

US Army Corps of Engineers
Chicago District

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting

Water Year 1992 Report

Table Of Contents

List of Tables	iii
List of Figures	iv
Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
Authority for Report	1
History of the Diversion	1
Background of Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting	5
Diversion Accounting Procedures	9
Revisions to the Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Procedures	12
Accounting Results	12
Discussions of Results	14
Columns	14
Column 1: Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal (CSSC) at Romeoville, USGS AVM Gage Record.....	14
Column 2: Diversions from the CSSC Above the Gage	14
Column 3: Total Flow Through the CSSC.....	15
Column 4: Groundwater Discharged to the CSSC And Adjoining Channels.....	15
Column 5: Water Supply Pumpage from Indiana Reaching the CSSC	16
Column 6: Runoff from the Des Plaines River Watershed Reaching the CSSC.....	17
Column 7: Lake Michigan Pumpage by Federal Facilities Which Discharge to the CSSC.....	17
Column 8: Total Deductions from the CSSC Romeoville Gage Record.....	17
Column 9: Lake Michigan Pumpage Not Discharged to the CSSC.....	17
Column 10: Total Diversion.....	19
Column 11 Through Column 13: Lake Michigan Diversion Components.....	20
Budgets	23
Budget 1 and Budget 2: Water Supply Pumpage.....	23
<i>Budget 1: Diverted Lake Michigan Water Supply</i>	23
<i>Budget 2: Groundwater Diverted to the CSSC</i>	23

Budgets 3 Through Budget 6: Stream Gaging Stations.....	24
Budgets 7 Through Budget 13: MWRDGC Water Reclamation Facilities	24
<i>Budget 7: Northside Water Reclamation Facility</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Budget 8: Upper Des Plaines Pump Station.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Budget 9: Mainstream TARP Pumping Station.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Budget 10: Stickney Water Reclamation Facility.....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Budget 11: Calumet TARP Pumping Station.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Budget 12: Calumet Water Reclamation Facility</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Budget 13: Lemont Water Reclamation Facility.....</i>	<i>39</i>
Budget 14: CSSC System Balance	39
Summary.....	43
References.....	44
Appendix A - Summary of Daily Diversion Flows.....	A-1

List of Tables

Table 1 - Description of the Diversion Accounting Columns	10
Table 2 - Description of the Diversion Accounting Computational Budgets.....	11
Table 3 - Status of the State of Illinois' Diversion from Lake Michigan under the 1980 Modified Supreme Court Decree.....	12
Table 4 - Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992 Summary of Diversion Flows.....	13
Table 5 - Breakdown of the Diversion by the State of Illinois Based on Columns 11 Through 13	21
Table 6 - Stream Gage Flow Separation.....	24
Table 7 - WY 1992 Summary of Simulation Statistics.....	27
Table 8 - WY 1992 Summary of Flow Components for the CSSC System Balance	42

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Development of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal System	3
Figure 2 - Location Plan - Lake Michigan Diversion at Chicago	4
Figure 3 - WY 92 Component Breakdown of Illinois' Diversion Based Upon Columns 11 through 13	22
Figure 4 - Budget 7 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Northside Water Reclamation Facility	28
Figure 5 - Budget 8 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Upper Des Plaines Pump Station.....	29
Figure 6 - Map of Mainstream and Calumet TARP	32
Figure 7 - Budget 9 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Mainstream TARP Pumping Station.....	33
Figure 9 - Budget 11 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Calumet TARP Pumping Station.....	37
Figure 10 - Budget 12 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Calumet Water Reclamation Facility	38
Figure 11 - Budget 13 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Lemont Water Reclamation Facility	40
Figure 12 - Budget 14 - CSSC System Balance.....	41

Executive Summary

In compliance with the modified 1980 U.S. Supreme Court decree (hereinafter, the Decree), the WY92 diversion was computed using the best engineering technology available to date.

Given the complexity of the hydrologic cycle in the heavily urbanized Chicago metropolitan area, and given the number of human and other factors that cannot be adequately represented in numerical modeling procedures, the results of the simulations which compute diversion flows worked exceptionally well.

The WY92 diversion accountable to the State of Illinois is 3,408.7 cfs. This is 208.7 cfs greater than the 3,200 cfs average specified by the Decree. The 40 year running average, rounded to the nearest cfs, beginning with WY81 is 3,457 cfs and the cumulative deviation from the 3,200 cfs average is -3,084 cfs-years. The negative cumulative deviation indicates a water allocation deficit and the maximum allowable debt is 2,000 cfs-years.

Introduction

The diversion of water from the Lake Michigan watershed is of major importance to the Great Lakes states and to the Canadian province of Ontario. The states and province that border the Great Lakes have concerns with both diversions during periods of low lake levels, as well as the long term effects of diversion. To insure that the concerns of these interested parties are considered, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers has been given the responsibility for the accounting of flow that is diverted from the Lake Michigan watershed.

The Corps of Engineers, Chicago District, is responsible for monitoring the measurements and the computation of the diversion of Lake Michigan water by the State of Illinois. The computations for Water Year 1983 (WY83), WY84 and WY85 (1 October 1984 through 30 September 1985) were completed by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC) for the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). Prior to the WY83 report, the calculations were made by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (MWRDGC) (formerly known as the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, (MSDGC)) for IDOT. The Corps reviewed, modified, and updated the WY84 and WY85 diversion accounting completed by NIPC. The computations for WY86 were performed jointly by NIPC (under contract to the Corps of Engineers) and the Corps of Engineers. Beginning in WY87, the computations were performed solely by the Corps of Engineers. This report represents the final Lake Michigan diversion accounting for WY92.

Authority for Report

Under the provisions of the U.S. Supreme Court Decree in the Wisconsin, et. al. v. Illinois et. al., 388 U.S. 426, 87 S.Ct. 1774 (1967) as modified 449 U.S. 48, 101 S.Ct. 557 (1980), the Chicago District of the Corps of Engineers is responsible for monitoring the measurement and computation of diversion of Lake Michigan water by the State of Illinois. The Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Section 1142 of PL 99-662) gave the Corps total responsibility for the computation of diversion flows as formerly done by the State of Illinois. The Corps' new mission became effective 1 October 1987.

History of the Diversion

Water has been diverted from Lake Michigan at Chicago into the Mississippi River Watershed since the completion of the Illinois and Michigan (I and M) Canal in 1848. At that time, diversion averaged about 500 cubic feet per second (cfs). The I

and M Canal was built primarily to serve transportation needs providing a connecting watercourse between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River system.

With the development of the Chicago metropolitan area, sewer and drainage improvements led to severe sanitation problems in the mid to late 1800's. The newly constructed sewers moved water and wastes into the Chicago River, which until 1900 drained to Lake Michigan. The water quality of Lake Michigan deteriorated and contaminated the city's primary water supply.

A second problem that occurred during this time period was an increase in the overbank flooding within the city. As more roads were built and buildings constructed, the sewer system was correspondingly expanded. The increase in impervious area from the newly constructed roads and buildings increased the rate and volume of stormwater runoff and resulted in increased flooding.

As a solution to the sanitation and flooding problems, construction of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal (CSSC) was undertaken. Construction of the CSSC allowed the flow direction of the Chicago River to be reversed (Figure 1). Construction of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal was completed in 1900 by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (MWRDGC). The CSSC followed the course of the older I and M Canal. The CSSC is much larger than the I and M canal and can handle the Chicago River flow, as well as increased shipping. In the 1930's, the Chicago River Controlling Works (CRCW) was constructed at the mouth of the Chicago River. The CRCW regulates the amount of Lake Michigan water allowed to pass into the river and restricts river flooding from entering Lake Michigan. The water levels in the CSSC are controlled by the Lockport Lock and Dam.

Between 1907 and 1910, the MWRDGC constructed a second canal called the North Shore Channel. It extended from Lake Michigan at Wilmette in a southerly direction 6.14 miles to the north branch of the Chicago River. The Wilmette Pumping Station regulates the amount of Lake Michigan flow allowed down the channel.

Construction of a third canal, the Calumet Sag Channel, was completed in 1922. The canal connects Lake Michigan through the Grand Calumet River, to the CSSC. The Calumet Sag Channel was constructed to carry sewage from South Chicago, Illinois and East Chicago, Indiana. The O'Brien Lock and Dam, which was completed in 1967, is located on the Calumet River and regulates the flow of Lake Michigan waters down the Calumet Sag Channel. The O'Brien Lock and Dam replaced the Blue Island Lock and Dam. Figure 2 shows the affected watershed.




Figure 1

Development of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal System




Figure 2

Location Plan - Lake Michigan Diversion at Chicago

Background of Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting

The Lake Michigan diversion accountable to Illinois is limited to 3,200 cubic feet per second (cfs) over a forty (40) year averaging period. During the forty (40) year period, the average diversion in any annual accounting period may not exceed 3,680 cfs except in any two accounting periods in which the average diversion may not exceed 3,840 cfs as a result of extreme hydrologic conditions. During the first thirty nine (39) year period, the maximum allowable cumulative difference between the calculated diversion and 3,200 cfs is 2,000 cfs-years. These limits apply to the period beginning with WY81.

Prior to the 1983 accounting report, diversion accounting was done by the MWRDGC in the form of monthly hydraulic reports. As required by Supreme Court Decree, the diversion was calculated by deducting non-diversion flows from the Lockport record measured by MWRDGC and adding those diversion flows not discharging to the CSSC. All of the deductible flows could not be measured, therefore MWRDGC used flow records from gaged areas to get typical flow values and then extrapolated to arrive at the total deduction.

The State of Illinois contracted with NIPC to revise the diversion accounting calculations. At the same time, the State of Illinois moved from monthly hydraulic reports to annual accounting reports. NIPC adapted computer models of the diverted Lake Michigan and the Des Plaines River watersheds previously developed for studies in Northeastern Illinois under Section 208 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500), to calculate those flows that could not be measured. Like MWRDGC, NIPC deducted non-diversion flows from the Lockport record and added those flows not discharged to the canal to calculate the Lake Michigan diversion. However, NIPC modeled both the gaged and ungaged areas to calculate much of the deduction and addition flows. Then computational budgets were developed around each of the gaged areas to verify the models. The budgets aid in identifying problem areas in the procedure. The procedure developed by NIPC is a significant improvement over the previous approach, because of the more rigorous approach and because of the verification provided by the budgets.

As required by Supreme Court Decree, a three (3) member technical committee is convened every five (5) years to evaluate the diversion accounting program to ensure that the accounting is accomplished using the best current engineering practice and scientific knowledge.

The first technical committee was convened during the period when diversion accounting was done by MWRDGC. The committee was primarily concerned with the rating of the various components at the Lockport facility, the primary diversion

measurement location (Espey et. al., 1981). In response to the Committee's concerns, the Corps' Waterways Experiment Station (WES) revised the ratings of the two sets of Lockport sluice gates (Hart and McGee, 1985).

In response to the Committee's concerns, the State of Illinois installed an acoustic velocity meter (AVM) at Romeoville five (5) miles upstream of Lockport. The AVM is a highly accurate flow measuring device that proved to provide better flow measurements than the MWRDGC reported Lockport flows and the new Corps rating curves. The AVM became operational 12 June 1984. However, USGS did not publish the AVM flows until 1 October 1985. Because of significant equipment problems with the original AVM, a replacement AVM was installed in November 1988.

To provide flows during periods of malfunction, various regression analyses were performed to relate the MWRDGC reported Lockport flows to the AVM flows. Several sets of equations were proposed by the Corps of Engineers, the United States Geological Survey (USGS), Harza Engineering Co., and the Second Technical Committee. The report, *Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal at Romeoville Acoustical Velocity Meter Backup System*, was completed September 1989 (USACE, 1989). The report documents the many efforts taken by various parties to develop useful regression equations. The regression equations that were ultimately used to estimate missing AVM flows from WY86 through WY92 were developed by the USGS in a report titled *Comparison, Analysis, and Estimation of Discharge Data from Two Acoustic Velocity Meters on the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal at Romeoville, Illinois* (USGS, 1994). This report is contained in the Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting WY93 Annual Report.

The second technical committee reviewed the NIPC hydrologic and hydraulic computer models and agreed that the approach was consistent with what was required by the decree (Espey et. al., 1987). However, the committee felt that some of the parameters used in the models were out of date and in need of revision. To address the committee's concerns, the Corps hired a consultant (Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd., (CBBEL)) in September of 1988 to review and update the modeling parameters. The final report (CBBEL, 1990) concerning the updating of modeling parameters was submitted to the Corps in October 1990.

The Water Resources Development Act of 1986 gave the Corps of Engineers the full responsibility for computation of the Illinois Lake Michigan diversion as of 1 October 1987. When the Corps' new responsibility became effective, the WY84 diversion accounting report, developed by NIPC, had not been certified. As a result, the Corps was responsible for the WY84 and all subsequent reports.

NIPC completed the WY84 diversion accounting report in April of 1987. It was subsequently reviewed by the Corps. The Corps found the report to be adequate

with two exceptions. First, the 1984 accounting was completed with the modeling parameters questioned by the second technical committee. Second, the MWRDGC Lockport flows, which were adjusted using the WES rating curves, were used rather than the AVM flows. The Corps, knowing that the modeling parameters required updating and that AVM flows for the period prior to installation could be calculated accurately using regression equations, refrained from certifying the WY84 report until these issues were resolved.

NIPC completed the WY85 diversion accounting report in December of 1988 and the report was reviewed by the Corps. Like the WY84 report, the WY85 accounting was done with the modeling parameters questioned by the second technical committee. Additionally, NIPC used the AVM flows published by the USGS in their WY85 Water Resources Data for Illinois report. Since the publication of the WY85 USGS report, more reliable equations have been developed for calculating flows when the AVM was malfunctioning. These equations are periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.

Upon completion of the analysis of the modeling parameters by CBBEL, the WY84 and WY85 diversion flows were recalculated using the revised modeling parameters and the Romeoville AVM flows. The diversion flows were certified by the Corps of Engineers and transmitted to all interested parties in the Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting 1989 Annual Report (USACE, 1990).

The computation of Illinois' diversion from Lake Michigan for WY86 was undertaken as a joint effort between NIPC (under contract to the Corps of Engineers) and the Corps of Engineers. The computation of Illinois' diversion from Lake Michigan for WY87 through WY90 was performed solely by the Corps of Engineers. The WY86 through WY89 Diversion Accounting Reports are contained in the Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Annual Report covering WY90 through WY92 (USACE, 1994).

The primary revision implemented for the WY90 diversion accounting was the incorporation of the new 25-gage precipitation network into the runoff simulation models. The 25-gage precipitation network replaces the previous 13-gage network. The new precipitation network has solved many of the problems associated with the old network, such as poor exposure and distribution patterns. The Illinois State Water Survey (ISWS) installed and maintains the precipitation network for the Corps of Engineers. They also collect the data and adjust it if necessary. A description of the new 25-gage precipitation network can be found in the ISWS report titled *Installation and Operation of a Dense Raingage Network to Improve Precipitation Measurements for Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting: Water Year 1990* (ISWS, 1991). That report is contained in the Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting WY93 Annual Report.

In addition to the installation and use of the new 25-gage precipitation network was the subsequent modifications to the hydrologic runoff models and hydraulic sewer routing models. These models were revised in order to reflect the changes in the precipitation network. Many of the model changes were accomplished by Rust Environment and Infrastructure under contact with the Corps of Engineers. Their work culminated in a report titled *Diversion Accounting Update for the New 25-Gage Precipitation Network* (Rust,1993). That report is also contained in the Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting WY93 Annual Report.

Rust's work involved review and correction of map delineations of combined sewer special contributing areas, delineation of precipitation gage assigned areas for the 25-gage network, land-use/land-cover delineations, modifications to the hydraulic sewer routing model to reflect the revised precipitation network and land cover assignments, and an assessment of the model parameters used in the hydrologic runoff model, Hydrologic Simulation Program - FORTRAN (HSPF).

The Corps of Engineers modified the hydraulic sewer model, Special Contributing Area Loading Program (SCALP), in separate sewer areas in order to incorporate changes in the precipitation network. Since actual boundaries have not been mapped for those areas some assumptions as to the location of the separate sewer areas were made. This was necessary since effective areas have been applied for the separate sewer areas in the SCALP model. These assumptions will continue until a further study can be accomplished that will reflect actual boundaries for these separately sewered areas.

