributed storage projects (ponds) across the landscape.

a. Increased Precipitation and Index Points

To generate forcing data for the increased precipitation (IP) simulations a simple approach was followed. For each one of the rainfall pixels with observed hourly data (2002-2016), daily accumulations were calculated (see Figure 3.4). All the days were ranked and for the wettest 5% of the non-zero-rain days hourly precipitation values were increased by 10%. No other meteorological data were modified for the IP simulations. For the 15 years of available data, precipitation for approximately 100 days was altered.

This simple approach maintained the same spatial and temporal patterns of the heavy storms observed between 2002 and 2016 while increasing precipitation volumes. Furthermore, it is not an attempt to be a comprehensive weather generation exercise but rather an easy way to quantify the impact of projected changes in heavy precipitation on flooding in the Middle Cedar watershed. The IP simulations have slightly higher (< 3%) average values of annual precipitation. However, unsurprisingly, model predictions show more severe flooding events when using the altered precipitation time series. Measured flows coming into the Middle Cedar Watershed from contributing areas upstream (see Figure 3.3) were not modified for the IP simulations.

The hydrologic model makes predictions at approximately 1,700 locations along the stream network. Twelve index points were selected to present the results for the different watershed scenarios. These points were chosen based on several criteria including location of a USGS gauging station, areas of high risk potential and/or proximity to a community, and to demonstrate the model results at different spatial scales. Points are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Index Points.

Index Point	Description
1	USGS 05463000 Beaver Creek at New Hartford
2	USGS 05463500 Black Hawk Creek at Hudson
3	Middle Cedar at Gilbertville
4	USGS 05464220 Wolf Creek near Dysart
5	High Flood Risk Spring Creek
6	Bear Creek Near 380
7	Hinkle Creek Inflow Vinton
8	Blue Creek - Tributary to Cedar River
9	Dry Creek at Palo
10	Otter Creek above Cedar River Flood Plain
11	Prairie Creek at Fairfax
12	USGS 05464500 Cedar River at Cedar Rapids

b. High Runoff Potential Areas

Identifying areas of the watershed with higher runoff potential is the first step in selecting mitigation project sites. High runoff areas offer the greatest opportunity for retaining more water from large rainstorms on the landscape and reducing downstream flood peaks.

Figure 4.1 shows the runoff coefficient as a percentage (from 0% for no runoff to 100% when all rainfall is converted to runoff). Areas in the Middle Cedar Watershed with the highest runoff potential are primarily located on the eastern part of the watershed with runoff coefficients of up to 47%. Agricultural land use dominates these areas, however this is not the sole reason they might produce higher runoff. From a hydrologic perspective, flood mitigation projects that can reduce runoff from these high runoff areas would be a priority.

High runoff potential is but one factor in selecting locations for potential flood mitigation strategies. There are many factors to consider in site selection. Landowner willingness to participate is essential. Locations may have existing conservation practices in place or areas such as timber that should not be disturbed. Stakeholder knowledge of places with repetitive loss of crops or roads/road structures is also valuable in selecting locations. Lastly, the geology of the area may limit the effectiveness or even prohibit application of certain mitigation projects.




Figure 4.1. Runoff coefficient analysis for the Middle Cedar Watershed. This figure shows the runoff coefficients for the simulation period (2002-2016).

c. Mitigating the Effects of High Runoff with Increased Infiltration

Changes in a watershed that result in a particular area having greater infiltration will reduce the volume of water that leaves that drainage area during the storm event and for a few days thereafter. The increased water that passes from the surface into the ground may later evaporate or it will travel through the soil, either seeping deeper into the groundwater stores or travel beneath the surface towards a stream. The rate of travel of the water in this path beneath the surface is much slower than if it were running across the surface. While much of this water may eventually make it to a stream, it will be at a much later time than if it were surface runoff.

In this section, we examine two different alternatives to reduce runoff through land use changes and soil quality improvements. One hypothetical land use change would be the conversion of row crop agriculture back to native tall-grass prairie. Another possible land use change would be improvements to agricultural conditions that would result from planting cover crops during the dormant season as well as adoption of no-till in 100% of the rowcrop acres. These are hypothetical examples and are only meant to illustrate the potential effects on flood reduction. The examples

are also not project proposals; they are either economically undesirable or not practically feasible. Still, the hypothetical examples do provide valuable benchmarks on the limits of flood reduction that are physically possible with broad-scale land cover changes.

Modifications to baseline model parameters to represent land use changes (e.g. native vegetation and cover crops/no-till) were based on information reported by several studies: Baschle, (2017); Mohamoud, (1991); VanLoocke et al., (2012); Kang et al. (2003); Baron et al. (1993), Bharati et al. (2002); Yimam et al. (2015), and Cronshey, (1986).

i. Mitigating the Effects of High Runoff with Native Vegetation

Much has been documented about the historical hydrology of the native tall-grass prairie of the Midwestern states, with evidence suggesting the tall-grass prairie could handle up to six inches of rain without having significant runoff. This is a result of the deep, loosely-packed soils and the deep root systems of the prairie plants that allowed a high volume of the rainfall to infiltrate into the ground. The water was retained across the landscape in the soil pores or it slowly flowed beneath the ground surface through the soil instead of finding a rapid course to a nearby stream as surface flow. Much of the water once in the subsurface was actually taken up by the root systems of the prairie grasses and returned to the atmosphere via transpiration.

