

Received Date : 23-Apr-2015

Revised Date : 07-Apr-2016

Accepted Date : 19-Apr-2016

Article type : Technical Paper

The Great Lakes Hydrography Dataset: consistent, binational watersheds for the Laurentian Great Lakes Basin

Danielle K. Forsyth, Catherine M. Riseng, Kevin E. Wehrly, Lacey A. Mason, John Gaiot, Tom Hollenhorst, Craig M. Johnston, Conrad Wyrzykowski, Gust Annis, Chris Castiglione, Kent Todd, Mike Robertson, Dana M. Infante, Lizhu Wang, James E. McKenna, and Gary Whelan

Resource Analyst (**Forsyth**) and Fisheries Research Biologist (**Wehrly**), Institute for Fisheries Research, Michigan Department of Natural Resources and University of Michigan, 400 North Ingalls Building, NIB G250, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109; Assistant Research Scientist (**Riseng**) and GIS Analyst (**Mason**), School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109; Water Resources Information Project Data Analyst (**Gaiot**), Project Manager (**Todd**), and Imagery Project Manager (**Robertson**), Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada K9J8M5; Ecologist (**Hollenhorst**), Mid-Continent Ecology Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Duluth, Minnesota 55804; Physical Scientist GIS (**Johnston**), New England Water Science Center, United States Geological Survey, Pembroke, New Hampshire 03275; Retired Geomatics Data Specialist (**Wyrzykowski**), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3C3G7; Great Lakes Research Specialist (**Annis**), The Nature Conservancy of Michigan, Lansing, Michigan 48906; Fish and Wildlife Biologist (**Castiglione**), Lower Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Basom, New York 14013; Associate

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/1752-1688.12435-15-0052](https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12435-15-0052)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Professor (**Infante**), Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824; Biological Scientist (**Wang**), Great Lakes Office, International Joint Commission, Detroit, Michigan 48232; Research Ecologist (**McKenna**), Great Lakes Science Center, United States Geological Survey, Cortland, New York 13045; Research Program Manager (**Whelan**), Fisheries Division, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, Michigan 48909 (E-Mail/Forsyth: ForsythD1@Michigan.gov).

ABSTRACT: Ecosystem-based management of the Laurentian Great Lakes, which spans both the United States and Canada, is hampered by the lack of consistent binational watersheds for the entire Basin. Using comparable data sources and consistent methods we developed spatially equivalent watershed boundaries for the binational extent of the Basin to create the Great Lakes Hydrography Dataset (GLHD). The GLHD consists of 5,589 watersheds for the entire Basin, covering a total area of approximately 547,967 km², or about twice the 247,003 km² surface water area of the Great Lakes. The GLHD improves upon existing watershed efforts by delineating watersheds for the entire Basin using consistent methods; enhancing the precision of watershed delineation by using recently developed flow direction grids that have been hydrologically enforced and vetted by provincial and federal water resource agencies; and increasing the accuracy of watershed boundaries by enforcing embayments, delineating watersheds on islands, and delineating watersheds for all tributaries draining to connecting channels. In addition, the GLHD is packaged in a publically available geodatabase that includes synthetic stream networks, reach catchments, watershed boundaries, a broad set of attribute data for each tributary, and metadata documenting methodology. The GLHD provides a common set of watersheds and associated hydrography data for the Basin that will enhance binational efforts to protect and restore the Great Lakes.

(Key Terms: Watersheds, Laurentian Great Lakes; Geographic Information System (GIS), Surface Water Hydrology.)

INTRODUCTION

Tributaries of the Laurentian Great Lakes have been increasingly recognized as key drivers of ecological condition in both nearshore (Danz et al, 2007; Howell et al., 2012; Kelly and Yurista, 2013; Yurista et al., 2011, 2012) and offshore waters (Allan et al., 2013; Riseng et al., 2010;

Wehrly et al., 2012). For example, nutrient loads from the Maumee River influence water quality and toxic algae blooms in the western basin of Lake Erie (Michalak et al., 2013), and sediment loads from the Muskegon River increase plankton production in offshore waters of Lake Michigan (Johengen et al., 2008). Tributary inputs of nutrients, sediment, and other chemicals to the Great Lakes originate from land-based sources and are largely influenced by human activities in the watershed (United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 1996, Michalak et al., 2013). Therefore, protecting water quality and habitat in the Great Lakes is dependent upon managing tributaries and their watersheds (Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA), 2012, USEPA and EC, 2009). However, watershed management across the Great Lakes Basin, (hereafter “Basin”) is challenging because tributaries span county, state, provincial, and international units of government and standardized, up-to-date and widely available datasets, including watershed boundaries, are lacking (International Joint Commission (IJC) 2009; Wang et al., 2015; Wehrly et al., 2012). Consequently, there is a need to develop standardized watershed boundaries for the entire Basin.

Standardized watershed boundaries for Great Lakes tributaries have several benefits, including the development of more accurate streamflow and loading models that would be consistent across the U.S. and Canada. Such information could be used to assess nutrient loadings and identify priority watersheds for load reductions to meet nutrient targets outlined in the GLWQA (2012). Standardized binational watershed boundaries would also provide a consistent framework for assessing and comparing the State of the Lakes Ecosystem Conference (SOLEC; Environment Canada (EC) and USEPA, 2014) indicators across the Great Lakes (Danz et al., 2007). Additionally, standardized watershed boundaries would also benefit the Council of Great Lakes Governor’s Blue Accounting project (Seelbach et al., 2014) by providing consistent units to track and compare watershed conditions across political boundaries. Finally, standardized watershed boundaries for the entire Great Lakes would provide a framework to create Basin wide and lake wide management plans, prioritize locations for funding and management actions, and conduct research for science-based decision-making (Wang et al., 2015).

At the time this manuscript was written, the authors were aware of three efforts that had created or were creating binational watershed boundaries in the Basin: the Canada-U.S. Transboundary

Hydrographic Data Harmonization (Laitta, 2010), the Hydrological data and maps based on SHuttle Elevation Derivatives at multiple Scales (HydroSHEDS) project (Lehner, 2006), and the Great Lakes Environmental Indicators (GLEI) II Watersheds (Host et al., 2015; Hollenhorst et al., 2007). We identified a need to create consistent binational watershed boundaries because these existing watershed datasets either were not delineated using consistent methods across the entire Basin (Laitta, 2010), were too coarse for modeling and assessment (Lehner, 2006), or were created prior to the development of vetted hydrologically enforced flow direction grids for the entire Basin (Host et al., 2015; Hollenhorst et al., 2007; Tom Hollenhorst, USEPA, 23 July, 2012, personal communication). It is important to note, however, our work creating new watershed boundaries benefitted from hydrography and processing methods developed in previous watershed delineation efforts (Hollenhorst et al., 2007; Laitta, 2010; United States Geological Survey (USGS) et al, 2013).

The Great Lakes Hydrography Dataset (GLHD) is comprised of nested stream networks, reach catchments, and new, consistent watershed boundaries for the entire Great Lakes and upper St. Lawrence River up to the boundary between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The GLHD improves upon these existing watershed efforts by delineating watersheds for the entire Basin using consistent methods; enhancing the precision of watershed delineation by using recently developed flow direction grids that have been hydrologically enforced and vetted by provincial and federal water resource agencies; and increasing the accuracy of watershed boundaries by enforcing embayments, delineating watersheds on islands, and delineating watersheds for all tributaries draining to connecting channels. This work was part of a larger effort known as the Great Lakes Aquatic Habitat Framework project or GLAHF (Wang et al., 2015). GLAHF is a geospatial database and classification framework designed to share, track, and integrate aquatic biological and habitat data. Similarly, the GLHD provides a consistent framework for summarizing landscape characteristics and stream attributes, and modeling tributary flow and loading across Canada and the United States. Throughout the development of the GLHD, input was obtained from a binational advisory team of experts in hydrology, assessment, GIS, and resource management with the goal of creating a binational watershed layer that could be useful to a variety of stakeholders in the Great Lakes (Appendix 1). The objectives of this manuscript were to: 1) describe the data sources and methods used to develop and validate the binational,

Basin wide GLHD watersheds; 2) compare the GLHD watersheds to existing watershed datasets; 3) summarize key landscape variables across the Basin using the GLHD watersheds; and 4) provide information about public availability of the GLHD.