A study was also done by the Corps to improve the response of the HSPF hydrologic runoff models. Input on parameter improvements were received from NIPC and Rust. The study resulted in some minor parameter modifications to the HSPF runoff model to correct for past inconsistencies and improve parameter accuracy.

Diversion Accounting Procedures

The Lake Michigan diversion accountable to the State of Illinois is calculated by using the AVM measured flow in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal at Romeoville and deducting flows that do not constitute Lake Michigan diversion and are not accountable to the State of Illinois. Finally, additions are made to the Romeoville record for diversions that are not discharged to the canal. The deductions include groundwater water supply pumpage whose effluent is discharged to the canal, runoff from the Des Plaines River watershed that is discharged to the canal, Lake Michigan water supply pumpage from Indiana that is discharged to the canal, and water supply pumpage from Lake Michigan used for Federal facilities that is discharged to the canal. The additions to the Romeoville record include flows diverted from the canal upstream of Romeoville, and Lake Michigan water supply whose effluent is not discharged to the canal. This procedure represents the accounting method required by the Supreme Court Decree.

The diversion accounting results are presented as a series of columns that are listed in Table 1. Column 1 through Column 3 compute the total flow in the CSSC. Column 4 through Column 7 presents the deductions from the canal system flows with the total deduction being presented in Column 8. Column 9 presents the additions to the canal system record. Column 10 is the computed Lake Michigan diversion accountable to Illinois and is equal to the canal system flow minus the deductions plus the additions. Columns 11 through 13 are independent flow estimates for the three sources of diversion: water supply pumpage from Lake Michigan, runoff from the diverted Lake Michigan Watershed, and direct diversion through the lakefront structures. Column 11 through Column 13 are not used in the diversion calculation but are included as another estimate of the diversion for verification of the accounting flows in Column 10. The sum of Column 11 through Column 13 should theoretically equal the flow in Column 10.

In addition to the diversion calculations presented in the 13 columns, 14 computational budgets are prepared as input to the diversion calculation and to verify the estimated flows that cannot be measured. A summary of these budgets is presented in Table 2. Budgets 1 and 2 do not compare simulated to measured flows but are summations of critical water supply pumpage data. Budget 3 through Budget 6 partition stream gage records into runoff and sanitary/industrial discharge components to estimate a portion of the runoff from the diverted watershed that is used as input to Column 12, Runoff from the Diverted Lake Michigan Watershed. Budget 7 through Budget 13 compare simulated to measured flows at MWRDGC facilities. These budgets simulate all the deductible Des Plaines River Watershed contained in Column 6 and the deductible groundwater seepage into TARP contained in Column 4. These budgets also are used for verification of the diversion

accounting procedures and give an indication of the accuracy of the diversion accounting models. Budget 14 compares canal system inflows and outflows. It is used primarily as a verification of modeling results as well as an indicator of the accuracy and completeness of measured/reported flows.

Table 1

Description of the Diversion Accounting Columns

Column Number	Description
1	Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal (CSSC) at Romeoville AVM Gage Record
2	Diversion from the CSSC above the Romeoville AVM Gage
3	Total Flow Through the CSSC
4	Groundwater Pumpage Discharged into the CSSC and Adjoining Channels
5	Water Supply Pumpage from Indiana Reaching the CSSC
6	Runoff from the Des Plaines River Watershed which Reaches the CSSC
7	Lake Michigan Pumpage by Federal Facilities which Discharge to the CSSC and Adjoining Channels
8	Total Deduction from the CSSC Romeoville AVM Gage Record
9	Lake Michigan Pumpage Which is not Discharged into the CSSC
10	Total Diversion Accountable to the State of Illinois
11	Pumpage from Lake Michigan Which is Accountable to the State of Illinois
12	Runoff from the Diverted Lake Michigan Watershed
13	Direct Diversions Through Lake Front Control Structures Which is Accountable to the State of Illinois

Table 2
Description of the Diversion Accounting Computational Budgets

Budget Number	Title	Description
1	Diverted Lake Michigan Pumpage	This budget sums the Lake Michigan water diverted by the State of Illinois in the form of Industrial and Municipal water supply. The results of this budget are used in Column 11.
2	Groundwater Discharged to the CSSC	This budget sums groundwater pumpages that are discharged to the CSSC. The results of this budget are used in Column 4.
3	North Branch Chicago River at Niles,IL	This budget performs a simple separation of stream flow into sanitary and runoff portions. The results of this budget are used in Budget 14 and Column 12.
4	Little Calumet River at the IL-IN State Line	This budget performs a simple separation of stream flow into sanitary and runoff portions. The results of this budget are used in Budget 14 and Column 12.
5	Thorn Creek at Thornton, IL	This budget performs a simple separation of stream flow into sanitary and runoff portions. The results of this budget are used in Budget 14 and Column 12.
6	Little Calumet River at South Holland, IL	This budget performs a simple separation of stream flow into sanitary and runoff portions. The results of this budget are used in Budget 14 and Column 12.
7	MWRDGC Northside Water Reclamation Plant	This budget performs hydrologic and hydraulic simulation of the service basin tributary to the MWRDGC Northside Water Reclamation Facility. The simulations estimates the runoff from portions of the Lake Michigan and Des Plaines River watersheds within the Northside service basin that is diverted to the CSSC in the form of inflow-infiltration. The budget provides an internal verification of the accounting procedures. The results of this budget are used in Budget 14 and Columns 6 and 12.
8	Upper Des Plaines Pumping Station	This budget performs hydrologic and hydraulic simulation of the MWRDGC Upper Des Plaines Pumping Station. This budget provides a calibration point to verify models of the Des Plaines River watershed
9	MWRDGC Mainstream TARP Pumping Station	This budget performs hydrologic and hydraulic simulation of the MWRDGC Mainstream TARP Pumping Station. The results of this simulation are used in Budgets 10 and 14 and Columns 6 and 12. The budget also provides internal verification of the accounting procedures.
10	MWRDGC Stickney Water Reclamation Facility	This budget performs hydrologic and hydraulic simulation of the service basin tributary to the MWRDGC Stickney Water Reclamation Facility. The simulations estimates the runoff from portions of the Lake Michigan and Des Plaines River watersheds within the Stickney service basin that is diverted to the CSSC in the form of inflow-infiltration. The budget provides an internal verification of the accounting procedures. The results of this budget are used in Budget 14 and Columns 6 and 12.
11	MWRDGC Calumet TARP Pumping Station	This budget performs hydrologic and hydraulic simulation of the MWRDGC Calumet TARP Pumping Station. The results of this simulation are used in Budgets 12 and 14 and Columns 6 and 12. The budget also provides internal verification of the accounting procedures.
12	MWRDGC Calumet Water Reclamation Facility	This budget performs hydrologic and hydraulic simulation of the service basin tributary to the MWRDGC Calumet Water Reclamation Facility. The simulations estimates the runoff from portions of the Lake Michigan and Des Plaines River watersheds within the Calumet service basin that is diverted to the CSSC in the form of inflow-infiltration. The budget provides an internal verification of the accounting procedures. The results of this budget are used in Budget 14 and Columns 6 and 12.
13	MWRDGC Lemont Water Reclamation Facility	This budget performs hydrologic and hydraulic simulation of the service basin tributary to the MWRDGC Lemont Water Reclamation Facility. The simulations estimates the runoff from portions of the Des Plaines River watershed within the Lemont service basin that is diverted to the CSSC in the form of inflow-infiltration. The budget provides an internal verification of the accounting procedures. The results of this budget are used in Budget 14 and Column 6.
14	Chicago Canal System	This budget performs a water balance of the Chicago Canal System which includes the CSSC and adjoining channels. This budget provides a verification point for the accounting procedures.

Revisions to the Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Procedures

The primary revision to the WY92 diversion accounting procedure consisted of using the measured flow data for the Grand Calumet River instead of the regression equation that had previously been used. The Grand Calumet River data are used in Column 5 of the diversion accounting procedures.

Accounting Results

The WY92 diversion accounting monthly summary is presented in Table 4. Table 4 shows the total WY92 Lake Michigan diversion accountable to the State of Illinois is 3,408.7 cfs (Column 10). This is 208.7 cfs greater than the 3,200 cfs average specified by the Decree. The 40 year running average (Table 3), rounded to the nearest cfs, beginning with WY81 is 3,457 cfs and the cumulative deviation from the 3,200 cfs average is -3,084 cfs-years. The negative cumulative deviation indicates a water allocation deficit. The maximum allowable deficit is 2,000 cfs-years. Tabular data on daily diversion flows is presented in Appendix A.

Table 3

Status of the State of Illinois' Diversion from Lake Michigan Under the 1980 Modified U.S. Supreme Court Decree

Accounting Year	Certified Flow (cfs)	Running Average (cfs)	Cumulative Deviation (cfs-years)
1981	3,106	3,106	94
1982	3,087	3,097	207
1983	3,613	3,269	- 206
1984	3,432	3,309	- 438
1985	3,472	3,342	- 710
1986	3,751	3,410	-1,261
1987	3,774	3,462	-1,835
1988	3,376	3,451	-2,011
1989	3,378	3,443	-2,189
1990	3,531	3,452	-2,520
1991	3,555	3,461	-2,875
1992	3,409	3,457	-3,084

Table 4

**Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)**

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Oct-91	4098.1	0.5	4098.6	151.1	27.9	362.4	1.8	543.2	118.4	3673.8	1711.0	2058.8	173.2
Nov-91	3501.1	0.4	3501.5	143.6	30.3	309.1	1.5	484.5	98.9	3115.9	1644.4	1450.6	84.4
Dec-91	3185.9	0.9	3186.8	122.6	30.0	247.7	1.8	402.1	102.9	2887.6	1633.3	1037.6	66.8
Jan-92	2458.0	2.2	2460.2	90.5	24.6	130.4	1.9	247.4	111.5	2324.3	1645.3	455.0	69.6
Feb-92	2835.2	1.7	2836.9	104.2	28.1	180.2	1.6	314.1	127.8	2650.6	1633.9	818.2	69.5
Mar-92	3131.5	1.5	3133.0	122.5	32.4	212.9	1.8	369.6	157.0	2920.4	1614.2	983.3	83.5
Apr-92	5193.6	1.7	5195.3	95.2	39.3	168.5	1755.0	2058.0	192.3	3329.6	1607.5	659.9	164.7
May-92	5052.9	2.8	5055.7	69.1	35.8	40.2	2161.8	2306.9	283.9	3032.7	1852.8	135.4	194.1
Jun-92	3591.0	2.5	3593.5	74.0	29.7	50.0	2.4	156.1	345.8	3783.2	2110.1	331.1	662.7
Jul-92	4339.7	2.5	4342.2	122.6	31.4	121.6	2.0	277.6	268.5	4333.1	2049.8	610.5	1282.0
Aug-92	3957.1	2.6	3959.7	101.7	25.5	63.5	2.1	192.8	260.5	4027.4	2048.5	425.8	1138.3
Sep-92	4974.2	0.5	4974.7	125.3	29.5	232.6	1.7	389.1	240.1	4825.7	1870.6	1214.6	1423.7
Averages	3859.9	1.7	3861.6	110.2	30.4	176.6	328.0	645.2	192.3	3408.7	1785.1	848.4	451.0

Computations:

1. Column 3 equals the sum of Columns 1 and 2.
2. Column 8 equals the sum of Columns 4 through 7.
3. Column 10 equals Column 3 minus Column 8 plus Column 9.



Deductions from the Romeoville Gage Record



Additions to the Romeoville Gage Record

Discussions of Results

The following is a discussion of the column functions and computational budgets. The discussion of the column functions describes the purpose of each column, as well as some observations on the WY92 values in the columns. The discussion of the computational budgets presents the purpose of each budget and the results of the budget flow balances. The results of the computational budgets are used in the diversion calculations where seven (7) budgets are used to verify the diversion simulation models. The columns are discussed first, followed by the discussion of the budgets.

Columns

The first ten (10) columns display the components of the diversion calculation and include the Romeoville flow, as well as the various deductions and additions to the Romeoville record. The final three (3) columns (Columns 11 through 13) display the three (3) diversion components (Lake Michigan pumpage accountable to Illinois, runoff from the diverted watershed, and direct diversion through the lakefront control structures). The sum of Columns 11 through 13 should theoretically equal the Romeoville based diversion calculation. A comparison of the sum of these three (3) columns to the calculated diversion (Column 10) is presented in the discussion of Column 11 through Column 13.

Column 1: Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal (CSSC) at Romeoville, USGS AVM Gage Record

The discharge at Romeoville for WY92 was 3,859.9 cfs. For the ten (10) days when the AVM was inoperable, the flow at the Romeoville site was calculated from the USGS regression equations.

Column 2: Diversions from the CSSC Above the Gage

Argonne Laboratories and Uno-Ven Corporation were the only diversions from the CSSC upstream of the Romeoville gage in WY92. The average withdrawal upstream of the AVM for WY92 was 1.7 cfs.

Column 3: Total Flow Through the CSSC

Column 3 is the sum of Column 1 and Column 2 and represents the total flow entering the canal system. The average CSSC flow was 3,861.6 cfs for WY92.

Column 4: Groundwater Discharged to the CSSC And Adjoining Channels

Column 4 is groundwater pumpage by communities, industrial users and other private users whose effluent is discharged to the CSSC. The groundwater pumpage data is reported by the ISWS. It also includes the groundwater seepage into the TARP system that is discharged to the CSSC. This quantity is determined by summing all reported groundwater pumpages tributary to the CSSC, along with the estimated groundwater seepage into the Mainstream TARP (Budget 9) and Calumet TARP (Budget 11) systems. This total is then adjusted by subtracting the groundwater normally tributary to the canal that is contained in the combined sewer overflows that discharge to the Des Plaines River and other watercourses not tributary to the CSSC. This method prevents double accounting of the combined sewer overflow portion of the groundwater supply pumpage.

Using ISWS groundwater records, groundwater pumpages were assumed to reach the CSSC and adjoining channels if they were located in the diverted Lake Michigan watershed in Illinois or if they were located within MWRDGC Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) service boundaries in which their effluent was discharged into the CSSC and adjoining channels. Groundwater seepage into the Mainstream TARP and Calumet TARP systems was determined through simulation and is discussed in Budgets 9 and 11. The groundwater constituent of combined sewer overflows is determined entirely through simulation.

Groundwater pumpage from the Lake Michigan watershed whose effluent is discharged to the CSSC is a deduction, except to the extent that the groundwater sources are recharged by Lake Michigan. Current piezometric levels indicate that groundwater is discharging to the lake. Therefore, groundwater pumpage from within the Lake Michigan Watershed that reaches the canal continues to be a deduction. Research literature will be reviewed periodically to verify this assumption.

Column 4 represents a deduction from the Romeoville record and averaged 110.2 cfs. This is a decrease of 6.1 cfs from WY91. Groundwater pumpage tributary to the canal is composed of 20.2 cfs of groundwater pumpage from the Lake Michigan watershed, 16.8 cfs of groundwater pumpage from outside of the Lake Michigan watershed, 52.3 cfs of groundwater seepage into the Mainstream TARP system, and 21.1 cfs of groundwater seepage into the Calumet TARP system. The

total of these components is 110.4 cfs. However, the deduction from the Romeoville gage record is 110.2 cfs, since 0.2 cfs of this groundwater supply pumpage was determined, through simulation, to be discharged to the Des Plaines River and other watercourses not tributary to the CSSC in the form of combined sewer overflows.

Column 5: Water Supply Pumpage from Indiana Reaching the CSSC

Column 5 represents the computation of Indiana water supply reaching the canal through the Grand Calumet and the Little Calumet Rivers. In the case of the Little Calumet River, a drainage divide exists east of the confluence with Hart Ditch. Therefore, flows from Hart Ditch, including virtually all dry weather flows, normally flow westward into Illinois. Under high flow conditions, the drainage divide may shift westward and a portion of the Hart Ditch flows may be diverted eastward to Burns Ditch and ultimately to Lake Michigan. However, it is believed that the occurrence in the shift in the drainage divide is infrequent and the flow that is diverted eastward is insignificant. Therefore, it is assumed that all effluent discharged into Hart Ditch and the Little Calumet River west of the divide flow westward. For WY92, total flow in the Little Calumet River was 64.8 cfs, with 5.9 cfs of that flow being determined to be Indiana water supply.