An analysis could be performed proposing a scenario where all current rowcrop acres are converted back to native tall-grass prairie with its much higher infiltration characteristics within the Middle Cedar Watershed. The goal of the IWA project is to sustain Iowa's valuable agricultural economy while protecting vulnerable residents and communities. Therefore the simulation results from a scenario that assumes massive implementation of native vegetation is not intended to be a recommended flood mitigation strategy; rather these results are meant to provide a theoretical maximum of the flood reduction benefits that can be expected from land use changes.




Figure 4.2. Native vegetation scenario. Daily flow duration curves for Cedar River at Cedar Rapids (top) and Wolf Creek near Dysart (bottom). Results are shown for the 2002-2016 period. Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.

The hydrologic processes affected by the parameter modifications for the native vegetation simulations were 1) high transpiration by modifying leaf area index (LAI), crop-coefficient, and root depth 2) parameters controlling infiltration were increased by approximately 60% 3) the amount of water stored in the unsaturated zone (e.g. available to plants) was increased on average 9% 4) surface roughness for the overland flow was multiplied by a factor of 4. It is important to mention that the differences between baseline conditions and scenario results are the reflection of the parameter modifications reported above and are not a confirmation that the flood reduction benefits will come to pass if the scenario is implemented. In other words, the validity of the results presented here are highly dependent on the accuracy of the information reported in the studies we are basing our analyses on.

Figure 4.2 displays the effects of having deep-rooted vegetation in the landscape all year round. High, medium, and low flows are attenuated by replacing rowcrop acres with Switchgrass. Results presented in Figure 4.2 are consistent with high infiltration, high transpiration, and high surface roughness conditions.

Figures 4.3 and 4.4 display the flood frequency analysis at twelve index points (see Table 4.1) for three different simulations: baseline, native vegetation, and native vegetation plus increased precipitation. The plots were built using the 15 annual maximum peak discharges and a sample estimate of the exceedance probability. Results show that the adoption of native vegetation significantly reduces peak discharges at all 12 locations, for all the 15 years, and under both historic and increased precipitation conditions.

In each one of the panels in Figures 4.3 and 4.4 the average peak flow reduction is reported for both Baseline vs. Native Vegetation and Baseline vs. Native Vegetation + IP. For the index points located in the tributaries, average peak flow reductions (with historic precipitation) are at least 76%. As expected, estimations at the two index points along the Cedar River main stem (Site 3 and 12) are considerably smaller with the greatest reduction at Cedar Rapids of 28%. We mapped average peak reductions at the six index points in Figure 4.5. Results in this figure were obtained with information from the baseline and Native Vegetation simulations.

The transformation of rainfall into runoff is known to be a highly non-linear process and therefore increases in precipitation volumes by a given percentage are not expected to result in similar increases in peak flow magnitude. In other words, a 10% increase in heavy precipitation does not necessarily create flood peaks that are 10% larger. Model predictions show that for the most severe floods (see Figures 4.3 and 4.4, exceedance probabilities < 20%, scenario vs. scenario + IP), increases in peak discharges due to increases in heavy precipitation range between 20% and 60% at the index points located in the tributaries.




Figure 4.3. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, native vegetation, and native vegetation plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 1 to 6 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.




Figure 4.4. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, native vegetation, and native vegetation plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 7 to 12 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.




Figure 4.5. Average peak discharge reduction (%) for index points in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Baseline vs. Native Vegetation (historic precipitation).

ii. Mitigating the Effects of High Runoff with Cover Crops/Soil Health/No-Till

Cover crops can be an effective farming conservation practice. Cover crops are typically planted following the harvest of either corn or soybeans and “cover” the ground through winter until the next growing season begins. The cover crop can be killed off in the spring by rolling it or grazing it with livestock or most often with Roundup (Glyphosate); afterwards, row crops can be planted directly into the remaining cover crop residue. Cover crops provide a variety of benefits including improved soil quality and fertility, increased organic matter content, increased infiltration and percolation, reduced soil compaction, and reduced erosion and soil loss. They also retain soil moisture and enhance biodiversity (Mutch, 2010). One source suggests that for every one percent increase in soil organic matter (e.g. from 2% to 3%), the soil can retain an additional 17,000-25,000 gallons of water per acre (Archuleta, 2014). Examples of cover crops include clovers, annual and cereal ryegrasses, winter wheat, and oilseed radish (Mutch, 2010).

The purpose of this hypothetical example is to investigate the impact of improved agricultural management practices could have on reducing flood peak discharges throughout the watershed. Planting cover crops across all agricultural areas in the watershed during the dormant (winter) season is hypothesized to lower the runoff potential of these same areas during the growing season

(spring and summer) due to increased soil health and fertility. To be clear, this scenario does not represent the conversion of the existing agricultural landscape to cover crops. Rather, the existing agricultural landscape is kept intact, but its runoff potential during the growing season has been reduced by planting cover crops, in all rowcrop acres, during the dormant season.