METHODS

Our approach was to delineate watersheds for the entire Basin (Figure 1) using the Arc Hydro data model (Maidment, 2002) based on methods modified from Hollenhorst et al. (2007) and Merwade (2012). Table 1 shows Canadian and U.S. hydrography datasets that were evaluated for use in delineating watersheds. These datasets were created at dates ranging from 2006 to 2013 and represented a range of resolutions. Based on input from our advisory team, the Ontario Integrated Hydrology Data (OIHD) v1.0 (Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR), 2012) was selected for Canada and the National Hydrography Dataset Plus (NHDPlus) v2 (McKay et al., 2012) was selected for the U.S. These hydrography datasets were chosen because they were both released in 2012 and included stream-enforced flow direction grids at 30m resolution. The other available data sources either did not provide flow direction grids, provided flow direction grids but at a resolution that was too coarse, or had been retired for the Basin. Although it is possible to create flow direction grids using other hydrography layers such as the high resolution 1:24,000 NHD, the existing flow direction grids in the OHIDv1.0 and the NHDPlus v2 were vetted by USEPA, USGS, and OMNRF and are widely accepted and used datasets (Brakebill et al., 2011; Greene et al., 2014). Thus, we felt these datasets represented the most comparable data between Canada and the U.S. that would result in the most accurate delineation of watershed boundaries across the Basin.

One goal of this project was to develop watershed boundaries for Great Lakes tributaries on both the mainland and on islands. OIHDv1.0 flow direction grids on the Canadian side of the Basin provided coverage for both the Canadian mainland and islands. However, for islands on the U.S. side, flow direction grids in the NHDPlus v2 were only available for Drummond Island in Lake Huron and Grand Island in Lake Superior (McKay et al., 2012). For the remainder of the islands on the U.S. side of the Basin, additional stream enforced flow direction grids were created by lowering values for grid cells in the 1 arc second (~30 meter) 2009-2011 National Elevation Dataset (NED) elevation grids that coincided with river reaches in the high resolution 1:24,000

National Hydrography Dataset NHD drainage network. This process ensures flow continuity and flow direction along the course of a drainage network (Hollenhorst et al., 2007). The 1:24,000 NHD was selected because it provided the most comprehensive stream network data for islands in the U.S. waters of the Great Lakes. For the Basin, 247 of 29,100 islands were large enough to have drainage lines depicted on the 1:24,000 NHD (U.S. islands) and on the OIHDv1.0 (Canadian islands) and were considered for watershed delineation.

Before implementing the Arc Hydro data model, input flow direction grids were modified in five ways. First, areas outside of the Basin were removed from the flow direction grids. Second, OIHDv1.0 flow direction grids were clipped at the shoreline using a shoreline polygon derived from the Ontario Hydro Network (OHN) water-body layer. Third, flow direction grids for the NHDPlus v2 were clipped at the shoreline in connecting channels, including the St. Mary's River, St. Clair and Detroit Rivers System (SCDRS), Niagara River, and the St. Lawrence River using water features from the NHD 1:24,000. Fourth, flow direction grids for islands were clipped using shorelines created from island features in the OHN, National Hydro Network (NHN), and the 1:24,000 NHD, with additional island boundaries added from aerial imagery that were visible at the 1:24,000 scale. Finally, flow direction grids were modified at the shoreline to include the Bay of Quinte from the OHN and 35 bays found in the USEPA Great Lakes Basin bays dataset (USEPA, 1992). Adding these bays resulted in a more accurate depiction of where GLHD watersheds meet the shoreline, as illustrated in Lake Superior's St. Louis River Estuary in Figure 2. Table 2 lists and describes all of the datasets used to modify the input flow direction grids.

Arc Hydro was used to develop watershed boundaries in a step-wise fashion using a suite of tools. Flow direction grids were used to create flow accumulation grids, which provided a measure of potential upstream accumulation along a flow network (Maidment, 2002). From the flow accumulation grids, confluence to confluence drainage lines were created, then reach catchments, and finally aggregated reach catchments and downstream outlet points where major tributaries discharge to the Great Lakes. The stream drainage lines were created using an upstream threshold area of 3,000 30m x 30m grid cells to initiate delineation of a stream-reach (equivalent to 2.7 km²), following recommendations in Hollenhorst et al., (2007). Tributary watersheds were delineated by OIHDv1.0 and NHDPlus v2 hydrologic processing units, and by

basin for most U.S. islands (Figure 1) and subsequently combined. In a secondary GIS processing step, watershed boundaries were delineated for interfluves. Interfluves are areas along the Great Lakes shoreline that are drained by multiple, small coastal streams and not included in a major tributary watersheds (Gilliam et al., 1997). Attributes and sources for data used in watershed delineation are shown in Table 2.

Following initial Arc Hydro processing, watershed boundaries were edited in several ways. First, small isolated and erratic watersheds were combined with adjacent interfluve watersheds. Second, local sink watersheds were combined topographically with bordering watersheds so the entire area of the Basin would drain to watershed outlet points. Finally, overlaps and gaps were removed in the boundary waters between Ontario and Minnesota, the only locations where the modified OIHDv1.0 and NHDPlus v2 flow direction grids coincided. Flow direction grids were not altered for large anthropogenic modifications such as shipping channels; all such diversions were maintained as represented in the original flow direction grids. Additional information on how watershed boundaries were edited can be found in the GLHD metadata.

The final edited watershed boundaries and outlet point layers were imported into a geodatabase, the GLHDv1.0. Along with the final layers, some “intermediate” layers such as drainage lines and reach catchments created during Arc Hydro watershed delineation, were included in the geodatabase. These intermediate layers can be used in future watershed studies and provide reference material for users interested in replicating the GLHD watershed delineation methods. To facilitate use of the GLHD with existing hydrography data, the geodatabase also includes stream networks from the OIHDv1.0 and NHDPlus v2, and reach catchments from the NHDPlus v2. These stream networks and reach catchments were modified to account for changes made in shorelines, connecting channels, and bays associated with the GLHD watershed boundaries. Attributes such as stream names and stream orders (Appendix 2) for the downstream most drainage line were linked from the original NHDPlus v2, OIHD v1.0, and NHD stream networks to the GLHD watersheds. Names for U.S. streams were taken from the NHDPlus v2 and NHD. Names of Canadian streams were taken from the Geographic Named Extent (GEL) layer and NHN layers because stream names were not available in the OIHDv1.0. Unique identifiers were assigned to each watershed in the Basin starting with the watershed in the Ontario and Minnesota

boundary waters and continuing counterclockwise across the Basin in sequential order (Hollenhorst et al., 2007). Island watersheds were also assigned unique identifiers using the same counterclockwise sequential numbering method beginning with the northwestern-most island, Isle Royale, in Lake Superior. The geodatabase includes metadata describing data sources, methods and attribute tables associated with each layer.

As the GLHD was developed as part of the larger GLAHF project, we used the GLHD watersheds to summarize a subset of Canadian and U.S. datasets that had been crosswalked by the GLAHF project (Wang et al., 2015). The GLAHF Basin wide datasets included land use/land cover, roads, and population density datasets and are listed in Table 3. Land use/land cover data (Appendix 3) were summarized by percent area for each watershed. Road density for each watershed was calculated by dividing the length of all roads within a watershed by watershed area. Population density was calculated by first creating an area-weighted population count estimate for each watershed, and then dividing that value by the watershed area. GIS procedures were carried out using ArcGIS 10 (Esri 2011) and Python 2.6 (Van Rossum and Drake, 2009). All statistics were calculated using R Statistical Software (R Core Team, 2014)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of GLHD watersheds

The GLHD consists of watersheds for the entire Basin, covering a total area of approximately 547,967 km², or about twice the 247,003 km² surface water area of the Great Lakes. Summary statistics describing the 5,589 watersheds delineated across the Basin are shown in Table 4. A similar number of tributary (N=2,354) and interfluvial watersheds (N=2,373) were delineated on the mainland. In contrast, more interfluvial watersheds (N=546) than tributary watersheds (N=316) were delineated on islands. This occurred because most islands were too small to reach the 2.7 km² flow accumulation threshold necessary to delineate a stream-reach and a subsequent tributary watershed boundary. Thus, watersheds on a large number of islands were represented only as interfluvial watersheds. In terms of surface area, the majority of watersheds were small, and tributary watersheds tended to be larger than interfluvial watersheds on both the mainland (median=12.2 km² vs. 2.4 km²) and on islands (median=6.2 km² vs. 2.1 km²). Interfluvial watersheds tended to be smaller because no minimum flow accumulation threshold was used in

their delineation. Although tributary watersheds accounted for 97% of the Basin in terms of land surface area, interfluvial watersheds accounted for 98% of shoreline length. Coastal development can have significant local impacts on water quality (Danz et al., 2007; USEPA and EC, 2009). Consequently, the GLHD consistent set of interfluvial watersheds along the Great Lakes shoreline, as well as tributary watersheds, could aid coastal zone managers by providing a common framework for characterizing land use effects on coastal habitats.