The Grand Calumet River has a summit. On one side of the summit, the flow is toward Lake Michigan. On the other side of the side of the summit, the flow is toward the Calumet Sag Channel which flows into the CSSC. However, the location of the summit is variable and highly influenced by Lake Michigan levels (USGS, 1984). Thus the calculation of this deduction from the Romeoville record is influenced by Lake Michigan levels. Beginning with the WY92 accounting, Grand Calumet River flow was measured by a gage that was installed in 1991 that began officially measuring flows on 1 October 1991.

Flow in the Grand Calumet River is estimated to be in excess of 90% sanitary effluent. Therefore, it is assumed that the portion of this flow that is attributable to domestic water supply is equal to the sum of the daily water supply pumpage for East Chicago, Whiting, and Hammond (whose pumpage includes water supply for Munster, Highland, and Griffith). If the total water supply pumpage for these communities is greater than the flow in the Grand Calumet River, it is assumed that the flow consists entirely of effluent that originates from water supply.

The total Grand Calumet flow reaching Illinois in WY92 was measured as 24.9 cfs. It was determined that 24.5 cfs was water supply pumpage. Therefore, the total WY92 Indiana water supply deduction, including the flow from the Little Calumet and Grand Calumet Rivers is 30.4 cfs. This is the same as the Indiana water supply deduction for WY92 which was 30.4 cfs.

Column 6: Runoff from the Des Plaines River Watershed Reaching the CSSC

The WY92 average discharge of Des Plaines River watershed runoff reaching the canal (Column 6) is 176.6 cfs. This deduction is determined almost entirely through simulation. The runoff is composed of two elements, surface runoff and subsurface runoff. Surface runoff that enters sewers is referred to as inflow, while subsurface runoff is referred to as infiltration. The infiltration and inflow discharged to the water reclamation plants is 101.4 cfs, the infiltration and inflow reaching the canal through combined sewer overflows is 11.3 cfs and the runoff from the Lower Des Plaines and Summit Conduit areas is 63.7 cfs. The deduction is also influenced by the O'Hare basin flow transfer that contributed 8.7 cfs of the 101.4 cfs of runoff to the water reclamation facilities during WY92. The deductible Des Plaines River watershed runoff decreased 23.3 cfs from WY91 to WY92. Decreased runoff may be partially due to the reduced rainfall volumes that occurred in the southern portion of the diverted watershed.

Column 7: Lake Michigan Pumpage by Federal Facilities Which Discharge to the CSSC

Column 7 represents Lake Michigan diversions for Federal use, not chargeable to the State of Illinois, and is typically comprised of water supply pumpage used by federal facilities. Also included is emergency navigation makeup water used for federal purposes. Column 7 represents a deduction from the Romeoville record and the total amount of the WY92 deduction is 328.0 cfs.

The deduction for WY92 is much greater due to the release of water during the old freight tunnel flooding that occurred on 13 April 1992. The Chicago River flowed through a punctured freight tunnel, which flooded approximately 23 buildings and 40 miles of the freight tunnel system in downtown Chicago. The Chicago River was drawn down to reduce the water pressure so that the collapsed tunnel could be sealed. The increase in diversion associated with this effort appears in this column. The deduction for WY92 of 328.0 cfs which consists of 1.9 cfs of water supply to Federal Facilities and 326.1 cfs for the emergency drawdown of the Chicago River System.

Column 8: Total Deductions from the CSSC Romeoville Gage Record

Column 8 is the sum of Columns 4, 5, 6, and 7 and represents the total deduction from the Romeoville record. The total deduction for WY92 is 645.2 cfs.

Column 9: Lake Michigan Pumpage Not Discharged to the CSSC

This column represents water supply pumpage from Lake Michigan that is not discharged to the canal. The water supply pumpage not discharged to the canal is composed of two components:

- Lake Michigan water supply used by communities serviced by water reclamation facilities that do not discharge to the CSSC (190.9 cfs). This is an increase of 75.8 cfs from WY91. The large increase in the WY92 value is due to the addition of two (2) water supply agencies, Central Lake County Joint Action Water Agency and the DuPage Water Commission. The WY93 water supply value will even greater because these agencies were not fully operational until the latter part of WY92.
- The sanitary portion of combined sewer overflows attributable to Lake Michigan domestic water supply that does not discharge to the CSSC (1.4 cfs).

The communities that make up the flow in the first component are suburbs whose treated effluent is discharged to the Des Plaines River and other watercourses not tributary to the CSSC. The water supply agencies or communities are:

- Northwest Suburban Joint Action Water Agency (NWJAWA) - Member communities include Elk Grove Village, Hanover Park, Hoffman Estates, Mount Prospect, Rolling Meadows, Schaumburg and Streamwood.
- Northwest Water Commission - Member communities include Arlington Heights, Buffalo Grove, Palatine, Prospect Heights and Wheeling.
- Central Lake County Joint Action Water Agency (CLCJAWA) - Member communities include Grayslake, Gurnee, Lake County Public Works Department (Vernon Hills and Wildwood-Gages Lake), Libertyville, Mundeline, Round Lake, Round Lake Park and Round Lake Beach.
- Lake County Public Water District - Member communities include Illinois Beach State Park, Winthrop Harbor and Zion.
- DuPage Water Commission - Member communities include Addison, Bensenville, Bloomingdale, Carol Stream, Citizen's Utilities (Arrowhead, Country Club Highlands, Lombard Heights and Valley View), Clarendon Hills, Darien, Downers Grove, Elmhurst, Glen Ellyn, Glendale Heights, Hinsdale, Itasca, Lisle, Lombard, Naperville, Oak Brook, Roselle, Villa Park, Westmont, Wheaton, Willowbrook, Wood Dale, Woodridge, DuPage County Water Works (Farmington,

Glen Ellyn Heights, Hinsdale, Lake in the Woods, Rosewood Trace, Steeple Run).

- Lincolnshire
- Riverwoods
- Waukegan
- Lake County - Bradley Road
- North Chicago - 76 percent
- Des Plaines - 38.2 percent

The communities of Lake Bluff and Knollwood-Roundout (who receive their water from CLCJAWA) are not included in Column 9, as they discharge their effluent into the Chicago River System.

It should also be noted that the Lake Michigan water supply component of the O'Hare flow transfer is subtracted from the total Lake Michigan water supply of the above communities since:

- The O'Hare flow transfer is treated at the Northside WRP which discharges sanitary effluent that is tributary to the CSSC.
- The entire Lake Michigan water supply component of the O'Hare flow transfer is from communities contained in the above list.

The Lake Michigan water supply for these communities is measured, while the sanitary portion of the CSO's is derived through simulation. Column 9 represents an addition to the Romeoville record and the total WY92 addition is 192.3 cfs. This is an increase of 75.7 cfs from WY91 to WY92 and is primarily due to the startup of the two (2) water agencies, CLCJAWA and the DuPage Water Commission.

Column 10: Total Diversion

Column 10 is equivalent to Column 3 with the deduction of Column 8 and the addition of Column 9. The total diversion for WY92 is 3,408.7 cfs. This amount is 208.7 cfs greater than Illinois's long term diversion allocation of 3,200 cfs. The 40-year running average diversion, rounded to the nearest cfs, beginning with WY81, is 3,457 cfs and the cumulative deviation from the 3,200 cfs allocation is

-3,084 cfs. The negative deviation indicates that the cumulative diversion is greater than an average of 3,200 cfs for the period.

Column 11 Through Column 13: Lake Michigan Diversion Components

Columns 11 through 13 represent the three (3) Lake Michigan diversion components:

- Column 11 - Lake Michigan pumpage accountable to Illinois (1,785.1 cfs)
- Column 12 - Runoff from the diverted Lake Michigan watershed (848.4 cfs)
- Column 13 - Direct diversion through the lakefront structures (451.0 cfs)

The sum of the columns (3,084.5 cfs) should theoretically equal the total diversion as shown in Column 10 (3,408.7 cfs), with one exception. The Romeoville record receives effluent that is assumed to contain only 90% of the water supply pumpage, while Column 11 (Lake Michigan water supply pumpage accountable to Illinois) does not account for consumptive use. This is based on a consumptive loss (water supply pumpage that is consumed or lost prior to reaching the water reclamation facilities) estimate of 10% of the water supply pumpage (International Great Lake Diversion Consumptive Use Study Board, 1981).

Because the diversion estimate from Columns 11 - 13 is based on simulation, suspect ratings of the lakefront structures, and simple flow separation techniques, the estimate is not expected to be as accurate as the AVM based calculations. Consequently, a difference between estimates of 324.2 cfs or 9.5% is a good balance. However, this discrepancy becomes greater when consumptive use is accounted for in Column 11. The discrepancy in these two (2) estimates is related to the canal system balance in Budget 14, discussed in a subsequent section and potential sources of the discrepancy are addressed in that budget discussion.

Using the figures from these three (3) columns, 57.9% of the WY92 Illinois diversion is attributable to pumpage from Lake Michigan for domestic water supply. Runoff from the diverted Lake Michigan Watershed accounted for 27.5% of the diversion, and direct diversion through the lakefront structures accounted for 14.6% of the diversion. Water supply from Lake Michigan decreased 33.9 cfs from WY91 to WY92. This is most likely due to the overall increase in basin wide precipitation between WY91 and WY92. Due to the reduced volume of rainfall occurring in the southern portion of the diverted watershed between WY91 and WY92, there was a 193.0 cfs decrease in runoff from the Lake Michigan watershed that occurred between WY91 and WY92. A more detailed breakdown of these percentages is shown in Table 5 and Figure 3.

Table 5

Breakdown of the Diversion by the State of Illinois
Based on Columns 11 Through 13

Description	Average Flow (cfs)	Percentage of Total Flow
Lake Michigan Pumpage by the State of Illinois	1785.1	57.9%
Runoff from the Diverted Lake Michigan Watershed	848.4	27.5%
Direct Diversions		
Lockages	82.7	2.7%
Leakages	32.6	1.1%
Navigation Makeup Flow	43.4	1.4%
Discretionary Flow	293.0	9.5%
Total Direct Diversions	451.7	14.6%

Note: The direct diversions shown in Table 5 do not agree with the results contained in Column 13 of Table 4 due to the different rounding methodologies employed. The direct diversions shown in Table 5 is the yearly average of each of the direct diversion components, while the yearly average value shown in Column 13 of Table 4 is the yearly average of each of the monthly averages.




Figure 3

Component Breakdown of Illinois' Diversion Based Upon Columns 11 through 13

Budgets

The first two (2) budgets are used to sum the water supply for the area influenced by the diversion. The next four (4) budgets are of stream gage sites that are not simulated and are used as part of the calculation of the runoff from the diverted Lake Michigan watershed. The remaining seven (7) budgets compare measured and simulated flows and compute Column inputs used in the diversion computations.

Budget 1 and Budget 2: Water Supply Pumpage

Budgets 1 and 2 are summations of critical water supply pumpage data. Budget 1 sums Lake Michigan water supply diverted by the State of Illinois. The Lake Michigan water supply data is supplied by the state as daily values for primary users and monthly data for secondary users. Budget 2 sums groundwater pumpages in the Lake Michigan and Des Plaines River watersheds that are diverted to the CSSC. Groundwater pumpage data is recorded by the ISWS as a total annual withdrawal based on calendar years.

Budget 1: Diverted Lake Michigan Water Supply

Budget 1 represents the summation of Lake Michigan pumpage accountable to the State of Illinois. For WY92, the average annual Lake Michigan pumpage accountable to Illinois is 1785.1 cfs. This is a decrease of 33.9 cfs from WY91.

Budget 2: Groundwater Diverted to the CSSC

Budget 2 is groundwater water supply pumpage by communities, industrial users, and other private users whose effluent is discharged to the canal. The groundwater pumpage data are reported by the ISWS on a calendar year basis. The groundwater quantity is determined by summing all reported groundwater sources in the area tributary to the CSSC, less groundwater not discharged to the CSSC in the form of combined sewer overflows.

Using the ISWS groundwater records, groundwater pumpages were assumed to reach the CSSC and adjoining channels if they were located in the diverted Lake Michigan watershed in Illinois, or if they were located within MWRDGC service boundaries in which their effluent was discharged into the CSSC and adjoining channels.

The total groundwater pumpage by communities, industrial users, and other private users whose sanitary effluent is tributary to the canal is 37.0 cfs for WY92. It

was determined through simulation that 0.2 cfs of this flow never reached the canal. Instead it was discharged to the Des Plaines River or other watercourses not tributary to the canal in the form of combined sewer overflows. The total groundwater pumpage reaching the canal represents a decrease of 9.5 cfs from WY91 to WY92.

In addition to groundwater supply pumpage, there was also a significant amount of groundwater infiltration into the two TARP systems that ultimately reached the canal. Mainstream TARP and Calumet TARP accounted for 52.3 cfs and 21.1 cfs, respectively, of groundwater discharged to the canal during WY92.

Budgets 3 Through Budget 6: Stream Gaging Stations

The stream gage budgets are used to make estimates of runoff from portions of the diverted Lake Michigan watershed. Sanitary and other point source flows are subtracted from the stream gaging record to develop the runoff estimates. The runoff estimates are used in Column 12. The flows at the stream gaging sites are also part of Budget 14, the canal system budget.

Table 6 presents the estimated runoff from these budgets. It should be noted that Budgets 4 through 6 are a composite calculation of the runoff above the Little Calumet River at the South Holland gage. It should also be noted that the Little Calumet River is a losing stream (i.e. it recharges groundwater). The computations in deriving runoff account for this when recharge is significant (i.e., when groundwater recharge is computed).

Table 6

Stream Gage Flow Separation

Budget Number	Location	Stream Flow (cfs)	Sanitary Flow (cfs)	Runoff (cfs)
3	North Branch Chicago River at Niles, IL	103.2	18.8	84.4
4	Little Calumet River at IL-IN State Line	64.7	4.1	60.6
5	Thorn Creek at Thorton, IL	101.9	16.7	85.2
6	Little Calumet River at South Holland,IL	167.4	159.3	8.1

Budgets 7 Through Budget 13: MWRDGC Water Reclamation Facilities

The budgets for the water reclamation plants compare the simulated flows to the measured inflows at the MWRDGC facilities and perform verifications of the diversion accounting program. The simulated flows were developed from an estimated sanitary flow with a daily, weekly, and monthly flow variation, from hydrologic precipitation-based runoff models, and from hydraulic sewer routing models. The estimated sanitary flow input to the hydraulic simulation models is based on the population estimates for each plant's service basin. Per capita sanitary flows are determined based on the service basin's water supply minus an assumed 10 percent consumptive loss. Simulated flows were compared with recorded inflows at each facility to assess the accuracy of the simulations.

The discussion of the budgets will concentrate on the results of each simulation as the development of these models have been discussed in previous reports. A summary of the simulation results is presented in Table 7. At all four (4) water reclamation plants and the Upper Des Plaines Pump Station, the simulation results were maintained. This is the result of the new 25-gage precipitation network first utilized for the WY90 diversion accounting, improvements and updates in the land cover delineations, and modifications to the hydrologic and hydraulic models .

Budget 7: Northside Water Reclamation Facility

Budget 7 analyzes the water balance at the MWRDGC Northside Water Reclamation Facility (Figure 4). The balance for WY92 of the inflow to the Northside facility is very good. The simulated to adjusted recorded inflow ratio (S/R) for the Northside WRP is 0.95, indicating that the simulated inflow volume is slightly less than the adjusted observed inflow volume. The coefficient of correlation (R) of simulated to observed flow is 0.82, indicating that the model predicted the inflow hydrograph to the Northside facility well.

Budget 8: Upper Des Plaines Pump Station

Budget 8 analyzes the water balance at Upper Des Plaines Pump Station (UDPPS) (Figure 5). The pump station budget is used to verify simulated flows. Although it has no direct impact on the diversion calculation, it is intended to be used as a primary calibration point for the models that simulate the deductible runoff from the Des Plaines watershed contained in Column 6. This will be possible only after the existing measurement problems at that site are resolved. This has been discussed in the WY90 diversion report.