Figure 4.6. Cover Crops/Soil Health/No-Till scenario. Daily flow duration curves for Cedar River at Cedar Rapids (top) and Wolf Creek near Dysart (bottom). Results are shown for the 2002-2016 period. Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.

The hydrologic processes affected by the parameter modifications for the cover crop/soil health/no-till simulations were 1) high transpiration by modifying leaf area index (LAI), crop-

coefficient, and root depth for the dormant season 2) parameters controlling infiltration were increased by approximately 40% 3) the amount of water stored in the unsaturated zone (e.g. available to plants) was increased on average 4% 4) surface roughness for the overland flow was multiplied by a factor of 3. It is important to mention that the differences between baseline conditions and scenario results are the reflection of the parameter modifications reported above and are not a confirmation that the flood reduction benefits will come to pass if the scenario is implemented. In other words, the validity of the results presented here are highly dependent on the accuracy of the information reported in the studies we are basing our analyses on.

The model parameter modifications described above to simulate the massive implementation of cover crops and no-till practices in the Middle Cedar Watershed are a “light version” of the changes implemented in the model for the native vegetation scenario. Both scenarios assume that the soil is covered all year round, that infiltration is increased, transpiration increases, and overland flow is less likely to occur with all those changes being more severe in the native vegetation scenario than in the cover crops/no-till simulations.

Figure 4.6 shows that daily streamflows are reduced by the implementation of cover crops/no-till practices with this behavior being more apparent Wolf Creek near Dysart than at Cedar Rapids. For the ten index points located in the tributaries cover crops/no-till practices reduce annual peak discharges for all the years when using either historic precipitation or increased precipitation data (Figures 4.7 and 4.8). Average reductions under historic precipitation conditions at the two index points in the Cedar River main stem (points 3 and 12) are considerably smaller. Furthermore, there are a few instances with peak discharge values for the simulations with increased precipitation being larger than those of the baseline condition (see Figure 4.7, Site 3, black and green circles above the blue squares). For the two largest peak flows at Site 3, the values predicted by the model with cover crops/no-till (historic precipitation) are slightly higher than those of the baseline condition (Figure 4.7). These results may seem at first counterintuitive since we typically expect some level of flow reduction from the scenarios. However, streamflows at Site 3 (and Site 12) are controlled by both runoff generated outside and inside the Middle Cedar watershed. Flows generated outside of the Middle Cedar watershed were not altered for any of the simulations included in this report (Figure 3.3). With cover crops/no-till the model predicts that flows are typically attenuated and delayed. At Site 3 these delayed flows coincided with the peak of flood wave (originated for the most part outside of the Middle Cedar watershed) resulting in, for two years, slightly higher peak flows for the cover crops/no-till scenario.




Figure 4.7. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, cover crops/no-till, and cover crops/no-till plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 1 to 6 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.




Figure 4.8. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, cover crops/no-till, and cover crops/no-till plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 7 to 12 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.




Figure 4.9. Average peak discharge reduction (%) for index points in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Baseline vs. Cover Crop/No-Till (historic precipitation).

d. Mitigating the Effects of High Runoff with Distributed Storage

Storage ponds (Figure 4.10) hold floodwater temporarily, and then release it at a lower rate later. Therefore, the peak flood discharge downstream of the storage pond is lowered. The effectiveness of any one storage pond depends on its size (storage volume) and how quickly water is released. By adjusting the size and the pond outlets, storage ponds can be engineered to efficiently utilize their available storage for large floods. Generally, these ponds have a permanent pond storage area, meaning the pond holds water all the time. This is done by constructing an earthen embankment across a stream and setting an outlet (usually a pipe) called the principal spillway at some elevation above the floor of the pond. When there is a storm event, runoff enters the pond. Once the elevation of the water surface is greater than the pipe inlet, water will pass through the pipe, and leave the pond, but at a controlled rate. Additionally, the earthen dam is built higher than the pipe, allowing for more storage capacity within the pond. An emergency spillway that can discharge water at a much faster rate than the pipe is set some elevation higher than the pipe. This emergency spillway is constructed as a means to release rapidly rising waters in the pond so

they do not damage the earthen embankment. The volume of water stored between the principal spillway and the emergency spillway is called the flood storage.

The hypothetical distributed storage analysis performed using the Middle Cedar GHOST model was based on potential project locations developed from the outputs of the ACPF tool (see Figure 2.10) within the Middle Cedar Watershed and the distributed storage concept developed by the Soap Creek Watershed.




Figure 4.10. Schematic of a pond constructed to provide flood storage.

The Soap Creek Watershed Board was formed in the 1980's as a result of the watershed's landowners coming together wanting to do something to reduce flood damage and erosion within their watershed. They adopted a plan that included identifying the locations of 154 distributed storage structures (mainly ponds) that could be built within the watershed. As of 2018, 135 of these structures have been built (Stolze, 2018).