The Nipigon River watershed (39,149 km²) in Lake Superior was the largest watershed in the Basin. The representation of the Nipigon River watershed in the GLHD was larger than other Great Lakes watershed datasets, such as the NHN, because the OIHDv1.0 included the Ogoki headwater diversions that were created to increase the net supply of water to the Great Lakes (United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), 2009). The remaining ten largest watersheds in the Basin included the French River Eastern Outlet, Spanish River, and Trent River watersheds in Canada, and the Maumee, Fox, Saginaw, Grand, Oswego, and Saint Joseph watersheds on the U.S. side of the Basin as shown in Table 5. Nine of the 30 largest area watersheds were in the Lake Huron basin, seven were in the Lake Michigan basin, six were in the Lake Superior basin, five were in the Lake Ontario basin, and 3 were in the Lake Erie basin.

Using the GLHD watershed layer to summarize Basin wide data

The GLHD watersheds provide a framework to summarize and compare landscape characteristics consistently across the Basin. Because the GLHD includes detail for embayments not included in other watershed datasets and delineated watersheds for island and tributaries draining to connecting channels, the GLHD watersheds allow for more accurate and spatially comprehensive data summaries. The GLHD watershed layer was used to summarize a set of landscape variables across all watersheds in the Basin. Due to the large number of watersheds, summary tables were only included for the 30 largest watersheds (Tables 5 and 6; Figure 3); summaries are available for all Basin watersheds (See Supporting Information).

Forest (42%) and agriculture (23%) were the predominant land use types across all watersheds in the Basin, followed by urban land use (13%) and wetlands (12%). Forested land cover was concentrated in the northern half of the basin and was the predominant land cover in the Lake

Superior (75%) and Lake Huron (46%) basins. Agriculture was concentrated in the southern half of the basin and was highest in the Lake Erie (41%), Lake Ontario (39%), and Lake Huron (24%) basins. Six percent of the watersheds in the Basin were comprised of more than 80% agricultural lands, and 17% were comprised of more than 60% agricultural lands. In the Lake Erie basin, a large number of watersheds including the Sydenham (84%) and Thames river (80%) in Canada and the Portage River (81%), Sandusky River (81%), and Maumee River (78%) in the U.S. were dominated by agricultural land use. Wetlands were most common in the Lake Michigan (24%), Lake Erie (14%), and Lake Ontario (13%) basins.

Like agriculture, urban land use, road density, and population densities tend to be concentrated in the southern portion of the Basin near metropolitan hubs like Chicago (IL), Milwaukee (WI), Detroit (MI), and Toledo and Cleveland (OH) in the U.S. and Toronto in Canada. About 30% of watersheds contained 10% or more urban land use and 62% of those were located in the U.S. Approximately 19% of the watersheds contained 20% or more urban land, including the Clinton, Cuyahoga, and River Rouge basins on the U.S. side of the Lake Erie basin, and the Kinnickinnic River draining to Lake Michigan. These watershed also had high road densities (the length of road per km² of watershed area) ranging from 3.8 to 8.6 km/km². Road densities and urban land cover percentages were also high in the Humber (3.4 km/10km² and 31%) and Credit River (2 km/10km² and 24%) watersheds near Toronto, ON. About 2% of watersheds in the Basin had a population density greater than 1,000 people/km² including watersheds of large metropolitan areas such as the Ecorse and Rouge Rivers (Detroit, MI), small watersheds associated with Cleveland, OH, and Buffalo and Rochester, NY in the Lake Erie basin, and the Humber and Don River watersheds draining to Lake Ontario. Approximately 14% of watersheds had a population density between 100 and 1,000 people/km², including the Grand River near Grand Rapids, MI, the Kinnickinnic River near Milwaukee, WI, and other tributary watersheds near Hamilton and Toronto, ON, including the Grand River basin.

Comparison of GLHD Watersheds to Other Great Lakes Watershed Layers

A number of GIS-based watershed layers have been created that only cover the U.S. or the Canadian side of the Basin. Currently, only three major broad-scale international watershed

layers exist: the HydroSHEDS drainage areas, the Canada-U.S. Transboundary Hydrographic Data Harmonization drainage areas, and the GLEI II watersheds.

The HydroSHEDS project, led by the Conservation Science Program of the World Wildlife Fund, provides consistent, Basin wide hydrography data, including flow direction grids, flow accumulation grids, a river network, and drainage basins (Lehner, 2006). The HydroSHEDS effort differs from the GLHD in that it provides hydrography information at the global scale. Consequently, spatial resolution of the HydroSHEDS data is much coarser than the NHDPlus v2 and OIHDv1.0, and the Basin is represented as a single watershed in the drainage area layer.

The Canada-U.S. Transboundary Hydrographic Data Harmonization project, convened by the IJC, is working to harmonize stream networks, water features such as lakes, ponds, and reservoirs, and nested hydrologic units for drainage areas that cross the international boundary (Laitta, 2010; IJC, 2016). Unlike the GLHD, the Canada -U.S. Transboundary Hydrographic Data Harmonization project combines existing watershed boundaries that were developed using different methods for those hydrologic units that straddle the international border. In contrast, the GLHD used a consistent method to delineate comparable watersheds across the entire Basin. In addition, the Canada -U.S. Transboundary Hydrographic Data Harmonization drainage areas currently do not provide the same detail as the GLHD because interfluvial watersheds are lumped with tributary watersheds, and watersheds are generalized in connecting channels as shown in Figure 4 A and B. At this time, the Canada -U.S. Transboundary Hydrographic Data Harmonization project does not provide a consolidated data package that incorporates the harmonized drainage areas, streams, and water features, along with the rest of the data for the entire Basin.

The GLEI II watersheds are nested, tributary watersheds that were created for the U.S. side of the Basin (Danz et al., 2007; Hollenhorst et al., 2007) and subsequently expanded to the Canadian side of the Basin, in an unpublished effort in which a co-author on this paper participated (Tom Hollenhorst, USEPA, 23 July, 2012, personal communication). The GLEI II watershed data layer is most similar to the GLHD in that it provides consistent Basin wide coverage, was created using similar delineation methods in the U.S. and Canada, and provides interfluvial watersheds in

addition to tributary watersheds. The GLHD differs from the GLEII watersheds in several key ways: updated and externally validated flow direction grid across the Basin; consistent island stream networks and watersheds; input from a binational panel of hydrology experts; and, public access to consistent, nested watershed layers and related data in one package. The different hydrography input data used to delineate watersheds is a key difference between the GLEI II watersheds and the GLHD watersheds. The GLHD watersheds were based on the most current NHDPlus v2 (U.S.) and the OIHDv1.0 (Canada) which both include expert verified and hydrologically corrected flow direction grids. The GLEI II project developed flow direction grids using the high resolution NHD to hydrologically correct the 30 meter NED for the U.S. tributaries. Unlike the NHDPlus v2 flow direction grids used to develop the GLHD watershed boundaries on the U.S. side of the basin, the resulting GLEI II flow direction grid was not reviewed by experts. The subsequent Canadian portion of the GLEI II Watersheds used the expertly verified stream enforced elevation data from the 2002 Provincial Digital Elevation Model (DEM) of the Provincial Watershed Project that was intended for watershed delineation (OMNR, 2002). However, the 2002 Provincial DEM has been retired and subsequently replaced by a series of updated hydrography data, the most current of which is the OIHDv1.0.

There are a number of noteworthy characteristics of the GLHD. First, the GLHD used expert-verified flow direction grids, and relied on a binational team of experts to iteratively review and provide input at each step of the delineation process to improve the accuracy of the Basin wide GLHD watersheds. Second, the GLHD uniquely developed a comprehensive package of publically available watershed boundaries that includes stream networks, reach catchments, watershed boundaries, a broad set of attribute data for each tributary, and metadata that documents methodology. Finally, the GLHD also uniquely expanded the number of unique features such as islands and estuaries which will enhance research and management in the Basin. For example, inventory and conservation efforts focused on Great Lakes islands is a growing area of interest for federal, state and provincial agencies (Penskar et al., 2002). Likewise, inclusion of major Great Lakes estuaries in the GLHD will facilitate assessment and evaluation of tributary influences on estuary processes. For example, the St. Louis River estuary, shown in Figure 2, is a National Estuarine Research Reserve (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), 2015) that represents an important freshwater estuary in the Reserve

system. Delineation of tributary watersheds to the St. Louis estuary will enhance efforts to assess human influences on coastal resources.

GLHD Validation

To ensure the methods used to create the GLHD accurately reproduced watershed boundaries across the Basin at the scale of the NHDPlus v2, the GLHD U.S. watersheds were compared to the NHDPlus v2 tributary watersheds developed by aggregating NHDPlus v2 reach catchments. The GLHD watersheds were not compared to the Canadian OIHDv1.0 watersheds because the OIHDv1.0 watersheds were not bounded at the shoreline and extended into the Great Lakes. In addition, interfluves were not identified in the OIHDv1.0 but were merged together with the tributary watersheds at the coast. Thus, the OIHDv1.0 watersheds were not spatially comparable to the GLHD watersheds. When comparing the GLHD watershed to the NHDPlus v2 watersheds, the vast majority (96%) of the GLHD U.S. tributary watersheds were within 1% of the surface area of the aggregated tributary watersheds in the NHDPlus v2, excluding those areas where the GLHD watershed layer enhanced the NHDPlus v2 (connecting channels watersheds and enforced embayments and estuaries). Based on the results of this comparison, we determined the GLHD delineation method created Canadian watersheds that were also comparable to the NHDPlus v2 watersheds in spatial scale.