The balance at UDPPS for WY92 was reasonable. The simulated to recorded flow ratio (S/R) for the UDPPS is 1.0, indicating that the simulated inflow volume to UDPPS matches the recorded inflow volume. However, the daily S/R ratio shows a high degree of variability, indicating that the trends within the recorded and

simulated inflow may not correspond very well. The coefficient of correlation (R) of simulated to recorded flow is 0.72, indicating the time series trends in the simulated inflow compared well with the time series trends of recorded inflow. The improved coefficient of correlation is consistent with the results obtained in WY90 and WY91. The improvement may be the direct result of the revised raingage network and subsequent modifications to the hydrologic and hydraulic models.

Table 7
WY 1992 Summary of Simulation Statistics

Budget No.	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Description	Northside WRP (1)	Upper Des Plaines Pump Station (1),(3)	Mainstream TARP Pump Station (2)	Stickney WRP (1),(4)	Calumet TARP Pump Station (2)	Calumet WRP (1),(4)	Lemont WRP (1)	Chicago Canal System Balance (1)
Mean Recorded Flow, cfs	433.3	72.7	92.2	1,051.9	36.2	368.8	2.5	3,870.5
Max. Recorded Flow, cfs	744.6	137.0	300.0	2,194.4	156.5	574.4	6.6	10,657.0
Min. Recorded Flow, cfs	162.6	23.9	18.8	661.9	4.0	264.9	1.0	2,084.4
Mean Simulated Flow, cfs	404.9	71.0	101.0	1,141.1	27.4	385.5	1.9	3,451.6
Max. Simulated Flow, cfs	656.5	179.0	257.3	2,698.9	89.6	605.8	5.3	17,790.0
Min. Simulated Flow, cfs	305.9	42.4	39.7	842.8	3.2	297.7	1.3	1,721.5
Mean S/R	0.95	1.00	1.51	1.09	0.89	1.05	0.79	0.88
Max. S/R	2.38	3.07	5.75	1.96	2.18	1.33	1.64	2.24
Min. S/R	0.63	0.59	0.41	0.66	0.23	0.78	0.43	0.63
Correlation	0.82	0.72	0.65	0.76	0.89	0.87	0.77	0.89

- (1) Based on daily values.
- (2) Based on weekly values.
- (3) Does not include days with missing records.
- (4) Does not include pumpage from TARP.




Figure 4

Budget 7 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Northside Water Reclamation Facility




Figure 5

Budget 8 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Upper Des Plaines Pump Station

While the statistical results for WY92 at the Upper Des Plaines Pump Station have been maintained, this does not lead to the conclusion that flow measurement alternatives should not be investigated. This site has continued to experience its share of problems. During WY92, 125 days of records were unavailable that were attributable to meter malfunctions, problems with the recording charts which made data transformation impossible and various other reasons. In view of the significant quantity of missing data (34.2 % missing data), the quantitative analyses of the simulation are of limited value. Second, the accuracy of the flow meters at the pump station is questionable and unmetered bypass flows are a frequent occurrence. Therefore, total flow may not be measured in storm events and the recycling of flow is possible. Further investigation of the accuracy of flow measurement at the pump station is required to verify and calibrate the simulation models that compute the deductible runoff from the Des Plaines watershed contained in Column 6.

Budget 9: Mainstream TARP Pumping Station

Budget 9 analyzes the water budget at the MWRDGC Mainstream TARP Pumping Station. The results of Budget 9 are used as a verification point for simulated flows. Budget 9 also is used for the purpose of computing a portion of Column 6 (Des Plaines River watershed runoff deduction). The deductible portion of Budget 9 includes groundwater seepage into the TARP tunnel walls and a small amount of Des Plaines River watershed runoff captured by Mainstream TARP as overflows. Until the Des Plaines TARP segment goes on-line, the Des Plaines River watershed runoff conveyed to the Stickney Water Reclamation Plant through TARP tunnels will remain very small. The modeling of Mainstream TARP is performed using the Tunnel Network (TNET) dynamic hydraulic model. A simplified map of Mainstream TARP is contained in Figure 6. A more in-depth description of Mainstream TARP and the simulation model is contained in the Water Year 1986 report which is an appendix to the Diversion Accounting Annual Report for WY90-92 (USACE, 1994).

In analyzing the balance at the Mainstream TARP Pumping Station, weekly flows were used rather than daily flows. While MWRDGC maintains daily pumpage records, days with no pumpage occur frequently. Therefore, it is not possible to compute a daily S/R ratio.

The balance for WY92 of the inflow to the Mainstream Pumping Station is fair. The simulated to recorded flow ratio (S/R) for the Mainstream Pumping Station is 1.51, indicating that the simulated inflow volume is greater than the recorded inflow volume. The coefficient of correlation (R) of simulated to recorded flow is 0.65, indicating that there still exists a need for improvement in the ability of the model to predict trends in the pump station flows.

From a review of the plot of the simulated versus recorded flow at the pump station (Figure 7), it appears that the model responds similarly to recorded pumpage record. However, the model is sometimes out of phase with the observed record. This could be the result of simulated pumpages occurring sooner and more frequently than actual pumpages. The TNET model pumps normally turn on sooner and pump more frequently in order to maintain computational stability during a simulation. Additionally, base flows appear to be overestimated in the simulation. This is probably due to overestimation of groundwater infiltration into the TARP tunnels.

In summary, it appears that the simulation of the Mainstream TARP system is reasonable. However, there is concern regarding the estimation of pumpage volume and the difference in simulated and recorded pumpage time series. A review of MWRDGC information regarding Mainstream TARP indicates that bypass flows are discharged to TARP, when available, via drop shaft 11 (DSN 11). Coordination with MWRDGC established that this is a frequent occurrence. This may account for the simulation of a pumpage volume that is greater than the recorded pumpage volume. Records concerning the dates and pumpages back to TARP were not maintained for WY92. Therefore, data necessary to evaluate the impact of pumping back into TARP is not available. Therefore, it was decided that the model would not be adjusted to correct for double accounting of flows.

Budget 10: Stickney Water Reclamation Facility

Budget 10 analyzes the water balance at the MWRDGC Stickney Water Reclamation Facility (Figure 8). Simulated Mainstream TARP pumpages from Budget 9 are no longer combined with simulated interceptor inflow to the Stickney Water Reclamation Facility to derive the total simulated inflow to the Stickney Facility. Instead, only simulated interceptor inflows are compared with recorded interceptor inflows to assess the accuracy of the simulation. The decision to not include TARP pumpages in the treatment plant budgets was based on the fact that the TARP systems are already analyzed in separate budgets. Including TARP pumpages in the treatment plant budgets is detrimental to the statistical results of the treatment plant budgets, since the TARP models generally do not respond as well. When simulations of interceptor flows are treated separately, the response of the hydrologic runoff models (HSPF) and the hydraulic sewer routing models (SCALP) can be better isolated and not diluted by the TARP model results, which are analyzed separately on their own merits and contained in their own budgets (Budgets 9 and 11).





Figure 6

Map of Mainstream and Calumet TARP



—○— OBSERVED FLOW TO THE STICKNEY WRP FROM TARP
 - - - - - SIMULATED FLOW TO THE STICKNEY WRP FROM TARP

Figure 7

Budget 9 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Mainstream TARP Pumping Station




Figure 8

Budget 10 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Stickney Water Reclamation Facility

Overall, the balance for WY92 of the inflow to the Stickney facility is very good. The simulated to recorded flow ratio (S/R) for the Stickney is 1.09, indicating that the simulated interceptor inflow volume is greater than the recorded interceptor inflow volume. The coefficient of correlation (R) of simulated to recorded flow is 0.76, indicating that the model predicted the interceptor inflow hydrograph to the Stickney facility fairly well.

Budget 11: Calumet TARP Pumping Station

Budget 11 analyzes the water budget at the MWRDGC Calumet TARP Pumping Station (Figure 9). The results of Budget 11 are used as a verification point for simulated flows. The modeling of Calumet TARP is performed using the Tunnel Network (TNET) dynamic hydraulic model. A simplified map of Calumet TARP is contained in Figure 6. A more in-depth description of Calumet TARP and the simulation model is contained in the Water Year 1987 report contained in the Diversion Accounting Annual Report for WY90-92 (USACE, 1994).

In analyzing the balance at the Calumet TARP Pumping Station, weekly flows were used instead of daily flows. While MWRDGC maintain daily pumpage records, days with no pumpage occur frequently. Therefore, it is not possible to compute a daily S/R ratio.

The balance for WY92 of the inflow to the Calumet TARP Pumping Station is fair. The simulated to recorded flow ratio (S/R) for the Calumet TARP Pumping Station is 0.89 indicating that the simulated inflow volume is less than the recorded inflow volume. The coefficient of correlation (R) of simulated to recorded flow is 0.89, indicating that there is a good agreement between the trends of the simulated and observed Calumet TARP pumpages.

From a review of the plot of the simulated versus recorded flow at the pump station (Figure 9) it appears that the model responds similarly to the recorded pumpage record, except that the recorded pumpage often lagged behind the simulated pumpages for WY92.

Volume matching between the simulated and recorded Calumet TARP pumpages also was more difficult for WY92 as evidenced by the 0.89 S/R ratio. Because of the instability of the TARP model, as well as uncertainties in the Calumet TARP system, it was difficult to improve on this ratio. However, as the system is presently modeled, this does not impact the computed diversion, since all Des Plaines River watershed areas whose overflows are modeled as tributary to Calumet TARP are also modeled such that "non-captured" overflows flow to rivers that are tributary to the CSSC. Therefore, whether or not these Des Plaines River watershed runoff flows enter the tunnel or not, they are presently included in the Des Plaines River watershed runoff deduction in Column 6. This assumption will remain until

separately sewered areas are modeled such that actual areas are used instead of effective areas in the hydraulic models. This has been discussed in the WY90 diversion accounting report.

Budget 12: Calumet Water Reclamation Facility

Budget 12 analyzes the water balance at the MWRDGC Calumet Water Reclamation Facility (Figure 10). Simulated Calumet TARP pumpages from Budget 11 are no longer combined with simulated interceptor inflows to the Calumet Water Reclamation Facility to derive the total simulated inflow to the Calumet Facility. Instead, only simulated interceptor inflows are compared with recorded inflows to assess the accuracy of the simulation. This was revised for the same reasons as outlined previously in the discussion for Budget 10.

The annual simulated to recorded flow ratio (S/R) and the coefficient of correlation for the Calumet Water Reclamation Facility are considered good. The S/R ratio is 1.05 indicating that the simulated Calumet interceptor flow volume was slightly higher than the recorded interceptor flow volume. The coefficient of correlation was 0.87 indicating a good correlation between simulated and recorded interceptor flows.




Figure 9

Budget 11 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Calumet TARP Pumping Station




Figure 10

Budget 12 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Calumet Water Reclamation Facility

Budget 13: Lemont Water Reclamation Facility


Budget 13 analyzes the water balance at the MWRDGC Lemont Water Reclamation Facility (Figure 11). Overall, the balance for WY92 of the inflow to the Lemont facility is fair. The simulated to recorded flow ratio (S/R) for the Lemont is 0.79, indicating that the simulated inflow volume was somewhat less than the recorded inflow volume. The coefficient of correlation (R) of simulated to recorded flow is 0.77, indicating that the model predicted the inflow hydrograph to the Lemont facility fairly well.

Budget 14: CSSC System Balance

Budget 14 compares the inflows and outflows to the CSSC system (Figure 12). The inflow components include direct diversions through the lakefront structures, stormwater runoff discharged to the canal system, and domestic water supply whose effluent discharges to the canal system. The outflows from the canal system include the discharge past the Romeoville AVM, backflows through the lakefront structures and withdrawals upstream of Romeoville by Argonne National labs and Uno-Ven Corporation. The individual components are presented in Table 8 for WY92.

Overall, the balance for WY92 between the inflows to the canal system and the outflows from the canal system is fair. The S/R (inflow/outflow) for the canal system is 0.88, indicating that the inflow to the canal system is less than the outflow from the canal system. The average measured/simulated inflow was 3,451.6 cfs while the average measured/simulated outflow was 3,870.6 cfs. This is a difference of 419.0 cfs (10.8%) for WY92, as compared to 360.1 cfs (9.5%) for the previous water year, WY91.

The coefficient of correlation (R) of inflow to outflow is 0.89, indicating that the time series trends of inflow to outflow are well correlated. The coefficient of correlation is based on daily flows. Therefore, timing between inflows and measured outflows at Romeoville is a major issue, especially during changes in flow that occur at the beginning or end of a day. This is the result of travel time from inflow locations downstream to the Romeoville AVM site. Therefore, variability in the coefficient of correlation from year to year may be attributed to the variability in the timing of significant flow changes during a particular year.



OBSERVED FLOW AT THE LEMONT WRP
 SIMULATED FLOW AT THE LEMONT WRP

Figure 11

Budget 13 - Simulation of the MWRDGC Lemont Water Reclamation Facility




Figure 12

Budget 14 - CSSC System Balance

Table 8

WY 1992 Summary of Flow Components for the CSSC System Balance

INFLOWS (cfs)	
Lake Controlling Structures (measured)	
- Wilmette Controlling Works	41.2
- Chicago River Controlling Works	218.3
- O'Brien Lock and Dam	192.2
Streamflows (measured)	
- North Branch Chicago River at Niles	103.2
- Little Calumet River at South Holland	167.4
- Grand Calumet River at Holman Ave.	24.9
MWRDGC Water Reclamation Facilities (measured)	
- Northside	442.2
- Stickney	1,144.9
- Calumet	405.0
- Calumet TARP Pumpage to River	0.0
- Lemont	2.5
Other Point Sources (measured)	333.2
Summit Conduit (simulated)	11.1
Combined Sewer Overflows (simulated)	197.9
Direct Runoff to CSSC (simulated)	167.6
TOTAL INFLOWS (cfs)	3,451.6
OUTFLOWS (cfs)	
Cal-Sag Flow Transferred to Calumet WRP as Steel Mill Blow-down	2.5
Lake Front Backflows	0.0
Argonne Laboratory	0.5
Uno-Ven Corporation	7.1
USGS AVM Record	3,860.5
TOTAL OUTFLOWS (cfs)	3,870.6
DIFFERENCE (cfs)	-419.0

Based on the fact that the inflow is well correlated with the outflow, it appears that there is a moderately variable to constant underreported or unreported inflow. Possible sources of the canal system flow imbalance may include underreporting of the lakefront flows through the sluice gates and locks as well as unaccounted for flow sources. The underreporting of the lakefront flows could be the result of both inaccurate rating curves for the lakefront control structures and leakage through those structures. Flow meter measurements at the lakefront direct diversion points were done to assess if leakage is significant. This study (USGS, 1994) showed that lakefront leakage flows are greatly underreported. Unaccounted flows could also include unreported discharges to the canal.

Summary

In compliance with the modified 1980 U.S. Supreme Court decree, the WY92 diversion was computed using the best engineering technology available to date.

Overall, the simulations that comprise a significant portion of the diversion accounting computations worked well. The two most significant budgets to the diversion accounting computations, Budget 7, Northside Water Reclamation Facility, and Budget 10, Stickney Water Reclamation Facility, performed very well. Together, Budgets 7 and 10 compute the majority of the deductible Des Plaines River watershed runoff. These budgets have simulated to recorded ratios of 0.95 and 1.09 and correlations of 0.82 and 0.76, respectively. Given the complexity of the hydrologic cycle in the heavily urbanized Chicago metropolitan area, and given the number of human and other factors that cannot be adequately represented in numerical modeling procedures, the results of these two (2) budgets are good. Additionally, results for Budget 12, the Calumet WRP, were also very good. This budget also models a portion of the deductible Des Plaines River watershed runoff. The S/R ratio was 1.05 while the coefficient of correlation was 0.87.

The WY92 diversion accountable to the State of Illinois is 3,408.7 cfs. This is 208.7 cfs greater than the 3,200 cfs average specified by the Decree. The 40 year running average beginning with WY81 and rounded to the nearest cfs is 3,457 cfs, and the cumulative deviation from the 3,200 cfs average is -3,084 cfs-years. The negative cumulative deviation indicates a water allocation deficit and the maximum allowable deficit is 2,000 cfs-years.