Soap Creek Watershed drains approximately 250 square miles, equaling an average density of 1 built pond for every 1.9 square miles of drainage area. Further analysis of the Soap Creek structures shows that most of these structures are constructed in the headwater areas of the watershed, which allows for smaller structures, rather than having large, high-hazard class structures on the main rivers.

For the analysis, 684 ponds were simulated in Middle Cedar (Figure 4.11). A "typical" pond was developed for use for the Middle Cedar Watershed using the existing Soap Creek ponds and NRCS Technical References as guidance. The geometry of this typical pond consists of a 12-inch pipe outlet as the principal spillway with a 10-foot wide emergency spillway set at an elevation above the pipe to provide a flood storage of 20 acres-feet. Site topography will actually dictate the placement of the emergency spillway and the potential dam height. The stage-storage relationship of a pond also depends on local topography and is highly variable from site to site. There certainly are opportunities to design and construct ponds at locations in subbasins that have not been used in this analysis. Therefore flood reductions presented below do not represent the theoretical maximum of the flood reduction benefits that can be expected from massive construction of ponds throughout the watershed.




Figure 4.11. Ponds (684) placement in the Middle Cedar

Model results show that the system of ponds generates minor changes in the daily flow duration curve at Cedar Rapids and slightly more noticeable modifications of the baseline conditions at Wolf Creek near Dysart (see Figure 4.12). It is important to mention that in both the native vegetation and cover crops/no-till simulations more water was being removed from the watershed via transpiration than in the baseline case. In contrast, the pond scenario does not have different transpiration parameters than the baseline case.

Information on annual peak discharge reduction is presented in Table 4.2 and Figures 4.13, 4.14 and 4.15. The 684 ponds result in average peak flow reductions at all index points, under historic precipitation conditions, that range between 0.4% and 15.4%. However, this reductions are smaller than those of the cover crops/no-till and native vegetation scenarios. As expected reductions are greater at the index points with a larger percent of the drainage area regulated by the ponds (points 2, 5, 8,9,10, see column DAR/DA in Table 4.2).




Figure 4.12. Distributed Storage scenario. Daily flow duration curves for Cedar River at Cedar Rapids (top) and Wolf Creek near Dysart (bottom). Results are shown for the 2002-2016 period. Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.

Simulation results with increased precipitation conditions show that at virtually all index points the ponds are insufficient to keep the predicted flows below the baseline conditions with results for index point 8 showing small average peak reductions.

Table 4.2. Average peak flow reduction at the index points.

Index Point	Drainage Area (DA) (mi²)	Number of Ponds	Drainage Area Regulated (DAR) (mi²)	DAR/DA	Avg. Peak Reduction (%)	Avg. Peak Reduction under IP (%)
1	345.4	89	93.2	0.27	4.7	-14.3
2	299.8	134	123.7	0.41	11.3	-6.3
3	5236.0	281	284.8	0.05	0.5	-2.6
4	296.4	99	74.0	0.25	7.2	-12.0
5	30.7	16	21.5	0.70	10.8	-8.0
6	48.3	12	13.6	0.28	6.8	-9.1
7	25.1	21	6.8	0.27	3.5	-13.4
8	61.6	22	18.0	0.29	15.4	0.4
9	25.4	15	8.7	0.34	12.1	-4.9
10	66.0	11	22.8	0.35	10.1	-7.9
11	181.5	84	40.7	0.22	5.6	-12.6
12	6726.1	684	594.0	0.09	0.4	-4.9




Figure 4.13. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, distributed storage, and distributed storage plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 1 to 6 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.




Figure 4.14. Sample probability distribution of annual maximum peak discharges for the baseline, distributed storage, and distributed storage plus increased precipitation simulations. Results are shown for index points 7 to 12 (Table 4.1). Baseline corresponds with the calibrated model.




Figure 4.15. Average peak discharge reduction (%) for index points in the Middle Cedar Watershed. Baseline vs. Distributed Storage (historic precipitation).

5. Summary and Conclusions

The Middle Cedar Watershed is one of nine distinct Iowa watersheds participating in the IWA program. The program will accomplish six specific goals in each watershed: (1) reduce flood risk; (2) improve water quality; (3) increase flood resilience; (4) engage stakeholders through collaboration and outreach/education; (5) improve quality of life and health, especially for susceptible populations; and (6) develop a program that is scalable and replicable throughout the Midwest and the United States. The purpose of this hydrologic assessment report is to provide an understanding of the watershed hydrology in the Middle Cedar Watershed and the potential of various hypothetical flood mitigation strategies that may be leveraged to accomplish goals of the IWA.

a. Middle Cedar Water Cycle and Watershed Conditions

We examined the water cycle of the Middle Cedar Watershed using historical precipitation and streamflow records. The average annual precipitation for the Middle Cedar Watershed is approximately 36.0 inches. Of this precipitation amount, roughly 70% (25.0 inches) evaporates back into the atmosphere and the remaining 30% (11.0 inches) runs off the landscape into the streams and rivers. The majority of the runoff amount is baseflow (70% or 7.7 inches), and the rest is surface flow (30% or 3.3 inches). Average monthly streamflow peaks in June, and decreases slowly through the summer growing season. In most years, the largest discharge observed during the year occurs in May or June, associated with heavy spring/summer rainfall events.