The main difference between the NHDPlus v2 and GLHD watershed boundaries occurred in coastal areas resulting from the 2.7 km² upstream stream reach threshold and the shoreline modifications outlined in the methods section of this manuscript. The NHDPlus v2 identified artificial channels (e.g., agricultural drainage ditches) in addition to the main channel, while the GLHD thresholding procedure only identified the main channel. In some cases this resulted in more watersheds being identified in the NHDPlus v2 than in the GLHD. Along the coastline, interfluve watershed boundaries differed because the NHDPlus v2 shoreline is inland of the tributary outlet point creating one narrow continuous band along the shoreline that links the interfluves. In contrast, the GLHD represented watersheds outlet points at the coast, and separate interfluves between each watershed outlet point.

While the GLHD watershed boundaries were similar to the aggregated NHDPlus v2 watershed boundaries, the GLHD individual reach-catchment boundaries may differ. Due to the area threshold used to create the synthetic stream-reaches, the GLHD synthetic drainage network was sometimes more detailed and sometimes less detailed than the NHDPlus v2 drainage network, which was hand digitized from USGS 1:100,000 scale topographic maps (Johnston et al., 2009). This resulted in some differences in corresponding reach catchment boundaries, e.g., either multiple NHDPlus v2 reach catchments in a GLHD reach catchment or vice versa as shown in panels C and D of Figure 4.

We were confident that although the source hydrography differed in scale between the NHDPlus v2 and the OHIDv1.0, delineated watersheds were comparable across the U.S and Canada. The finer scale of the OHIDv1.0 stream networks (1:10,000 and 1:20,000 vs 1:100,000) resulted in a more complex drainage network, which included more headwater streams and meanders. This detail was reflected in the OHIDv1.0 flow direction grid since the flow direction grid represented the drainage network. However, variability in spatial scale of the input data was mitigated by using flow direction grids with 30 meter grid cells, which helped to generalize (remove excess detail from) the network, and by using a consistent size threshold to create stream networks. The threshold generalized the synthetic networks created from the flow direction grids by removing most of the small headwater streams resulting in drainage networks with similar headwater extent resolution. Confluence-to-confluence reach catchment area in the U.S. (mean=4.998 km², SE=0.016) and Canada (mean=5.007 km², SE=0.018) were similar, indicating the effects of scale differences in source hydrography on reach catchment size and resulting watershed areas were negligible.

Use and public availability

An important objective of this project was to provide a publically accessible and consistent dataset for summarizing watershed characteristics across the mainland and island areas within the entire Basin for use in characterizing watershed influences on Great Lakes nearshore and offshore habitats. The GLHD GIS data is available as part of the GLHDv1.0 data package that is stored in an Esri file geodatabase with associated documentation and can be downloaded from the GLAHF website at: <http://glahf.org/watersheds/>. The geodatabase includes the watershed

and interfluvial boundaries along with watershed outlet points, the synthetic intermediate data layers created in the Arc Hydro processing steps, modified versions of the NHDPlus v2, OIHDv1.0, and NHD drainage networks, and a modified version of the NHDPlus v2 reach catchments. The GLHD watershed layer provides Canadian tributary watershed boundaries that are comparable to the NHDPlus v2 watershed boundaries. The watershed and interfluvial boundaries and watershed outlet points are also accessible to the public from a web viewer (<http://glahf.org/Explorer>).

The watershed boundaries and associated layers are current to the time period of publication for each data source. The GLHD is scheduled to be updated at specific time steps (5 years at a minimum) or based on significant changes to the input datasets. The OIHDv1.0, NHDPlus v2, and NHD drainage networks and the NHDPlus v2 reach catchments are created by federal and provincial agencies and are incorporated into a number of projects throughout the region. For projects using NHDPlus v2 or OIHDv1.0 hydrography data, the modified versions of those layers that are included in the GLHD data package should be used over the synthetic GLHD drainage network and reach catchments that were created using Arc Hydro. However, if Basin wide applications require similar scale drainage networks or reach catchments, the GLHD synthetic layers may be applicable and useful, and can be linked back to the original NHDPlus v2, OIHDv1.0, or NHD drainage lines or the NHDPlus v2 reach catchments. Additionally, analysis of stream length across the Basin using the GLHD Arc Hydro derived stream network could be problematic since the GLHD stream network has more meanders and detail on the Canadian side of the Basin, though the stream extents are similar across the Basin.

CONCLUSION

We used comparable data sources and consistent methods to develop spatially equivalent nested stream networks, reach catchments, and watershed boundary layers for the binational extent of the Great Lakes Basin to create the GLHD. The GLHD watersheds improve upon existing watershed efforts by delineating watersheds for the entire Basin using consistent methods; enhancing the precision of watershed delineation by using recently developed flow direction grids that have been hydrologically enforced and vetted by provincial and federal water resource agencies; and increasing the accuracy of watershed boundaries by enforcing embayments,

delineating watersheds on islands, and delineating watersheds for all tributaries draining to connecting channels. In addition the GLHD is packaged in a publically available geodatabase that includes detailed metadata.

The GLHD provides a common set of spatially comparable watersheds and associated hydrography data for the entire Basin. Linking the GLHD with crosswalked U.S. and Canadian landscape datasets, such as those created by GLAHF (Wang et al., 2015), will facilitate development of more consistent watershed-based hydrologic, loading, and assessment models at the Basin scale. As an example, the 2017 SOLEC used the GLHD and GLAHF landscape data to develop a uniform summary of their land cover indicator for all watersheds in the Basin (Terry Brown, University of Minnesota Duluth, 29 October, 2015, personal communication). Consistent Basin wide analyses such as these provide critical information to managers and policy makers and are essential for developing binational strategies to protect and restore the Great Lakes.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article: table summarizing watershed area and landscape variables (roads, land cover, and population) across the GLHD watersheds.

APPENDICES

[INSERT APPENDIX 1]

[INSERT APPENDIX 2]

[INSERT APPENDIX 3]

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Arthur Cooper for his advice and guidance on catchment and watershed development in the GIS environment. This project was funded by the Great Lakes Fishery Trust and received in-kind support from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, International Joint Commission, NOAA Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services,

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environment Canada, The Nature Conservancy, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota-Duluth, and University of Windsor.

LITERATURE CITED

- Allan, J. D., P.B. McIntyre, S.D. Smith, B.S. Halpern, G.L. Boyer, A. Buchsbaum, G. A. Burton, L.M. Campbell, W.L. Chadderton, J.J.H. Ciborowski, P.J. Doran, T. Eder, D.M. Infante, L.B. Johnson, C.A. Joseph, A.L. Marino, A. Prusevich, J.G. Read, J.B. Rose, E.S. Rutherford, S.P. Sowa, A.D. Steinman, 2013. Joint analysis of stressors and ecosystem services to enhance restoration effectiveness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110(1):372–377. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1213841110
- Brakebill, J., D. Wolock, and S. Terziotti, 2011. Digital hydrologic networks supporting applications related to spatially referenced regression modeling. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 47(5):916–932. DOI: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2011.00578.x
- Danz, N.P., G.J. Niemi, R.R. Regal, T. Hollenhorst, L.B. Johnson, J.M. Hanowski, R.P. Axler, J.J. Ciborowski, T. Hrabik, V.J. Brady, J.R. Kelly, J.A. Morrice, J.C. Brazner, R.W. Howe, C.A. Johnson, G.E. Host, 2007. Integrated measures of anthropogenic stress in the U.S. Great Lakes basin. *Environmental Management* 39(5):631-647. DOI 10.1007/s00267-005-0293-0.
- Environment Canada and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2014. State of the Great Lakes 2011. Cat No. En161-31/1-2011EPDF. EPA 950-R-13-002.
<http://binational.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/sogl-2011-technical-report-en.pdf>.
- Esri, 2011. ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10. Redlands, CA.
- Gilliam, J. W., D.L. Osmond, R.O. Evans, 1997. Selected agricultural best management practices to control nitrogen in the Neuse River basin. NC Agricultural Research Service, North Carolina State University.

Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, 2012. Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, protocol amending the agreement between Canada and the United States of America on Great Lakes water quality, 1978, as amended on October 16, 1983, and on November 18, 1987. Signed September 7, 2012 and entered into force February 12, 2013.