References

1. Barkau, Robert L. 1991. *Modeling of the Chicago Tunnel and Canal System*. Prepared for Christopher B. Burke Engineering Ltd. as part of reference 2.
2. Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd. 1991. *Data Collection and Model Revisions*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago.
3. Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd. 1990. *Infiltration and Inflow Study and Diversion Accounting Model Modification*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago.
4. Espey, William H., Harry H. Barnes, and Svein Vigander. 1981. *Lake Michigan Diversion Findings of the Technical Committee for Review of Diversion Flow Measurements and Accounting Procedures*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago.
5. Espey, William H., Harry H. Barnes, and David Westfall. 1987. *Lake Michigan Diversion Findings of the Second Technical Committee for Review of Diversion Flow Measurements and Accounting Procedures*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago.
6. Hart, Dale E., and Richard G. McGee. 1985. *Final Report - Lockport Power Plant Sluice Gate and Control Works Discharge Evaluation*. Waterways Experiment Station. Vicksburg, MS.
7. Illinois State Water Survey. 1991, *Installation and Operation of a Dense Rainage Network to Improve Precipitation Measurements for Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting: Water Year 1990*.
8. International Joint Commission. 1981. *Great Lakes Diversions and Consumptive Uses, Annex F, Consumptive Use*.
9. Keifer Engineering. 1982. *Input Data CRSM for Existing Conditions - Mainstream System*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago.
10. Kleinbaum, David G., and Lawrence L Kupper. 1978. *Applied Regression Analysis and Other Multivariable Methods*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
11. Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. 1984. *1984 Facility Planning Study - MSDGC Update Supplement and Summary*.

12. Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. 1989. *1988 Annual Report of the Maintenance and Operations Department*.
13. Neubauer, Ronald A. 1990. Request for TARP Information from the Army Corps of Engineers. Memorandum to Mr. William Eyre, Supervising Civil Engineer, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago.
14. Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission. 1985. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Manual of Procedures*.
15. Kleinbaum, David G., and Lawrence L Kupper. 1978. *Applied Regression Analysis and Other Multivariable Methods*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
16. Rust Environment & Infrastructure. 1993. *Diversion Accounting Update for the New 25-Gage Precipitation Network*.
17. Steel, Robert G. D., and James H. Torrie. 1980. *Principles and Procedures of Statistics - A Biometrical Approach*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
18. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1990. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting 1989 Annual Report Including WY84 and WY85 Accounting*.
19. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1990. *Current Meter Measurements of Discretionary and Leakage Flows at the Chicago River Controlling Works, O'Brien Lock and Dam, and the Wilmette Controlling Works*.
20. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Water Year 1993 Annual Report*.
21. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Annual Report, Water Years 1990-92*.
22. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Water Year 1986 Report*.
23. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Water Year 1987 Report*.
24. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Water Year 1988 Report*.
25. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Water Year 1989 Report*.

26. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Water Year 1990 Report.*
27. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1995. *Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting Water Year 1991 Report.*
28. U.S. Geological Survey. 1984. *Streamflow and Water Quality of the Grand Calumet River, Lake County, Indiana, and Cook County, Illinois.*
29. U.S. Geological Survey. 1992. *Water Resources Data, Illinois, Water Year 1991, Volume 2, Illinois River Basin.*
30. U.S. Geological Survey. 1994. *Comparison, Analysis, and Estimation of Discharge Data from Two Acoustic Velocity Meters on the Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal at Romeoville, Illinois.*
31. U.S. Geological Survey. 1994. *Measurements of Leakage through Chicago River Controlling Works and Other Control Structures Near Chicago Illinois.*
32. Wisconsin et. al., v. Illinois et. al., Michigan v. Illinois et. al. New York v. Illinois et. al. U.S. 2, 3, and 4, Original 1 - 18, 1980.

Appendix A

Summary of Daily Diversion Flows

Computations:

1. Column 3 equals the sum of Columns 1 and 2.
2. Column 8 equals the sum of Columns 4 through 7.
3. Column 10 equals Column 3 minus Column 8 plus Column 9.



Deductions from the Romeoville Gage Record



Additions to the Romeoville Gage Record

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
October 1991 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Oct-91	2245.0	0.7	2245.7	116.6	19.6	31.7	1.9	169.8	117.3	2193.2	1871.1	97.6	118.0
02-Oct-91	2968.0	0.6	2968.6	85.8	28.6	590.4	1.9	706.7	117.2	2379.1	1852.3	2723.0	112.0
03-Oct-91	4123.0	0.6	4123.6	289.0	28.3	486.7	1.9	805.9	121.6	3439.3	1753.8	2154.5	122.0
04-Oct-91	10650.0	0.5	10650.5	281.1	57.4	1922.9	1.8	2263.2	141.7	8529.0	1723.8	14249.0	509.0
05-Oct-91	8089.0	0.4	8089.4	317.6	42.2	387.9	1.7	749.4	116.7	7456.7	1710.5	3063.4	106.0
06-Oct-91	4718.0	0.5	4718.5	359.8	26.2	228.7	2.0	616.7	111.9	4213.7	1675.5	1556.5	111.0
07-Oct-91	3466.0	0.5	3466.5	113.3	25.4	125.0	1.7	265.4	116.8	3317.9	1724.5	677.7	107.0
08-Oct-91	2567.0	0.6	2567.6	45.6	22.3	71.6	1.9	141.4	114.5	2540.7	1757.3	361.0	105.0
09-Oct-91	2887.0	0.6	2887.6	52.1	23.3	47.6	1.9	124.9	117.2	2879.9	1768.2	231.9	122.0
10-Oct-91	2514.0	0.6	2514.6	99.7	22.3	39.3	1.9	163.2	116.0	2467.4	1745.3	188.4	142.0
11-Oct-91	2476.0	0.5	2476.5	37.0	22.5	29.0	1.8	90.3	116.6	2502.8	1731.1	121.2	127.0
12-Oct-91	2634.0	0.4	2634.4	99.4	23.2	30.6	1.8	155.0	111.6	2591.0	1690.8	152.5	163.0
13-Oct-91	2272.0	0.5	2272.5	64.1	21.3	25.9	1.7	113.0	112.9	2272.4	1638.5	113.2	139.0
14-Oct-91	2736.0	0.5	2736.5	135.2	25.4	71.5	1.8	233.9	115.8	2618.4	1724.2	401.0	100.0
15-Oct-91	2264.0	0.5	2264.5	37.0	21.3	24.8	1.8	84.9	119.2	2298.8	1703.2	111.6	113.0
16-Oct-91	2432.0	0.6	2432.6	45.3	21.3	23.9	1.9	92.4	117.2	2457.4	1724.7	90.4	82.0
17-Oct-91	2171.0	0.6	2171.6	37.0	21.5	22.7	1.8	83.0	116.2	2204.8	1726.2	81.9	133.0
18-Oct-91	2331.0	0.4	2331.4	117.2	23.2	59.8	1.8	202.0	117.0	2246.4	1671.4	276.4	102.0
19-Oct-91	2822.0	0.4	2822.4	46.0	21.2	24.6	1.9	93.7	113.2	2841.9	1668.9	141.3	109.0
20-Oct-91	2257.0	0.4	2257.4	110.7	21.2	27.7	1.8	161.4	112.8	2208.8	1645.2	143.5	110.0
21-Oct-91	2077.0	0.6	2077.6	55.7	21.4	23.2	1.8	102.1	117.1	2092.6	1709.8	96.6	80.0
22-Oct-91	2413.0	0.6	2413.6	37.0	21.3	21.2	2.0	81.5	116.8	2448.9	1733.7	79.5	117.0
23-Oct-91	2379.0	0.6	2379.6	88.9	22.6	24.2	1.8	137.5	115.5	2357.6	1738.9	105.0	113.0
24-Oct-91	4829.0	0.6	4829.6	132.4	25.7	610.6	1.8	770.5	123.7	4182.8	1678.8	4142.3	154.0
25-Oct-91	8084.0	0.5	8084.5	263.2	36.6	1206.3	1.9	1508.0	122.5	6699.0	1682.6	7585.4	855.0
26-Oct-91	8737.0	0.5	8737.5	311.7	41.8	1553.6	1.8	1908.9	131.2	6959.8	1645.6	8563.5	82.0
27-Oct-91	6024.0	0.5	6024.5	303.6	35.2	486.9	1.9	827.6	115.4	5312.3	1673.9	2085.1	474.0
28-Oct-91	4239.0	0.5	4239.5	285.1	28.4	581.3	1.9	896.7	117.8	3460.6	1670.3	2148.8	143.0
29-Oct-91	4501.0	0.6	4501.6	270.8	31.3	491.1	1.9	795.1	116.5	3823.0	1674.8	1890.2	431.0
30-Oct-91	9241.0	0.5	9241.5	205.5	46.1	1514.2	1.9	1767.7	131.2	7605.0	1659.0	7809.4	83.0
31-Oct-91	5894.0	0.6	5894.6	239.3	36.5	450.4	1.9	728.1	117.9	5284.4	1667.9	2382.2	104.0
Averages	4098.1	0.5	4098.6	151.1	27.9	362.4	1.8	543.2	118.4	3673.8	1711.0	2058.8	173.2

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
November 1991 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Nov-91	6087.0	0.5	6087.5	279.2	40.2	759.9	1.5	1080.8	105.1	5111.8	1669.4	4740.0	313.0
02-Nov-91	4907.0	0.4	4907.4	283.2	32.2	366.7	1.6	683.7	97.3	4321.0	1660.0	1743.8	39.0
03-Nov-91	3773.0	0.4	3773.4	165.0	28.3	247.9	1.6	442.8	96.9	3427.5	1631.4	1063.6	44.0
04-Nov-91	3320.0	0.3	3320.3	53.6	28.3	168.8	1.7	252.4	98.5	3166.4	1675.4	702.7	57.0
05-Nov-91	2609.0	0.4	2609.4	51.5	28.3	129.9	1.4	211.1	98.3	2496.6	1666.3	557.6	51.0
06-Nov-91	2759.0	0.3	2759.3	92.9	27.2	112.4	1.5	234.0	99.6	2624.9	1688.8	495.8	80.0
07-Nov-91	2534.0	0.4	2534.4	43.5	26.3	96.9	1.6	168.3	98.2	2464.3	1651.7	381.9	73.0
08-Nov-91	2362.0	0.4	2362.4	136.3	25.1	97.1	1.5	260.0	98.2	2200.6	1654.7	357.7	87.0
09-Nov-91	2480.0	0.5	2480.5	45.6	24.3	84.5	1.5	155.9	97.0	2421.6	1662.4	253.1	81.0
10-Nov-91	2423.0	0.7	2423.7	52.3	23.4	152.7	1.3	229.7	94.2	2288.2	1612.3	397.7	82.0
11-Nov-91	2243.0	0.4	2243.4	143.5	25.3	118.0	1.6	288.4	97.8	2052.8	1680.1	380.7	73.0
12-Nov-91	2462.0	0.3	2462.3	44.0	24.3	89.2	1.6	159.1	99.3	2402.5	1671.4	256.6	77.0
13-Nov-91	2134.0	0.4	2134.4	43.6	25.2	83.4	1.6	153.8	98.1	2078.7	1656.4	219.4	77.0
14-Nov-91	3374.0	0.4	3374.4	82.7	25.4	592.1	1.5	701.7	106.3	2779.0	1674.3	2142.9	223.0
15-Nov-91	4338.0	0.4	4338.4	247.2	34.3	571.0	1.3	853.8	101.6	3586.2	1655.7	2381.2	177.0
16-Nov-91	3638.0	0.5	3638.5	308.1	26.2	267.2	1.4	602.9	95.0	3130.6	1620.7	1205.4	77.0
17-Nov-91	2889.0	0.4	2889.4	50.4	24.3	175.1	1.5	251.3	96.2	2734.3	1610.2	621.8	69.0
18-Nov-91	3500.0	0.6	3500.6	253.4	32.3	392.6	1.5	679.8	98.0	2918.8	1647.2	1476.9	65.0
19-Nov-91	3503.0	0.5	3503.5	93.6	34.2	568.5	1.6	697.9	106.1	2911.7	1661.4	3238.6	130.0
20-Nov-91	5083.0	0.4	5083.4	233.3	46.2	432.9	1.4	713.8	97.7	4467.3	1630.7	2750.0	55.0
21-Nov-91	4899.0	0.5	4899.5	296.2	33.3	239.2	1.4	570.1	97.7	4427.1	1645.5	1841.8	63.0
22-Nov-91	3823.0	0.4	3823.4	48.2	29.4	167.2	1.6	246.4	96.2	3673.2	1626.4	965.4	72.0
23-Nov-91	3578.0	0.3	3578.3	53.4	32.2	232.2	1.8	319.6	96.8	3355.5	1613.3	951.7	54.0
24-Nov-91	2560.0	0.3	2560.3	145.0	27.3	154.6	1.5	328.4	94.5	2326.4	1590.4	709.8	68.0
25-Nov-91	2682.0	0.5	2682.5	43.0	27.2	127.0	1.8	199.0	98.0	2581.5	1666.8	466.4	58.0
26-Nov-91	2671.0	0.4	2671.4	52.6	26.3	118.0	1.6	198.5	95.3	2568.2	1657.0	394.8	56.0
27-Nov-91	2705.0	0.4	2705.4	268.0	27.2	394.0	1.5	690.7	100.8	2115.5	1668.0	1413.0	55.0
28-Nov-91	3511.0	0.4	3511.4	134.4	36.2	969.8	1.5	1141.9	107.8	2477.3	1608.2	4303.0	59.0
29-Nov-91	6237.0	0.5	6237.5	262.2	45.3	854.9	1.6	1164.0	102.0	5175.5	1591.2	3779.1	61.0
30-Nov-91	5950.0	0.3	5950.3	301.6	44.3	509.3	1.5	856.7	97.5	5191.1	1584.5	3324.7	55.0
Averages	3501.1	0.4	3501.5	143.6	30.3	309.1	1.5	484.5	98.9	3115.9	1644.4	1450.6	84.4