The water cycle has changed due to land use and climate changes. Since the 1970s, Iowa has seen increases in precipitation, changes in timing of precipitation, and changes in the frequency of intense rain events. Streamflow records in Iowa (including those for the Middle Cedar watershed) suggest that average flows, low flows, and perhaps high flows have all increased and become more variable since the late 1960s or 1970s; however, the relative contributions of land use and climate changes are difficult to sort out.

The Middle Cedar Watershed is located almost entirely within the Iowa Surface landform region. In this region, characteristic features include gently rolling topography, common glacial ‘erratics’ (rocks and boulders not native to Iowa that have been transported here by glaciers), and loess-mantled paha (northwest to southeast trending uneroded upland remnants of the former landscape). The soil distribution of the Middle Cedar shows that the watershed consists primarily of HSG B type soils (65.6%), which have a moderate runoff potential when saturated. Components of type B/D (27.1%) soils are present as well. The remaining classes each comprise less than 4% of the total.

b. Middle Cedar Hydrologic Model

The modeling activities described in this report were performed using the physically-based integrated model GHOST developed at IIHR to simulate the hydrologic responses over time periods on the order of decades. GHOST stands for Generic Hydrologic Overland-Subsurface

Toolkit. GHOST is based on the open source hydrologic code MM-pihm (Qu and Duffy 2007, Yu et al. 2013), which fully couples surface and subsurface domains to predict streamflow as well groundwater movement for normal and extreme rainfall and snowmelt events. All the model simulations, baseline and scenarios, were forced using 15 years (2002-2016) of hourly climatological data with 4-km spatial resolution and provided information not only for flood events but also on the watershed's hydrology during medium and low flows. Simulations were run using both measured precipitation as well as increased precipitation values obtained by applying the projected changes in heavy precipitation reported in the Climate Assessment Report for the mid and late 21st century.

c. Watershed Scenarios for the Middle Cedar Watershed

We used the GHOST model to better understand the flood hydrology of the Middle Cedar Watershed, and to evaluate potential flood mitigation strategies. We first assessed the runoff potential throughout the basin identifying locations with the highest runoff potential; mitigating the effects of high runoff from these areas should be a priority for flood mitigation planning.

The GHOST model was used to quantify the potential effects of three different flood mitigation strategies applied throughout the Middle Cedar Watershed: 1) conversion of 100% of the rowcrop acres to native vegetation, 2) adoption of both no-till and cover crops in 100% of the rowcrop acres, and 3) a distributed storage system built with ponds (684) located in the headwater catchments.

The results for these strategies were compared to simulations of flows for the existing watershed condition using both historical and increased precipitation values. Although each scenario simulated is hypothetical and simplified, the results provide valuable insights on the relative performance of each strategy for flood mitigation planning.

Figure 5.1 presents average peak flow reductions at index points 12 (Cedar River at Cedar Rapids) and 4 (Wolf Creek near Dysart). All the reductions were estimated in reference to the baseline simulation with historic precipitation. The native vegetation scenario results reveal the enormous flood reduction potential of this practice and highlights why this land use change should be considered when evaluating flood reduction alternatives. When a landowner decides to take some land out of production (e.g. CRP program or excessive wetness making the land unprofitable) planting native vegetation in those acres has the potential to generate flood reduction benefits. Cover Crops/No-Till is a management practice that when implemented throughout agricultural watersheds has the potential to lead to important flood reduction benefits. Based on the Middle Cedar model results, this practice shows average peak flood reduction of 40% and 30% at Wolf Creek near Dysart with historic rain and increased precipitation, respectively. The 684 ponds provide peak flow reductions of up to 15% in the tributaries with historic rain, when increased precipitation conditions were simulated model results show higher peak flows than those of the baseline condition (with historic rain).

Flood stage reductions, expressed in inches, are presented in Figures 5.2 and 5.3. During the historic flood of 2008 cover crops/no-till and the 684 ponds would have provided flood stage reductions of approximately 7 and 3 inches at Cedar Rapids. Under increased precipitation conditions neither of these two practices would have been able to provide any reduction at Cedar

Rapids. Model results show that important investments in conservation (in the Middle Cedar Watershed alone) can achieve significant levels of flood protection along the different tributaries flowing into the Cedar River. For Cedar Rapids (and all other places affected by flooding from the Cedar River main stem) to have comparable levels of flood protection upstream mitigation strategies are needed at both the Middle Cedar Watershed the upstream areas draining into the Middle Cedar Watershed (see Figure 3.3).





Figure 5.1. Average peak flow reductions for all the simulations at two different index points. Top: Cedar River at Cedar Rapids and bottom: Wolf Creek near Dysart. IP stands for increased precipitation. Peak flow reduction were estimated in reference to the baseline conditions with historic precipitation.





Figure 5.2. Peak flow stage reductions. Cedar River at Cedar Rapids. IP stands for increased precipitation. Peak flow stage reductions were estimated in reference to the baseline conditions with historic precipitation.