Greene, C. M., K. Blackhart, J. Nohner, A. Candelmo, and D.M. Nelson, 2014. A national assessment of stressors to estuarine fish habitats in the contiguous USA. *Estuaries and Coasts* 38(3):782-799. DOI 10.1007/s12237-014-9855-9.

Hollenhorst, T. P., T.N. Brown, L.B. Johnson, J.J. Ciborowski, and G.E. Host, 2007. Methods for generating multi-scale watershed delineations for indicator development in Great Lake coastal ecosystems. *Journal of Great Lakes Research* 33:13–26. DOI: 10.3394/0380-1330(2007)33[13:MFGMWD]2.0.CO;2

Host, G. E., K.E. Kovalenko, T.N. Brown, P. Meysembourg, J.J.H. Ciborowski and L.B. Johnson, 2015. A risk-based classification and interactive map of watersheds contributing anthropogenic stress to Great Lakes coastal ecosystems. In Review.

Howell, E., K. Chomicki, and G. Kaltenecker, 2012. Tributary discharge, lake circulation and lake biology as drivers of water quality in the Canadian nearshore of Lake Ontario. *Journal of Great Lakes Research* 38:47–61. DOI:10.1016/j.jglr.2012.03.008

International Joint Commission, 2009. The international watersheds initiative: Implementing a new paradigm for transboundary basins. Third report to governments on the international watersheds initiative. Cat. No.: E95-2/8-2009E, ISBN: 978-1-100-12002-7, <http://www.ijc.org/files/publications/ID1627.pdf>.

International Joint Commission, 2016. U.S.-Canadian Hydrographic Data Harmonization Information Sheet: A cooperative effort managed by the International Join Commission.

- Johengen, T. H., B.A. Biddanda, and J.B. Cotner, 2008. Stimulation of Lake Michigan plankton metabolism by sediment resuspension and river runoff. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 34(2):213–227. DOI: 10.3394/0380-1330(2008)34[213:SOLMPM]2.0.CO;2
- Johnston, C. M., T.G. Dewald, T.R. Bondelid, B.B. Worstell, L.D. McKay, A. Rea, B.B. Moore, and J.L. Goodall, 2009. Evaluation of Catchment Delineation Methods for the Medium-Resolution National Hydrography Dataset. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2009-5233. <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2009/5233/pdf/sir2009-5233.pdf>
- Kelly, J. and P. Yurista, 2013. Development of an integrated assessment of large lakes using towed in situ sensor technologies: Linking nearshore conditions with adjacent watersheds. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management*, 16(3):248–266.
- Laitta, M., 2010. Canada-US transboundary hydrographic data harmonization efforts gain momentum. Unpublished report for the International Joint Commission, http://www.ijc.org/rel/boards/watershed/Canada-US_Hydro_Harmonization_e.pdf.
- Lehner, B., 2006. HydroSHEDS technical documentation, version 1.2. http://www.hydrosheds.org/images/inpages/HydroSHEDS_TechDoc_v1_2.pdf
- Maidment, D., (editor), 2002. *Arc Hydro: GIS for water resources*. Esri Press, Redlands, California, ISBN: 978-1589480346.
- McKay, L., T. Bondelid, T. Dewald, J. Johnston, R. Moore, and A. Rea, 2012. NHDPlus Version 2: User guide. ftp://ftp.horizon-systems.com/nhdplus/nhdplusv21/documentation/nhdplusv2_user_guide.pdf
- Merwade, V, 2012. Watershed and Stream Network Delineation using Arc Hydro Tools. https://web.ics.purdue.edu/~vmerwade/education/terrain_processing.pdf

- Michalak, A. M., E.J. Anderson, D. Beletsky, S. Boland, N.S. Bosch, T.B. Bridgeman, J.D. Chaffin, K. Cho, R. Confesor, I. Dalog̃lu, J.V. DePinto, M.A. Evans, G.L. Fahnenstier, L. He, J.C. Ho, L. Jenkins, T.H. Johengen, K.C. Kuo, E. LaPorte, X. Liu, M.R. McWilliams, M.R. Moore, D.J. Posselt, R.P. Richards, D. Scavia, A.L. Steiner, E. Verhamme, D.M. Wright, and M.A. Zagorski, 2013. Record-setting algal bloom in Lake Erie caused by agricultural and meteorological trends consistent with expected future conditions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(16):6448–6452.
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, 2002. A guide to the provincial watershed project. Water Resources Information Project. Provincial Geomatics Service Center, Peterborough, Ontario. <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/Business/LIO/index.html>
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, 2012. Ontario Integrated Hydrology Data: Technical specifications, version 1.0. Water Resources Information Project, Geographic Information Branch, Science and Information Resources Division.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015. National Estuarine Research Reserve System, Lake Superior National Estuarine Research Reserve. Accessed September 1, 2015, <http://nerrs.noaa.gov/reserves/lake-superior.html>.
- Penskar, M.R., Y.M. Lee, M.A. Kost, D.A. Hyde, J.J. Paskus, D. L Cuthrell, and H.D. Enander., 2002. Biological inventory for conservation of Great Lakes islands: 2002 inventory and final report. Michigan Depart of Natural Resources Report No. 2002-27.
- R Core Team, 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Riseng, C. M., M.J. Wiley, P.W. Seelbach, and R.J. Stevenson, 2010. An ecological assessment of Great Lakes tributaries in the Michigan peninsulas. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 36(3):505–519. DOI: 10.1016/j.jglr.2010.04.008.

Seelbach, P., J. Read, K. Buckner, T. Eder, and C. Manninen, 2014. Great Lakes Blue Accounting: Empowering decisions to realize regional water values. A report to the council of Great Lakes governors. <http://glc.org/files/docs/2014-blue-accounting-recommendations-glc.pdf>.

United States Army Corps of Engineers, 2009. Great Lakes update. USACE Detroit District. vol. 175. <http://www.lre.usace.army.mil/Portals/69/docs/GreatLakesInfo/docs/UpdateArticles/Update175.pdf>.

United States Environmental Protection Agency and Environment Canada, 2009. Nearshore areas of the Great Lakes 2009. EPA 905-R-09-013, Cat No. En164-19/2009E, <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=9101WY1P.txt>.

United States Environmental Protection Agency, 1992. Environmental monitoring and assessment program: Great Lakes monitoring and research strategies. Environmental Research Laboratory, Office of Research and Development, Duluth, Minnesota. EPA/620/R-92/001.

United States Environmental Protection Agency, 1996. Watershed approach framework. Office of Water (4501F), EPA 840-S-96-001, <http://water.epa.gov/learn/training/wacademy/upload/watershed-approach-framework.pdf>.

United State Geological Survey, United States Department of Agriculture, United States Department of the Interior, and Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2013. Federal Standards and Procedures for the National Watershed Boundary Dataset (WBD) (4 ed.): Techniques and Methods 11-A3. <http://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/11/a3/>.

Van Rossum, G. and F. Drake, 2009. Python 2.6: Distributing modules. CreateSpace, Paramount, California.

- Wang, L., C.M. Riseng, L.A. Mason, K.E. Wehrly, E.S. Rutherford, J.E. McKenna, C. Castiglione, L.B. Johnson, D.M. Infante, S. Sowa, M. Roberston, J. Schaffer, M. Khoury, J. Gaoit, T. Hollenhorst, C. Brooks, M. Coscarelli, 2015. A spatial classification and database for management, research, and policy making: The Great Lakes aquatic habitat framework. *Journal of Great Lakes Research* 41(2) 584:596. DOI: 10.1016/j.jglr.2015.03.017
- Wehrly, K., L. Wang, D. Infante, C. Joseph, A. Cooper, L. Stanfield, and E. Rutherford, 2012. Landscape change and its influence on aquatic habitats and fisheries in the Great Lakes basin. In Taylor, W., Lynch, A., and Leonard, N., (editors), *Great Lakes Fisheries Policy and Management: A Binational Perspective*. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, MI. pp. 81-83.
- Yurista, P., J.R. Kelly, and S.E. Miller, 2011. Lake Superior: nearshore variability and a landscape driver concept. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management*, 14(4):345–355. DOI: 10.1080/14634988.2011.624942.
- Yurista, P. M., J.R. Kelly, S. Miller, and J. Van Alstine, 2012. Lake Ontario: Nearshore conditions and variability in water quality parameters. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 38:133–145. DOI: 10.1016/j.jglr.2011.09.002

TABLES

TABLE 1. Resolution, Coverage, and Update Year for all of the Data Sources Considered for Watershed Delineation. The resolution of the stream network was only included for the network inside the Basin. In some cases, such as the OHN and the NHN, there are other resolutions (in these cases 1:50,000) outside of the area covered by the GLHD. *Note that once the NHN/NHD stream networks are harmonized by the Canada-U.S. Transboundary Hydrographic Data Harmonization effort, the harmonized networks will then be incorporated back into the original NHD and NHN datasets, so there is no separate entry for the NHN/NHD harmonized layer in this table.