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
December 1991 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Dec-91	5138.0	0.8	5138.8	291.5	35.9	342.9	1.7	672.0	102.2	4569.0	1593.9	1886.1	47.0
02-Dec-91	4029.0	0.8	4029.8	66.9	32.9	288.7	1.8	390.3	105.8	3745.3	1636.5	1287.6	54.0
03-Dec-91	3450.0	0.8	3450.8	59.4	37.9	213.9	1.9	313.1	99.4	3237.1	1646.3	955.8	76.0
04-Dec-91	3732.0	1.0	3733.0	142.4	30.9	185.4	1.8	360.5	98.6	3471.1	1646.9	840.3	64.0
05-Dec-91	2918.0	0.9	2918.9	48.2	27.8	167.7	1.8	245.5	103.2	2776.6	1652.0	633.3	53.0
06-Dec-91	2631.0	0.8	2631.8	225.0	27.9	534.2	1.9	789.0	108.7	1951.5	1652.0	1448.9	65.0
07-Dec-91	3960.0	0.8	3960.8	356.7	34.1	657.9	1.8	1050.5	107.6	3017.9	1631.2	4142.3	62.0
08-Dec-91	5212.0	0.9	5212.9	299.5	36.8	529.6	1.9	867.8	102.9	4448.0	1627.0	2611.1	64.0
09-Dec-91	4368.0	1.0	4369.0	205.0	35.8	317.7	1.9	560.4	102.8	3911.4	1653.5	1742.5	57.0
10-Dec-91	3600.0	0.9	3600.9	59.1	30.9	235.1	1.8	326.9	103.4	3377.4	1654.5	1130.8	58.0
11-Dec-91	3462.0	0.9	3462.9	55.0	29.9	193.8	1.8	280.5	102.3	3284.7	1665.6	793.6	56.0
12/12/199	4766.0	1.0	4767.0	261.1	43.8	539.3	1.7	845.9	107.7	4028.8	1640.3	2503.1	62.0
13-Dec-91	3679.0	1.0	3680.0	204.3	38.8	283.7	2.0	528.8	102.7	3253.9	1632.9	1701.8	60.0
14-Dec-91	4112.0	0.9	4112.9	56.6	35.9	231.1	1.8	325.4	98.9	3886.4	1614.5	1275.5	50.0
15-Dec-91	2777.0	1.0	2778.0	59.5	31.9	183.4	1.8	276.6	100.6	2602.0	1613.3	793.4	50.0
16-Dec-91	2771.0	1.0	2772.0	143.0	29.8	169.1	1.8	343.7	103.9	2532.2	1656.0	635.4	50.0
17-Dec-91	2857.0	0.9	2857.9	48.0	30.9	149.2	1.9	230.0	105.1	2733.0	1680.8	505.7	245.0
18-Dec-91	2919.0	1.0	2920.0	47.8	28.8	140.1	2.1	218.8	101.3	2802.5	1670.3	430.7	55.0
19-Dec-91	2610.0	0.9	2610.9	42.1	25.9	133.3	1.8	203.1	105.4	2513.2	1694.7	385.5	63.0
20-Dec-91	2656.0	0.9	2656.9	173.1	25.0	326.1	1.8	526.0	106.5	2237.4	1645.1	1104.4	62.0
21-Dec-91	2839.0	0.9	2839.9	160.0	25.8	206.7	1.8	394.3	101.8	2547.4	1618.7	552.3	56.0
22-Dec-91	2551.0	0.8	2551.8	60.7	23.9	231.2	1.8	317.6	102.2	2336.4	1592.0	578.6	50.0
23-Dec-91	2579.0	0.9	2579.9	148.2	27.9	262.3	1.8	440.2	102.6	2242.3	1611.8	879.6	56.0
24-Dec-91	2636.0	0.9	2636.9	73.1	25.9	187.5	1.8	288.3	101.3	2449.9	1633.6	505.1	76.0
25-Dec-91	2357.0	0.8	2357.8	49.5	24.1	167.1	1.7	242.4	101.6	2217.0	1568.8	452.2	62.0
26-Dec-91	2401.0	0.9	2401.9	121.4	23.8	219.8	1.7	366.7	100.0	2135.2	1618.1	630.5	56.0
27-Dec-91	2487.0	0.9	2487.9	77.1	25.0	145.8	1.7	249.6	102.1	2340.4	1633.2	487.0	68.0
28-Dec-91	2311.0	0.9	2311.9	53.8	25.9	121.5	1.7	202.9	102.1	2211.1	1601.4	352.2	73.0
29-Dec-91	2318.0	0.8	2318.8	49.3	26.0	108.7	1.8	185.8	101.4	2234.4	1605.7	316.5	71.0
30-Dec-91	2250.0	1.0	2251.0	119.2	26.1	108.0	1.9	255.2	102.9	2098.7	1619.4	335.8	78.0
31-Dec-91	2386.0	0.8	2386.8	43.2	24.9	97.8	1.8	167.7	101.5	2320.6	1623.5	268.1	73.0
Averages	3185.9	0.9	3186.8	122.6	30.0	247.7	1.8	402.1	102.9	2887.6	1633.3	1037.6	66.8

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
January 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Jan-92	2427.0	2.2	2429.2	52.8	23.6	94.9	1.8	173.1	106.8	2362.9	1554.4	259.0	60.0
02-Jan-92	2382.0	2.2	2384.2	117.1	23.7	97.8	1.9	240.5	109.2	2252.9	1605.5	330.4	61.0
03-Jan-92	2407.0	2.2	2409.2	43.2	25.7	89.3	1.8	160.0	111.0	2360.2	1622.5	264.9	72.0
04-Jan-92	2193.0	2.2	2195.2	43.6	24.7	86.7	1.9	156.9	109.6	2147.9	1613.9	255.2	75.0
05-Jan-92	2334.0	2.1	2336.1	123.7	23.7	90.3	1.9	239.6	108.4	2204.9	1596.7	306.5	57.0
06-Jan-92	2193.0	2.1	2195.1	43.8	24.8	81.9	2.0	152.5	111.5	2154.1	1643.3	239.7	63.0
07-Jan-92	2417.0	2.2	2419.2	59.5	23.8	80.8	1.9	166.0	110.2	2363.4	1639.4	245.7	78.0
08-Jan-92	2916.0	2.2	2918.2	89.5	27.6	81.2	1.8	200.1	109.7	2827.8	1650.3	290.0	71.0
09-Jan-92	2527.0	2.2	2529.2	225.5	24.7	372.1	2.0	624.3	115.1	2020.0	1648.4	1290.0	62.0
10-Jan-92	2253.0	2.2	2255.2	110.2	23.7	140.8	2.1	276.8	111.9	2090.3	1643.0	415.8	60.0
11-Jan-92	2415.0	2.2	2417.2	53.9	23.8	107.1	1.9	186.7	109.2	2339.7	1621.6	314.1	65.0
12-Jan-92	2299.0	2.2	2301.2	86.5	22.6	111.4	1.8	222.3	108.8	2187.7	1614.8	396.1	58.0
13-Jan-92	2418.0	2.3	2420.3	82.1	25.7	225.6	1.9	335.3	111.1	2196.1	1621.2	702.6	71.0
14-Jan-92	2645.0	2.3	2647.3	43.5	38.7	107.5	1.8	191.5	111.1	2566.9	1638.7	377.3	72.0
15-Jan-92	2444.0	2.3	2446.3	132.4	27.7	99.0	2.0	261.1	111.1	2296.3	1641.2	338.8	67.0
16-Jan-92	2207.0	2.2	2209.2	43.8	22.7	83.9	1.9	152.3	112.2	2169.1	1657.0	249.7	76.0
17-Jan-92	2503.0	2.2	2505.2	44.1	22.6	78.3	1.9	146.9	113.0	2471.3	1668.3	231.8	104.0
18-Jan-92	2261.0	2.2	2263.2	133.3	21.6	80.3	2.0	237.2	109.2	2135.2	1650.3	283.3	75.0
19-Jan-92	2151.0	2.1	2153.1	44.1	20.8	69.4	1.8	136.1	110.1	2127.1	1626.9	209.5	57.0
20-Jan-92	2459.0	2.2	2461.2	44.2	22.8	65.9	1.9	134.8	114.4	2440.8	1694.9	201.6	69.0
21-Jan-92	2342.0	2.2	2344.2	151.2	22.7	200.3	2.0	376.2	113.7	2081.7	1706.9	550.4	87.0
22-Jan-92	2386.0	2.4	2388.4	127.5	23.7	370.4	1.9	523.5	119.4	1984.3	1679.1	1867.9	76.0
23-Jan-92	3352.0	2.2	3354.2	227.7	28.8	233.5	1.9	491.9	112.9	2975.2	1676.1	874.2	63.0
24-Jan-92	2792.0	2.3	2794.3	52.1	26.7	103.3	2.2	184.3	111.1	2721.1	1687.7	450.0	73.0
25-Jan-92	2527.0	2.2	2529.2	44.7	25.6	80.3	2.2	152.8	109.9	2486.3	1643.7	337.6	55.0
26-Jan-92	2715.0	2.2	2717.2	44.6	23.8	67.8	1.9	138.1	110.8	2689.9	1631.2	274.0	56.0
27-Jan-92	2696.0	2.3	2698.3	121.9	23.8	66.6	1.9	214.2	110.5	2594.6	1671.2	296.2	77.0
28-Jan-92	2410.0	2.3	2412.3	46.0	23.7	69.5	1.9	141.1	114.2	2385.4	1665.1	242.1	75.0
29-Jan-92	2320.0	2.2	2322.2	141.8	22.5	195.4	1.9	361.6	113.2	2073.8	1668.0	732.4	87.0
30-Jan-92	2337.0	2.2	2339.2	106.6	22.7	260.0	1.9	391.2	115.0	2063.0	1659.1	722.8	69.0
31-Jan-92	2470.0	2.3	2472.3	123.6	23.7	150.4	1.9	299.6	112.7	2285.4	1665.0	555.8	67.0
Averages	2458.0	2.2	2460.2	90.5	24.6	130.4	1.9	247.4	111.5	2324.3	1645.3	455.0	69.6

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
February 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Feb-92	2294.0	1.6	2295.6	42.2	25.2	104.2	1.6	173.2	125.7	2248.1	1625.5	394.0	60.0
02-Feb-92	2444.0	1.7	2445.7	101.6	23.2	151.4	1.6	277.8	129.7	2297.6	1629.8	510.3	59.0
03-Feb-92	2277.0	1.8	2278.8	71.8	24.2	99.4	1.7	197.1	126.6	2208.3	1650.3	394.9	66.0
04-Feb-92	2583.0	1.8	2584.8	97.2	26.2	70.2	1.6	195.2	128.9	2518.5	1668.8	334.9	67.0
05-Feb-92	2705.0	1.7	2706.7	44.6	24.0	57.5	1.6	127.7	128.2	2707.2	1664.9	313.0	59.0
06-Feb-92	2487.0	1.7	2488.7	44.1	24.2	54.5	1.7	124.5	128.5	2492.7	1667.6	295.7	70.0
07-Feb-92	2365.0	1.6	2366.6	121.4	25.2	59.2	1.6	207.4	127.2	2286.4	1652.3	324.9	73.0
08-Feb-92	2398.0	1.6	2399.6	44.1	24.3	53.0	1.7	123.1	126.5	2403.0	1653.1	229.1	72.0
09-Feb-92	2301.0	1.7	2302.7	106.1	23.3	57.7	1.6	188.7	126.9	2240.9	1636.1	238.1	67.0
10-Feb-92	2195.0	2.0	2197.0	70.8	22.3	105.3	1.6	200.0	127.3	2124.3	1635.3	296.0	59.0
11-Feb-92	2298.0	1.6	2299.6	52.3	25.2	83.3	1.7	162.5	127.2	2264.3	1631.3	312.3	59.0
12-Feb-92	2227.0	1.7	2228.7	84.2	23.2	67.8	1.7	176.9	127.3	2179.1	1642.1	241.3	71.0
13-Feb-92	2328.0	1.6	2329.6	78.0	23.1	62.6	1.7	165.4	127.8	2292.0	1667.3	220.5	55.0
14-Feb-92	2366.0	1.7	2367.7	73.6	23.2	362.1	1.6	460.5	131.0	2038.2	1624.4	1318.4	67.0
15-Feb-92	4450.0	1.6	4451.6	273.3	55.1	730.8	1.6	1060.8	131.7	3522.5	1619.1	4517.0	67.0
16-Feb-92	3801.0	1.7	3802.7	249.1	31.2	262.3	1.6	544.2	126.1	3384.6	1597.3	1202.4	57.0
17-Feb-92	3492.0	1.7	3493.7	49.9	28.1	222.8	1.6	302.4	125.6	3316.9	1657.6	789.4	57.0
18-Feb-92	3716.0	1.7	3717.7	233.0	40.2	609.0	1.6	883.8	132.7	2966.6	1627.3	2523.3	212.0
19-Feb-92	4038.0	1.6	4039.6	231.8	32.0	262.4	1.6	527.8	126.4	3638.2	1637.5	1558.7	109.0
20-Feb-92	3260.0	1.7	3261.7	54.9	29.1	163.7	1.6	249.3	127.6	3140.0	1645.0	896.0	43.0
21-Feb-92	2965.0	1.7	2966.7	51.5	30.2	125.4	1.6	208.7	127.2	2885.2	1621.9	676.2	66.0
22-Feb-92	2932.0	1.7	2933.7	43.0	28.1	104.6	1.6	177.3	126.0	2882.4	1601.0	536.5	62.0
23-Feb-92	2776.0	1.7	2777.7	118.3	28.2	100.1	1.6	248.2	126.6	2656.1	1592.8	502.4	66.0
24-Feb-92	2728.0	1.7	2729.7	69.2	30.3	424.1	1.7	525.3	132.3	2336.7	1632.5	1717.5	67.0
25-Feb-92	3573.0	1.6	3574.6	297.2	35.3	287.1	1.6	621.2	128.2	3081.6	1637.4	1143.3	71.0
26-Feb-92	2910.0	1.7	2911.7	85.6	28.0	184.0	1.6	299.2	128.1	2740.6	1646.2	731.0	52.0
27-Feb-92	2806.0	1.6	2807.6	52.0	28.2	137.6	1.6	219.4	127.8	2716.0	1621.8	551.3	62.0
28-Feb-92	2890.0	1.7	2891.7	94.8	29.1	119.6	1.7	245.2	126.8	2773.3	1608.5	532.8	59.0
29-Feb-92	2616.0	1.7	2617.7	85.7	26.1	104.7	1.6	218.1	125.3	2524.9	1589.2	427.9	61.0
Averages	2835.2	1.7	2836.9	104.2	28.1	180.2	1.6	314.1	127.8	2650.6	1633.9	818.2	69.5

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
March 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Mar-92	2565.0	1.6	2566.6	43.5	24.0	94.5	1.8	163.8	154.6	2557.4	1587.3	348.8	51.0
02-Mar-92	2488.0	1.6	2489.6	43.1	26.1	90.0	1.7	160.9	155.0	2483.7	1639.3	317.5	72.0
03-Mar-92	2430.0	1.6	2431.6	127.8	26.9	93.3	1.8	249.8	152.4	2334.2	1638.6	360.4	68.0
04-Mar-92	2341.0	1.5	2342.5	44.7	26.0	84.4	1.8	156.9	156.2	2341.8	1648.7	264.2	62.0
05-Mar-92	2534.0	1.9	2535.9	54.5	26.8	121.7	1.7	204.7	154.5	2485.7	1627.0	420.8	82.0
06-Mar-92	3731.0	1.6	3732.6	182.6	41.0	329.6	1.8	555.0	157.4	3335.0	1607.5	1907.1	145.0
07-Mar-92	3604.0	1.5	3605.5	276.5	36.9	230.3	1.7	545.4	156.9	3217.0	1585.7	1300.0	65.0
08-Mar-92	3335.0	1.5	3336.5	41.5	29.1	128.5	1.8	200.9	152.8	3288.4	1591.4	697.4	80.0
09-Mar-92	3761.0	1.6	3762.6	70.3	37.9	665.3	1.8	775.3	164.1	3151.4	1591.6	3256.9	258.0
10-Mar-92	4594.0	1.5	4595.5	244.4	71.3	315.1	1.7	632.5	155.5	4118.5	1636.8	2059.8	71.0
11-Mar-92	3455.0	1.5	3456.5	239.1	35.9	216.4	1.9	493.3	156.6	3119.8	1620.7	1032.1	70.0
12-Mar-92	3298.0	1.5	3299.5	74.2	36.9	152.2	1.7	265.0	157.5	3192.0	1629.5	712.1	68.0
13-Mar-92	2945.0	1.5	2946.5	59.0	30.9	142.0	1.6	233.5	157.0	2870.0	1636.0	700.7	63.0
14-Mar-92	2800.0	1.4	2801.4	143.3	30.0	123.1	1.3	297.7	155.8	2659.5	1612.7	573.7	61.0
15-Mar-92	2969.0	1.5	2970.5	49.8	29.0	97.3	2.6	178.7	154.0	2945.8	1586.3	430.5	56.0
16-Mar-92	2822.0	1.5	2823.5	52.8	28.9	232.9	2.3	316.9	158.5	2665.1	1619.7	821.5	53.0
17-Mar-92	3212.0	1.4	3213.4	271.3	32.9	203.2	1.6	509.0	156.6	2861.0	1619.3	1008.9	61.0
18-Mar-92	2732.0	1.5	2733.5	51.5	28.9	123.9	1.8	206.1	156.3	2683.7	1615.5	508.8	66.0
19-Mar-92	2437.0	1.5	2438.5	42.9	29.9	103.2	1.5	177.5	157.1	2418.1	1622.3	433.4	72.0
20-Mar-92	2850.0	1.4	2851.4	43.0	28.1	92.4	1.9	165.4	155.4	2841.4	1613.1	379.9	69.0
21-Mar-92	2495.0	1.4	2496.4	212.1	27.9	361.9	1.9	603.8	163.0	2055.6	1615.6	2578.2	84.0
22-Mar-92	3303.0	1.4	3304.4	271.6	40.0	448.0	1.7	761.3	155.7	2698.8	1585.1	1517.0	66.0
23-Mar-92	3665.0	1.5	3666.5	239.4	30.0	553.4	1.7	824.5	168.8	3010.8	1644.1	1880.2	71.0
24-Mar-92	3609.0	1.6	3610.6	251.6	28.9	422.1	1.8	704.4	162.9	3069.1	1643.2	1409.1	66.0
25-Mar-92	3937.0	1.5	3938.5	173.7	27.9	206.0	1.8	409.4	157.8	3686.9	1626.4	936.5	318.0
26-Mar-92	3669.0	1.6	3670.6	41.9	30.9	147.4	1.8	222.0	155.3	3603.9	1621.7	773.5	62.0
27-Mar-92	3087.0	1.6	3088.6	43.5	39.0	122.4	1.8	206.7	155.1	3037.0	1601.8	631.0	69.0
28-Mar-92	3102.0	1.7	3103.7	50.8	28.8	111.7	1.7	193.0	154.3	3065.0	1589.0	572.2	60.0
29-Mar-92	3170.0	1.7	3171.7	152.1	31.0	289.9	1.7	474.7	155.8	2852.8	1568.5	1248.3	68.0
30-Mar-92	3132.0	1.7	3133.7	153.9	33.0	167.8	1.8	356.5	158.2	2935.4	1606.4	713.7	62.0
31-Mar-92	3003.0	1.7	3004.7	52.5	29.8	130.9	1.7	214.9	154.5	2944.3	1609.2	688.1	71.0
Averages	3131.5	1.5	3133.0	122.5	32.4	212.9	1.8	369.6	157.0	2920.4	1614.2	983.3	83.5