Figure 5.3. Peak flow stage reductions. Wolf Creek near Dysart. IP stands for increased precipitation. Peak flow stage reductions were estimated in reference to the baseline conditions with historic precipitation.

d. Watershed Scenarios for the Middle Cedar Watershed

As a final note, it is important to recognize that the modeling scenarios evaluate the *hydrologic effectiveness* of the flood mitigation strategies, and not their effectiveness in other ways. For instance, while certain strategies are more effective from a hydrologic point of view, they may not be more effective economically. As part of the flood mitigation planning process, factors such as the cost and benefits of alternatives, landowner willingness to participate, and more need to be considered in addition to the hydrology.

Appendix A – References

- Archuleta, Ray. “Cedar River Watershed Coalition Meeting – Cover Crops and Other Conservation Practices,” Personal interview, April 2014.
- Baron, V.S., Dick, A.C., Najda, H.G. and Salmon, D.F., 1993. Cropping systems for spring and winter cereals under simulated pasture: yield and yield distribution. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*, 73(3), pp.703-712.
- Basche Andrea, *Turning Soils into Sponges: How Farmers Can Fight Floods and Droughts*, Union of Concerned Scientists, 2017, <http://www.ucsusa.org/foodagriculture/advance-sustainable-agriculture/turning-soils-sponges#.WZyYRyiGOUk>
- Bharati, L., Lee, K.H., Isenhardt, T.M., Schultz, R.C., (2002). “Soil-water infiltration under crops, pasture, and established riparian buffer in Midwestern USA,” *Agroforest. Syst.* 56 (3), 249–257.
- Bradley, A.A. (2010). “What Causes Floods in Iowa?” *A Watershed Year: Anatomy of the Iowa Floods of 2008*, C. Mutel (editor), University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa. 7 - 17.
- Burkart, M. (2010). “The Hydrologic Footprint of Annual Crops,” *A Watershed Year: Anatomy of the Iowa Floods of 2008*, C. Mutel (editor), University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa. 77 – 85.
- Brye, K.R., Norman, J.M., Bundy, L.G., Gower, S.T., (2000). “Water-budget evaluation of prairie and maize ecosystems,” *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 64 (2), 715–724
- Chow, V.T., Maidment, D., and Mays, L. (1988). *Applied Hydrology*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Cohen, D. (1993). *Iowa Prairies*. Iowa Association of Naturalists. Biological Communities (IAN). Iowa State University Extension Service. Ames, Iowa.
- Cronshey, R., 1986. *Urban hydrology for small watersheds*. US Dept. of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Engineering Division.
- Eash, D.A, Heinitz, A.J. (1991). *Floods in the Nishnabotna River Basin, Iowa*. Open-File Report 91-171. U.S. Geological Survey. 1991.
- Easterling, D.R., K.E. Kunkel, J.R. Arnold, T. Knutson, A.N. LeGrande, L.R. Leung, R.S. Vose, D.E. Waliser, and M.F. Wehner, (2017). *Precipitation change in the United States*.

- In: Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, pp. 207-230, doi: 10.7930/J0H993CC.
- Fischer, E.E. (1999). Flood of June 15-17, 1998 Nishnabotna and West Nishnabotna Rivers, southwest, Iowa. U.S. Geological Survey. Open-File Report 99-70.
- Frans, C., Istanbuluoglu, E., Mishra, V., Munoz-Arriola, F., Lettenmaier, D.P. (2013). Are climatic or land cover changes the dominant cause of runoff trends in the Upper Mississippi River Basin? *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol. 40 (17).
- Galloway, G.E., (2010). "The Great Flood of 1993," *A Watershed Year: Anatomy of the Iowa Floods of 2008*, C. Mutel (editor), University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa. 227 – 233.
- Hernandez-Santana, V., Zhou, X., Helmers, M., Kolka, R., & Tomer, M. (2013). Native prairie filter strips reduce runoff from hillslopes under annual row-crop systems in Iowa, USA. *Journal of Hydrology*, 94-103.
- Iowa Department of Natural Resources (2018, January 16). 2016 305(b) Assessment Summary-2016 Impaired Waters List. <https://programs.iowadnr.gov/adbnet/Assessments/Summary/2016>. Accessed July 01, 2018.
- Iowa Geological & Water Survey, Iowa Department of Natural Resources (2013). Landform Regions of Iowa. <http://www.igsb.uiowa.edu/browse/landform.htm>. Accessed January 2017.
- Jackson, R.B., Canadell, J., Ehleringer, J.R., Mooney, H.A., Sala, O.E., Schulze, E.D. (1996). "A global analysis of root distributions for terrestrial biomes," *Oecologia*, 389-411.
- Jones, C.S. and Schilling, K.E. (2011). "From Agricultural Intensification to Conservation: Sediment Transport in the Raccoon River, Iowa, 1916-2009," *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 40.
- Kang, S., Gu, B., Du, T. and Zhang, J., 2003. Crop coefficient and ratio of transpiration to evapotranspiration of winter wheat and maize in a semi-humid region. *Agricultural water management*, 59(3), pp.239-254.
- Kristensen, K.J. and Jensen, S.E., 1975. A model for estimating actual evapotranspiration from potential evapotranspiration. *Hydrology Research*, 6(3), p.170.
- Knox, J.C. (2001). "Agricultural Influence on Landscape Sensitivity in the Upper Mississippi River Valley," *Catena* 42, 193-224.
- Kumar M., Duffy C. and Salvage K. 2009. A second-order accurate, finite volume–based, integrated hydrologic modeling (FIHM) framework for simulation of surface and subsurface flow. *Vadose Zone* 8.
- Linhart, S.M., and Eash, D.A. (2010). Floods of May 30 to June 15, 2008, in the Iowa and Cedar River basins, eastern Iowa, Open-File Report 2010-1190, 99. U.S. Geological Survey.