Name	Stream Resolution	Flow Direction Grid		Last Publically		Download Link
		Resolution	Coverage	Available Update	Source	
Arc Hydro Quaternary Watershed Sessions	1:20,000 and 1:10,000	10 meters in Southern Ontario; 20 meters in Northern Ontario	Ontario	2009	OMNRF	https://www.javacoeapp.lrc.gov.on.ca/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home
HydroSHEDS	1:1,000,000 - 1:1,300,000; also includes water bodies delineated from 30 meter elevation data	90 meters at best near the equator	Global	2006	WWF	http://hydrosheds.cr.usgs.gov/dataavail.php
NHN*	1:20,000, 1:10,000, 1:50,000*	n/a	Canada	2008	NRCan	http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/earth-sciences/geography/topographic-information/free-data-geogratis/11042
NHD High Resolution*	1:24,000	n/a	United States	Updates ongoing	USGS	http://nhd.usgs.gov/data.html
NHDPlus v2	1:100,000	30 meters	United States	2012	Horizon System Corps	http://www.horizon-systems.com/NHDPlus/NHDPlusv2_data.php
OIHDv1.0	1:20,000 and	30 meters	Ontario	Updates ongoing	OMNRF	https://www.javacoeapp.lrc.gov.on.ca

	1:10,000 in Ontario					a/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home
OHN	1:20,000, 1:10,000, 1:50,000*	n/a	Ontario	Updates ongoing	OMNRF	https://www.javacoeapp.lrc.gov.on.ca/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home
Provincial Enhanced Flow Direction Grid v2.0	1:20,000 and 1:10,000	10 meters in Southern Ontario; 20 meters in Northern Ontario	Ontario	2008	OMNRF	https://www.javacoeapp.lrc.gov.on.ca/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home

1
2
3
4

TABLE 2. Attributes of data used for watershed delineation for Canada and the U.S. mainland and islands in the Basin. This includes data sources that were used to modify the shoreline of the flow direction grids, which were used as input for watershed delineation using Arc Hydro, and data sources that were compared to the GLHD finalized watershed boundary.

Name	Role in Watershed Development	Stream Resolution	Grid Cell Resolution	Area Covered in Study	Currency	Source	Download Link
Canada-US Transboundary Hydrographic Data Harmonization Drainage Areas (HUC 8/FDA 4)	Compared to finalized watershed boundaries	1:24,000; 1:100,000	n/a	n/a	2013	EC, AAFC, USGS, NRCan, USEPA	N/A, acquired from Kimberly Jones, USGS
GEL	Canadian watershed naming	1:10,000 - 1:250,000	n/a	Canadian outlet points within 200 m of downstream most drainage line	2011	OMNRF	https://www.javacoeapp.lrc.gov.on.ca/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home
GLAHF High Resolution Shoreline	Used to create island polygons	1:10,000 - 1:24,000	n/a	Island shoreline;	2013	NHD 1:24,000;	http://glahf.org/data

Name	Role in Watershed Development	Stream Resolution	Grid Cell Resolution	Area Covered in Study	Currency	Source	Download Link
Layer	for delineation			U.S. connecting channels		WBD; OHN; aerial imagery	
GLEI II Watersheds	Compared to finalized watershed boundaries	1:24,000 (U.S.); 1:10,000 &1:20,000 (Canada)	30 m (U.S); 10 m or 20 m (Canada)	n/a	2007	Hollenhorst et al., 2007; GLEI Project	http://data.nrri.umn.edu/data/dataset/ws597 1agdev
High Resolution 1:24,000 NHD	Input Data; Enforcement of U.S. connecting channels & EPA bays; U.S. watershed naming	1:24,000	n/a	U.S. islands except for Drummond & Grand Islands	2012	USGS	http://nhd.usgs.gov/data.html
NED	Input Data		~30 m	U.S. islands except for Drummond & Grand Islands	2009-2011	USGS	http://viewer.nationalmap.gov/basic/?basemap=b1&category=ned,nedsrc&title=3DEP%20View
NHDPlus v2	Input Data; U.S. watershed naming	1:100,000	30 m	U.S. mainland, Drummond & Grand Islands	2012	Horizon System Corp.	http://www.horizon-systems.com/NHDPlus/NHDPlus_v2_data.php

Name	Role in Watershed Development	Stream Resolution	Grid Cell Resolution	Area Covered in Study	Currency	Source	Download Link
NHN	Canadian watershed naming	1:50,000 or better	n/a	Canadian outlet points within 200 m of downstream most drainage line	2004	Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)	http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/earth-sciences/geography/topographic-information/free-data-geogratis/11042
OHN	Enforcement of Canadian shoreline; EPA bays for Canada	1:10,000; 1:20,000	n/a	Canadian mainland shoreline	2010	OMNRF	https://www.javacoeapp.lrc.gov.on.ca/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home
OIHDv1.0	Input Data	1:10,000 &1:20,000	30 m	Canadian mainland & islands	2013	OMNRF	https://www.javacoeapp.lrc.gov.on.ca/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home
USEPA Bays Layer	Used to identify additional bays	n/a	90 m	U.S. & Canada	2011	U.S. EPA	N/A, acquired from Tom Hollenhorst, USEPA

TABLE 3. Landscape data variables summarized and compared across the GLHD watersheds.

Variable	Dataset	Units	Resolution	Date	Source	Download Links
Land cover	NLCD; SOLRIS, PLO	km ²	30 m; 25 m	2011; 2012, 2000	USGS; OMNRF	http://www.mrlc.gov/nlcd11_data.php ; https://www.javacoeapp.lrc.gov.on.ca/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home
Population	TIGER; Census profile	#	Tract; Subdivision	2010; 2011	U.S. Census Bureau; Statistics Canada	http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/data/tiger.html ; http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/index-eng.cfm
Roads	TIGER; Road network files	km	1:100,000	2013; 2014	U.S. Census Bureau; Statistics Canada	http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/data/tiger-geodatabases.html ; http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/geo/RNF-FRR/index-2011-eng.cfm

TABLE 4. Area Summaries of the GLHD Watershed and Interfluve Boundaries. Summaries have been grouped by major lake basin and associated connecting channels, and further separated into island and mainland boundaries.

	Number	Minimum Area (km ²)	Median Area (km ²)	Maximum Area (km ²)
<i>Mainland Watersheds</i>				
GLB	2,354	2.7	12.2	39,149.1
LE	380	2.7	13.8	16,971.0
LH	581	2.7	8.9	16,129.2
LM	293	2.8	19.1	16,468.9
LO	432	2.7	12.7	13,218.3
LS	668	2.7	11.9	39,149.1
<i>Island Watersheds</i>				
GLB	316	2.7	6.2	336.8
LE	17	3.5	6.6	17.9
LH	175	2.8	6.5	336.8
LM	24	2.8	5.0	19.6

LO	18	2.7	6.3	26.6
LS	82	2.8	5.3	72.7
<i>Mainland Interfluves</i>				
GLB	2,373	< 0.1	2.4	288.4
LE	395	< 0.1	1.7	231.6
LH	582	< 0.1	2.2	288.4
LM	284	< 0.1	4.2	177.3
LO	447	< 0.1	1.9	46.0
LS	665	< 0.1	2.9	148.2
<i>Island Interfluves</i>				
GLB	546	< 0.1	2.1	203.3
LE	60	< 0.1	0.6	15.4
LH	308	< 0.1	1.9	203.3
LM	26	< 0.1	3.7	18.5
LO	33	< 0.1	0.7	75.6
LS	119	< 0.1	4.0	33.5

TABLE 5. GLHD Watershed Statistics, and Road Density and Population Summaries for the 30 Largest Watersheds in the Basin.