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
April 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Apr-92	2858.0	1.7	2859.7	89.7	32.9	117.5	1.8	241.9	190.1	2807.9	1622.0	536.1	71.0
02-Apr-92	2770.0	1.9	2771.9	87.1	30.9	118.1	1.7	237.8	190.6	2724.7	1631.4	507.5	69.0
03-Apr-92	2489.0	1.7	2490.7	61.1	30.9	125.0	1.8	218.8	192.0	2463.9	1626.8	523.7	70.0
04-Apr-92	2901.0	1.7	2902.7	42.5	32.0	100.4	1.7	176.6	190.0	2916.1	1591.0	419.8	88.0
05-Apr-92	2353.0	1.7	2354.7	124.1	30.1	100.0	1.7	255.9	189.5	2288.3	1547.5	424.6	89.0
06-Apr-92	2516.0	1.8	2517.8	43.1	31.0	90.7	1.8	166.6	192.7	2543.9	1624.7	320.3	70.0
07-Apr-92	2607.0	1.7	2608.7	55.4	31.1	88.6	1.8	176.9	191.8	2623.6	1644.8	310.7	125.0
08-Apr-92	2786.0	1.9	2787.9	106.0	30.9	89.5	1.7	228.1	192.7	2752.5	1642.3	331.3	226.0
09-Apr-92	2554.0	1.7	2555.7	44.6	31.0	81.6	1.8	159.0	192.9	2589.6	1638.1	269.3	86.0
10-Apr-92	3396.0	1.6	3397.6	43.6	31.9	112.0	1.7	189.2	193.4	3401.8	1621.1	359.4	376.0
11-Apr-92	3587.0	1.6	3588.6	210.2	42.0	149.0	1.5	402.7	190.9	3376.8	1605.7	780.9	553.0
12-Apr-92	2508.0	1.6	2509.6	44.3	34.0	88.8	1.2	168.3	191.5	2532.8	1559.3	370.4	78.0
13-Apr-92	3661.0	1.7	3662.7	43.9	34.1	89.8	1.4	169.2	191.1	3684.6	1614.1	297.0	931.0
14-Apr-92	2808.0	1.6	2809.6	202.2	36.9	183.0	1.5	423.6	193.4	2579.4	1611.4	619.9	86.0
15-Apr-92	7961.0	1.6	7962.6	175.4	48.0	719.3	1504.8	2447.5	201.8	5716.9	1620.5	3757.2	87.0
16-Apr-92	8614.0	1.6	8615.6	232.0	47.0	668.0	3351.5	4298.5	197.2	4514.3	1612.4	2603.5	100.0
17-Apr-92	7111.0	1.6	7112.6	259.4	41.9	298.8	2596.8	3196.9	191.5	4107.2	1589.7	1118.8	137.0
18-Apr-92	7340.0	1.6	7341.6	79.8	40.9	273.3	3388.7	3782.7	191.0	3749.9	1562.8	885.0	154.0
19-Apr-92	7092.0	1.7	7093.7	123.1	42.0	177.2	3473.8	3816.1	189.3	3466.9	1549.4	749.2	123.0
20-Apr-92	7050.0	1.7	7051.7	58.5	44.0	136.5	3448.8	3687.8	193.4	3557.3	1632.3	634.4	124.0
21-Apr-92	6761.0	1.6	6762.6	100.8	42.0	113.2	3518.8	3774.8	191.7	3179.5	1625.7	476.7	117.0
22-Apr-92	7179.0	1.6	7180.6	72.0	41.9	98.3	3368.8	3581.0	193.4	3793.0	1606.0	363.4	106.0
23-Apr-92	7534.0	1.6	7535.6	43.2	43.5	130.9	3573.8	3791.4	193.3	3937.5	1617.3	323.3	127.0
24-Apr-92	7397.0	1.5	7398.5	163.7	51.4	262.8	3358.8	3836.7	193.9	3755.7	1597.4	829.5	135.0
25-Apr-92	7327.0	1.7	7328.7	54.2	47.2	140.3	3558.6	3800.3	190.6	3719.0	1564.8	463.9	159.0
26-Apr-92	7169.0	1.6	7170.6	43.2	45.9	132.6	3647.8	3869.5	190.6	3491.7	1536.6	359.0	159.0
27-Apr-92	7211.0	1.6	7212.6	57.3	49.1	105.2	3763.9	3975.5	191.6	3428.7	1604.3	303.9	91.0
28-Apr-92	6686.0	1.6	6687.6	107.7	46.0	97.5	3188.9	3440.1	192.1	3439.6	1640.9	325.1	128.0
29-Apr-92	6765.0	1.7	6766.7	43.6	44.0	86.2	3410.6	3584.4	192.3	3374.6	1646.6	279.5	137.0
30-Apr-92	6816.0	1.8	6817.8	43.6	45.9	81.9	3472.9	3644.3	191.2	3364.7	1639.0	253.6	140.0
Averages	5193.6	1.7	5195.3	95.2	39.3	168.5	1755.0	2058.0	192.3	3329.6	1607.5	659.9	164.7

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
May 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-May-92	6583.0	3.0	6586.0	113.1	43.7	83.6	3026.8	3267.2	281.3	3600.1	1694.6	272.4	186.0
02-May-92	6732.0	2.7	6734.7	44.1	42.9	74.7	3120.9	3282.6	282.8	3734.9	1702.9	199.8	214.0
03-May-92	6639.0	2.6	6641.6	43.7	40.9	70.8	3584.9	3740.3	284.8	3186.1	1634.1	189.8	176.0
04-May-92	6563.0	2.7	6565.7	115.3	40.9	72.8	3542.0	3771.0	283.6	3078.3	1693.1	226.0	145.0
05-May-92	6623.0	2.6	6625.6	43.8	41.8	64.1	3520.9	3670.6	281.8	3236.8	1679.0	167.2	141.0
06-May-92	6557.0	2.7	6559.7	44.3	39.5	60.9	3359.8	3504.5	281.5	3336.7	1696.6	155.4	168.0
07-May-92	6594.0	2.7	6596.7	134.1	37.0	64.4	3627.9	3863.4	282.3	3015.6	1759.3	212.1	187.0
08-May-92	6527.0	2.7	6529.7	44.4	37.6	54.4	3496.0	3632.4	284.6	3181.9	1818.2	139.1	211.0
09-May-92	6514.0	2.7	6516.7	44.8	38.3	51.1	3459.0	3593.2	283.0	3206.5	1851.6	129.3	246.0
10-May-92	6500.0	2.8	6502.8	126.7	36.2	54.4	3403.9	3621.2	283.5	3165.1	1843.0	183.6	220.0
11-May-92	6478.0	2.9	6480.9	45.4	35.5	44.8	3495.0	3620.7	282.9	3143.1	1906.3	109.5	173.0
12-May-92	6541.0	2.8	6543.8	36.9	37.3	42.7	3590.8	3707.7	284.5	3120.6	1896.7	112.7	176.0
13-May-92	6540.0	2.6	6542.6	56.9	41.1	41.3	3525.9	3665.2	285.6	3163.0	1812.3	296.3	157.0
14-May-92	6506.0	2.7	6508.7	109.1	35.9	42.7	3442.1	3629.8	285.2	3164.1	1807.3	178.5	172.0
15-May-92	6465.0	2.7	6467.7	44.0	35.0	35.8	3532.1	3646.9	286.1	3106.9	1905.1	101.6	225.0
16-May-92	6469.0	2.9	6471.9	44.1	38.2	33.5	3327.0	3442.8	285.9	3315.0	2021.2	97.6	229.0
17-May-92	6613.0	2.9	6615.9	118.1	36.6	36.9	3289.9	3481.5	285.5	3419.9	1965.2	177.0	226.0
18-May-92	6298.0	2.7	6300.7	44.8	35.9	29.7	3433.9	3544.3	286.1	3042.5	1872.7	79.9	169.0
19-May-92	5945.0	2.8	5947.8	84.4	34.1	31.2	3362.0	3511.7	287.3	2723.4	1996.2	100.8	225.0
20-May-92	4083.0	2.9	4085.9	68.7	32.6	27.9	1853.9	1983.1	290.3	2393.1	2136.1	83.1	207.0
21-May-92	2337.0	3.0	2340.0	45.6	33.0	23.8	2.1	104.5	291.0	2526.5	2220.9	57.5	209.0
22-May-92	2685.0	3.0	2688.0	83.7	32.7	25.1	2.1	143.6	290.9	2835.3	2126.4	90.5	181.0
23-May-92	2641.0	2.7	2643.7	78.2	36.2	24.6	1.7	140.7	279.9	2782.9	1761.7	146.0	166.0
24-May-92	2914.0	2.7	2916.7	44.8	39.0	20.7	1.9	106.4	275.6	3085.9	1625.4	92.5	156.0
25-May-92	2535.0	2.7	2537.7	126.5	32.0	26.6	1.9	187.0	276.3	2627.0	1683.7	123.0	180.0
26-May-92	2428.0	2.7	2430.7	45.6	31.4	19.6	2.0	98.6	281.0	2613.1	1706.7	55.0	140.0
27-May-92	2378.0	2.8	2380.8	44.7	28.9	18.7	2.0	94.3	285.7	2572.2	1866.2	52.6	167.0
28-May-92	2768.0	2.9	2770.9	44.4	28.2	17.5	2.0	92.1	281.1	2959.9	2006.7	43.7	377.0
29-May-92	2884.0	2.7	2886.7	117.4	28.5	21.9	2.1	169.9	283.7	3000.5	2027.5	94.3	167.0
30-May-92	2617.0	2.6	2619.6	60.9	32.6	16.1	1.9	111.5	282.5	2790.6	1790.7	166.3	224.0
31-May-92	2682.0	2.7	2684.7	44.6	27.8	14.8	2.1	89.3	283.4	2878.8	1929.9	63.4	197.0
Averages	5052.9	2.8	5055.7	69.1	35.8	40.2	2161.8	2306.9	283.9	3032.7	1852.8	135.4	194.1

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
June 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Jun-92	3066.0	2.6	3068.6	138.5	29.4	21.0	2.3	191.2	348.5	3225.9	2089.5	110.2	535.0
02-Jun-92	3222.0	2.5	3224.5	36.9	29.4	13.0	2.3	81.6	351.7	3494.6	2148.3	41.5	536.0
03-Jun-92	3062.0	2.6	3064.6	36.9	29.6	12.1	2.6	81.2	348.8	3332.2	2225.7	33.6	525.0
04-Jun-92	3348.0	2.4	3350.4	69.6	30.7	13.8	2.4	116.5	344.7	3578.6	1979.3	73.8	394.0
05-Jun-92	3027.0	2.6	3029.6	86.4	31.9	14.9	2.1	135.3	343.1	3237.4	1915.5	121.6	527.0
06-Jun-92	3373.0	2.5	3375.5	36.9	30.1	10.6	2.2	79.8	338.8	3634.5	1967.9	76.3	537.0
07-Jun-92	3381.0	2.6	3383.6	36.9	32.4	10.1	2.3	81.7	341.0	3642.9	1963.2	78.2	560.0
08-Jun-92	3066.0	2.4	3068.4	116.9	30.1	15.3	2.3	164.6	342.6	3246.4	2106.3	104.9	567.0
09-Jun-92	3256.0	2.6	3258.6	45.6	30.3	9.5	2.3	87.7	344.4	3515.3	2157.1	45.8	593.0
10-Jun-92	3227.0	2.5	3229.5	61.0	30.5	10.7	2.5	104.7	348.0	3472.8	2265.7	52.7	721.0
11-Jun-92	3992.0	2.5	3994.5	93.7	30.8	12.8	2.7	140.0	349.7	4204.2	2363.9	70.2	941.0
12-Jun-92	4532.0	2.7	4534.7	36.9	30.0	8.7	2.5	78.1	352.4	4809.0	2440.5	28.5	1307.0
13-Jun-92	4652.0	2.7	4654.7	45.6	30.0	9.1	2.5	87.2	357.9	4925.4	2500.6	30.7	1268.0
14-Jun-92	4469.0	2.7	4471.7	118.4	33.3	14.6	2.5	168.8	350.2	4653.1	2399.0	85.6	1087.0
15-Jun-92	3008.0	2.8	3010.8	36.9	34.2	8.7	2.6	82.4	347.2	3275.6	2267.4	36.2	524.0
16-Jun-92	3349.0	2.8	3351.8	36.9	31.7	8.7	2.6	79.9	348.8	3620.7	2312.3	39.8	544.0
17-Jun-92	5780.0	2.7	5782.7	224.3	35.9	1123.7	2.4	1386.3	354.3	4750.7	2080.4	7853.6	364.0
18-Jun-92	4232.0	2.5	4234.5	246.4	34.1	51.6	2.2	334.3	340.5	4240.7	1902.2	401.3	396.0
19-Jun-92	3658.0	2.4	3660.4	36.9	30.1	12.5	2.4	81.9	342.7	3921.2	1838.7	75.4	484.0
20-Jun-92	3597.0	2.2	3599.2	36.9	30.1	10.8	2.1	79.9	344.0	3863.3	1781.4	53.7	545.0
21-Jun-92	3623.0	2.3	3625.3	66.1	30.2	12.0	2.4	110.7	341.7	3856.3	1808.0	61.5	548.0
22-Jun-92	3521.0	2.4	3523.4	97.8	25.7	13.6	2.3	139.4	343.1	3727.1	1887.8	75.7	510.0
23-Jun-92	2939.0	2.3	2941.3	36.9	25.3	9.0	2.4	73.6	341.4	3209.1	1906.0	36.2	447.0
24-Jun-92	3056.0	2.5	3058.5	45.6	27.6	9.2	2.2	84.6	342.0	3315.9	1990.1	34.5	524.0
25-Jun-92	3536.0	2.6	3538.6	115.5	26.8	14.4	2.4	159.1	341.9	3721.4	2099.1	79.5	540.0
26-Jun-92	3446.0	2.6	3448.6	36.9	26.9	8.7	2.2	74.7	342.0	3715.9	2125.1	39.4	762.0
27-Jun-92	3525.0	2.6	3527.6	36.9	27.1	8.7	2.2	74.9	348.0	3800.7	2083.1	34.4	881.0
28-Jun-92	3770.0	2.3	3772.3	122.4	25.1	14.9	2.3	164.7	341.7	3949.3	2105.5	90.3	893.0
29-Jun-92	3614.0	2.6	3616.6	45.5	25.3	9.1	2.5	82.4	346.9	3881.1	2301.0	32.1	884.0
30-Jun-92	3402.0	2.5	3404.5	36.9	27.0	8.7	2.4	75.0	345.1	3674.6	2291.6	35.2	938.0
Averages	3591.0	2.5	3593.5	74.0	29.7	50.0	2.4	156.1	345.8	3783.2	2110.1	331.1	662.7

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
July 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Jul-92	3818.0	2.6	3820.6	119.9	28.2	15.0	2.2	165.3	274.3	3929.6	2607.0	92.2	1317.0
02-Jul-92	6037.0	2.6	6039.6	134.8	33.5	370.2	2.2	540.7	278.1	5777.0	2423.0	1020.9	1959.0
03-Jul-92	5013.0	2.3	5015.3	235.0	35.4	31.0	2.0	303.4	264.5	4976.4	1943.4	280.4	1661.0
04-Jul-92	4244.0	2.5	4246.5	36.8	25.1	22.0	2.2	86.1	264.4	4424.8	1960.5	281.9	1240.0
05-Jul-92	4428.0	2.3	4430.3	163.0	24.5	54.1	2.0	243.6	264.5	4451.2	1900.1	269.5	1200.0
06-Jul-92	4079.0	2.6	4081.6	45.6	25.8	12.0	2.1	85.5	268.4	4264.5	2149.4	45.0	1243.0
07-Jul-92	4250.0	2.4	4252.4	44.3	26.8	21.4	2.2	94.7	268.5	4426.2	2041.2	84.7	1409.0
08-Jul-92	3644.0	2.7	3646.7	123.5	26.1	20.1	2.1	171.8	266.8	3741.7	2251.4	237.8	1278.0
09-Jul-92	3877.0	2.6	3879.6	60.0	28.1	11.6	2.3	102.0	269.0	4046.6	2302.1	112.8	1278.0
10-Jul-92	3573.0	2.6	3575.6	44.4	28.1	11.0	2.2	85.7	268.2	3758.1	2261.0	83.7	1247.0
11-Jul-92	4347.0	2.5	4349.5	83.3	28.0	40.4	2.1	153.8	268.9	4464.6	2324.1	522.0	1236.0
12-Jul-92	4668.0	2.7	4670.7	309.8	27.2	268.1	2.1	607.2	268.7	4332.2	1966.8	823.6	1372.0
13-Jul-92	6853.0	2.6	6855.6	153.9	32.1	633.0	2.0	821.0	279.3	6313.9	1936.6	4793.1	1321.0
14-Jul-92	5395.0	2.4	5397.4	307.7	51.1	470.8	1.9	831.5	272.1	4838.0	1925.6	2600.8	1936.0
15-Jul-92	4529.0	2.5	4531.5	285.4	38.1	60.5	2.0	386.0	265.8	4411.3	1960.7	592.2	953.0
16-Jul-92	4123.0	2.5	4125.5	44.3	31.0	30.3	2.0	107.6	265.5	4283.4	1927.0	210.4	1095.0
17-Jul-92	4115.0	2.8	4117.8	44.2	32.0	24.4	2.1	102.7	269.4	4284.5	2015.1	147.7	1242.0
18-Jul-92	4788.0	2.5	4790.5	239.4	29.0	460.5	2.0	730.9	267.6	4327.2	1958.1	1091.5	1000.0
19-Jul-92	4728.0	2.6	4730.6	45.6	28.1	40.5	2.0	116.2	265.2	4879.6	1945.9	118.4	1101.0
20-Jul-92	3654.0	2.5	3656.5	58.6	33.2	30.5	2.1	124.4	266.5	3798.6	1976.4	166.9	1284.0
21-Jul-92	4182.0	2.5	4184.5	109.8	32.0	28.3	2.0	172.1	268.7	4281.1	2037.4	144.0	1678.0
22-Jul-92	3473.0	2.3	3475.3	44.3	29.0	20.0	2.0	95.3	265.3	3645.3	1985.2	77.0	833.0
23-Jul-92	3975.0	2.3	3977.3	136.7	34.0	51.4	2.0	224.1	268.4	4021.6	1930.8	587.4	1182.0
24-Jul-92	3616.0	2.4	3618.4	36.9	30.0	18.7	2.0	87.6	265.6	3796.4	1932.3	189.4	1201.0
25-Jul-92	4068.0	2.4	4070.4	36.8	28.0	40.3	1.6	106.7	265.7	4229.4	1913.3	210.1	1165.0
26-Jul-92	4093.0	2.5	4095.5	220.4	32.0	206.0	1.4	459.8	265.3	3901.0	1877.4	793.4	1164.0
27-Jul-92	4041.0	2.6	4043.6	36.9	28.1	27.6	1.4	94.0	268.3	4217.9	2043.3	128.2	1402.0
28-Jul-92	3847.0	2.7	3849.7	78.4	28.1	175.6	1.7	283.8	268.6	3834.5	2140.3	340.1	1263.0
29-Jul-92	4309.0	2.5	4311.5	75.5	37.0	40.5	1.9	154.9	269.7	4426.3	2057.3	184.2	1082.0
30-Jul-92	4009.0	2.4	4011.4	190.2	33.1	368.4	2.0	593.7	275.5	3693.2	1912.4	1816.7	1139.0
31-Jul-92	4755.0	2.5	4757.5	254.5	52.1	166.3	2.0	474.9	267.4	4550.0	1938.7	878.4	1260.0
Averages	4339.7	2.5	4342.2	122.6	31.4	121.6	2.0	277.6	268.5	4333.1	2049.8	610.5	1282.0

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
August 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEDEVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEDEVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Aug-92	4334.0	2.6	4336.6	44.1	28.0	39.3	2.1	113.5	257.0	4480.1	1943.7	248.2	1245.0
02-Aug-92	3980.0	2.5	3982.5	118.2	23.1	49.6	2.1	193.0	258.7	4048.2	1902.7	512.4	1154.0
03-Aug-92	4008.0	2.6	4010.6	77.3	25.1	55.5	2.2	160.1	258.3	4108.8	1958.0	399.6	940.0
04-Aug-92	3801.0	1.9	3802.9	44.0	29.1	27.8	2.1	103.0	258.9	3958.8	1952.9	151.6	1306.0
05-Aug-92	4070.0	2.5	4072.5	147.2	26.0	31.9	1.9	207.0	261.1	4126.6	1971.0	176.1	1360.0
06-Aug-92	3751.0	2.6	3753.6	44.1	25.1	21.6	2.2	93.0	261.7	3922.3	2043.2	68.6	1290.0
07-Aug-92	3834.0	2.7	3836.7	57.6	24.1	118.0	2.2	201.9	264.5	3899.3	2001.6	1134.9	963.0
08-Aug-92	4082.0	2.7	4084.7	229.2	23.1	48.2	2.1	302.6	258.6	4040.7	1964.5	276.1	1284.0
09-Aug-92	4523.0	2.9	4525.9	44.2	24.2	22.3	2.2	92.9	258.8	4691.8	2219.6	98.2	1208.0
10-Aug-92	3349.0	3.1	3352.1	45.6	23.6	20.0	2.2	91.4	261.1	3521.8	2401.0	228.6	728.0
11-Aug-92	4083.0	2.5	4085.5	113.6	25.4	23.9	2.3	165.2	262.9	4183.2	2214.9	106.5	1215.0
12-Aug-92	4231.0	2.6	4233.6	86.6	40.4	52.9	2.1	182.0	261.1	4312.7	1998.0	583.1	718.0
13-Aug-92	3646.0	2.5	3648.5	101.1	29.1	24.1	2.1	156.4	258.6	3750.7	1901.4	219.7	1065.0
14-Aug-92	4002.0	2.3	4004.3	295.1	22.2	38.3	2.1	357.7	258.4	3905.0	1872.7	657.3	1061.0
15-Aug-92	3907.0	2.4	3909.4	36.9	21.3	16.7	2.0	76.9	257.7	4090.2	1905.1	60.1	1383.0
16-Aug-92	4014.0	2.5	4016.5	36.9	22.4	15.8	2.2	77.3	256.6	4195.8	1875.5	51.5	1350.0
17-Aug-92	3727.0	2.6	3729.6	36.9	21.7	15.0	2.1	75.7	259.4	3913.3	2000.3	38.3	1292.0
18-Aug-92	3301.0	2.6	3303.6	126.3	21.6	21.2	2.1	171.2	261.7	3394.1	2056.6	203.3	1082.0
19-Aug-92	3765.0	2.5	3767.5	45.6	21.4	14.3	2.0	83.3	259.7	3943.9	2071.1	36.2	1274.0
20-Aug-92	3711.0	2.6	3713.6	133.8	21.7	20.4	2.1	178.0	261.7	3797.3	2103.7	93.8	1314.0
21-Aug-92	3466.0	2.5	3468.5	44.3	21.1	12.9	2.2	80.5	261.3	3649.3	2179.3	22.2	1254.0
22-Aug-92	3764.0	2.6	3766.6	44.3	19.9	12.3	2.2	78.7	260.9	3948.8	2195.4	21.3	1283.0
23-Aug-92	3796.0	2.6	3798.6	131.0	20.0	18.3	2.1	171.4	261.4	3888.6	2245.4	102.9	1286.0
24-Aug-92	3465.0	2.8	3467.8	45.3	21.2	11.1	2.2	79.8	263.5	3651.5	2415.1	48.6	1239.0
25-Aug-92	3606.0	2.9	3608.9	36.9	20.8	11.5	2.2	71.4	263.6	3801.1	2469.5	68.2	1044.0
26-Aug-92	4022.0	2.7	4024.7	223.6	20.7	225.9	2.2	472.4	267.6	3819.9	2077.9	1091.5	691.0
27-Aug-92	5477.0	2.4	5479.4	243.7	64.2	854.1	2.1	1164.1	267.0	4582.3	1895.8	5295.5	1053.0
28-Aug-92	4798.0	2.4	4800.4	246.4	36.0	51.2	2.0	335.6	258.1	4722.9	1897.4	498.4	1122.0
29-Aug-92	4345.0	2.5	4347.5	168.8	24.9	55.5	2.0	251.2	259.5	4355.8	1890.2	508.1	1025.0
30-Aug-92	4251.0	2.3	4253.3	59.9	21.1	22.1	2.1	105.2	257.2	4405.3	1892.0	121.2	979.0
31-Aug-92	3562.0	2.4	3564.4	44.4	21.4	17.5	2.0	85.3	259.1	3738.2	1988.4	79.2	1078.0
Averages	3957.1	2.6	3959.7	101.7	25.5	63.5	2.1	192.8	260.5	4027.4	2048.5	425.8	1138.3

Lake Michigan Diversion Accounting - WY1992
September 1992 - Summary of Diversion Flows (All in cfs)

LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION ACCOUNTING WY 1992	ROMEOVILLE AVM GAGE RECORD	DIVERSIONS ABOVE THE GAGE	TOTAL FLOW THROUGH THE CANAL	GROUNDWATER PUMPAGE DISCHARGED INTO THE CANAL	WATER SUPPLY PUMPAGE FROM INDIANA REACHING THE CANAL	RUNOFF FROM THE DES PLAINES RIVER WATERSHED REACHING THE CANAL	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE BY FEDERAL FACILITIES DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DEDUCTION FROM THE ROMEOVILLE GAGE RECORD	LAKE MICHIGAN PUMPAGE NOT DISCHARGED TO THE CANAL	TOTAL DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	PUMPAGE FROM LAKE MICHIGAN ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	RUNOFF FROM THE DIVERTED LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED	DIRECT DIVERSION ACCOUNTABLE TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
DATE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01-Sep-92	3670.0	0.5	3670.5	45.6	23.8	15.5	1.8	86.7	241.4	3825.2	2006.3	59.3	1240.0
02-Sep-92	2987.0	0.7	2987.7	110.4	23.7	30.5	1.7	166.3	239.2	3060.6	1924.9	188.3	336.0
03-Sep-92	3527.0	0.5	3527.5	89.1	32.7	16.2	1.7	139.7	241.7	3629.5	1968.0	150.0	1016.0
04-Sep-92	3618.0	0.6	3618.6	36.9	20.7	13.0	1.7	72.3	240.8	3787.1	2015.2	149.2	1246.0
05-Sep-92	3941.0	0.6	3941.6	124.1	19.6	18.5	1.8	164.0	237.0	4014.6	2014.8	174.5	1255.0
06-Sep-92	3370.0	0.7	3370.7	45.7	18.8	12.0	1.7	78.2	239.0	3531.5	1929.5	83.1	1184.0
07-Sep-92	3613.0	0.6	3613.6	86.2	20.8	216.0	2.0	325.0	237.0	3525.6	1994.9	189.1	976.0
08-Sep-92	3884.0	0.6	3884.6	146.3	27.1	89.3	1.5	264.2	238.7	3859.1	1936.0	403.4	989.0
09-Sep-92	9767.0	0.6	9767.6	140.9	83.1	2684.0	1.7	2909.7	258.5	7116.4	1863.0	13719.0	556.0
10-Sep-92	7747.0	0.5	7747.5	347.7	83.1	419.7	1.7	852.2	238.1	7133.4	1848.2	2391.7	67.0
11-Sep-92	4946.0	0.5	4946.5	220.0	31.5	207.3	1.7	460.5	239.2	4725.2	1874.8	1122.4	639.0
12-Sep-92	4842.0	0.4	4842.4	52.3	25.4	119.3	1.6	198.6	235.7	4879.5	1824.8	476.1	1149.0
13-Sep-92	4026.0	0.3	4026.3	42.9	23.6	74.1	1.6	142.2	235.9	4120.0	1831.4	298.6	1113.0
14-Sep-92	4374.0	0.2	4374.2	151.8	29.8	262.5	1.7	445.8	244.2	4172.6	1917.7	2016.3	1014.0
15-Sep-92	5937.0	0.7	5937.7	255.1	28.6	195.2	1.6	480.5	247.4	5704.6	1889.6	3728.1	715.0
16-Sep-92	4915.0	0.9	4915.9	243.9	23.7	111.0	1.7	380.3	239.4	4775.0	1922.6	465.8	1171.0
17-Sep-92	5041.0	0.7	5041.7	44.5	23.6	75.1	1.7	144.9	239.0	5135.8	1907.9	275.2	1954.0
18-Sep-92	5048.0	0.6	5048.6	143.6	24.7	107.6	1.7	277.6	239.3	5010.3	1847.6	460.2	1882.0
19-Sep-92	5145.0	0.4	5145.4	36.9	25.4	54.8	1.6	118.7	237.5	5264.2	1838.1	176.7	2357.0
20-Sep-92	4611.0	0.4	4611.4	37.0	25.7	55.0	1.6	119.3	235.6	4727.7	1759.8	179.3	962.0
21-Sep-92	4727.0	0.6	4727.6	186.9	36.7	609.9	1.6	835.1	241.7	4134.2	1806.3	2843.0	519.0
22-Sep-92	4872.0	0.4	4872.4	182.2	26.6	121.2	1.7	331.7	239.4	4780.1	1824.3	417.9	2057.0
23-Sep-92	4529.0	0.4	4529.4	43.9	24.4	73.1	1.7	143.1	239.1	4625.4	1808.7	204.7	1763.0
24-Sep-92	5012.0	0.4	5012.4	44.3	23.7	53.7	1.7	123.4	238.2	5127.2	1799.8	145.8	2402.0
25-Sep-92	5829.0	0.6	5829.6	106.5	23.4	48.3	1.6	179.8	238.2	5888.0	1839.8	154.4	2921.0
26-Sep-92	6293.0	0.4	6293.4	191.5	33.6	834.9	1.7	1061.7	251.1	5482.8	1774.6	4262.7	1519.0
27-Sep-92	7116.0	0.4	7116.4	337.7	28.5	203.9	1.7	571.8	236.3	6780.9	1745.4	908.2	2588.0
28-Sep-92	6639.0	0.3	6639.3	177.1	25.6	120.6	1.7	325.0	238.6	6552.9	1804.6	432.5	3243.0
29-Sep-92	5104.0	0.3	5104.3	43.9	23.6	76.9	1.6	146.0	237.7	5196.0	1783.0	208.5	2471.0
30-Sep-92	4097.0	0.4	4097.4	44.2	24.7	59.6	1.8	130.3	238.2	4205.3	1817.1	154.1	1406.0
Averages	4974.2	0.5	4974.7	125.3	29.5	232.6	1.7	389.1	240.1	4825.7	1870.6	1214.6	1423.7