- Meierdiercks, K.L., Smith, J.A., Baeck, M.L., and Miller, A.J. (2010). "Analyses of Urban Drainage Network Structure and its Impacts on Hydrologic Response," *Journal of American Water Resources Research*, 14(4), 416-424.
- Mejia, A.I., Moglen, G.E. (2010). "Impact of the Spatial Distribution of Imperviousness on the Hydrologic Response of an Urbanizing Basin," *Hydrologic Processes*, 24, 3353-3373.
- Mohamoud, Y.M., 1992. Evaluating Manning's roughness coefficients for tilled soils. *Journal of hydrology*, 135(1-4), pp.143-156.
- Mora, C., Abby G. Frazier, A.G., Longman, R.J., Dacks, R.S., Walton, M.M., Tong, E.J., Sanchez, J.J., Kaiser, L.R., Stender, Y.O., Anderson, J.M., Ambrosino, C.M., Fernandez-Silva, I., Giuseffi, L.M. and Giambelluca, T.M. (2013). The projected timing of climate departure from recent variability, *Nature*, 502(7470).
- Moriassi, D.N., Arnold, J.G., Van Liew, M.W., Bingner, R.L., Harmel, R.D. and Veith, T.L., 2007. Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations. *Transactions of the ASABE*, 50(3), pp.885-900.
- Mutel, C.M. (2010). *A Watershed Year: Anatomy of the Iowa Floods of 2008*, C. Mutel (editor), University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa. 74.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2013). NOAA Atlas 14 Point Precipitation Frequency Estimates.
http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pdfs/pdfs_map_cont.html?bkmrk=ia.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2017). National Centers for Environmental Information Map Application – Version 1.8.4 Monthly Summaries Map.
<https://gis.ncdc.noaa.gov/maps/ncei/summaries/monthly>. Accessed April 2017.
- North Central Region Water Network (2018). About the Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework (ACPF). <https://northcentralwater.org/acpf/>. Accessed July 01, 2018.
- Papanicolaou, A.N., Wacha, K.M., Abban, B.K., Wilson, C.G., Hatfield, J.L., Stanier, C.O., Filley, T.R. (2015). "From soilscales to landscapes: A landscape oriented approach to simulate soil organic carbon dynamics in intensively manage landscapes," *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 120, 2375-
- Petersen W. (2010). "The Hydrology of Urban Landscape," *A Watershed Year: Anatomy of the Iowa Floods of 2008*, C. Mutel (editor), University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa. 87 – 95.
- Prior, Jean Cutler. *Landforms of Iowa*. University of Iowa Press, 1991.
- PRISM Climate Group. (2018). Oregon State University, <http://prism.oregonstate.edu>, created March 2018.
- Qu, Y. and Duffy C.J. 2007. A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated soils. *Soil science society of America journal* 44.

- Sayre, R. (2010). "The Dam and the Flood: Cause of Cure," *A Watershed Year: Anatomy of the Iowa Floods of 2008*, C. Mutel (editor), University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa. 103 – 109.
- Scharffenberg, W. (2013). *HEC-HMS User's Manual 4.0*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center.
- Schilling, K. (2000). "Patterns of Discharge and Suspended Sediment Transport in the Walnut and Squaw Creek Watersheds, Jasper County, Iowa: Water Years 1996-1998," Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Geological Survey Bureau, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Schilling, K.E., Chan, K-S., Jha, M.K., Zhang, Y-K., and Gassman, P.W. (2008). "Impact of Land Use and Land Cover Change on the Water Balance of a Large Agricultural Watershed: Historical Effects and Future Directions," *Water Resources Research*, 44, doi: 10.1029/2007WE006644.
- Schilling, K.E., Chan, K-S., Liu, K-S., and Zhang, Y-K., Gassman, P.W. (2008). "Quantifying the Effect of Land Use Land Cover Change on Increasing Discharge in the Upper Mississippi River," *Journal of Hydrology* 387, pp. 343-345.
- Schottler, S.P., Ulrich, J., Belmont P., Moore, R., Lauer, J.W., Engstrom, D.R., Almendinger, J.E. (2013). "Twentieth Century Agricultural Drainage Creates More Erosive Rivers," *Hydrological Processes*, doi:10.1002/hyp.9738.
- Smith, J. A., Baeck, M.L., Villarini, G., Wright, D.B., Krajewski, W.F. (2013). "Extreme flood response: The June 2008 flooding in Iowa." *Journal of Hydrometeorology*. 14(6). 1810-1825., doi: 10.1175/JHM-D-12-0191.1.
- Sprague, L.A., Hirsch, R.M., Aulenbach, B.T. (2011). "Nitrate in the Mississippi River and its tributaries, 1980 to 2008: Are we making progress?" *Environmental Science & Technology*. 2011. August 9;45(17):7209–16.
- Stolze, J.H. (2018). *A Tale of Soap and Water: Soap Creek Leads the State in Flood Mitigation*. Retrieved from <http://www.iowawatershedapproach.org/2018/02/a-tale-of-soap-and-water-soap-creek-leads-the-state-in-flood-mitigation/>
- Takle, E.S. (2010). "Was Climate Change Involved?" *A Watershed Year: Anatomy of the Iowa Floods of 2008*, C. Mutel (editor), University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa. 111 – 116.
- Thompson, J. (2003). "Wetlands Drainage, River Modification, and Sectoral Conflict in the Lower Illinois Valley," Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.
- Tomer, M.D., Porter, S.A, James, D.E., Boomer, K.M.B., Kostel, J.A., and McLellan, E. (2013). "Combining precision conservation technologies into a flexible framework to facilitate agricultural watershed planning" *Journal of Soil & Water Conservation*. 68:113A-120A.
- United States Department of Agriculture-Iowa State University (2011). USDA-NIFA Award No. 2011-68002-30190. <http://sustainablecorn.org/Weather&Agriculture/Pubs/IA-Northeast.pdf>.

- United States Department of Agriculture–National Resource Conservation Service (2007). National Engineering Handbook. Part 630. Chapter 7. <http://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/OpenNonWebContent.aspx?content=17757.wba>
- Urban, M.A. and Rhoads, B.L. (2003). “Catastrophic Human-Induced Change in Stream-Channel Planform and Geometry in an Agricultural Watershed, Illinois, USA”, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 93(4), 783-796.
- VanLoocke, A., Twine, T.E., Zeri, M. and Bernacchi, C.J., 2012. A regional comparison of water use efficiency for miscanthus, switchgrass and maize. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 164, pp.82-95.
- Wang, C., Chan, K., Schilling, K.E. (2016). “Total Phosphorus Concentration Trends in 40 Iowa Rivers, 1999 to 2013.” *Journal of Environmental Quality*. Madison, WI. doi: 10.2134/jeq2015.07.0365.
- Weber, L.J., Muste, M., Bradley A.A., Amado Arenas, A., Demir, I., Drake, C.W., Krajewski, W.F., Loeser, T.J., Politano, M.S., Shea, B.R., Thomas, N.W. (2018). “The Iowa Watershed Project: Iowa’s prototype for engaging communities and professionals in watershed hazard mitigation.” *International Journal of River Basin Management*, 16:3, 315-328, doi: 10.1080/15715127.2017.1387127.
- Wehmeyer, L.L., Weirich, F.H., and Cuffney, T.F. (2011). “Effect of Land Cover Change on Runoff Curve Number Estimation in Iowa, 1832–2001,” *Ecohydrol.* 4, 315–321.
- Winsor, R. (1975). “Artificial Drainage of East Central Illinois 1820-1920,” PhD Thesis, Department of Geography, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
- Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, B. DeAngelo, S. Doherty, K. Hayhoe, R. Horton, J.P. Kossin, P.C. Taylor, A.M. Waple, and C.P. Weaver, (2017). Executive summary. In: *Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I* [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, pp. 12-34, doi: 10.7930/J0DJ5CTG
- Xia, Y., Mitchell, K., Ek, M., Sheffield, J., Cosgrove, B., Wood, E., Luo, L., Alonge, C., Wei, H., Meng, J. and Livneh, B., 2012. Continental-scale water and energy flux analysis and validation for the North American Land Data Assimilation System project phase 2 (NLDAS-2): 1. Intercomparison and application of model products. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 117(D3).
- Yiping Wu, Y., Liu, S., Sohl, T.L., Young, C.J. (2013). Projecting the land cover change and its environmental impacts in the Cedar River Basin in the Midwestern United States, *Environmental Research Letters*, 8(2).
- Yimam, Y.T., Ochsner, T.E. and Kakani, V.G., 2015. Evapotranspiration partitioning and water use efficiency of switchgrass and biomass sorghum managed for biofuel. *Agricultural Water Management*, 155, pp.40-47.
- Yu, X., Bhatt, G., Duffy C. and Shi Y. 2013. Parametrization for distributed watershed modeling using national data and evolutionary algorithm. *Computer and Geosciences* 58.

Zhang, Y. K. and Schilling, K.E. (2006). "Effects of Land Cover on Water Table, Soil Moisture, Evapotranspiration, and Groundwater Recharge: a Field Observation and Analysis," *Journal of Hydrology*, 319(1-4), 328-338.

Zhang, Y-K. and Schilling, K.E. (2006). "Increasing Streamflow and Baseflow in the Mississippi River since the 1940s:Effects of Land-use Change," *Journal of Hydrology* 325, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.200509.033, 412-42.