Watershed name	Lake basin	Country	Watershed area (km²)	Road density (km/km²)	Population (#/km²)
Nipigon River	LS	Canada	39,149	0.1	< 1
Maumee River	LE	US	16,971	2.1	64
Fox River	LM	US	16,469	1.6	48
Saginaw River	LH	US	16,129	2.0	74
Eastern Outlet (French River)	LH	Canada	15,489	0.4	5
Grand River	LM	US	14,456	2.2	108
Spanish River	LH	Canada	13,646	0.3	8
Oswego River	LO	US	13,218	1.9	79
Trent River	LO	Canada	12,591	1.1	23
Saint Joseph River	LM	US	12,226	2.2	79
Menominee River	LM	US	10,535	1.2	6
Mississagi River	LH	Canada	9,277	0.2	< 1
Saint Louis River	LS	US	9,259	0.9	11

Kaministiquia River (Dog)	LS	Canada	7,834	0.3	3
Muskegon River	LM	US	7,062	2.0	34
Grand River	LE	Canada	6,773	1.6	151
Genesee River	LO	US	6,454	1.8	63
Severn River - Lake Simcoe	LH	Canada	6,043	1.1	82
Thames River	LE	Canada	5,664	1.6	94
Michipicoten River	LS	Canada	5,368	0.1	< 1
Old Au Sable River	LH	US	5,304	2.2	11
Kalamazoo River	LM	US	5,272	2.2	89
White River	LS	Canada	5,228	0.1	< 1
Manistee River	LM	US	5,050	1.9	12
Black River	LO	US	4,961	0.9	12
Moon River (Muskoka)	LH	Canada	4,948	0.8	9
Pic River	LS	Canada	4,359	0.2	1
Oswegatchie River	LO	US	4,188	0.9	14
Saugeen River	LH	Canada	3,990	1.0	17
Wanapitei River	LH	Canada	3,871	0.2	13

Author Manuscript

TABLE 6: Percentage of Land Cover Type in the 30 Largest GLHD Watersheds in the Basin.

Name	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	Urban	Agriculture	Water	Barren	Forest	Scrub Shrub	Grassland/Herbaceous	Wetland	No Data
Nipigon River	0.1	< 0.1	23.8	< 0.1	64.1	0.4	7.5	3.5	0.6
Maumee River	11.5	77.5	0.8	0.1	6.8	0.1	1.0	2.2	< 0.1
Fox River	8.4	41.5	6.3	0.1	24.6	0.4	0.6	18.0	< 0.1
Saginaw River	12.7	45.2	1.4	0.3	22.6	1.1	2.8	13.8	< 0.1
Eastern Outlet (French River)	0.8	3.5	15.5	0.8	75.6	< 0.1	0.9	2.8	0.2
Grand River	14.8	53.4	1.5	0.4	16.6	0.3	0.9	12.0	< 0.1
Spanish River	1.6	1.1	10.1	3.0	77.9	< 0.1	4.4	1.9	< 0.1
Oswego River	8.3	39.5	6.4	0.2	30.5	6.4	0.8	7.9	< 0.1
Trent River	3.2	28.4	9.6	0.3	43.7	< 0.1	0.1	14.6	0.2
Saint Joseph River	13.7	58.6	2.3	0.2	11.4	0.3	1.0	12.4	< 0.1
Menominee River	3.9	4.3	2.9	0.1	53.5	2.0	2.4	30.9	< 0.1
Mississagi River	0.1	0.3	10.5	0.5	81.5	0.0	5.2	2.0	< 0.1
Saint Louis River	3.2	3.2	3.8	1.2	33.7	7.3	1.3	46.3	< 0.1
Kaministiquia River (Dog)	0.4	1.0	10.3	0.1	76.1	0.0	8.2	3.6	0.2
Muskegon River	8.5	19.5	4.2	0.2	39.5	3.1	7.0	18.0	< 0.1
Grand River	9.0	71.6	0.9	0.4	6.0	< 0.1	< 0.1	12.2	< 0.1
Genesee River	7.2	44.9	0.9	0.2	37.7	3.7	0.4	5.1	< 0.1
Severn River - Lake Simcoe	5.9	30.2	16.8	1.6	33.0	< 0.1	0.2	12.2	0.1
Thames River	8.1	79.9	0.7	0.3	6.0	< 0.1	< 0.1	4.9	< 0.1
Michipicoten River	0.1	< 0.1	13.9	< 0.1	79.3	< 0.1	4.0	2.2	0.5
Old Au Sable River	8.5	3.3	2.0	0.1	55.9	10.0	7.6	12.8	< 0.1
Kalamazoo River	13.7	48.0	2.3	0.5	21.4	0.4	1.4	12.4	< 0.1
White River	< 0.1	< 0.1	10.6	0.5	78.1	< 0.1	8.6	2.0	0.1
Manistee River	6.0	9.0	1.4	0.2	55.4	5.1	11.3	11.7	< 0.1
Black River	1.7	11.8	3.9	0.2	66.5	7.8	1.1	7.1	< 0.1
Moon River (Muskoka)	1.7	2.7	16.8	0.7	76.4	< 0.1	< 0.1	1.6	0.2
Pic River	< 0.1	< 0.1	6.3	< 0.1	86.6	< 0.1	5.6	1.3	0.2
Oswegatchie River	2.7	13.4	4.5	0.1	60.7	2.6	2.4	13.6	< 0.1
Saugeen River	3.0	66.8	0.8	0.2	10.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	19.2	< 0.1
Wanapitei River	1.0	< 0.1	10.4	5.1	75.8	< 0.1	4.4	3.3	< 0.1

APPENDIX 1. Agency Representation in the GLHD Technical Advisory Committee.

Agency Name	Division/Office
Michigan Department of Natural Resources	Institute for Fisheries Research, Fish Division
University of Michigan	School of Natural Resources and Environment
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry	Land Information Ontario, Water Resources Information Program
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Mid-Continent Ecology Division
U.S. Geological Survey	New England Water Science Center, Great Lakes Science Center
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	Agriculture Environment Services Branch
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Lower Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office
The Nature Conservancy	The Nature Conservancy of Michigan
Michigan State University	Department of Fisheries and Wildlife
International Joint Commission	Great Lakes Office

Author Manuscript

APPENDIX 2. Attributes Associated with the GLHD Watersheds and Watershed Outlet Points. Attributes sources include the NHDPlus v2, OIHDv1.0, and the NHD, NHN, GEL, and additions from Arc Hydro Tools or the GLHD team.

Name of Field	Description	Data Source	Field Format
HydroID	Unique identifier created using the “Assign HydroID” tool in Arc Hydro.	Arc Hydro	Long
W_Link	An ID that links each watershed feature in Watershed_Interfluve_Altered_Attributed_Island or Watershed_Interfluve_Altered_Attributed_Mainland to corresponding watershed outlet points in Watershed_Altered_Attributed_Island or WatershedPoint_Altered_Attributed_Mainland. The number was originally derived in Arc Hydro and was combined with the OrigUnit abbreviation along with an "I" for island features or an "M" for mainland features.	Arc Hydro/GLHD	String
COMID	NHDPlus v2 identifier.	NHDPlus v2	Long
FDate_NHDPlus OR FDate	Currency date for feature. (In the Island feature class, this field is called FDate_NHDPlus, in the Mainland feature class, this field is called FDate).	NHDPlus v2	Date
RESOLUTION	Text description of dataset resolution.	NHDPlus v2	String
GNIS_ID	Geographic Names Information System (GNIS) ID that corresponds to GNIS_Name.	NHDPlus v2	String
GNIS_NAME	GNIS name.	NHDPlus v2	String
REACHCODE	Code assigned to each reach.	NHDPlus v2	String
FLOWDIR	Used to indicate whether the feature included in the NHDPlus v2 DEM; “With Digitized” = included and “Uninitialized” = not included.	NHDPlus v2	String
WBAREACOMI	If the NHDPlus v2 reach is an artificial path that flows through a polygon water features, this is the associated ComID of the polygon water feature.	NHDPlus v2	Long

Name of Field	Description	Data Source	Field Format
FTYPE	Corresponds to the NHD Feature Type.	NHDPlus v2	String
FCODE	Code from NHD describing type of flow line; corresponds to FTYPE.	NHDPlus v2	Long
ENABLED	Is “True” for both OIHDv1.0 and NHDPlus v2 derived data.	NHDPlus v2, OIHDv1.0	String
GNIS_NBR	GNIS number.	NHDPlus v2	Long
Tertiary	Corresponding 3 digit Canadian tertiary watershed code.	OIHDv1.0	String
WRCS_TYPE	Watercourse type (default is Stream).	OIHDv1.0	String
PERMANENCY	Permanency of water feature.	OIHDv1.0	String
FLOW_CLASS	Describes the route of water flow. Two codes: Primary (main route) or secondary (alternate routes such as braided streams).	OIHDv1.0	String
STRAHLER	Strahler stream order.	OIHDv1.0	Long
SHEREVE	Shreve stream order.	OIHDv1.0	Long
CAN_Name	Names attributed from the nearest downstream-reach in the NHN or the GEL layer within 200m (names are not included in the OIHDv1.0 drainage network).	NHN, GEL	String
Permanent_Identifier	NHD unique identifier.	NHD	String
FDate_NHD	Date assorted with each feature that represents the date the feature was last modified.	NHD	Date
Resolution_1	Resolution of the feature source.	NHD	Long
GNIS_ID_1	Unique identifier from GNIS.	NHD	String

Name of Field	Description	Data Source	Field Format
GNIS_Name_1	GNIS name.	NHD	String
ReachCode_1	Unique identifier for reach.	NHD	String
FlowDir_1	Direction of flow.	NHD	Long
WBD_Permanent_Identifier	WBD Unique identifier.	NHD	String
FType_1	A three-digit code which represents a specific feature type.	NHD	Long
FCode_1	A five-digit code which is created using the feature type and other characteristics.	NHD	Long
Enabled_1	This value is always true, and means that the feature was incorporated into the geometric network.	NHD	Short
OrigUnit	Two digit code that corresponds to the original NHDPlus v2 (4A, 4B, 4C, 4D), OIHDv1.0 (NC, NE, SW, SE), or island (LE, LH, LM, LO, LS) processing unit of the flow direction grid used to delineate the layer.	NHDPlus v2, OIHDv1.0, NHD, GLHD	String
Lake	Abbreviated name of Lake basin in which the feature resides (Erie, Huron, Michigan, Ontario, or Superior).	GLHD	String
Main_Island	Describes whether the feature is part of the mainland (Mainland) or islands (Island).	GLHD	String
Type	Original name of layer assigned by Arc Hydro.	Arc Hydro, GLHD	String
Country	Name of the country that contains the feature. (Binational, Canada, US) If the feature is located within both the US and Canada, this field is populated with "Binational."	GLHD	String

Name of Field	Description	Data Source	Field Format
GLHDID	Unique ID created by the GLHD team that numbers all of the watersheds and interfluves sequentially counterclockwise across the Basin, beginning with the mainland Boundary Waters area. Island numbers start at 10,000 and are also numbered sequentially counterclockwise across the Basin.	GLHD	Long
Interfluve	Identifies the features as either a watershed feature (blank) or an interfluve feature (“Interfluve”).	GLHD	String
ShreveDL	Shreve stream order of the most downstream-reach within 100m of an outlet point of the network created using the Stream Order tool (This network was roughly equivalent to the network in the DrainageLine feature class in the Synthetic_Intermediate_Layers feature dataset)	GLHD/ Stream Order Tool (ArcGIS Spatial Analyst)	Short
StrahlerDL	Strahler stream order of the most downstream-reach within 100m of an outlet point of the network created using the Stream Order tool (This network was roughly equivalent to the network in the DrainageLine feature class in the Synthetic_Intermediate_Layers feature dataset)	GLHD/ Stream Order Tool (ArcGIS Spatial Analyst)	Short

APPENDIX 3: Land Cover Crosswalk Categories. Data sources were the 2011 National Land Cover Database (NLCD), the 2012 Southern Ontario Land Resource Information System (SOLRIS), and the 2000 Provincial Land cover Ontario (PLO).

GLAHE	NLCD 2001	NLCD 2011	Ontario Provincial	SOLRIS v2
Common Description	(2011 Edition) Description	Description	Land Cover Description	Description
Great Lakes	Open Water (Great Lakes)	Open Water (Great Lakes)	Water- deep or clear, Water-shallow or sedimented	Open Water
Water	Open Water	Open Water	Water- deep or clear, Water-shallow or sedimented	Open Water

GLAHF Common Description	NLCD 2001 (2011 Edition) Description	NLCD 2011 Description	Ontario Provincial Land Cover Description	SOLRIS v2 Description
Developed	Developed Open Space, Developed Low Intensity, Developed Medium Intensity, Developed High Intensity	Developed Open Space, Developed Low Intensity, Developed Medium Intensity, Developed High Intensity	Settlement/Infrastructure	Transportation, Built Up Area - Pervious, Built Up Area - Impervious
Barren Land	Barren Land (Rock/Sand/Clay)	Barren Land (Rock/Sand/Clay)	Sand/Gravel/Mine Tailings, Bedrock	Open Beach/Bar, Open Sand Dune, Open Cliff and Talus, Extraction - Aggregate, Extraction - Peat/Topsoil
Deciduous Forest	Deciduous Forest	Deciduous Forest	Deciduous Forest	Deciduous Forest
Evergreen Forest	Evergreen Forest	Evergreen Forest	Coniferous Forest	Coniferous Forest
Mixed Forest	Mixed Forest	Mixed Forest	Sparse forest, Mixed forest	Treed Sand Dune, Treed Cliff and Talus, Forest, Mixed Forest, Hedge Row
Scrub/Shrub	Shrub/Scrub	Shrub/Scrub	Regenerating depletion	Tallgrass Woodland
Grassland/ Herbaceous	Grassland/Herbaceous	Grassland/Herbaceous	Cutovers, Burns	Open Alvar, Shrub Alvar, Treed Alvar, Open Tallgrass Prairie, Tallgrass Savanah
Agriculture	Pasture/Hay, Cultivated Crops	Pasture/Hay, Cultivated Crops	Pasture, Cropland	Plantations (Tree Cultivated), Tilled, Undifferentiated

GLAHF Common Description	NLCD 2001 (2011 Edition) Description	NLCD 2011 Description	Ontario Provincial Land Cover Description	SOLRIS v2 Description
Forested Wetland	Woody Wetlands	Woody Wetlands	Deciduous Swamp, Coniferous Swamp, Open Fen, Treed Fen, Open Bog, Treed Bog, Tundra Heath	Treed Swamp, Thicket Swamp, Fen, Bog
Emergent Wetland	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	Mud Flats, Intertidal Marsh, Supertidal Marsh, Inland Marsh	Marsh
Other/Undefined	NoData	NoData	Other (Undefined), Cloud or Shadow	N/A

Author Manuscript

1 FIGURES

2

3 **FIGURE 1.** The GLHD Coverage Extent and Input Data Extents. Watershed coverage of the
4 Laurentian Basin is indicated with a black line; the international boundary is
5 indicated in a black dashed line; the shaded areas illustrate the U.S. (NHDPlus v2:
6 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d) and Canadian (OIHDv1.0, North Central, North East, South
7 West, and South East) processing units used for delineating watersheds. “NHD”
8 indicates data was not available for islands in the NHDPlus v2 and the delineation
9 sources was the 1:24,000 NHD and the 30 m NED DEM.

10

11 **FIGURE 2.** Example of Added Bay Enforcement for the St. Louis River Estuary Using the
12 USEPA Embayment Layer. Before enforcement, (A) the watershed boundaries
13 resulting from the unaltered NHDPlus v2 flow direction grid represented the estuary
14 as a single watershed with a corresponding outlet point at the mouth of the estuary;
15 (B) after adding the USEPA bays layer the hydrologic complexity of the estuary
16 was captured creating numerous watersheds with outlet points and drainage lines
17 emptying directly into the waters of the estuary. Watershed boundaries are in dark
18 gray, synthetic drainage lines in light gray, and watershed outlet points in black.


19

20 **FIGURE 3.** GLHD Basin Wide Watershed Boundaries. This includes partial coverage of the St.
21 Lawrence Seaway with the 30 largest watersheds shaded in gray.


22

23 **FIGURE 4.** Comparison of the NHDPlus v2 and GLHD Derived Watershed Boundaries in the
24 SCDRS Connecting Channel between Lake Huron and Lake Erie. In Panels A and
25 B, the dark gray lines indicate the watershed/s corresponding to the SCDRS, and the
26 light gray lines represent the rest of the watersheds outside of the connecting
27 channel. Panel A shows how the NHDPlus v2 generalizes watershed boundaries in

1 the connecting channels while Panel B shows how the GLHD watershed boundaries
2 empty directly into the waters of the connecting channel. In Panels C and D, reach
3 catchments are represented by the dark gray lines and drainage lines are indicated in
4 light gray, with the shoreline outlined in medium gray. Panel C and D depict a
5 small coastal reach catchment near Sandusky, OH that drains into Sandusky Bay in
6 Lake Erie and illustrates minor stream and reach catchment differences between
7 the NHDPlus v2 (C) and the GLHD (D) due to the GLHD threshold processing
8 methods.




A



- Outlet Points
- Watershed Boundaries
- DrainageLine


Lake Superior

Author Manuscript



N






Author Manuscript


- Outlet Points
- Watershed Boundaries
- DrainageLine_Mainland

Lake Superior



N





United States

Canada

Top 30 Largest Watersheds

0 50 100 200 300 400 Kilometers



Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved



A

Lake Huron

Canada

Lake Erie

Author Manuscript

-  NHD+v2 Lake St. Clair Watershed
-  NHD+v2 Tributary and Interfluvial Watersheds

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved



B

Lake Huron

Canada

Author Manuscript

Lake Erie



GLHD Lake St. Clair Watersheds



GLHD Tributary and Interfluve Watersheds

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved




N






Sandusky Bay

C

Author Manuscript



-  NHD+v2 Reach Catchments
-  NHD+v2 Drainage Lines
-  Shoreline




0 0.5 2 Kilometers




This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Sandusky Bay

Author Manuscript

D



-  GLHD Reach Catchments
-  GLHD Drainage Lines
-  Shoreline



0 0.5 2 Kilometers
This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved