Cover letter for the revised version of our article: *"Improving the understanding of flood risk in the Alsatian region by knowledge capitalization: the ORRION participative observatory"*, submitted to Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences

Dear Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences editorial board, dear Dr. Uwe Ulbrich, dear referees,

Thank you very much for the publication of our article in Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussion, and for the encouragements and valuable comments conveyed by the three referee reports. These have been very useful for us to improve the paper. We have addressed each of their concerns as outlined below. The corresponding changes have been included in the revised version of the paper that we are glad to submit to your kind consideration.

We provide in what follows a point-by-point answer to the two referee reports and a tracked-change version of the paper (changes appear in blue). You will see that we have given special care to better justify our methodological choices and further discuss our results, the pro's and con's of our approach and the great further potential of the information summed up.

Regarding the specific comment regarding our statistical methodology, we fully agree that in this work, only a very simple statistical analysis of the abundant information summed-up was performed. However, as it is now more clearly stated in the paper this choice was made because it is arguably sufficient to highlight the main characteristics in space and time of the data while allowing to keep the paper reasonable in terms of length. Specifically, assessing association on the basis of the sole Pearson coefficient may be seen as oversimplified but it was feasible with our binary / continuous dataset and sufficient to identify couples of variables, rivers, municipality, etc. that behave similarly over the study area and/or the study period. Also, it allowed processing all the data in a unified and systematic way and we could not find a method with stronger mathematical justifications that would have allowed this at reasonable computational costs (see response to referee 3 and the deeply reworked sections 3.4 and 6).

All in all, we feel that the new version of the paper is clearer and more precise, and hope that this will make it adequate for publication in Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences.

With best regards,

Florie Giacona, for the authors.

Author's response to Anonymous referee 1

Thank you for this substantial contribution.
Authors' response: Thank you very much for your interest in our work and for your constructive review. Below are our responses to all the comments and questions raised.

I have some general remarks and questions:
Questions:

1.) Did you take into account the accumulation of wealth and infrastructure over time and its influence on the statistical results? If yes, did you apply an approach that tried to correct this artefact? Please describe your correction approach. If you did not correct it, please reason why you choose not to correct it.
Authors' response: No, no "correction" has been made, mainly because it was not the aim of the ORRION database that our paper aims at introducing and describing. Indeed, ORRION's goal is to share raw flood information only, at least in its current state, avoiding subjective choices as much as possible. The objective of ORRION is to provide in a transparent manner all the information required to conduct a geo-historical analysis of the event chronologies. Such an analysis allows to highlight the factors that explain the spatio-temporal distribution of flood events, namely anthropogenic factors related to sources, vulnerability and infrastructures, but also natural factors related, e.g., to climate. This is what is discussed in section 5.1 of the paper, that highlights the major pattern of change that are visible at the scale of the entire database, and/or more specifically for certain rivers and locations. For instance we clearly say that the shape of the records (number, damage types) reflects, among other effects, the increase in wealth and stakes and of infrastructure construction with time. However, our discussion is only a first step aiming at putting the events in their social and biophysical contexts. Much more work is required in one wants to go further in order to precisely distinguish the weight of the different factors that explain the distribution of the retrieved flood events. Same applies if one more specifically wants to get rid of one specific effect such as vulnerability and infrastructure changes as your comment suggests.
Hence, the second reason for not doing such a "correction" of the record is the complexity of doing this in a realistic way. Indeed, the increase of wealth and infrastructures can have various consequences on flood risk, either direct or indirect, immediate or delayed, positive or negative, local or at larger scale, etc. Also, these consequences can be on the hazard, the stakes and the vulnerability, the perception and the memory of risk, the production of sources etc. In short, all the chain that leads to the data currently in ORRION can be affected and a very large amount of additional information regarding the evolution of land use, sources, natural factors, etc., is required in order to really understand the changes of the system at risk through time and draw firm conclusions. Conducting such an analysis is extremely time consuming and could not, so far be achieved at the scale of our entire database. This was done, however, at the finer scale of a municipality or a small catchment, so as to highlight specific effects. For example, Martin et al (2017) demonstrated the impact of the construction of the Ill canal at Mulhouse and in Strasbourg on the flood record. At a more regional scale, it could be shown that the spatial distribution of the consequences of the 1910 flood in the Rhine plain can only be understood if one considers the uneven development of river correction works at that time. These examples and similar studies we aim at undertaking on other rivers and locations should help, in the future, extrapolating at the scale of the entire database.
These points, already present in the first version of the paper are highlighted much more strongly in the reworked version of the paper, especially Sects. 5.1.1 and 5.1.2.

2.) Similiar question as above. Did you take statistically into account the different availability of documentary evidence on floods over time and location? If yes, how did you correct this, if no, reason why you choose not to correct it?

Authors' response: Again, no correction, and same justification. Our willingness is to disseminate all the raw information collected, avoiding subjective choices as much as possible. Also, the time required to do such a correction for each river/location is too large for the work to be conducted at the scale of the entire database.

However, we want to stress that ORRION data is based on an extensive archival campaign (Transrisk project) further complemented by participative data. This was made in order to maximize the amount of information summed up regarding past events. In addition, all sources related to events are documented in the database, and the evolution of sources with time at regional scale has been already studied by Himmelsbach et al (2014) and, regarding specific bias, by Martin et al. (2015). This all should enable the source bias to be corrected in the future by anyone interested in using the information for, e.g., improving risk mitigation or studying the influence of climate on flood occurrences.

This point, already present in the current version of the paper is highlighted even more strongly in the reworked version of the paper (Sects. 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 and Sect. 6).

3.) Does the quality of some of the documentary flood evidence allow to assess the discharge of the pre measurment period flood events? If yes, why did you not assess the discharges? This could help to improve e.g. the design floods of e.g. a 100 year or a 300 year event. You furthermore could quantify the effects of local to transregional river engineering measures and/or the effects of landuse and climate change on the flood magnitudes over time.

Authors' response: Thanks for this question/comment important in terms of flood mitigation. Indeed, the information gathered makes it possible to reconstruct peak discharges (more or less precisely). Reconstruction methods are now available in the flood literature and are becoming more and more popular. Annette Boessmeier developed and used some of these in her PhD to reconstruct peak discharges for the Kinzig river belonging to the German part of the TRansrisk project. Also, ORRION's information already allowed to better characterize the mapping of the historical floods of 1852 and 1860 for the Ill in Mulhouse, and to validate the corresponding discharge modelling that has been realized within the framework of the European flood directive. Finally, the study of old water levels already revealed that the computation of the centennial flood of the Zorn river was affected by several errors (Martin et al, 2018). Hence, we are well aware of the potential of discharge reconstructions and of the usefulness of our data to achieve this goal. Simply, again, doing this for all our rivers is beyond the scope of the work presented here. Annette Boessmeier did it for one river only, and this took her most of her PhD…   Here, the objective is more modest: to introduce what we already have (a lot of information and chronologies of events, typologies..) which leads to an article that is already long (cf. referee 2 review.). However, of course it would be very useful to do the discharge reconstruction all over the study area and period, and this is clearly an objective for future developments.

The reworked version of the paper precises this and insist on the promising perspectives offered by discharge reconstructions on the basis of the available information (Sect. 6).

Remarks: I would suggest to not only include pictorial evidence of floods but also (historical) river profiles and to georeference them at the correct location with GIS.

Authors' response: We indeed summed up some historical river profiles, but not that many and most of these concern the Rhine and the Ill rivers only. This information was found in the archives but the search was not very successful. Apparently, old profiles have been often lost or destroyed (a pity). However, when found, such documents were indeed very useful to retrieve the past profiles of the Ill and Rhine rivers and, e.g., better understand the floods of 1910 and 1919. Hence, in the future, the profiles we already have will be included in ORRION. Also, we plan to conduct some new archival searches at the Services of Navigation which has been so far inaccessible to us because of successive removals. This may be the right place to gather more information about past river profiles.

This is précised in the revised version of the paper (Sect. 5.1.2 and 6).

Author's response to Anonymous referee 2

This paper presents a thorough review of the ORRION database, it details the content, spatial and temporal extent of the database and provides some preliminary analysis of the results. The paper is of particular interest to those interested in the Alsatian region, but more could be done to highlight why this is of interest beyond this particular case-study. I have added a broader range of references to the attachment which the authors may find of value, many more are available beyond these which would strengthen some of the arguments you make. There are some interesting points in the paper, but these need to be clearly teased out in the conclusion, as it is a long paper.

Authors' response: Thank you very much for your interest in our work, your positive and constructive feedback and your detailed review. All suggested references and minor corrections proposed in the attached document have been taken into account in the reworked version of the paper. Also, the conclusion has been reworked, notably to better highlight main results and conclusion of our work. We agree that this was necessary given that the paper is long due to the very large amount of information it conveys regarding both the investigation method and the data summed up. Especially we have made clearer how the work conducted already strongly contributed to very concretely improve flood risk management in the targeted area. By the way, below are our responses to all the comments and questions raised.

I was surprised that the paper did not reference any previous work using the historical descriptors as either a proxy flood level indicator and in indices production, I have added suggestions from the literature, this may just be an oversight in writing the paper up, with this undertaken during the development phase. It would be good to know how you accounted for recorder bias through time, e.g. a potentially more interested individual at a site, and changing literacy rates.

Authors' response: Thank you very much again for all the suggested references. They have been considered in the revised manuscript. Regarding the question of the source bias, we want to stress that that our paper aims at introducing and describing the ORRION database. ORRION's goal is to share raw flood information only, at least in its current state, avoiding subjective choices as much as possible, with the ultimate objective to provide in a transparent manner all the information required to conduct a geo-historical analysis of the event chronologies. Such an analysis allows to highlight the factors that explain the spatio-temporal distribution of flood events, namely anthropogenic factors related to sources, vulnerability and infrastructures, but also natural factors related, e.g., to climate. This is discussed in section 5.1 of the paper, that highlights the major patterns of change that are visible at the scale of the entire database, and/or more specifically for certain rivers and locations. For instance we clearly say that the shape of the records (number, damage types) reflects, among other effects, the availability of sources as function of time. Hence, we do not correct the record but we tried to make the record as exhaustive as possible, and we reports all sources related to events within the database. These remain available to anyone interested. Indeed, ORRION data is based on an extensive archival campaign (Transrisk project) further complemented by participative data. This was made in order to maximize the amount of information summed up regarding past events. In addition, the evolution of sources with time at regional scale has been already studied by Himmelsbach et al (2014) and, regarding specific bias, by Martin et al. (2015). This all, in addition to the complete availability of sources within the database, should enable the source bias to be corrected in the future by anyone interested in using the information for, e.g., improving risk mitigation or studying the influence of climate on flood occurrences.

This point, already present in the current version of the paper are highlighted even more strongly in the reworked version of the paper (Sects. 5.1.1 and 6).

I am very surprised that no attempt at flood reconstruction is undertaken, either in a simple e.g. level to discharge estimation, or in a more advanced manner (Herget & Meurs, 2010). Surely the documentary evidence would permit such in some instances, particularly if sufficient information to map flood extents. If this is planned state that, as this is of value to flood risk managers. It would be good to see some comment on the influence of the engineering activities over several decades on some of these systems in more detail – can they account for the changes? Or guide reader to other work that has undertaken this.

Authors' response: Indeed, the information gathered makes it possible to reconstruct peak discharges (more or less precisely). Reconstruction methods are now available in the flood literature and are becoming more and more popular. Annette Boessmeier developed and used some of these in her PhD to reconstruct peak discharges for the Kinzig river belonging to the German part of the TRansrisk project. Also, ORRION's information already allowed to better characterize the mapping of the historical floods of 1852 and 1860 for the Ill in Mulhouse, and to validate the corresponding discharge modelling that has been realized within the framework of the European flood directive. Finally, the study of old water levels already revealed that the computation of the centennial flood of the Zorn river was affected by several errors (Martin et al, 2018). Hence, we are well aware of the potential of discharge reconstructions and of the usefulness of our data to achieve this goal. Simply, doing this for all our rivers is beyond the scope of the work presented here. Annette Boessmeier did it for one river only, and this took her most of her PhD… Here, the objective is more modest: to introduce what we already have (a lot of information and chronologies of events, typologies, etc.) which leads to an article that is already long (cf. referee 2 review.). However, of course it would be very useful to do the discharge reconstruction all over the study area and period, and this is clearly an objective for future developments. The reworked version of the paper precises this and insists on the promising perspectives offered by discharge reconstructions on the basis of the available information (Sect. 6).

Regarding the question of the impact of engineering activities including construction of mitigation measures and more widely of land use on the flood records, as for the sources, this was already in the discussion section of the paper where we provide quick explanations for some changes we observe. This applies, e.g., to flood chronologies with/without overflow for the Rhine and the Bruche rivers. Clearly, more could be done at the fine scale of specific municipalities or rivers and such analyses were already done in some cases. For example, Martin et al (2017) demonstrated the impact of the construction of the Ill canal at Mulhouse and in Strasbourg on the flood record. At a more regional scale, it could be shown that the spatial distribution of the consequences of the 1910 flood in the Rhine plain can only be understood if one considers the uneven development of river correction works at that time. However, conducting such analyses is extremely time consuming and could not, so far be achieved at the scale of our entire database. This point is now highlighted even more strongly in the reworked version of the paper (Sects. 5.1.2 and 6).

I felt the discussion would benefit from some comparison of the flood rich years that emerge potentially being discussed in more detail and comparison with other databases on long flood series from across Europe - no more that that is possible at present until underlying trends within the data resulting from social factors are addressed – the lack of this limits the utility of the results to a database compilation.

Authors' response: This is a good suggestion, thanks. In the paper, we already briefly compare the smooth temporal trend in our records with other examples of the literature (e.g. Wilhelm, 2012). However, comparing specific flood years / events is another appealing option. We therefore compared the most severe events of our record (class III and IV) to the extreme flood events identified by Glaser et al. (2010) for 12 major rivers of central Europe including the Rhine. Specifically, Glaser et al. (2010) identifies 13 major flood events

between 1500 and 1900. Among these, two correspond to high (class III) or extreme (class IV) events of our record: January-February 1862 (class IV) and February 1876 (class III). Another event of Glaser et al.'s inventory is for us a class I event (march 1784) whereas 4 other events of Glaser et al.'s inventory correspond to events in our record, for which the severity class could not be determined using our specific scale (this is the case for 35% of the studied ORRION events in total). Considering this latter specific difficulty, the comparison appears therefore as rather probative, with around half of the years of Glaser's inventory corresponding to ORRION events. This is all the more true when considered that, whereas the work of Glaser et al. focuses on major rivers of the length and watershed side corresponding to the ones of the Rhine, ORRION events correspond to a very wide range of flood types in terms of concerned rivers and spatial extent. Especially, a significant part of ORRION events concerned only one or few "small" Alsatian tributaries flowing down from the Vosges mountains, and that occurred after a very localized rainfall event such as a thunderstorm. It is therefore not surprising at all that the agreement between Glaser et al.'s and ORRION records is far from perfect. Finally, for the 20th century, correspondence between well-known flood events and our record can also be found. January 1910 was the most intense flood event of the Seine river in Paris over the last centuries. It is also a class IV event in our record. January 1936 that was the time of an extremely widespread and intense flood episode over the north Atlantic (Ballesteros Canovas et al., 2018) is also in our record, but corresponds to an event for which the severity class could not be determined. All in all, even if, of course, much more could be done in terms of comparison between ORRION and other records, this quick comparison already further demonstrates that, even if the event chronologies that can be derived from ORRION database are clearly affected by human factors related to sources, vulnerability etc., they also include information related to the physics of the flood process and its underlying hydro-meteorological causes.
The 5.1.3. discussion section of the reworked article now include this quick comparison as an outlook, among others, offered by the data summed up in ORRION, and as a further demonstration of the consistency of the record.

Further discussion on quality control of public database contributions is needed, a statement on how this was managed.
Thank you for this question. The quality checking is indeed a crucial point for the reliability of the database, and also a huge part of the work of the database management. Basically the team of database administrators do this by verifying possible redundancy with pre-existing information, directly interact with the public information providers, check themselves the provided sources (e.g. pictures, newspaper articles, etc.), and, if necessary, go themselves on the field for further verifications or do themselves further archival searches. In practice, the likelihood of many testimonies is to be investigated in details, and also retrieving the date and location of the pictures provided is often a huge work. This information has been added in the revised manuscript (Sect. 3.1).

p.5/6 I would benefit from some indication of size of river discharges being considered, I don't recall seeing anything of this nature – consider adding.
Herget, J., & Meurs, H. (2010). Reconstructing peak discharges for historic flood levels in the city of Cologne, Germany. Global and Planetary Change, 70(1–4), 108–116.
You are right considering the interest of a brief river description. Basically, the Rhine river is a well-known very large river, the Ill river is one of its important tributaries whose basin encompasses most of the studied area, and the 11 other rivers considered are smaller rivers, most of them being tributaries of the Ill river. The following table sums up the characteristics of these 13 rivers in terms of length and 10 and 50 year return period peak discharge as considered in flood prevention plans. This information has been added in the revised manuscript (now Table 1).
By the way, the suggested reference has been added in the revised manuscript

River (municipality)	Length (km)	Q_{10} (m^3/s)	Q_{50} (m^3/s)
Ill (Osthouse)	216	200	260
Largue (Spechbach)	51	61	82
Doller Burnhaupt)	47	62	84
Thur (Bollwiller)	53	91	120
Lauch (Guebwiller)	47	22	30
Fecht (Ostheim)	49	91	120
Giessen (Sélestat)	34	80	110
Lièpvrette (Liepvre)	25	34	48
Bruche (Oberschaeffolsheim)	77	140	190
Mossig (Soultz)	33	15	20
Zorn (Waltenheim)	97	79	110
Moder (Schweighouse)	82	68	93
Rhin (Lauterbourg)	1233	3900	4600

Please also note the supplement to this comment: https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2018-210/nhess-2018-210-RC2-supplement.pdf

Authors' response: Thank you very much again for all these suggestions (references, typos corrections etc.) and editing comments. They have all been considered in the revised paper.

Author's response to Anonymous referee 3

General comments

The paper presents a data set on regional river floods which is certainly a valuable contribution to natural hazards research. It is furthermore well structured. However, I have comments on the definition of variables and the statistical analyses. I think this can be a lot more informative if the associated sections are revised. In many of the analyses given, binary variables are related and in this case Pearson's correlation coefficient is not informative, nor can its significance be tested with a t-test. All these analyses need to be revised. The resulting paper will be a lot more valuable than the current version. See my detailed comments below.

Authors' response: Thank you very much for your generally positive appreciation of our work, your positive and constructive feedback and your detailed review. We agree that some points in the variable definition and statistical analysis sections needed to be precised and this has been done in the revised version of the paper. Below are our detailed responses to all the comments and questions raised.

Let us however make first a general answer regarding the statistical methodology. We do not base our answer on Gilks et al. (2011) that is sadly not available to us but on the references at our hand.

Most important thing is that for binary variables, computation of standard metrics such as spearman rank correlation, Kendall tau and Pearson cross product-moment coefficient lead exactly to the same result (this can be checked by developing the formulas). The result gives a measure of the link between the two variables that one indeed should refer in a generic way as "association" (how the variables behave together or not) instead of "correlation" which may have the more restrictive sense of the strength of the potential linear link. For a couple of variables with one binary and one continuous variable or one binary and one discrete unbounded variable, the point-biserial coefficient is the standard choice, which can also be rewritten at the Pearson cross product-moment coefficient. Hence, there is nothing wrong with using Pearson cross product-moment coefficient in such cases as a measure of association/correlation, and other standard choices arguably provide exactly the same result.

For categorical variables with more than two values, however, this is no longer true (which may be what the reviewer has in mind), and one may need to look at other metrics such as the Tetrachronic correlation which does not exactly correspond to the Pearson cross product-moment coefficient (even if it remains close). This is not required for us because our variable definition is made to avoid this more difficult case.

The second point is how to test the significance of this association/correlation, and this is a trickier question. Arguably (and surprisingly), this may even be a kind of grey area in statistical science because despite a deep search it was not completely possible for us to get a complete definite answer. Yet, what is clear is that having one or two binary variables within the Pearson cross product-moment coefficient does not blur the convergence of its estimate to asymptotic normality on the basis of standard theorems (Central limit theorem, Slutsky theorem, etc.). As a consequence there is nothing wrong in principle in using the standard t-test as we do in such cases. However, what is true is that in such cases convergence to asymptotic normality of the estimate with sample size may be slow (and clearly much slower than in the optimal case of an underlying bivariate Gaussian population) which may be why the t-test is often (not always, there is no consensus) referred as inappropriate in such case. On the other hand, when applying tests, nobody generally cares about the convergence to the asymptotic distribution of the estimate and simply apply it to get the yes/no answer… More practically, we have rather large samples at hand (366 events, more than 500 years of data) so this may not be really an issue…

Yet, the problem comes when considering that, for binary variables, the same association measure may be seen, as said before, either as spearman rank correlation, Kendall tau and Pearson cross product (and similarly, with one binary and one continuous variable or one binary and one discrete unbounded variable, as the point-biserial coefficient or as the Pearson cross product coefficient). And these different quantities have different asymptotic distributions for their estimates providing different p-values and hence different answers to the same question of stating if the variables are associated or not. In full rigor, one should therefore try different tests in each case (as one should try different tests for the identity of the mean of two Gaussian distributions…). However, due to the very high amount of couples of variables we consider and to the scope of the paper (see below) we prefer not doing that.

This would indeed increase the complexity and length of the paper without much added value with regards to the scope of the paper.

Finally, we indeed want to stress that, even if the statistical analysis is an important point of the paper, it is only one among different aspects of our work which also includes the constitution of the database with a mixed historical-participative approach. The latter leads a very large data set and the aim of the statistical analyze if only to demonstrating that the data overall makes sense and to highlight its main characteristics in space and time. The size of the analyzed data set makes that only a very simple strategy like ours can be systematically applied to all event characteristics and time series. For instance, we fully agree than more advanced approaches base on statistical modelling using e.g. logistic regression would be much more appropriate to answer specific questions such as, e.g. linkages between binary and continuous variable, but doing this systematically and interpret all related results would clearly expand the paper length beyond reasonable standards.

It was already stated in the conclusion and outlook section of the paper: "However, only a rapid analysis of this abundant information was performed. Hence, further research could clearly exploit the data in many directions, for example, explicit statistical modeling with advanced nonseparable spatiotemporal covariance models instead of the rather simple descriptive techniques that were used in this work. Coupled with the diachronic analysis of land use, settlements, and practices, this may facilitate further understanding of the main pattern of change in flood risk", but we will make sure in the revised version of the paper that this message is even more explicit.

All in all it seems to us that the statistical debate goes far beyond what we want to show in the paper and even beyond the discussions that the standard readership of NHESS may expect to find in the journal. We also believe that our methodological approach, even simple, is sufficient to reach want we want to show.

To avoid ambiguities, we have in the reworked version of the paper justify our methodological choice with the arguments detailed above, replace "correlation" by "association" as much as possible and say even more clearly that further work should ground on the data but chose (much) more advanced statistical modelling strategies to answer specific questions (Sect 3.4 and 6).

2 Detailed comments
Comments are sorted according to the different sections and subsection.

2.1 Introduction
p.2, l.8 statistical analyses is the first concept mentioned in your introduction. Make it a valuable concept in your paper!
Authors' response: According to our main comment, statistical analysis is not at the hearth of this paper, and it is also a bit restrictive at this stage. This has been changed into "analyses of long data series is a prerequisite for any effective management of natural hazards".

p.2, l.8 chronologies is a synonym for time series?
Authors' response: In a strict sense, yes, it is the temporal distribution of past events, but for us it goes a bit beyond since from the point of view of the historical analysis the rough time series comes with various elements allowing to put past events within their bio-physical and societal contexts. See, e.g., Giacona et al. NHESS 2017). This has been precised in the revised version of the paper.

2.2 Further filtering and additional event typologies
Table 2. Is the Multi-criteria severity scale for flood events really as informative as it could be? There are initially 2 dimensions: Damage level (3 categories) and Spatial extension (3 categories). There are thus 9 possible combinations from which only 7 are attained. Using the Severity this is mapped onto 1 dimension with 4 categories. In the text, category IV is mapped onto III. I cannot follow the argument why this reduction of information is made. 7 combinations are not so much. Please explain what is the reason behind this reduction to 3/4 categories.
Authors' response: Thank you for this point. First, we really wanted to have a measure that combines spatial extent and damage level to asses flood severity, which led us define 7 possible combinations. This is not that much, but these different combinations are somewhat difficult to rank (is a regional flood with slight damage worse or less severe than a local flood having caused strong damages?). Also, scales usually used in the risk / natural hazard worlds have 5 levels, not seven, which is a bit too much. We therefore mapped the 7 combinations into 3 or 4 categories. This is not a huge reduction of

the complexity, but it already makes things easier for the analysis. Especially, the obtained severity class is arguably really an increasing function of flood severity (class II more severe than class I, etc.). By the way, the damage and spatial extension scores for each event have obviously been kept, so that they remain usable for further work including specific analyses within more detailed categories (e.g. only regional extent damageable events, localized damageable events, etc.). This has been further precised in the reworked version of the paper (Sect. 5.2).

2.3 3.4 Statistical analyses
This section apparently gives the methodological background needed to understand and reproduce the statistical analyses made in this paper. Unfortunately, I see both goals not met. I have a rough idea what is going to happen with these methods and I fear that the results are prone to misinterpretation. The description is not sufficiently detailed to enable the reader to reproduce the research. I suggest to rewrite this subsection completely with more mathematical rigour, without Pearson's correlation but including conditional means, conditional probabilities, and, if you like, logistic regressin. The reason is given in the following section.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

p.10 l.16 ... was analyzed through a comprehensive set of basic statistical methods. I noted only one method, which is calculating Pearson's correlation coeffcients. I agree with basic but not with comprehensive.
Authors' response: We agree that this sentence was a bit cumbersome. "Comprehensive" was for us not related to the set of methods used (arguably mostly an association analysis, even if the computation of smooth underlying trends can be considered as another method, why not?) but to the whole set of variables it was applied: the quantitative and presence/absence variables (including rivers and municipality) both in the event table (correlation between events) and in the chronology table (time series table). This leads to a huge amount of information arguably sufficient to highlight the main pattern of the very large amount of data at our hand. This point is further precised in the reworked version of the paper. Note by the way that Sect 3.4 has been completely reworked to be more precise and comprehensive.

p.10 l.17 each categorical variable. A categorical variable is a variable X which can take one value out of a set of categories, e.g. X={A;B;C}, compare https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Categorical_variable. This holds for your variables hydrological configuration and severity class. The latter can take values from {I; II; III; IV} and can be even ordered. It is thus a special case of a categorical variable. The other _variables_ can take on more than one value,
Authors' response: We agree that our use of "categorical" may be seen as insufficiently precise from a strict mathematical point of view. But in fact we only consider binary variables in our analyses (which are indeed specific categorical variables) since we transform all information such as cause, damage type, etc. in a vector of presence (1)/absence(0) variables whose length depend on the considered group (e.g. 5 for the severity class, the four class and unknown, etc.). This has been precised in the reworked version of the paper, with Sect 3.4 hving been completely reworked to be more precise and comprehensive.

p.7 l.25 Causes. For each event, one or several causes (if any) and is thus not a categorical variable,
Authors' response: OK, this has been changed (see previous comment, we have as much binary variables as possible causes, plus the unknown case).

p.7 l.26 Damage types: human ..., material, functional, environmental, unknown. For each event, zero to four damage types can be documented and is thus not a categorical variable,
Authors' response: ibid.

hydrological configuration, it is not completely clear to me, if more than one value can be attained.
Authors' response: No one single configuration per event, either Rhine, Tributaries or both. This has been precised.

p.10, l.18 each categorical variable ... was coded in terms of presence/absence. I don't think that is what you meant. A categorical variable can take values out of a set of categories. A binary variable can take on 0 (absence) or 1 presence. What are these binary variables now? My understanding is that you have groups of binary variables as follows

_ Group causes
_ Ice breakup (binary)
_ Ice jam (binary)
_ Snow melting (binary)
_ Heavy rainfall (binary)
_ . . .
_ Unknown (binary)
_ Group consequences
_ Environmental (binary)
_ Functional (binary)
_ Human (binary)
_ Material (binary)
_ other (binary)
This section needs to be more precise. Use mathematical definitions and equations.
Authors' response: Again, this simply means that we transform all information such as causes, damage types, etc. in a vector of presence (1)/absence(0) variables whose length depend on the considered group (e.g. 5 for the severity class, etc.). This has been reworked for more clarity but we think that there is no need to introduce mathematical notations / equations for such simple operations.

p.10, l.19. Presence/absence codes were also given for each event in all municipalities. What does that mean? A municipality A gets assigned A = 1 if it was affected by the event? Please be more precise.
Authors' response: Yes, exactly, this has been precised in the reworked version of the paper.

p.10, l.20. For the rivers, distinct codes were given, depending on whether water overflow was documented or not_. What codes are given to the rivers? Is a river denoted as, e.g., Rhin and gets assigned a Rhine = 3 if there was an overflow? Please be more precise.
Authors' response: Again, we transformed the information into as many variables as necessary. For each event we have a list of rivers which have been affected and for each of them we know if water overflow was documented or not. As a consequence, for each event we have the variable "overflow for Rhine" which takes the value 1 if this was documented, 0 if not, "flood without overflow for Rhine" which takes the value 1 if this was documented, 0 if not, and ""flood with or without overflow for Rhine" which takes the value 1 if Rhine was flooded during the event and 0 in not. And this is done for the 13 rivers we specifically consider plus for a binary variable corresponding to all other rivers specifically known in the target area as well as for unknown rivers (if any). Also, for each event, we count among the 13 rivers we focus on, the number of rivers with overflow, of rivers without overflow and of flooded rivers in total. At the end of the day, for each event, we have therefore (13+2*)*3=45 binary variables plus 3 positive discrete variables. This has been precised in the reworked version of the paper.

p.10, l.22. Also, visualization and analysis of the spatial characteristics of each event under a GIS environment was possible. I agree with visualization.
Authors' response: Analysis here refers to the fact that it was then possible to do the correlation analysis and the computation of all time-series. We agree that it does not refer here to specific GIS treatments, so that the word "analysis" has been removed in the reworked version of the paper

_ p.10, l.24. _All correlations between variables, rivers, municipalities, etc. were evaluated_. I can see how a correlation between variables is evaluated but not how to obtain a correlation coeffcient for rivers. What is meant? The variable river length, river flow, water level? Same question for municipalities, is it the number of people living there? This needs to be more precise.
Authors' response: This refers to the correlation between the presence / absence between couples of rivers or couple of municipalities in the event table. For rivers, the analysis could be done for specific binary variables referring to overflow, flood without overflow or both. For simplicity, only the latter case was considered in the paper. This analysis highlights to which amount couples or rivers or municipalities tend to be affected by the same flood events which is exactly the aim of an association analysis.

_ p.10, l.24._ The Pearson's correlation coeffcient is easy to interpret for pairs from a bivariate normal distributed variable. If we want or not, this is what most of us have in mind when seeing this coeffcient. I expect that you obtain Pearson's correlation coefficient not just for pairs from a bivariate normal distributed variable but also for other pairs, e.g. from ordered categorical variables as your _Severity

class_ or for binary variables as, e.g. Cause: Heavy rainfal (0/1), etc. I don't think it is clear, how to interpret Pearson's correlation coefficient in this case, neither is Student's t-test valid. This makes your analyses questionable.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

p.11, l.1 percentage: fraction
Authors' response: Thank you, this will be changed in the revised version of the paper.

p.11, l.1 having occured each calendar month
Authors' response: Thank you, this has been changed in the revised version of the paper.

p.22, l.2 time trends: large time-scale variations
Authors' response: Thank you, , this has been changed in the revised version of the paper.

p. 22, l.4 ... for each series, the moving averages values_ what are these values? How are they standardized? How can the standardized value be interpreted? This should be made more precise (and shorter) using equations.
Authors' response: Simply, for each time series (e.g. number of events per year in the river Rhine as function of time, number of type III events per year as function of time, etc.) we computed 51- and 31-year moving averages. In the plots, rather than superposing the raw counts and these moving averages, we rescaled the latter as follows: for each series, the moving average values were multiplied by the ratio between the raw annual count standard deviation and the moving average standard deviation. This gives both the row series and rescaled moving average series the same variance, i.e. the same range of variability on the plots, allowing easier visualization. Only the shape of the rescaled moving average series is analyzed which is exactly the same as the one of the non-scaled moving averages series (increase, decrease, etc.). On the other hand, we do not analyze the quantitative rescaled values in terms of trends (+0.xxx event per year, etc.) as this should indeed be done with the non-scaled series. This has been clarified in the reworked version of the paper (fully reworked Sect. 3.4). Again, we do not think it is really necessary to introduce equations within the text core for such simple operations.

2.4 Results
_ p.11, l.15 _... all damage types are positively correlated with the 'source number' variable_. What is the source number variables? This has not been explained in the previous sections. It appears from this section now that it is the number of sources reporting a given events, i.e. an positive integer variable including 0. Please explain this variable in the appropriate section before.
Authors' response: Thank you, this has been included in the 3.2 Section of the revised version of the paper.

_ p.11, l.16 _... Pearson correlation coe_cient is 0.26 with human damage presence/absence, non-zero at the 0.05% signi_cance level...._ What does this number imply if we do not have pairs from a bivariate normal variable? What is _0.05%_? Do you mean a level of the test of 0.05? Or equivalently a level of 5%? Saying _non-zero_, I expect you mean a two-sided test. However, as mentioned earlier, results of a t-test are questionable for non-normal input variables as the presence/absence variables. I suggest deleting this correlation analysis and obtain conditional mean values instead. For source number Si and human damage Hi for event i that implies … (see latex doc) with i counting the events from 1 to N, hi being the binary variable for human damage associated with event i. This gives the conditional mean source number for events with human damage. This can be compared to the conditional mean for no human damage. If you like, you can obtain confidence intervals for these means using the central limit theorem or even t-test them for significant difference. Here, the t-test is very likely to hold as means become quickly normal distributed due to the central limit theorem, see e.g., Wilks [2011]. Alternatively, you can also show conditional distributions as histograms.
Authors' response: See main comment at the beginning of our answer. And yes, 0.05% refers to a level of 5% of the t-test, this is precised in the reworked version of the paper.

p.11, l.18 There is also a very strong correlation between the source number variable and the extreme-sized events (class IV) and large-sized events (class III). It appears here that Severity is not used as an ordered categorical variable with values from 1 to 4 but as a collection of binary variables. I suggest to use the same conditional mean as explained before for all four categories.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

p. 11, l.25 Here, you obtain conditional probabilities for the different causes. That is very easy to understand and meaningful! You should use this kind of conditional analyses instead of correlation. As up to 4 causes can be selected for an event, you can also obtain probability estimates conditioned on two or more causes at the same time. Confidence intervals can be obtained with the help of the binomial distribution.
Authors' response: See our main comment and our response about categorical/binary variables.

Table 3. Total of right column is 100 not 1. Furthermore, I would call it Fraction (%) instead of Percentage
Authors' response: Thank you, this has been changed in the revised version of the paper.

p.13, l.1 Again you relate two binary variables (e.g. class II and snow melting) with Pearson's correlation. Please change this in conditional probabilities as before.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

probability of a class III event given snow melting
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

probability of a class III event given heavy rainfall
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

Vice versa, you can even estimate the probabilities of the various causes given a class III event. Both would be much more helpful than a correlation coeffcient.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

p.13, l.30 Instead of correlations, I's suggest to estimate probabilities of common flooding.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

Replace Table 5 with joint probabilities instead of Pearson's correlation coefficient. As the table is symmetric, only the upper or lower triangle needs to be given. The space in the other triangle can be used e.g. for uncertainty information. There is a typo in the Table caption: Bod
Authors' response: Regarding the choice of a correlation analysis, see our main comment at the beginning of our answer. We agree that only half of the table is required due to symmetry and we did that in the revised version of the paper. Thanks for the typo, it is corrected.

p.14, l.7 Again, replace the correlation analysis with probabilities. This can be probably also nicely shown on a map.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

p.15, l.11 Again, correlation should be replaced with conditional probabilities.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

I stop citing every case where Pearson's correlation coefficient should not be used. It should be replace in all cases using binary variables by either the conditional mean or conditional probabilities.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

p.18, l.2 and l.14. Here we have Pearson's correlation for class III events (binary) and time. If you want to show an increase/decrease in the probability for class III events in time, logistic regression [e.g., Wilks, 2011] would be a good choice. Same holds for the change in probability of causes and damage types.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

_ p.19, l.3 Floods of the Ill and total number of floods can be studied with conditional means of total number of floods conditioned on Ill floods, see above.
Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

All through Section 4, the authors should replace the correlation analyses with either conditional means, conditional probabilities or logistic regression as indicated above. I did not explicitly mark

every occurrence which needs replacement. This should have became clear from the examples discussed.

Authors' response: see main comment at the beginning of our answer.

Improving the understanding of flood risk in the Alsatian region by knowledge capitalization: the ORRION participative observatory

Florie Giacona[1-2], Brice Martin[3], Benjamin Furst[3], Rüdiger Glaser[4], Nicolas Eckert[2], Iso Himmelsbach[4], Charlotte Edelblutte[3]

[1]Institut des Sciences de l'Environnement – Université de Genève, 66 bd Carl Vogt, CH-1205 Genève, Suisse

[2]Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Irstea, UR ETGR, 2 rue de la Papeterie-BP 76, F-38402 St-Martin-d'Hères, France

[3] Cresat, Université de Haute-Alsace, Campus Fonderie, 16 rue de la Fonderie 68093 Mulhouse cedex, France

[4] IPG, Albert-Ludwig Universität Freiburg, Werthmannstrasse 4, 79098 Freiburg, Germany

Correspondence to: Florie Giacona (florie.giacona@irstea.fr)

Abstract. Despite the strong societal impact of natural hazards, their documentation remains incomplete, with only a few inventories exceeding the past two centuries. Surprisingly enough, this also applies to Europe, a densely populated territory, and to floods, which along with storms are the most common and damage-causing natural hazard in Europe. In addition, existing inventories have often been compiled by scientists and technicians and are used for risk management in a top-down manner, although the participation of all parties concerned has been recognized as a key factor for disaster reduction. To address this double paradox, the present article presents the regional flood risk observatory ORRION for the Alsatian region, northeastern France, and its very rich data content. Stemming from two successive interdisciplinary and transnational French-German research projects, ORRION was designed as a participative online platform where information is shared between individuals, stakeholders, engineers, and scientists. This original approach aims at maximizing knowledge capitalization and contributes to building a common knowledge base for flood risk. ORRION is organized by events including all river floods that have likely arisen from a single synoptic situation. For each event, it documents information sources, date of occurrence, causes, and consequences in terms of damage and affected river basins and municipalities. ORRION contributed toward renewing our knowledge of flood hazard and risk in the target area. Notably, here, long chronicles of floods are derived for 13 rivers, the Rhine and most of its main Alsatian tributaries, and for all Alsatian municipalities, most of them since the end of the 15th century, but over more than one millennium for the Rhine. Their main characteristics according to various typologies (seasonality, causes, severity, etc.) are analyzed. Major developments over the study period related to sources, land use, and/or climate change are identified. The advantages and limitations of the approach are discussed and the potential to expand both data exploitation and the building of common flood risk knowledge are listed.

1. Introduction

Analyses of long data series is a prerequisite for any effective management of natural hazards. They facilitate our understanding of the spatial and temporal dimensions of natural hazards, the relationship between intensity and frequency and, thus, help in evaluating reference scenarios for the definition of zoning maps or the design of defense structures. Today, the need to capitalize historical information regarding natural phenomena and related damages over long time periods is therefore a priority among researchers and risk managers (e.g., Stediger and Cohn, 1986; Naulet et al., 2005; Paraystre et al. 2011; Wilhelm et al., 2018). In order to complete instrumental series, generally limited to a few decades, historical analysis is increasingly used to reconstruct chronologies (i.e. temporal distribution of past events) and understand the dynamics of the potentially damage-causing phenomena over several centuries. In practice, however, spatially and temporally comprehensive databases dedicated to natural hazards are relatively rare (e.g., Giacona et al., 2017), even in the case of hydrological risks (e.g., Guzzetti and Tonelli, 2004; Bradzil et al., 2006; Hilker et al., 2009; Martin ,2010; Wetter et al., 2011; Lang and Cœur, 2012; Kjeldsen et al., 2014, Veale et al., 2017).

From a different perspective, the information on natural hazards that is available to the public is generally summed up by researchers and/or managers. Furthermore, it more often than not remains limited to the mapping of hazard-prone areas (e.g., InfoTerre, Internet portal managed by the French Geological Survey) and to mentions of remarkable and/or severe phenomena (e.g., French historical flood database, BDHI, http://bdhi.fr/; French avalanche database, Bourova et al., 2016). More rarely, comprehensive records in a given territory are offered (e.g., HISTRHONE, a historical database of floods in the lower Rhône River catchment, France, https://histrhone.cerege.fr/; French National Observatory for Natural Risks, Observatoire National des Risques Naturels, www.onrn.fr 2015, the British Hydrological Events database http://www.cbhe.hydrology.org.uk/index.php, etc.). All these databases only partially contribute to detailed knowledge based on the memory of the past. Instead, information is transferred in a one-way top-down manner, from experts to the public, to which "expert knowledge" (Höppner et al., 2012) is exposed without a clear logic of dialogue (Martin, 2006). Very few databases and platforms have been created to date as tools for sharing knowledge with mutual benefit between citizens, stakeholders, technicians, and scientists (e.g., Sangster et al., 2018).

Yet, the importance of public involvement and participation in environmental decision-making is now widely acknowledged and promoted, especially regarding risk management and/or knowledge capitalization (Scarwell and Laganier, 2004; Kenyon, 2007; Koehler and Koontz, 2008; Fournier, 2010; Collombat, 2012; Wehn et al., 2015). Participative knowledge capitalization is particularly relevant in the European context of flood risk management. Indeed, many major floods have occurred in Europe during the past centuries, but also since the beginning of the 21st century (Hilker et al., 2009; Glaser et al., 2010; IPCC, 2014). These floods caused an estimated 150 billion euro of damage between 2002 and 2013 (Collet, 2014), costs that could increase in the near future due to global change (Glaser, 2014). As a consequence, the European Floods Directive of 2007 – Directive 2007/60 / EC – jointly established by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union proposed a paradigm shift (Albrecht, 2016; European Union, 2007). It introduced the need to reduce the

consequences of floods using an integrated risk management approach that goes far beyond merely refined risk mapping. Specifically, it is considered essential that the different actors, including the public, work together (European Union, 2007; Challies et al., 2016; Evers et al., 2016).

Fulfilling the wish of the European Floods Directive to establish closer cooperation between the European Union countries

5   on this question, the French-German research programs ANR-DFG TRANSRISK (2008-2011) and TRANSRISK² (2014-2017) involved researchers from both the University of Haute-Alsace Mulhouse (France) and the University of Freiburg-im-Breisgau (Germany). The interdisciplinary project team included hydrologists, climatologists, geographers, and historians. The TRANSRISK project thus made it possible to create a transnational database of historical floods in the south of the Rhine basin from the end of the 15th century to the present day. The data collected could then be used to address several

10   scientific questions at different spatial and temporal scales. For instance, the data were used as a basis for a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the floods having affected the major European rivers since the 16th century (Glaser et al., 2010). Also, Himmelsbach et al. (2015) conducted a study of the floods of the Rhine river and of its main French and German tributaries across the study area of the TRANSRISK research program. These authors presented a statistical summary of the flood chronology, determined the meteorological causes for the occurrence of the floods, and proposed a cartographic

15   representation of some of the major floods. More specific studies proposed a flood classification model valid in the long term, focusing on the specific analysis of the 1910 flood, used geohistorical data to analyze legal hazard mapping procedures and address the change in risk over time and space (Martin et al., 2015a; 2015b; 2017). Despite this broad outlook, however, a detailed analysis of floods that have affected all major rivers in this territory is still lacking.

The TRANSRISK² project expanded the study area. It also defined as a specific goal the strengthening of the collaboration

20   between local authorities and relevant administrations in terms of flood risk management. More broadly, it aimed at involving all the stakeholders concerned. During the project, the information required to implement Flood Risk Prevention Plans (PPRI), Flood Prevention Action Programs (PAPI), and Local Flood Risk Management Strategies (directive 2007/60/EC) was provided to the services in charge of these programs. In return, the latter contributed to the database by providing feedback from their archives or from local populations.

25   It is in this context that the participative database ORRION (for Regional Observatory of flood risk) was launched. As a first step, currently, it only considers the French part of the study area (e.g., the Alsace region within its 2015 administrative boundaries). This original initiative was elaborated with the dual objective of (i) making the information collected by the research programs available to everyone, and (b) gathering information from all those involved in the local risk area. Indeed, it is believed that by collecting the different types of knowledge (from experts, profane, administrative, and scientific), one

30   can hope to achieve a global, integrated, approach to the risk problem (Decrop, 1997). The TRANSRISK² research program aims, in particular, at anchoring the risk in its territory through the enhancement and sharing of local knowledge. It must be noted that this process, and especially the online and open access information, takes place in the context of a clear lack of public knowledge regarding flood risk in the Alsace region (Martin et al., 2015a). Indeed, during the national survey on risk

perception carried out by the IFEN in 2005, Alsatian inhabitants demonstrated their singularity by declaring that, in their opinion, earthquakes were the risks to which they were the most exposed (Roy, 2005). However, according to the Alsatian public authorities, flood risk (including urban runoff, flashfloods, and rising groundwater) is likely to affect more than half of the Alsatian townships, including the major cities of Strasbourg and Mulhouse, even though their city center has not been

5   flooded since the end of the 19th century (Martin et al., 2017).

The current article presents this original approach, involving both the creation of a database within the framework of a basic research project and the process by which it has been made available to a wider public who can enrich it in return. To address the need for developing long territorialized hazard and risk chronologies, the proposed analysis uses the information gathered, making it possible to highlight the main characteristics of the floods that have affected the Alsace, mostly since the

10   end of the 15th century, but even before that period for a few rivers, and over more than one millennium for the Rhine river. After providing a brief overview of the territorial context of the study area, special attention is paid to presenting the data entered in ORRION as well as to the structure of the sharing platform. For detailed analyses, two specific classifications are proposed to further distinguish the floods based on the rivers that were affected and the damage reported. Simple statistical methods are then systematically applied to infer the main patterns in flood causes, consequences, spatial extension, temporal

15   distribution, seasonality, etc. Further analyses at the scale of selected rivers and municipalities are also presented. All these illustrate the potential of ORRION, both for providing useful data to risk managers and for further improving our geophysical and socioeconomical understanding of flood risk in the target area. Finally, the main outcomes, advantages, and limits of the work are discussed and further perspectives are suggested.

2.   Description of the territorial context

20   The study area, the Alsace, is located in northeastern France, in the French part of the Upper Rhine Valley (Fig. 1). It extends over 200 km between Saint Louis in the south and Lauterbourg in the north, with a width of around 50 km from the Vosges Mountains in the west to the Rhine in the east. The highest mountain is the Grand Ballon (1,424 m a.s.l.) and the average elevation of the Alsace plain is around 150 m a.s.l (from 300 m a.s.l. in the south to 110 m a.s.l. in the north), with a slight slope toward the Rhine. The area is under the influence of prevailing westerly winds, and the Alsace Plain is situated

25   in the transition area of maritime to continental climate (Minářová, 2013). Topography has a strong effect on the spatial distribution of precipitation. According to records from meteorological stations available at a daily frequency since ca. 1950 (for some even over a much longer period), the annual precipitation is around 2,200 mm.a-1 in the south of the Vosges Mountains and less than 550 mm.a-1 at Colmar, one of the driest regions in France. Precipitation is also heterogeneous within the Alsatian plain. The southern part of the plain has a high precipitation amount because of the Belfort Gap and the

30   absence of mountain relief. This is the same in the northwestern part – the Alsace Bossue – where the Vosges Mountains are lower. Precipitation levels reach a maximum in the spring and summer and a minimum in autumn and winter. Furthermore,

the moist western air masses and the prevalent temperature conditions allow for the accumulation of a deep snow cover in the Vosges Mountains in winter, but its seasonal developments are frequently perturbed by temperature oscillations around the freezing level, even at the highest elevations (Giacona et al., 2017). This makes rain-on-snow likely any time during winter and spring.

5 The Alsace has different soil types: loess and filtering soil (sands, gravels, and limes), among others, forming a mosaic pattern in the hillsides beneath the Vosges Mountains as a result of a complex structural geology with fractures and faults. This leads to a variety of landscapes and land uses: (i) forest in the mountain areas, (ii) vineyards on the hillsides beneath the Vosges Mountains, (iii) grain production (as a result of irrigation) and farming (south and northwestern parts) in the plain, and (iv) wetlands due to aquifers along the Rhine and in the "Ried." Also, the Alsatian hydrographic network is particularly

10 dense. It is composed of two systems (Rhin and Ill rivers), which both flow toward the North. The Ill river flows into the Rhine in the north of Strasbourg. Because of the density of this hydrographic network, the low elevation, and the nature of the ground, the soils in the plain are regularly strained by water-logging (particularly in the wetlands located between the Rhine and the Ill rivers). Indeed, many rivers are affected by groundwater aquifers, in particular by the upper Rhine alluvial aquifer (Europe's most important due to its extent, depth, and volume of water stored) and smaller aquifers accompanying

15 some of the major tributaries of the Rhine. Relationships between rivers and aquifers are thus also important. As a result of the diversity in the topography, climate, soil, and land-use conditions, a large number of hydrological process and flood types (localization, spatial extent, origin, duration, etc.) are likely to occur (Himmelsbach et al., 2015).

On the other hand, Alsatian settlements are ancient, population, is dense and urbanization is important in both the plain and the valleys (Alsace is the third French region in terms of population density and urbanization), especially along rivers.

20 Indeed, watercourses were already used by proto-industrial activities (sawmill, mill, metallurgy, etc.) and then by industry, especially the textile and chemical industries. The more recent development of commercial/industrial zones in flood-prone areas is also significant, as is the simultaneous expansion of urbanization in areas now protected by dikes. Over a longer timeframe, until the 20th century, river correction and flood mitigation measures were specific and focused on main cities only. As an exception, the Rhine river channel has undergone considerable modifications since the middle of the 19th century

25 in order to limit flow divagations. The presence of many stakes along the Rhine river as well as along its Alsatian tributaries makes them prone to more or less regular flooding. This has led to the existence of sources documenting past floods.

[Figure 1] Presentation of the studied area

3. Data and methods

3.1. From the TRANSRISK database to ORRION online

A large part of the information currently stored in ORRION comes from the database built during the TRANSRISK project using geohistorical methods. The latter compiles information derived mainly from the analysis of archives (departmental and

5   communal) as well as from scientific publications, local nonscientific literature, and a few newspapers. The research focused on the main rivers of the Alsace in France (Largue, Ill, Doller, Thur, Fecht, and Lauch) and of the Baden region in Germany (Wiese, Klemmbach, Kander, Neumagen/Möhlin, Dreisam, Elz, Schutter, and Kinzig) as well as on the Rhine river. The database contains more than 3,000 entries (for each watercourse, each flood counts as one entry) of varied magnitude and extension. Most of these floods occurred between 1480 and 2015, although a few entries refer to even older floods. Details

10   about the data, the sources, and the historical methodology can be found in Himmelsbach et al. (2015). The tambora.org database provides the data for the German part (Riemann et al., 2015; Glaser et al., 2016).

The TRANSRISK database was designed by researchers for academic purposes. In order to facilitate data sharing, it was decided to build a regional observatory for flood risk (ORRION). The ORRION website was launched in 2015 after its conceptual phase and its construction during 2014. The design of ORRION was guided by a SWOT analysis of flood risk

15   databases already existing at that time: the French National Observatory of Natural Risks, the French database on the Historic Flood Events (BDHI) built reference to the European Floods Directive, the database of the French *Restauration des Terrains en Montagne* services, and the Regional risk observatory in Provence-Alpes-Côtes-d'Azur Region (southeastern France). The last one, like our study case, is based not on the French national scale but a regional scale. However, all these databases have a complex or unattractive interface and do not meet the essential requirement of our objectives. Indeed, in

20   these examples, the collaborative aspect concerns government services only, *de facto* excluding citizens. On the contrary, the objective of the ORRION database was not only to make raw data on historical floods in Alsace region available to all stakeholders, but also to provide a tool allowing all types of actors to actively take part in the compilations of flood risk knowledge in a collective approach. Quality control of the data collected with this participative approach is a crucial part of the database management work. The team of database administrators verifies possible redundancy with pre-existing

25   information, directly interacts with the information providers, checks by itself the provided sources (e.g. pictures, newspaper articles, etc.), and, if necessary, goes on the field for further verifications and/or conducts further archival searches. In practice, the likelihood of many testimonies needs to be investigated in details, and retrieving the exact date and location of the pictures provided is often a huge and time consuming work.

3.2. Structure of the ORRION website and presentation of the data

30   The website ORRION was designed in this sense in partnership with the company CYSTEME. To minimize management difficulties, it is not structured along the lines of a "classic" online database but is built on a CMS structure (WordPress

type). It is composed of four main parts (Fig. 2). The homepage reflects the territorial anchorage of ORRION and provides information regarding local flood risk management procedures. A second page, called "overview," presents the research program TRANSRISK (objectives and administrators of the website) and the main characteristics of floods that took place in the Alsace. The third section leads to the database itself. A general map localizes all the floods recorded in the area and gives

5 access to detailed information. A contact form is accessible both on the "database" page and directly on the homepage. It allows anyone to contribute to ORRION's comprehensiveness by sharing their information and knowledge about floods in the target area. Of course, information provided this way by online contributors is crosschecked by administrators before it is integrated in the database. As the website is intended to inform and to share information in the particular context of a cross-border territory, it has a bilingual presentation (French and German). With the same perspective of sharing, communicating,

10 and informing, ORRION benefits from a link to a Facebook page intended to increase the visibility and the attractiveness of the website, via, for example, the regular publication of photos (especially public contributions) or former postcards illustrating old floods. Finally, as confirmation of its territorial anchorage, since 2017, ORRION has provided information on its homepage regarding various ongoing local procedures related to flood risk management, information, and prevention.

In addition to the participatory nature of the database, three other important factors differentiate the ORRION and

15 TRANSRISK databases. First, the latter deals with the whole upper Rhine Valley (French and German sides), whereas ORRION focuses only on the French side. Second, supplementary research was carried out for ORRION in the departmental archives of the Bas-Rhin and of the Haut-Rhin, enriching the information on floods that occurred in particular during the 19th and 20th centuries. Third, data are structured by "*events*" in ORRION: Each event in the website corresponds, at the scale of the entire study area, to a set of local floods that likely resulted from the same meteorological drivers (same synoptic

20 situation, similar soil saturation state, etc.). This is why there are far fewer ORRION events than entries in the TRANSRISK database, where each river flood is a single entry. Specifically, each ORRION event includes all rivers where a flood occurred within the same time window of 10 days (the downstream travel time of the flood wave may take several days). As a consequence, an ORRION event may correspond to one river that overflowed in one specific location (or to a more generalized extent) or to a situation where water overflow has been reported for almost all major Alsatian rivers at the same

25 time and often at several locations along the rivers (Figs. 3-5). Note that, in addition to a variety of river flood types, ORRION also reports on some mass movements due to local storms and on floods by surface runoff or by rising groundwater. Here, however, we focus only on river floods, and thus the latter types of events have not been taken into account.

In ORRION, events were characterized as precisely as possible, taking into account the fact that descriptions in the historical

30 sources are largely heterogeneous, which makes it difficult to produce homogeneous data. Thus, for each event, different fields are filled in when the information is available (Fig. 2D):

- Date of occurrence: day/month/year, month/year, or year;
- Affected rivers;
- Impacted municipalities;

- Causes. For each event, one or several causes (if any) can be documented;
- Damage types: human (i.e., with at least one person killed), material, functional, environmental, unknown. For each event, zero to four damage types can be documented;
- Number of sources reporting the event;
5 - And the complete quotes accompanied by their sources.

Moreover, the database structure allows one to include tables and photos via hypertext links (Fig. 2D). The indexing facilitates searches by keywords (years, river names, municipality names, causes, and consequences). To this aim, lists of terms have been pre-registered in order to standardize spellings and denominations, and to speed up data entering and browsing. The way of quoting sources has also been harmonized. When the impacted municipalities are known, there are

10 displayed on a map (from Google) that is attached to each event. This map indicates the global extension of each flood event, but not the exact location of the damage that occurred.

[Figure 2] ORRION users' interface

[Figure 3] Maps of specific Class I events

15 [Figure 4] Maps of specific Class II events

[Figure 5] Maps of specific Class III–IV events

3.3. Further filtering and additional event typologies

For a more detailed analysis of this specific work, four additional filters were applied for all the ORRION data. First, this article does not consider low-magnitude events during which no river overflowed its banks. Such events were discarded. By

20 contrast, every event where water overflow occurred for at least one river was retained, as we wanted the most exhaustive overview possible of each event. Hence, for each event, we distinguished between rivers where flooding without water overflow was described (i.e., simply an "abnormally high" runoff) and rivers with water overflow. Second, this study deals only with floods from overflowing rivers and does not include surface runoff or rising groundwater. As a consequence, from the whole set of flood causes documented in the ORRION database, we retained only heavy rainfall, long-lasting

25 precipitation, snow melting/thaw, ice jam, ice breakup, thunderstorm, and soil saturation. Third, only the municipalities where water overflow has been explicitly documented are studied. Moreover, these items are defined here according to the list of Alsatian municipalities from the 2006 French National Statistical Institute (INSEE) inventory, knowing that some changes occurred over the long period covered by ORRION such as merging or name changes of a few municipalities. Fourth, the analysis is focused on 13 of the main Alsatian rivers: Sarre, Moder, Zorn, Bruche, Lièpvrette, Giessen, Fecht,

30 Lauch, Thur, Doller, Largue, Ill, and Rhine (Table 1). The Rhine river is a well-known very large European river flowing from Switzerland to the North See, the Ill river is one of its important tributaries whose basin encompasses most of the studied area, and the 11 other rivers considered are smaller rivers, most of them being tributaries of the Ill river. To account

for ORRION events that do not correspond to these rivers, "other" and "unknown" categories were added. The "other" category includes two types of rivers:

- Tributaries of the main rivers mentioned earlier;
- Some major rivers for which fewer than 10 floods are known in ORRION and for which a specific analysis would not have been relevant.

In addition, two further classifications of the events were implemented. The first concerns the hydrological configuration of the event: (i) type R: only the Rhine river is concerned; (ii) type T: one or several Alsatian tributaries of the Rhine are concerned, but not the Rhine itself; (iii) type RT: both the Rhine and at least one of its Alsatian tributaries are concerned. This leads one single configuration per event.

The second classification concerns the severity of the events, taking into account both their spatial extent and the documented damage. Himmelsbach et al. (2015) proposed a classification of flood severity for TRANSRISK events, taking into account the same criteria, plus secondary and tertiary parameters such as the duration of the flood or the mitigation strategies that were implemented. The scale of Himmelsbach et al. (2015) has three levels ranging from "small flood" to "extreme/supra-regional flood." However, this scale could not be used. For our events, the sources do not often allow the necessary secondary and tertiary criteria to be identified. Indeed, since our study covers a multisecular period, the available data are disparate, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The corpus of events is thus affected by different major types of heterogeneity (Martin et al., 2015): the nature of the sources evolves in time and space and the mass of documentation tends to increase with time. Moreover, quantitative data are scarce. The classification must therefore be based on qualitative elements easily accessible in the archives over the entire study period. As the sources are essentially related to damage, they generally indicate, in a more or less detailed manner, the consequences of the floods. It is therefore possible to classify past events according to the damage described (Table 2). Taking inspiration from existing approaches (Thema, 2001; Benito et al., 2003; Llasat et al., 2005), we distinguished three classes of damage according to the consequences observed on the natural environment, on infrastructures, as well as on property and people. The level of damage was then coupled with the spatial extent of the floods (local or regional, taking into account both the number of impacted rivers and municipalities).

With this simple multi-criteria approach, we distinguished four classes of event severity (Table 3). Such a classification could be applied to three quarters of the studied ORRION events. For the other ORRION events studied here, the severity class is considered as unknown (Table 4). This classification approach is robust because the classification result is the same regardless of whether the spatial extension or the level of damage is considered first.

River (municipality where the peak discharge is estimated)	Length (km)	Q_{10} (m^3/s)	Q_{50} (m^3/s)
Ill (Osthouse)	216	200	260
Largue (Spechbach)	51	61	82

Doller Burnhaupt)	47	62	84
Thur (Bollwiller)	53	91	120
Lauch (Guebwiller)	47	22	30
Fecht (Ostheim)	49	91	120
Giessen (Sélestat)	34	80	110
Lièpvrette (Liepvre)	25	34	48
Bruche (Oberschaeffolsheim)	77	140	190
Mossig (Soultz)	33	15	20
Zorn (Waltenheim)	97	79	110
Moder (Schweighouse)	82	68	93
Rhin (Lauterbourg)	1233	3900	4600

Table 1: Characteristics of the 13 considered rivers in terms of length and 10 and 50 year return period peak discharge according to local flood prevention plans.

Type of stake	Null to minor damage	Moderate damage	Major damage
Environmental	Overflowed agricultural and forested areas (near rivers)	Vast overflowed areas of agricultural and/or wooded land	Vast overflowed areas of agricultural and/or wooded land; crop destructions
Functional		Road traffic cutoffs (roads under water); path deterioration	Destruction of a large number of dams, dykes, bridges, and/or roads
Material		Damage to infrastructures located close to rivers: mills, dams (gaps, holes, erosion, etc.), footpaths, etc.	
Human		Single casualty (death)	Several casualties (death)
Urban area			Water penetrating in urban areas: flooding of roads, basements, and companies. Damaged or destroyed buildings
River bed			Important morphodynamic process (significant changes of the river bed)

Table 2: Grid used to discriminate observed damage in three levels. Five types of stakes are considered, and for each of them the level of damage is identified (consequences increase from one damage level to another). The retained damage level for the event is the strongest among the different types of stakes.

Damage level	Null to minor		Moderate		Major		
	0		1		2		
Spatial extension	Local	Regional	Local	Regional	Local	Regional	Regional Plus
	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Total score	0	1	1	2	2	3	4
Class	I	I	I	II	II	III	IV

Table 3: Multi-criteria severity scale for flood events. Classification is made according to (1) the level of damage evaluated as detailed in Table 2, (2) the spatial extension.

Class I, "small-sized events," includes floods with a total score of 0 or 1 (Table 3). It corresponds to local events that had no impact to moderate impact and to more regional events that had no impact or low impact. Class II, "medium-sized events," comprises events with a total score of 2. It includes two types of floods: those that caused significant damage but occurred very locally or regionally, and those that caused moderate damage but had a regional extension. Class III "large-sized events" brings together the events with a total score of 3 and corresponds to regional floods that have caused extensive damage. Within this third class, we identified a class IV of "extreme-sized events" corresponding to events that impacted at least 20 municipalities ("Regional Plus" level). Note that it is possible to identify these biggest events only over the last two centuries because the sources are not detailed enough to make comprehensive lists of affected municipalities for older events. Therefore, the fourth class is not set up as an independent class, but rather as a product of the third class. Hence, in the following analysis, all class IV events are included in class III, which makes the chronology of class III events *a priori* more homogeneous in time.

3.4. Statistical analyses

The complete data set of studied ORRION events was analyzed with a basic statistical approach in order to identify the major spatiotemporal patterns of flood hazard and risk. First, for each event, additional binary variables representing presence/absence were created. This led to a data set from which deriving chronologies for the different types of events, rivers, and municipalities was straightforward. Also, visualization of the spatial characteristics of each event under a GIS environment was possible (Figs. 3-5). Specifically, we transformed the causes, damage types, hydrological configuration, and severity class variables into vectors of presence(1)/absence(0) variables whose lengths depend on the considered group

(e.g., 5 for the severity class group: the four classes and the unknown case, etc.). Also, presence/absence codes were given for each event in all municipalities (the 2006 Alsatian ones from INSEE). Namely, a municipality got assigned 1 for a given event if it was affected by the event, and 0 if not. Finally, for each event, presence/absence codes were given for the 13 rivers we specifically consider plus for a binary variable corresponding to all other rivers specifically known in the target area as

5 well as for a binary variable corresponding to other unknown rivers (if any). Also, for each of these 15 cases (our 13 rivers, other known rivers and unknown rivers), we distinguished events "with overflow", events "without overflow" and events "with or without overflow", leading 45 binary variables per event related to rivers. From these presence/absence sequences, all specific time series (number of events per year with specific severity class, cause, in a specific river or municipality, etc.) were built.

10 Large time-scale variations in the different chronologies were highlighted. For each time series (e.g. number of events per year in the river Rhine as function of time, etc.), we computed 51- and 31-year moving averages. For an easier visual interpretation, rather than superposing the raw counts and these moving averages on the corresponding figures (Figs 8-14 and 16), we rescaled the latter as follows: for each series, the moving average values were multiplied by the ratio between the raw annual count standard deviation and the moving average standard deviation. This gives both the row series and the

15 rescaled moving average series the same variance, i.e. the same range of variability on the plots.

We evaluated association between variables with the classic Pearson cross product-moment coefficient. This was systematically done for all quantitative variables and for presence/absence variables. Also, association between events and time series were both investigated. The first highlights to which extent couples of variables are related over the complete set of analyzed events, and the second how the time series of events of given characteristics are related over the study period.

20 Note, that, for rivers, for simplicity, only presence/absence variables summing up events "with and without overflow" were considered at this stage (association between flood events "with overflow only", or "without overflow only" is not considered in what follows). Seasonality was included into the analysis on the basis of the interannual monthly distribution (fraction of events having occurred each calendar month). This analysis highlights, e.g., to which extent couples or rivers or municipalities tend to be affected by the same flood events, to which extent certain variables tend to be related (e.g. damages

25 and source numbers) and if certain characteristics of the events have markedly evolved trough time.

We are aware that, for non-continuous variables, using Pearson cross product-moment coefficient is sometimes criticized. However, for binary variables, computation of standard alternative metrics such as Spearman rank correlation or Kendall *tau* leads exactly the same measure of association between the two variables (how they behave together or not). For a couple of variables with one binary and one continuous variable, or with one binary and one discrete unbounded variable, the point-

30 biserial coefficient is the standard choice, but it can also be rewritten at the Pearson cross product-moment coefficient. For a couple of variable with at least one categorical variable taking potentially more than two values, this is no longer true, and one may need to look at other association metrics such as the Tetrachronic correlation. This refinement is, however, not required in our case because of our variable definition strategy.

A related tricky point is how to rigorously test the significance of the association. Having one or two binary variables within the Pearson cross product-moment coefficient does not blur the convergence of its estimate on the basis of standard asymptotic likelihood theorems. Since we have rather large samples at hand (366 events, more than 500 years of data), this is therefore not an issue. The problem comes when considering that, for binary variables, the same association measure may be

5   seen, as said before, either as Spearman rank correlation, the Kendall *tau* or the Pearson cross product-moment coefficient. Similarly, with one binary and one continuous variable the same association measure is either the point-biserial or the Pearson coefficient. These different quantities have different asymptotic distributions for their estimates providing different p-values and hence different answers to the same question of stating if the variables are associated or not. In full rigor, one should therefore perform different tests in each case corresponding to the different way of seeing each measure. However,

10   due to the very high amount of couples of variables we consider, we only assessed association significance in each case on the basis of the classical Student test. This has the advantage to be applicable in a unified way to all the couples of variables we consider (binary or binary/continuous), and to provide in each case a single yes/no answer. Even if each individual result should therefore be conspired with care and may need to be investigated in more detail to definitively answer a specific question (e.g., the linkage between a given cause and a given severity class, of between two local series), this systematic

15   strategy provides a comprehensive first assessment of the main patterns in space and time in the large amount of data at our hand. Statistical significance was set at 0.05 (5% level of the t-test).

4.   Results

4.1.   Overview

The corpus comprises 366 events that occurred between the years 886 and 2014. In total, 382 Alsatian municipalities were

20   impacted at least once (Fig. 6). Of these, 19 experienced at least 10 events, among which four municipalities stand out: Strasbourg with 48 events, Mulhouse with 36 events, Colmar with 29 events, and Illfurth with 24 events (Figs. 6, 7F). Overall, the impacted municipalities are logically mostly located along the Rhine river and its tributaries, the Ill river, and the smaller rivers flowing down from the Vosges mountains. Also, most of them are located in the south of the study region. Events are mentioned by one to 324 sources (the latter for the September 1852 event). Two thirds of the events are

25   documented by two or more sources. The events mentioned by a large number of sources are floods that caused damage (especially affecting humans) and that had a large spatial extension. Indeed, all damage types are positively associated with the "source number" variable. Specifically, the Pearson coefficient is +0.26 with the human damage presence/absence variable, non-zero at the 0.05% significance level (in what follows, only such significantly non-zero associations are reported and discussed). There is also a very strong association between the source number variable and the extreme-sized

30   events (class IV) and large-sized events (class III) variables (Pearson coefficient: +0.56 and +0.29, respectively). Finally, it

should be noted that the events mentioned by a large number of sources affected both the Rhine and its tributaries in particular (Pearson coefficient with RT type: +0.27).

[Figure 6] Total number of flood events per municipality

4.2. Well-identified causes and consequences

Most of the analyzed events can be attributed to heavy rainfall (50% of the known values), snow melting/thaw (37%), long-lasting rainfall (32%), and thunderstorms (14%). Soil saturation, ice breakup, and ice jam were more rarely involved, for 7%, 5%, and 3% of the events, respectively (Table 4). Several causes (up to four) could be involved in a single event. For ca. 20% of the events, at least two causes could be documented, which represents a little less than a half of the events for which at least one cause could be identified (Fig. 7A).

		Number of events	Fraction of events (excluding unknown values)
Total		366	100%
Causes	Ice breakup	10	5%
	Ice jam	5	3%
	Snow melting/thaw	71	37%
	Heavy rainfall	95	50%
	Thunderstorm	26	14%
	Long-lasting rainfall	62	32%
	Soil saturation	13	7%
	Unknown	175	/
Consequences (damage types)	Environmental	199	68%
	Functional	207	70%
	Human (at least one person killed)	31	11%
	Material	189	64%
	Unknown	72	/
Severity classes	Class I	83	36%
	Class II	71	31%
	Class III	77	33%

	Class IV	13	6%
	Unknown	122	/
Hydrological configurations	Type R (Rhine river alone)	42	13%
	Type T (Alsatian tributaries of the Rhine river only)	208	65%
	Type RT (both the Rhine river and its Alsatian tributaries)	72	22%
	Unknown	44	/

Table 4: Characterization of the ORRION events according to their causes, consequences, severity class, and hydrological configuration. Please refer to text and Tables 3-4 for a full definition of the different categories.

Moreover, the high-severity events (class III) mainly occurred during specific conditions: snow melting/thaw, heavy rainfall, and soil saturation (Pearson coefficient: +0.35, +0.29, and +0.24, respectively). Also, the most severe events were due to a combination of unfavorable elements (Pearson coefficient: +0.51 and +0.29 between the variables class III and class IV and the number of causes, respectively).

Flood events generated all kinds of damage: human, material, functional, and environmental (Table 4). Over the entire study period, 70% of the events (known values) led to functional damage (mostly road being cut off), 68% to environmental damage (mostly flooding of agricultural lands and forests), and 64% to material damage (mostly destruction of buildings and bridges). In total, 11% of the recorded events killed at least one person; 19.7% of the events had consequences that were not fully documented. Most of the events (51.1%) caused several types of damage and for 5.5% of the events, all four damage types were documented (Fig. 7B).

[Figure 7] Characterization of the interannual distribution of events

4.3. Spatial extension: from local to widespread events

The extension of the events was often local. Indeed, 44% of the events involved only one river among the 13 we specifically studied. In this case, by definition, overflow would have occurred for the river. However, single events sometimes had a much larger extension, with the two largest events affecting up to 12 of our 13 rivers (December 1947 to January 1948 and January 1955). For such events, rivers with and without overflow were distinguished, leading to specific distributions of number of rivers per event with and without overflow (Figs. 7 C-E). Regarding the hydrological configuration (Table 4), the recorded events mostly affected only the Alsatian tributaries of the Rhine (type T, 65% of the events), and, to a lesser extent, both the Rhine and its Alsatian tributaries (type RT, 22%). The Rhine alone (type R) is documented to have been involved in only 13% of the events for which this typology could be determined.

In detail, for our 13 main rivers, between 15 and 163 events are known (considering floods with and without overflow; Table 5). The Ill river leads, with 163 events, followed by the Rhine river with 103 events, and the Largue river with 76 events. Extensive research was not carried out for the Sarre and the Lièpvrette rivers. This explains, at least partly, the smaller number of events for these rivers, respectively, 15 and 19. However, the distinction between flood with and without overflow

5 is important. The proportion of floods without overflow is, for some rivers, very high in comparison with the total number of floods. This is notably the case for the Rhine river, for which around 42% of the recorded events correspond to floods without overflow, and, even more so, for the Bruche river, for which this proportion reaches 73%.

Some rivers tend to flood simultaneously (i.e., during the same events), or, on the contrary, at distinct times (i.e., during different events). This can be simply assessed by the association between the presence/absence variable sequences (Table 6).

10 Thus, the Sarre river tends to flood with the Moder, the Giessen, the Zorn, and the Bruche rivers (Pearson coefficient: +0.45, +0.32, +0.44, and +0.27, respectively). This makes sense since all these rivers are located in the north of the Alsace (Fig. 1). On the contrary, the Rhine and the Largue rivers tend to flood during distinct events (Pearson coefficient: -0.14).

Even if more than two thirds (68%) of the events affected only one municipality, the flood that occurred in February 1958 impacted up to 89 municipalities (Fig. 7F). In all, 31 events (8.5%) impacted more than 10 municipalities, among which 13

15 events (8.5%) affected more than 20 municipalities, and four (1.1%) more than 40 municipalities. The latter group of events correspond to the floods of December 1947 – January 1948, 17 September 1852, December 1919 (Fig. 5B), and January 1882. There was a significantly positive association between 16, 11, and 4 municipalities and the variables "material damage," "functional damage, and "environmental damage," respectively, among which the municipality of Illhaeusern (Fig. 1) appears in every case (Pearson coefficient: +0.16, +0.16, and +0.18, respectively). This identifies the municipalities more

20 prone to the respective damage types, and Illhaeusern as the municipality that suffered the highest damage, apart from casualties. The latter point may be related to the fact that Illhaeusern is often affected by floods of the Ill river, which are rather "slow" floods, so that people have time to escape and are used to doing so.

	With overflow in the considered river	Without overflow in the considered river	Total (with and without overflow)
Sarre	10	5	15
Lièpvrette	13	6	19
Lauch	19	7	26
Moder	19	7	26
Giessen	17	11	28
Zorn	11	21	32
Doller	34	11	45
Fecht	37	8	45

Thur	35	12	47
Bruche	16	43	59
Largue	57	19	76
Rhine	60	43	103
Ill	146	17	163
Other known rivers	54	21	75
Unknown rivers	85	6	91

Table 5: Number of events per river. The 13 rivers for which at least 10 events with water overflow were documented are listed. ORRION also documents flood events (with and without water overflow) having affected other known rivers, as well as rivers that could not be identified in the available sources.

	Sarre	Lièpvrette	Lauch	Moder	Giessen	Zorn	Doller	Fecht	Thur	Bruche	Largue	Rhine	Ill
Sarre	**1.00**	**0.21**	0.06	**0.45**	**0.32**	**0.44**	0.06	0.06	0.05	**0.26**	0.00	0.00	-0.01
Lièpvrette		**1.00**	**0.32**	**0.23**	**0.40**	**0.28**	**0.32**	**0.29**	**0.28**	**0.34**	-0.03	**0.13**	**0.14**
Lauch			**1.00**	0.09	**0.24**	**0.14**	**0.35**	**0.41**	**0.40**	**0.23**	0.02	**0.14**	**0.20**
Moder				**1.00**	**0.37**	**0.61**	**0.20**	**0.13**	0.09	**0.39**	0.05	0.10	0.04
Giessen					**1.00**	**0.42**	**0.33**	**0.24**	**0.23**	**0.47**	**0.11**	0.10	**0.18**
Zorn						**1.00**	**0.27**	**0.21**	**0.20**	**0.50**	0.08	0.04	**0.17**
Doller							**1.00**	**0.39**	**0.43**	**0.27**	0.05	0.05	**0.25**
Fecht								**1.00**	**0.40**	**0.32**	0.03	**0.14**	**0.24**
Thur									**1.00**	**0.24**	0.09	**0.14**	**0.25**
Bruche										**1.00**	0.07	**0.20**	**0.26**
Largue											**1.00**	-0.14	**0.11**
Rhin												**1.00**	0.05
Ill													**1.00**

5 **Table 6: Pearson cross moment-product coefficient between individual rivers by event presence/absence sequences.** Events with and without water overflow are considered together. Bold values are significantly non-zero at the 0.05 significance level on the basis of a Student test.

4.4. From low to exceptional severity

In all, 231 events (63%) could be classified according to their severity following our classification approach (Table 4): 36%
10 (of the known values) in Class I, 31% in Class II, 33% in Class III, among which 6% in class IV. Our three main classes are thus more or less balanced. As expected, the 13 events identified as Class IV events (they affected at least 20 municipalities)

all occurred since 1801. Specifically, these are: December 1801 – January 1802, January 1855, Mai 1856, February 1860, January – February 1862, February 1877, January 1910, February 1958, and February 1990, and the four events that affected more than 40 municipalities listed earlier.

High-severity events correspond generally to the configuration "Rhine and its Alsatian tributaries – RT" (Pearson coefficient with this configuration: +0.43 for Class III and +0.32 for Class IV). On the contrary, the association is significantly negative with the configurations "Rhine alone – R" (Pearson coefficient: -0.22) and "Alsatian tributaries alone – T" (Pearson coefficient: -0.23). Symmetrically, low-severity events are more strongly related to the configuration "Rhine alone – R" than to the configuration "Rhine and its Alsatian tributaries – RT" (Pearson coefficient: +0.27, and -0.30, respectively). This reflects the contribution of the spatial extension, and especially of the number of affected rivers, to the severity classification. In addition, the greater the severity of the events, the higher the association with the existence of damage, which is also logical since this is an even more important factor in the classification of severity. Hence, there is a positive association between Class III events and all types of damage (Pearson coefficient higher than +0.26 for all kinds of damage), even stronger for functional and material damage (Pearson coefficient: +0.32 and +0.42, respectively). The opposite is observed for class I events, for which the association is very significantly negative with functional and material damage (Pearson coefficient: -0.38 and -0.51, respectively).

4.5. Seasonality

Overall, the analyzed events took place during throughout the year but they occurred mainly in winter (from December to March: 45.9 %), especially in December (12.8%) and January (13.6%, Fig. 15A). A second peak is found in July (6.5%). It should be noted, however, that the month of occurrence is not known for 21% of the events sample. Snow melting/thaw and thunderstorms are physically coherent, well-identified causes for these two winter/summer peaks (Pearson coefficient: +0.32 and +0.31, respectively).

However, this global seasonal distribution of events hides large disparities between the rivers studied. The seasonal distribution of floods affecting only the Alsatian tributaries (T configuration) is comparable to the global distribution (Fig. 15D). This is not surprising since these T events comprise the majority of the total sample. Specifically, the winter months – December, January, and February – are predominant and a slight summer peak is observable. The Bruche river is an archetypal case of this seasonal behavior: about four fifths of all its flood events took place during the three winter months (especially in December, representing almost half of the total, Fig. 15E).

The seasonal distribution is very different for the Rhine river, whose floods occurred in July and August instead. However, this does not prevent the occasional occurrence of significant flooding at other times of the year, as was the case in mid-September 1852. No event occurred in April and October in the configuration "Rhine alone – R" (Fig. 15B). When considering the floods that affected the Rhine river (both "the Rhine alone – R" and "the Rhine and its Alsatian tributaries –

RT" configurations), the seasonal distribution is a little more noisy but the seasonal trend remains more or less the same (no flood in April, maximum activity in July, Fig. 15C).

[Figure 15] Flood event seasonality (monthly distribution)

4.6. Temporal distribution of events over the study period

To date, events have been considered independently of their year of occurrence. We now analyze their temporal distribution over the study period by year of occurrence, which could be documented for all events.

Overall, recorded events are very sporadic until the middle of the 15th century. Before that, only one event per year occurred for a few years, often separated by many years without any event. January – February 1374 stand as an exception, with three events that all concerned the Rhine river. From the middle of the 15th century, there is more regular information about events and the long-term trends starts to emerge, with a first activity peak just before 1600. The long-term trend then shows a significant decrease at around 1700, before a 150-year period of increased continuous and strenuous flood activity occurs, up to a peak in the middle of the 19th century. After this peak, the number of recorded events is significantly lower but activity remains strenuous up to the last 20-30 years during which the last flood activity peak occurred (Fig. 8). This global trend, however, contains differentiated temporal patterns such as the function of rivers, municipalities, and events types, which are analyzed in the next section.

The typology of the hydrological configuration provides the first level of detail (Fig. 9). The frequency of events affecting the Rhine alone (type R) decreased over the study period (Pearson coefficient with time: -0.45). Indeed, such events almost disappeared over the second half of the 20th century. Before this period, type R events could be retrieved rather regularly, even in the High Middle Ages (nearly all of the oldest events in the global chronology are type R events). On the contrary, the number of events that affected only the tributaries of the Rhine (type T) tends to increase over time (Pearson coefficient: +0.37). In more detail, regular but sporadic flooding of the Alsatian tributaries was documented between the end of the 15th and the 18th century. Subsequently, the type T record significantly increases, showing a 200-year period of higher activity (1800–2000) and a very pronounced peak over the last 20 years. Finally, the floods that affected both the Rhine and its Alsatian tributaries (type RT) are distributed sporadically between the end of the 15th century and the 2000s, but with a very marked event concentration during the 19th century, especially in the second half.

In the second step, we propose to look separately at each of the 13 rivers under study. The temporal distribution of events differs considerably from one river to another, especially if the distinction with/without overflow is included in the analysis (Figs. 10, 11). The Ill and, as mentioned earlier, the Rhine rivers are those for which the most continuous information is available over the entire study period, whereas for other rivers such as the Sarre, Moder, Zorn, Lièpvrette, and Giessen rivers, the first mentions that could be retrieved go back to the second half of the 18th century. Also, there is usually a maximum of one event per year, except for the Ill and, to a lesser extent, for the Rhine, for which there are regularly two or

three records per year. This suggests a higher flood frequency in major rivers with regard to their tributaries. In terms of long-term trend, in addition to the difference between the record starting dates, the major pattern is the high activity phase around the middle of the 19th century already highlighted overall and for the type R – RT chronologies. It is remarkably visible, e.g., for the Liepvrette, Fecht, Thur, Doller, Ill, and Rhine rivers, with some slight delay from one river to another.

5 To a lesser extent, the very recent increase over the last 20-30 years is also visible for different rivers, e.g., the Giessen, the Sarre, and, in an even more pronounced way, for the Largue rivers. Concerning floods with/without overflow, it is noticeable that some drastic changes in proportions occurred for some rivers. For instance, during the 20th century there are about 15 events for the Rhine river, but no more floods with overflow after 1940. For the Bruche river also, floods without overflow, more numerous in proportion through the recorded period compared with the other studied rivers, are especially numerous

10 over the last decades. For most of the other rivers, however, proportions of floods with/without overflow seem to have remained rather stable over the last centuries.

In terms of severity class, the temporal pattern is not very different for classes I–III. One notes that the global increase over the study period is slightly more marked for Class III events (Pearson coefficient with time: +0.17) than for other classes. In other words, and surprisingly enough, severe floods are not easier to retrieve than milder ones far back in the past. The

15 presence of the high activity peak of the last 20-30 years in all classes I-III, and of the high activity peak around the middle of the 19th century in classes I and IV, is also remarkable (Fig. 12).

[Figure 8] Chronology of all recorded events: annual distribution and smooth underlying trend

[Figure 9] Chronologies according to event typology

20 [Figure 10]: Individual chronologies for the 13 study rivers: events with and without water overflow (1)

[Figure 11] Individual chronologies for the 13 study rivers: all events and underlying smooth trend

[Figure 12] Chronologies according to the event severity class as defined in Table 2

One can also see changes in the cause of events (Figs. 13). For instance, except for one flood in the early 1940s, no event

25 could be attributed to ice breakups since the 1860s (Pearson coefficient between ice breakup and time: -0.16). Similarly, the few events related to ice jam all occurred before the beginning of the 19th century. On the contrary, "heavy precipitation" and "soil saturation" tend to increase from the 18th century and even more so from the 19th century (Pearson coefficient: +0.16, and +0.30, respectively). Also, over the very recent period, records of events attributed to thunderstorms have increased greatly (Fig. 7E). Hence, significant changes in event-generating conditions may have occurred over the study period and

30 may partially explain the overall shape of the chronology of events and their decline over the different rivers in terms of frequency, severity, and seasonality.

Finally, in terms of damage types (Fig. 14), as we move forward in time, environmental damage and functional damage are proportionally greater (Pearson coefficient with time: +0.13 and +0.22, respectively), their time trend following more or less

the overall trend. Human damage, however, occurred rather regularly throughout the study period. Events that killed at least one person are therefore proportionately lower in number for recent events than for older ones (Pearson coefficient with time: -0.14).

5   [Figure 13] Chronologies of events according to their causes

[Figure 14] Chronologies of events according to their consequences

4.7. Focus on individual rivers

From the large sample of studied events, refined analyses can easily be carried out to better understand the behavior of individual rivers. Two examples corresponding to two different flood contexts are presented here: the Ill river, which has its

10   source in the Alsatian Jura and extends over a large part of the Alsace, and the Thur river, an affluent of the Ill river flowing down from the Vosges mountains.

Floods of the Ill usually occur simultaneously with a large number of other rivers (Pearson coefficient: +0.52 between presence/absence for the Ill river and the total number of rivers per event). Logically, they often occur at the same time as those of its tributaries, especially the Lauch, Fecht, Doller, Thur, and Bruche rivers (Pearson coefficient: +0.20, +0.24,

15   +0.25, +0.25, and +0.26, respectively). Events have occurred more often in recent times (Pearson coefficient with time: +0.28) and, with regard to the total sample, are more related to snow melting/thaw and heavy rainfall and less to thunderstorms (Pearson coefficient: +0.24, +0.18, and -0.14, respectively). Flood events in which the Ill river was included have caused a lot of functional and, to a lesser extent, environmental and material damage (Pearson coefficient between the presence/absence of the event and of the corresponding damage: +0.37, +0.15, and +0.15, respectively). Finally, it should be

20   noted that Ill floods correspond mainly to high-severity events (Pearson coefficient with Class III and Class IV: +0.23 and +0.18, respectively). This is because the Ill flood often affects large areas of the Alsatian plain, leading to, e.g., numerous roads being cut off.

Floods affecting the Thur river generally also affect most of the other rivers (Pearson coefficient: +0.58 with the total number of rivers per event, +0.43, +0.40, and +0.40 with the Doller, Lauch, and Fecht rivers, respectively). These are also

25   events known from several sources (Pearson coefficient with the number of sources: +0.30), more related to snow melting/thaw (Pearson coefficient, +0.22), and causing a lot of damage (Pearson coefficient with the number of damage per event: +0.37), especially human and functional damage (Pearson coefficient: +0.31 and +0.23, respectively). Thur floods correspond mostly to severe events, particularly of Class III (Pearson coefficient: +0.40), having affected both the Rhine and its tributaries (Pearson coefficient with RT hydrological configuration: +0.31). Thus, the Thur floods are rather typical of

30   those of the rivers flowing down from the highest part of the Vosges Mountains in terms of generating factors and they often cause significant losses.

4.8. Focus on individual municipalities

Similarly, a detailed analysis can be conducted at the scale of the Alsatian municipalities.

As an example, we focus here on the three major cities of the Alsace, distributed from south to north, and representing a variety of situations in terms of flood hazard and risk. Strasbourg is situated along both the Ill and the Rhine rivers, Mulhouse close to the Ill and Doller rivers, and Colmar close to the Lauch and Ill rivers (Fig. 1). The temporal distribution of the events shows a reduction of overflow frequency during the 20th century for the three cities, certainly related to, at least partially, increased mitigation efforts to reduce damage. The overflow frequency reduction is especially outstanding in Strasbourg (only three occurrences since 1900) and took place later in Mulhouse (significant drop after 1950 only). Also, documented floods with overflow activity were particularly high in Strasbourg during the 19th century, whereas the rate has been rather regular in Mulhouse since 1500, and especially over the 1700-1950 period (Fig. 16).

More specifically, the events that affected Mulhouse impacted many other municipalities (Pearson coefficient with the number of municipalities per event: +0.21), among which are Altkirch, Baldersheim, Brunstatt, Meyenheim, Réguisheim, Walheim, and even more often Sausheim, Logelheim, and Illzach (Pearson coefficient: +0.20, +0.27, +0.21, +0.22, +0.25, +0.23, +0.30, +0.33, and +0.47, respectively). As expected, the corresponding events are mostly severe ones (especially Class IV, Pearson coefficient: +0.14), caused significantly more functional and material damage (Pearson coefficient: +0.17 and +0.20, respectively), and were more often linked to ice jams (Pearson coefficient: +0.15) than other events were. These significantly positive associations between municipalities simply reflect a common location along the Ill and/or Largue rivers. In addition, Illzach and Sausheim have been put at higher risk by a discharge channel constructed to protect Mulhouse.

Likewise, the events that affected Colmar usually also impacted several neighboring towns (Pearson coefficient with the number of municipalities per event: +0.14), including Holtzwihr, Merxheim, Ribeauvillé, Zimmerbach (Pearson coefficient: +0.25, +0.25, +0.25, and +0.23, respectively), and even more often Illhaeusern (Pearson coefficient: +0.40). These flood events were significantly more related to ice jams and long-lasting rainfall than the other events of the analyzed sample (Pearson coefficient: +0.24, and +0.16, respectively) and they caused in particular functional damage (Pearson coefficient: +0.16). Among the events that affected Colmar, medium-severity events (Pearson coefficient: +0.21) as well as type RT events (Pearson coefficient: +0.14) are over-represented, whereas Class I events are under-represented (Pearson coefficient: -0.25). Stronger positive associations are seen with municipalities situated like Colmar along the Ill and Lauch rivers, or along the Ill and Fecht rivers, which is due to the fact that the hydrological regime of the Lauch and Fecht rivers is rather similar.

Finally, the events that affected Strasbourg also often involved Artolsheim, Benfeld, Boofzheim, Diebolsheim, Friesenheim, Gerstheim, Illhaeusern, Ostheim, Ostwald, Réguisheim, Saasenheim, and Schoenau (Pearson coefficient: +0.23, +0.23, +0.23, +0.23, +0.23, +0.27, +0.25, +0.22, +0.24, +0.20, +0.23, and +0.23, respectively) during Class III and IV events (Pearson coefficient: +0.30 and +0.24, respectively), and rarely during Class I events (Pearson coefficient: -0.18). Strasbourg

floods are generally well documented (Pearson coefficient with the number of sources: +0.26), and often caused different damage types (Pearson coefficient with the amount of damage: +0.28). They often match the RT typology, and hardly fit the T typology (Pearson coefficient: +0.48 and -0.42 respectively). Stronger positive associations between municipalities are seen for those situated either along the Rhine or along the Ill rivers.

[Figure 16] Chronologies per municipality

5. Discussion: floods in the Alsatian region as currently documented in ORRION

Owing to its particular hydrological, climatic, and topographic context and to its dense population (roughly two times the mean population density of France), the Alsatian region is very sensitive to flood risk, with large flood-prone areas and

10 potentially disastrous consequences (people killed, buildings and/or crop destroyed, economic losses due to functional damage, etc.) for the most intense events (high return period floods in single rivers and/or widespread events affecting a large number of rivers, up to almost all of the Ill – Rhine tributaries together). For this specific territory, the web platform ORRION documents floods in terms of sources, dates of occurrence, causes, and consequences. Most of the events have occurred since the end of the 15th century, but a few of them occurred earlier for distinct rivers, especially the Rhine, for

15 which the time frame covered extends over more than one millennium.

This article has shown that information accumulated this way and its organization by event is sufficiently rich and convenient to significantly update what was known to date about floods in the greater Alsatian region (Himmelsbach et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2017 and previous work). Specifically, it allows us to complement the results already obtained at the much larger scale of major European rivers (Glaser et al., 2010) and for specific events in the database (Martin et al., 2010).

20 For instance, comprehensive flood occurrence data are now available for many rivers and municipalities with a careful distinction of floods with or without overflow, and of specific typologies regarding the hydrological configuration, causes, and severity of each event. The combination of these data with a simple but systematic statistical analysis allowed us to document the flood hazard and risk for the study territory with unprecedented accuracy and exhaustiveness. For example, significant associations that are generally easy to interpret could be provided between almost all the variables we analyzed

25 (causes, consequences, severity class, season of occurrence, damage types, etc.). In more detail, the Rhine river is known to be largely influenced by the Alps, where it has its source, and therefore has a nivo-glacial hydrological regime with high water in early summer. This is obviously consistent with the flood seasonality and causes documented by ORRION. On the contrary, the Alsatian tributaries are known to have their peak discharge generally in winter, and sometimes in summer, although in Alsace precipitation amounts are at a maximum in spring-summer. Again, this fits our results showing that the

30 floods affecting the Alsatian tributaries have a bimodal seasonal distribution, mostly due to snowmelt in the Vosges Mountains and to continuous precipitation (for winter floods) and to thunderstorms (for summer floods). These differentiated

flood causes and seasonal distribution as a function of the hydrological configuration reflect the results obtained by Himmelsbach et al. (2015) with a smaller number of Alsatian rivers. Yet, the richest information in ORRION is related to the time-depths of the series, whose outcomes are summarized in the following sections.

5.1. Flood changes over time as a function of social and environmental factors

5   We indeed highlighted strong nonstationarity in the flood chronologies, at all spatial scales (rivers, municipalities) and for the different event typologies we considered. Explaining in detail all the patterns of changes in all the chronologies is beyond the scope of this paper because the sources (in particular the way archives were created and analyzed), land use (including corrective measures for rivers), and climatic factors have undergone major changes over the study period, and all played a role (Martin et al., 2017). However, contextualizing the sources and the events is sufficient to understand the main effects
10   underpinning our results.

5.1.1. Changes related to sources and documentation of past events

The way the search is conducted through the archives (systematic or not, etc.) influences the results. Thus, it is not relevant to look at trends before the end of the 15th century. The TRANSRISK research program begins its study at that time. Older records are periodic and generally attributed to indirect sources that have rarely been verified. It should also be noted that the
15   systematic search in the archives focused on the 19th and 20th centuries only, a period that enjoys certain homogeneity in terms of production and conservation of archives (Giacona et al., 2017; Lang et al., 2003). However, some recent events are missing or incomplete in the ORRION database because documents related to these were not already available in the departmental archives. The floods of April and May 1983 were major floods indeed, but they appear in our chronology as Class III events only (10 impacted municipalities for both floods) because departmental archives are still incomplete for this
20   recent period. Additional searches were conducted in the local press within the framework of TRANSRISK², generating a huge number of new data currently not integrated into the ORRION database. This is certainly the most important factor explaining flood nonstationarity in our chronologies. For instance, the slight (and counterintuitive) increase in the number of Class III events over time is certainly partly due to the more systematic research conducted over the last two centuries. Moreover, as already mentioned, the appearance of Class IV events at the end of the 17th century constitutes an artifact
25   linked to our typology and to more incomplete and/or less detailed sources for the earlier periods. Hence, increasing patterns in Classes III and IV are partially related to an increase in sources simply meaning that more and more elements at risk were set up along rivers (vulnerability increase). Similarly, the apparently higher exposure to risk of the municipalities situated in the south of the studied region is, at least partly, linked to the fact that more research was done in this sector to retrieve old events than in the rest of the Alsatian region, especially for the Largue, Lauch, Fecht, and Ill rivers.
30   However, other societal factors also play a role, and our capacity to retrieve past events must be related to the cultural and political context. The study area has, for instance, faced three French-German conflicts between 1870 and 1945. During

these 75 years, it changed its sovereignty five times, its administrative system, and its language. Such a history does not benefit the continuity of knowledge on flood risk. In addition to the fact that part of the information included in the archives may have been destroyed or lost, information is sometimes very hard to understand or interpret for the layperson: imprecise classifications, documents and press in German and in Gothic script, etc. (e.g., Himmelsbach et al. 2015), . This especially

5 applies to the German period between 1870 and 1918: although the Alsatian population faced the strongest floods of the last 150 years during that period (i.e., 1876, 1882, 1910, and 1919), these events remain largely unknown by the local French authorities today (Martin et al., 2015).

More generally, the process that transforms observations into sources depends on the relations between societies and their environment, in particular rivers. Sources are closely related to damage, but also to strategic and economic issues. Thus,

10 because of the Rhine's strategic importance as a transport corridor since the 19th century (see below), floods without overflow were systematically documented during part of the 19th and 20th centuries and kept in the archives. This was not the case for the earlier period, where the Rhine was much less navigated. This explains the sudden increase in records of floods without overflow since the 19th century (Fig. 10M). Moreover, it should be noted that, in many cases, the floods we considered as "without overflow" correspond to sources with brief information only. This means that there is often doubt

15 about the exact nature of the flood (with or without overflow). Hence, this information must be considered with extra caution. For instance, the great proportion of floods without overflow of the Bruche river is clearly an artifact directly related to the nature of the sources that could be analyzed (a large number of technical reports document each abnormally high runoff for this specific river).

All in all, it should be stressed that ORRION and, hence, our paper, aims at presenting the "raw" flood information avoiding

20 subjective choices as much as possible, so that no explicit correction of potential biases related to sources has been achieved. By contrast, the information required to conduct a rigorous geo-historical analysis of the event chronologies is provided. Specifically all sources referring to events remain fully available within the database. Also, the evolution of sources with time at the regional scale has been already studied by Himmelsbach et al (2014) and, specific biases have been identified by Martin et al. (2015). This all should enable the source bias to be, in the future, disentangled from other effects by anyone

25 interested in using the information for, e.g., improving risk mitigation or studying the influence of climate on flood occurrences. It should also be recalled at this stage that the proposed record is based on an extensive archival campaign (Transrisk project) further complemented by participative data, so as to maximize the amount of information summed up regarding past events and limit the initial source bias as much as possible.

5.1.2. Changes related to land use and risk management

30 The chronologies that go far back in time are those of the Rhine and the Ill rivers. Those of the smaller tributaries flowing down the Vosges mountains start much later. Events recorded are also more regular over time for the Rhine and Ill rivers. This can be partly linked to sociospatial dynamics. Indeed, most of the population of the region for a long time lived in the

lowlands along the rivers, where a large number of elements at risk were thus located throughout the study period. On the contrary, the Vosges Mountains have always been less densely populated, thereby explaining the difference in the length and regularity of records.

However, until the 19th century, the Rhine river was characterized by a sinuous course formed of braided and anastomosed channels, with a very wide main bed that changed very often. Massive corrective works were then conducted to channel its course. This allowed for the economic development of the territories bordering the river, which became a major axis of goods circulation. Furthermore, this probably contributed to the drastic reduction of Rhine river floods at the turn of the 20th century (Tulla correction achieved in 1876, correction of the Swiss Jura rivers carried out between 1868 and 1891) and to their quasi-disappearance since the mid-20th century (construction of the Grand Canal d'Alsace between 1932 and 1959), especially regarding floods with overflow. A similar analysis can also be applied to other smaller rivers to explain certain major breaks that occurred locally at certain times points in the study period, and to major cities, where important works were carried out to reduce their vulnerability to flood. As a striking example, the absence of significant flooding affecting Mulhouse since the beginning of the 20th century may be related to the construction of the Ill river discharge channel completed in 1906, which has proven to be effective (Martin et al. 2015; Fournier and Holleville, 2016). The same holds true for Strasbourg, protected from any floods of the Ill river since the construction of a discharge channel in 1891. The old town of Strasbourg has not been flooded since 1882. Moreover, even if the flood of 1919 was probably the largest of the 20th century, the damage was extensive in the entire basin but not in Strasbourg.

As already stressed for sources, no attempt was made to correct biases in the record induced by land use changes, including construction of mitigation measures. This choice was guided by i) the objective of our work –providing the raw data in a transparent manner-, and ii) the complexity and time required to do this in a realistic way. Indeed, e.g., the increase of wealth and infrastructures can have various consequences on flood risk, direct or indirect, immediate or delayed, positive or negative, local or at larger scale, etc. Also, these consequences can be on the hazard, the stakes and the vulnerability, the perception and the memory of risk, the production of sources etc. In short, all the chain that leads to the data currently in ORRION can be affected and a very large amount of additional information is required in order to really understand the changes of the whole system at risk through time. In addition to the fine scale studies mentioned above that demonstrated, e.g., the impact of the construction of the Ill canal on the flood record in Mulhouse and in Strasbourg, it could already be shown at a more regional scale that the spatial distribution of the consequences of the 1910 flood in the Rhine plain can only be understood if one considers the uneven development of river correction works at that time (Martin et al., 2017). However, much work remains to be done to generalize the approach at the scale of our entire database. To this aim, rather than disseminating in ORRION "corrected" records and "definite" conclusion", the idea is to provide as much information as possible. This should allow anyone to conduct its own analysis, so as to determine and weight the different factors that combine to explain the flood record for each river/location. In this perspective, it is planned to document further information regarding past engineering activities in ORRION. For instance, historical river profiles, mostly from the Rhine and the Ill

rivers, were already searched in the archives and were found useful to, e.g. better understand the major floods of 1910 and 1919. These profiles will be included in ORRION. However, so far, such archival searches were not very successful (apparently many old river profiles have been lost or destroyed), so that new archival searches at the Services of Navigation (which was inaccessible until very recently) will be undertaken. This should in fine contribute to a better understanding of the spatio-temporal distribution of flood events, distinguishing anthropogenic factors related to sources, vulnerability and infrastructures, to natural factors related, e.g., to climate.

5.1.3. Changes related to climate drivers and consistency with other flood records

Climate factors were indeed clearly not stationary over the study period spanning more than one millennium, and the way they have changed in the study area is now well documented (e.g., Glaser and Riemann, 2009; Zorita et al., 2010; Le Roy Ladurie, 2011; Glaser, 2013). How this may explain the changes in flood activity that we document remains difficult to determine. This is especially true for the beginning of the study period, owing to the sparseness of the data at that time and the complexity of the combination of weather factors generating floods. However, the major climate change patterns of the past centuries are clearly visible in most of our chronologies. After the rather warm medieval period, the study area experienced the colds of the Little Ice Age (LIA) up to the second half of the 19th century (Grove, 1988; 2001), and is now affected by the recent anthropogenic warming occurring in the past few decades. The temporal distribution of flood causes reflects these patterns of change: floods attributed to ice break ups and ice jams have no longer been documented since the mid-19th century (except one event during the 1940s). This may simply result from the end of the LIA that caused a significant increase of winter temperature in the area (Flageolet, 2005; Auer et al., 2007). Also, the recent warming may explain the concomitant drastic increase of floods caused by thunderstorms we report (Fig. 13).

Hence, if one puts aside the more or less continuous increase of sources over the study period, phases of high/low flood activity can roughly be related to the prevalent climate context. For instance, the first activity peak in our event chronology (~1600) corresponds to the Maunder Minimum (coldest decades) of the LIA. Similarly, the second activity peak in the 19th century corresponds to the Dalton LIA minimum. Notably, many of the most remarkable floods of the Rhine river we report are concentrated during this short time period corresponding to the LIA termination: 1851, 1852, 1872, 1876, 1876, 1877, 1881, and 1882, and most of the other Alsatian tributaries were also intensively flooded at that time (Figs 10-11). This is consistent with findings of other studies in areas where a social explanation for the increase in flood occurrences documented during these decades cannot be invoked (e.g., Wilhelm et al., 2013). Hence, this high activity pattern appears as robust and climate factors as a plausible explanation for its origin.

To further test the consistency of our record, we compared our most severe events (class III and IV) to the extreme flood events identified by Glaser et al. (2010) for 12 major rivers of central Europe including the Rhine. Specifically, Glaser et al. (2010) identified 13 major flood events between 1500 and 1900. Among these, two correspond to high (class III) or extreme (class IV) events of our record: January-February 1862 (class IV) and February 1876 (class III). Another event of Glaser et

al.'s inventory is for us a class I event (march 1784) whereas 4 other events of Glaser et al.'s inventory correspond to events in our record, for which we could not determine the severity class (as for 35% of the studied ORRION events in total). Considering this latter specific difficulty, the comparison appears therefore as rather probative, with around half of Glaser's years corresponding to ORRION events. This is all the more true when considered that, whereas the work of Glaser et al.

5   focuses on major rivers of the length and watershed side corresponding to the ones of the Rhine, ORRION events correspond to a very wide range of flood types in terms of concerned rivers and spatial extent. Especially, a significant part of ORRION events concerns only one or few "small" Alsatian tributaries flowing down from the Vosges mountains, and correspond to floods that occurred after a very localized rainfall event such as a thunderstorm. It is therefore not surprising at all that the agreement between Glaser et al.'s and ORRION records is far from perfect. Finally, for the 20th century, correspondence

10   between well-known flood events and our record can also be found. January 1910 was the most intense flood event of the Seine river in Paris over the last centuries. It is also a class IV event in our record. January 1936 that was the time of an extremely widespread and intense flood episode over the north Atlantic (Ballesteros Canovas et al., 2019) is also in our record, but corresponds to an event for which we could not determine the severity class. All in all, of course, much more could be done in terms of comparison between ORRION and other records. However, this quick comparison already further

15   suggests that, even if the event chronologies that can be derived from ORRION database are clearly affected by human factors related to sources, vulnerability etc., they also include information related to the physics of the flood process and to its underlying hydro-meteorological causes.

5.2. Pros and cons of the data structure and chosen event typologies

The space and time comprehensiveness of ORRION, and the easy browsing of the database allows information that is highly

20   valuable for supporting risk management policies to be easily extracted and used. For instance, its original by-event organization facilitates the easy characterization of areas potentially threatened within a single meteorological situation, with a direct measure of the likelihood of different rivers flooding at the same time, a very valuable contribution to operational risk management at the local scale. As a further example of its value, the database has already been mobilized for the positioning of flood marks in the framework of the French PAPIs (flood protection plans). It thus allowed local stakeholders,

25   who had forgotten old and severe floods affecting rivers for which they had the risk management responsibility, to increase their knowledge about flood risk.

Yet, to build ORRION and further exploit and summarize the large number of data at our hand in this specific study, we had to make stringent working choices and assumptions. For instance, we chose simple but robust classification schemes for the severity and hydrological configuration of events. These were shown to be sufficient to reach meaningful conclusions, but,

30   clearly, they could be refined and reconsidered in further work. Also, our choices must be kept in mind when deriving conclusions from our results. For example, the distinction we made between floods with and without overflow was found useful but, in practice, it raises some questions. Indeed, some floods caused damage without overflowing (to a mill in the

main channel, for example). Since sources are mainly related to damage, this situation is found rather frequently. For a given event, we chose to define a flood as an overflow (i.e., in order to appear in the analyzed sample an event must include an overflow for at least one river). As a result, not all the damage currently in ORRION was taken into account in this study. Damage that occurred during events without known overflow was de facto excluded. Also, for the work done at the scale of

5 municipalities, only overflows were considered. Therefore, not all damage that occurred without overflow in a given municipality appears in the corresponding local statistics. The results we obtained regarding municipalities where thus highly dependent on the implementation of defense structures such as dykes, which make (theoretically) overflow much more difficult. This effect explains in part the temporal changes in the chronology of events for the Rhine river (Fig. 10M) and for the largest Alsatian cities (Fig. 16).

10 Finally, our severity classification is strongly driven by damage, and the damage score we retain for an event is the one corresponding to the highest registered damage. This has the effect of smoothing potential spatial differences across the study area, especially for events of large extension. However, our severity classification approach was based on pragmatic considerations. We wanted a measure that combines spatial extent and damage level to asses flood severity, which led us define 7 possible combinations (Table 3). This is not that much, but these different combinations are somewhat difficult to

15 rank (is a regional flood with slight damage worse or less severe than a local flood having caused strong damages?). Also, scales usually used in the risk / natural hazard worlds have 5 levels, not seven, which is a bit too much. We therefore mapped the 7 combinations into 3 or 4 categories. This is not a huge reduction of the complexity, but it already makes things easier for the analysis. Especially, the obtained severity class is arguably really an increasing function of flood severity (class II more severe than class I, etc.). By the way, the damage and spatial extension scores we gave to each event (when this was

20 possible) have obviously been kept, so that they will be usable for further work including specific analyses within the 7 more refined categories (e.g., regional damageable events, localized damageable events, etc.).

5.3. The participative choice: a long-lasting but rewarding effort

Given the now well-known limits of top-down approaches in the field of risk management, the TRANSRISK² research program focused on the implementation of a participatory approach. The ORRION database has been developed in this way,

25 with the double objective of knowledge capitalization and sharing. The participatory dimension of the database remains for the moment somewhat weak, with only a small amount of the information currently in ORRION coming from the public. However, this is not surprising since many studies already highlighted the low public interest in natural hazard issues and their management. These studies identified different factors influencing the active engagement of the public, such as "the direct experience of flooding," "education" and "knowledge," "the technical resources of the public," and "public perceptions

30 of technical complexity related to hazard mitigation" (Koehler and Koontz, 2008; Kenyon, 2007; Godschalk et al., 2003). It has even been shown that, because the participative dimension is absent from the prevalent culture of flood risk management, a paradigm shift can be problematic in terms of method and/or practical implementation (Evers et al., 2016;

Ruiz-Villaverde and Garcia-Rubio, 2017; Hegger et al., 2013; Simonovic and Akter, 2006; Thaler and Levin-Keitel, 2016; Wehn et al., 2015). As a consequence, the participative approach remains uncommon (Jingling et al., 2010; Koehler and Koontz, 2008), and is even sometimes considered as responsible for generating tension between the actors concerned (Kuhlicke et al., 2016).

5   Hence, in practice, it is still largely "experts" who define the risk and the answers to be given (e.g., November et al. 2011), thereby inducing a clear distinction between public knowledge and expert knowledge. In practice, often, at best an integration of local authorities and experts into the risk management process is aimed at. Even more simply, it is sometimes deemed sufficient to set up communication strategies to inform/raise public awareness of the risks involved (e.g., Dunbar, 2007; Kuhlicke et al., 2016) or to help it accept the management strategies defined by the experts (Hubert and De Vanssay,

10   2005; Vinet, 2010). Finally, when a participative approach is adopted, it usually consists in summing up oral memory or, more generally, in exploiting information produced by the public in a one-way movement in order to improve the mapping of a phenomenon or the crisis management (e.g., Kundu and Kundu, 2011). As an example, the citizens' natural risk observatory of the French geological survey aims at collecting information from social media. Thus, few projects conceive the participative choice as a collaborative exchange and decision-making process where the different stakeholders and public

15   involved fully contribute to the risk management process, from the definition of the problem to the answers to be given (Simonovic and Akter, 2006).

 Despite these difficulties and the few successful participative experiences currently underway, the adoption of the ORRION tool by citizens is fundamental given the currently poor documentation of extreme floods in the Alsatian region, and, more generally the weakness of the existing risk awareness schemes. This latter situation is certainly partly due to the particular

20   historical context of the region, as mentioned earlier. Another reason may be that the last major flood occurred in 1990, almost 30 years ago, and therefore its memory has blurred with time. Indeed, things may have been different in the context of more frequent major floods or just after a disaster. For instance, during the June 2013 Pyrenees floods, researchers from the University of Toulouse (France) issued a call for experiences (lived, felt, etc.) and testimonies, including photographs and videos, not only of the current event but also of older episodes. This call for contributions was successful as more than

25   5,000 photographs were collected (June 2013 Pyrenees' floods, http://cruespyr2013.canalblog.com).

Thus, the participative part of the ORRION is currently not perfect but it represents an encouraging start. The platform is now very well identified by local risk management actors, but some work remains to be done to involve the general public more. To this aim, communication is clearly necessary to make more people aware of the existence of ORRION, of the reality of flood risk in the Alsatian region, and of the importance for disaster reduction that any information they have is

30   made largely available on the platform. As an example of such actions, the Facebook page devoted to ORRION has helped greatly in increasing visibility among the 18-35-year-olds (more than 5,000 have seen a publication concerning the 1947 flood). Also, after a report in the local newspapers of the major flood of December 1947, 70 years after its occurrence, there was an increase in public contributions to ORRION. In a similar spirit, a commemoration of the 1919 – 1920 extreme-size

flood event for its centennial anniversary is now planned to remember the destruction the region suffered at that time and to highlight how difficult it would be to deal with a similar event today. Illustrative numerical simulations of the event and of its damage potential using the participative ORRION information as input and with results displayed and explained on the web platform are also envisaged. This would be a step further in the direction of a better sharing of risk knowledge between citizens, stake-holders, technicians, and scientists, and may exemplify how exchanges between all these groups of people may lead to mutual benefits.

6. Conclusion and outlook

The European Flood Directive has published specific guidelines for disaster reduction. As a response to the expressed need of improving both the documentation of past events and the sharing of information between all parties concerned, this article has presented the regional flood risk observatory ORRION and its very rich data content. Grounded on two multidisciplinary research projects, ORRION has been designed as a participative online platform where knowledge capitalization and exchange are maximized. Hence, the uniqueness of ORRION is to be a collaboration, communication, and awareness tool with strong potential for both geophysical inference and operational outcomes.

This article has shown that the data and original organization by events attest to the complex and specific historic situation of the Alsatian region that has undergone manifold political changes over the past few centuries. Consequently, the database helps to renew our knowledge of flood hazard and risk in the French upper Rhine catchment area, providing long spatiotemporal chronicles of floods for 13 rivers, and for all Alsatian municipalities, as well as their main characteristics according to various typologies (seasonality, causes, damage types, severity). It also helps identify the major changes and their social and environmental drivers throughout the study period. However, no attempt of any kind was made to correct the different bias in the records. Instead, in ORRION, the choice was made to provide as much information as possible to allow the records to be meaningfully interpreted by any potential user. Methodological developments now exist to remove the trend due to population increase and sources availability (Macdonald and Sangster, 2017). Such an approach could be put at use for ORRION's events, so as to help interpret these in terms of increase/decrease of flood frequency, and more generally in terms of changes in hazard and risk through time.

Indeed, in this work, only a simple statistical analysis of the abundant information summed-up was performed. This choice was made because it is arguably sufficient to highlight the main characteristics in space and time of the data, and to highlight and discus the factors that explain the spatio-temporal distribution of flood events, namely a combination of anthropogenic factors related to sources, vulnerability and infrastructures, but also of natural factors related, e.g., to climate, both at the scale of the entire database, and/or for more specific rivers and locations. Assessing association on the basis of the sole Pearson coefficient may be seen as oversimplified but it was feasible with our binary / continuous dataset and sufficient to identify couples of variables, rivers, municipality, etc. that behave similarly over the study area and/or the study period.

Also, the data set at our hand was very large, we wanted to process it in a unified and systematic way and we could not find a method with stronger mathematical justifications that would have allowed this at reasonable computational costs. However, further research could clearly ground on our preliminary analysis to exploit the pre-processed data in many more specific directions. For example, using logistic regressions would be much more appropriate that what we did to assess linkages between binary and continuous variables, and specific tests could be implemented to evaluate the significance of joint flooding conditional to various conditions. More generally, explicit statistical modeling with advanced nonseparable spatiotemporal covariance models instead of the rather simple descriptive techniques that were used in this work would be beneficial. Coupled with the diachronic analysis of land use, settlements, and practices, this may facilitate further understanding of the main pattern of change in flood risk, such as, e.g., the respective weight of climatic and social factors in the dramatic increase in flood activity that was identified in the first half of the 19th century. Doing this systematically for the records at hand and interpret all related results is clearly out of the scope of our first analysis, but the door is wide open for many appealing further analyses.

Among possible directions, reconstruction of past peaks discharge stands among priority. Indeed, methods making it possible to reconstruct peak discharges more or less precisely from historical sources are now increasingly popular in the flood literature (Benito et al., 2004; Herget and Meurs, 2010). These were already used for the Kinzig river belonging to the German part of the Transrisk project. Also, ORRION's information already allowed to better characterize the historical floods of 1852 and 1860 for the Ill in Mulhouse, and to validate the corresponding discharge modelling that has been realized within the framework of the European flood directive. Finally, the study of historical water levels already revealed that the computation of the centennial flood of the Zorn river should be reconsidered (Martin et al, 2018). Hence, we are well aware of the potential of the available information for discharge reconstructions and of the usefulness of doing this for improving operational flood risk managements. These preliminary approaches will therefore be expanded and generalized, in order to, in the future, associate discharge information to ORRION events within the database. For instance, the information summed up in ORRION will certainly be used to drive further hydrological and hydraulic simulations in order to provide greater detail on the dynamic characteristics of the flood events themselves (response time of the watersheds, flooded areas and corresponding water depths, efficiency of existing or potentially new countermeasures for the hazard, etc.). This will be a valuable contribution to the improvement of current legal hazard and risk maps and to their necessary adaptation to ongoing climate and societal changes. Hence, as already acknowledged by the concrete examples given above, ORRION should really be seen as a powerful tool to concretely improve flood risk management in the targeted area.

Finally, concerning the data already available, some improvements are also necessary. The available information, although impressive, is certainly not exhaustive. Further browsing of archival documents, local press, and official documents initiated after disaster occurrences and integration of their output into ORRION are envisaged if the funds can be obtained. This would allow for better documentation of the Alsatian rivers that have not been studied so far because the number of flood events involving these rivers has not been regarded as representative enough of the physical reality of flood hazard and risk.

In parallel, documentation of certain major events of the past such as the 1910 and 1919 floods could thus be improved and more context information regarding, e.g., past engineering work and ancient river profiles will be included in the database. However, the main challenge in terms of data improvement is to promote database enrichment through its participative interface. The advantages and limitations of the participative approach have been discussed, highlighting its potential but also the difficulty of ensuring that the highest number of potential contributors take part. We sincerely hope that, thanks to devoted communication and dissemination actions, it will be possible to intensify this effort in the upcoming years.

7. Acknowledgments

The research presented in this paper was conducted in the framework of the project "TRANSRISK²" which was supported by the French National Research Agency and the German Research Foundation (DFG).

8. Data availability

All the data supporting this study can be freely accessed and browsed on the ORRION participative platform (http://orrion.fr/). Feedback and contributions are most welcome.

References

Aman, A. A. and Bman, B. B.: The test article, J. Sci. Res., 12, 135–147, doi:10.1234/56789, 2015.

Aman, A. A., Cman, C., and Bman, B. B.: More test articles, J. Adv. Res., 35, 13–28, doi:10.2345/67890, 2014.

Albrecht, J.: Legal framework and criteria for effectively coordinating public participation under the Floods Directive and Water Framework Directive: European requirements and German transposition, Environmental Science & Policy, 55, 368–375, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.07.019, 2016.

Auer I., Böhm R., Jurkovic A., Lipa W., Orlik A., Potzmann R., Schöner W., Ungersböck M., Matulla C., Briffa K., Jones P.D., Efthymiadis D., Brunetti M., Nanni T., Maugeri M., Mercalli L., Mestre O., Moisselin J.-M., Begert M., Müller-Westermeier G., Kveton V., Bochnicek O., Stastny P., Lapin M., Szalai S., Szentimrey T., Cegnar T., Dolinar M., Gajic-Capka M., Zaninovic K., Majstorovic Z., and Nieplova E.: HISTALP – Historical instrumental climatological surface time series of the greater Alpine region 1760-2003, Int. J. Climatol., 27,17-46, 2007.

Ballesteros-Cánovas, J. A., Stoffel, M., Benito, G., Rohrer, M., Barriopedro, D., García-Herrera, R., ... & Brönnimann, S.: On the extraordinary winter flood episode over the North Atlantic Basin in 1936. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1436(1), 206-216, 2019.

Benito, G., Díez-Herrero, A., and De Villalta, M. F.: Magnitude and frequency of flooding in the Tagus basin (Central Spain) over the last millennium. Clim. Change, 58(1-2), 171-192, 2003.

Benito, G., Thorndycraft, V. R., Enzel, Y., Sheffer, N. A., Rico, M., Sopeña, A., and Sánchez-Moya, Y.: Palaeoflood data collection and analysis. Systematic, Palaeoflood and Historical Data for the Improvement of Flood Risk Estimation, Methodological Guidelines, 15-27, 2004.

Berrebi-Hoffmann, I., and Lallement, M.: A quoi servent les experts?, Cahiers internationaux de sociologie, 126, 1, 5-12, 2009.

Bourova, E., Maldonado, E., Leroy, J.-B., Alouani, R., Eckert, N., Bonnefoy-Demongeot, M., and Deschatres, M.: A new webbased system to improve the monitoring of snow avalanche hazard in France, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 16, 1205–1216, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-16-1205-2016, 2016.

Brázdil, R., Kundzewicz, Z. W., and Benito, G.: Historical hydrology for studying flood risk in Europe, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 51, 5, 739–764, 2006.

Buchecker, M., Ogasa, D. M., and Maidl, E.: How well do the wider public accept integrated flood risk management? An empirical study on two Swiss Alpine valleys, Environmental Science & Policy, 55, 309–317, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.07.021, 2016.

Challies, E., Newig, J., Thaler, T., Kochskämper, E., and Levin-Keitel, M.: Participatory and collaborative governance for sustainable flood risk management: An emerging research agenda, Environmental Science & Policy, 55, 275–280, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.09.012, 2016.

Chi Aye, Z., Jaboyedoff, M., Derron, M.-H., and Westen van, C. J.: Prototype of a Web-based Participative Decision Support Platform in Natural Hazards and Risk Management, ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Inf, 4, 1201–1224, doi:10.3390/ijgi4031201, 2015.

Collet, P.: Inondation : vers une forte hausse des dommages subis par les 28 états membres de l'UE, Environnement et technique, 335, 14–15, 2014.

Collombat, P.: Se donner les moyens de ses ambitions : les leçons des inondations du Var et du sud-est de la France, report n° 775 (2011-2012) on behalf on the floods' information mission in the Var Region (France), http://www.senat.fr/rap/r11-775/r11-77599.html, 2012.

Decrop, G., and Charlier, C.: De l'expertise scientifique au risque négocié. Le cas du risque en montagne, CEMAGREF éd., Antony, France, 102 pp., 1997.

Eckert, N., Keylock, C. J., Castebrunet, H., Lavigne, A., and Naaim, M.: Temporal trends in avalanche activity in the French Alps and subregions: from occurrences and runout altitudes to unsteady return periods, Journal of Glaciology, 59, 213, 93–114, 2013.

European Union: Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the assessment and management of flood risks of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and managed of flood risks, Official Journal of the European Union, L 288/27, 27–34, 2007.

Flageolet J.C. : Où sont les neiges d'antan ? Deux siècles de neige dans le massif vosgien, Nancy, Presses universitaires de Nancy, 220 p, 2005.

Fournier, M., 2010, Le riverain introuvable ! La gestion du risque d'inondation au défi d'une mise en perspective diachronique. Une analyse menée à partir de l'exemple de la Loire, Ph.D. thesis, University of François Rabelais – Tours, France 431 pp., 2010.

Fournier, M., Holleville., N. : Le « canal de décharge des eaux d'inondation de l'Ill » : retour sur la construction d'un ouvrage de protection structurant dans l'essor urbain de la ville de Mulhouse, in Fournier P. et Massard-Guilbaud G., Aménagement et environnement. Perspectives historiques, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2016

Giacona, F., Eckert, N., and Martin, B.: A 240-year history of avalanche risk in the Vosges Mountains based on non-conventio nal (re)sources, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 17, 887–904, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-17-887-2017, 2017.

Glaser R, Riemann D: A thousand-year record of temperature variations for Germany and Central Europe based on documentary data J Quaternary Sci, 2009; 24 (5) : 437-449.

Glaser, R., Riemann, D., Schönbein, J., Barriendos, M., Brazdil, R., Bertoli, C., Camuffo, D., Deutsch, M., Dobrovolny, P., van Engelen, A., Enzi S., Halickova, C., König, S., König, O., Limanowka, D., Mackova, J., Sghedoni, M., Martin, B., and Himmelsbach, I.: The variability of European floods since AD 1500, Climatic Change, 101, 235–256, 2010.

Herget, J., and Meurs, H..: Reconstructing peak discharges for historic flood levels in the city of Cologne, Germany, Global Planet. Change, 70(1-4), 108-116, 2010.

Glaser R: Klimageschichte Mitteleuropas - 1200 Jahre Wetter, Klima, Katastrophen WBG, Darmstadt, 3. Auflage, 2013

Glaser, R. : Global Change: Das neue Gesicht der Erde. Primus Verlag, 2014.

Glaser, R,, Kahle, M, Hologa, R.: The tambora.org data series edition.- tambora.org data series., 2016, http://dx.doi.org/10.6094/tambora.org/2016/seriesnotes.pdf, 2016.

Godschalk David R., Brody Samuel, Burby Raymond, 2003, Public Participation, in Natural Hazard Mitigation Policy Information: Challenges for Comprehensive Planning, Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, 46, 5, 733–754.

Grove, J. M.: The little ice age, London and New York: Taylor & Francis, 1–524, 1988.

Guzzetti, F., and Tonelli, G.: Information system on hydrological and geomorphological catastrophes in Italy (SIDI): a tool for managing landslide and flood hazards, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 4, 213–232, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-4-213-2004, 2004.

Hegger, D., Green, C., Driessen, P., Bakker, M., Dieperink, C., Crabbé, A., Deketelaere, K., Delvaux, B., Suykens, C., Beyers, J.-C., Fournier, M., Larrue, C., Manson, C., van Doorn-Hoekveld, W., van Rijswick., M., Kundzewicz, Z., Goytia Casermeiro, S.,: Flood Risk Management in Europe – similarities and differences between the STAR-FLOOD consortium countries, Open file report (1_D1.1.4_2013_06_11) of the EU 7th Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013), 24–25, 2013.

Hilker, N., Badoux, A., and Hegg, C.: The Swiss flood and landslide damage database 1972-2007, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 9, 913–225, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-9-913-2009, 2009.

Himmelsbach, I., Glaser, R., Schoenbein, J., Riemann, D., and Martin, B.: Reconstruction of flood events based on documentary data and transnational flood risk analysis of the Upper Rhine and its French and German tributaries since AD 1480, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19, 4149–4164, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-4149-2015, 2015.

Höppner, C., Whittle, R., Bründl, M., and Buchecker, M.: Linking social capacities and risk communication in Europe: a gap between theory and practice?, Natural Hazards, 64, 1753-1778, doi:10.1007/s11069-012-0356-5, 2012.

Hubert, G., and De Vansay, B. (Eds.): Le risque d'inondation et la cartographie réglementaire. Analyse de l'efficacité, des impacts et de l'appropriation locale de la politique de prévention. Programme "Evaluation et Prise en compte des Risques naturels et technologiques", Ministère de l'Ecologie et du Développement Durable, Paris, France, 188 pp., 2005.

IPCC: Climate Change 2014: Synthesis report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental panel on Climate Change, IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp., 2014.

Jingling, L., Yun, L., Liya, S., Zhiguo, C., Baoqiang, Z.: Public participation in water resources management of Haihe river basin, China: the analysis and evaluation of status quo, Procedia Environmental Sciences, 2, 1750–1758, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2010.10.187, 2010.

Kenyon, W.: Evaluating flood risk management options in Scotland: A participant-led multi-criteria approach, Ecological Economics, 64, 1, 70–81, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.06.011, 2007.

Kjeldsen, T. R., Macdonald, N., Lang, M., Mediero, L., Albuquerque, T., Bogdanowicz, E., ... and Gül, G. O. Documentary evidence of past floods in Europe and their utility in flood frequency estimation. J. Hydrol., 517, 963-973, 2014.

Koehler, B., and Koontz, T. M.: Citizen Participation in Collaborative Watershed Partnerships, Environmental Management, 41, 143–154, DOI: 10.1007/s00267-007-9040-z, 2008.

Kundu, A., and Kundu, S.: Flood Vulnerability Assessment Using Participatory GIS Approach, Journal of Remote Sensing & GIS, 2, 1, 8–22, 2011.

Lang, M., Cœur, D., Bard, A., Bacq, B., Becker, T., Bignon, E., Blanchard, R., Burckmann, L., Delserieys, M., Edelblutte, C., and Merle, C.: Les inondations remarquables en France au XXe siècle : premiers éléments d'analyse issus de l'enquête EPRI 2011, La Houille Blanche, 5, 37–47, https://doi.org/10.1051/lhb/2013041, 2013.

Lang, M., Cœur, D., Brochot, S., and Naudet, R.: Information historique et ingénierie des risques naturels: l'Isère et le torrent du Manival, Cemagref, Lyon, France, 1–180, 2003.

Llasat, M. C., Barriendos, M., Barrera, A., and Rigo, T.: Floods in Catalonia (NE Spain) since the 14th century. Climatological and meteorological asects from historical documentary sources and old instrumental records, J. Hydrol., 313(1-2), 32-47, 2005.

Le Roy Ladurie, E., Rousseau, D., VASAK, A.,: Les fluctuations du climat: de l'an mil à nos jours, Fayard, Paris, France, 321 pp., 2011.

Martin B., Drescher A., Fournier M., Gerrouah O., Giacona F., Glaser R., Himmelsbach I., Holleville N., Riemann D., Schonbein J., Vitoux M.-C., and With L.: Les évènements extrêmes dans le fossé rhénan entre 1480 et 2012. Quels apports pour la prévention des inondations?, La Houille Blanche, 2, 82–93, https://doi.org/10.1051/lhb/20150023, 2015a.

5   Martin, B., Holleville, N., Furst, B., Giacona, F., Glaser, R., Himmelsbach, I., and Schönbein, J. : La géohistoire des inondations au service de l'évaluation critique du zonage du Plan de Prévention des Risques d'Inondation : l'exemple de Thann (Haut-Rhin, France), Belgeo, 1, 16 pp., 2015b.

Martin, B., Holleville, N., Giacona, F., Glaser, R., and Himmelsbach, I.: La variabilité spatio-temporelle des inondations dans le Fossé Rhénan à la lumière de l'évolution de la vulnérabilité, Vertigo, 1, 21 pp., DOI : 10.4000/vertigo.18488, 2017.

10 Martin, B., Ansel, R., Guerrouah, O., Vitoux, M.-C., With, L., Drescher, A., Glaser, R., Himmelsbach, I., Schönbein, J.: Géohistoire critique de la crue de janvier 1910 dans le Fossé Rhénan (Alsace / Pays de Bade), La Houille Blanche, 1, 62–68, https://doi.org/10.1051/lhb/2011008, 2011.

Martin, B., Guerrouah, O., Vitoux, M.-C., and With, L.: Territorialisation ou déterritorialisation du risque ? Analyse comparative et critique de la procédure de réalisation des PPRNP, Riseo : risques études et observations, 1,
15 http://www.riseo.fr/-Revue-1-#page29, 2010.

Martin, B.: Expertise et risques majeurs, le point de vue des géographes, Droit de l'Environnement, 142, 314–322, 2006.

Martin, B. : Une base de données historiques pour gérer les risques de demain, l'exemple de Vars (Hautes-Alpes, France), in Nancy MESCHINET DE RICHEMOND (dir.), Quelles archives aujourd'hui pour mieux gérer les risques demain ? Approches géographiques et historiques, Collection Géorisques, n° 3, Montpellier, PULM, 2010.

20 Macdonald, N., and Sangster, H.: High-magnitude flooding across Britain since AD 1750. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 21(3), 1631-1650, 2017.

Minářová, J.: Climatology of precipitation in the Vosges Mountain range area, AUC GEOGRAPHICA, 48(2), 51-60, 2013.

Naulet, R., Lang, M., Ouarda, T. B., Coeur, D., Bobée, B., Recking, A., and Moussay, D.: Flood frequency analysis on the Ardèche river using French documentary sources from the last two centuries, Journal of Hydrology, 313, 58–78,
25 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2005.02.011, 2005.

November, V., Penelas, M., and Viot, P.: Habiter les territoires à risques, PPUR, Lausanne, Switzerland, 264 pp., 2011.

Observatoire national des risques naturels: The National Observatory for natural Risks, http://www.onrn.fr/site/binaries/content/assets/documents/onrn/publications_2015/15-02-11-brochure_onrn_ang.pdf, 2015.

Payrastre, O., Gaume, E., and Andrieu, H.: Usefulness of historical information for flood frequency analyses: Developments
30 based on a case study, Water Resour. Res., 47, 8, doi: 10.1029/2010WR009812, 2011.

Roy A.: La perception sociale des risques naturels, Les données de l'environnement, 99, 4 pp., 2005.

Riemann, D,, Glaser, R,, Kahle, M,, Vogt, S.: The CRE tambora.org – new data and tools for collaborative research in climate and environmental history. Geoscience Data Journal 2 (2): 63–77, 2015.

Sangster, H., Jones, C., Macdonald, N. The co-evolution of historical source materials in the geophysical, hydrological and meteorological sciences: Learning from the past and moving forward. Progress Phys. Geog.: Earth and Environment, 42(1), 61-82, 2018.

Scarwell, H. J. Laganier, R : Risque d'inondation et aménagement durable des territoires 916, Presses Univ. Septentrion, 2004.

Schläppy, R., Jomelli, V., Grancher, D., Stoffel, M., Corona, C., Brunstein, D., Eckert, N., and Deschatres, M.: A New Tree-ring based, Semi-quantitative Approach for the Determination of Snow Avalanche Events: Use of Classification Trees for Validation, Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research, 45, 3, 383–395, 2013.

Simonovic, S. P., and Akter, T.: Participtory floodplain management in the Red River Basin, Canada, Annual Reviews in Control, 30, 183–192, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2006.05.001, 2006.

Stedinger, J. R., and Cohn, T. A.: Flood frequency-analysis with historical and paleoflood information, Water Resources Research, 22, 5, 785–793, Doi: 10.1029/wr022i005p00785, 1986.

Thaler, T., and Levin-Keitel, M.: Multi-level stakeholder engagement in flood risk management − A question of roles and power: Lessons from England, Environmental science & policy, 55, 292–301, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.04.007, 2016.

Thema, P. G. M.: Hochwasser in Mitteleuropa seit 1500 und ihre Beziehung zur atmosphärischen Zirkulation, Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen, 145, 6, 2001.

Veale, L., Endfield, G., Davies, S., Macdonald, N., Naylor, S., Royer, M. J., ... and Jones, C. Dealing with the deluge of historical weather data: the example of the TEMPEST database. Geo: Geography and Environment, 4(2), e00039 : 2017.

Vinet, F.: Le Risque inondation. Diagnostic et gestion, Ed. Tec & Doc, Paris, France, 318 pp., 2010.

Wetter, O., Pfister, C., Weingartner, R., Luterbacher, J., Reist, T., Trösch, J.: The largest floods in the high Rhine basin since 1268 assessed from documentary and instrumental evidence, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 56, 5, 733–758, https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2011.583613, 2011.

When, U., Rusca, M., Evers, J., and Lanfranchi, V.: Participation in flood risk management and potential of citizen observatories: A governance analysis, Environmental Science & Policy, 48, 225–236, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2014.12.017, 2015.

Wilhelm, B., Arnaud, F., Sabatier, P., Magand, O., Chapron, E., Courp, T., Tachikawa, K., Fanget, B., Malet, E., Pignol, C., Bard, E., and Delannoy, J. J.: Palaeoflood activity and climate change over the last 1400 years recorded by lake sediments in the NW European Alps, J. Quat. Sci., 28, 189–199, doi: 10.1002/jqs.2609, 2013.

Wilhelm, B., Ballesteros Cánovas, J. A., Macdonald, N., Toonen, W. H., Baker, V., Barriendos, M., ... & Glaser, R.: Interpreting historical, botanical, and geological evidence to aid preparations for future floods. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water, 6(1), e1318, 2018.

Zorita E, Moberg A, Leijonhufvud L, Wilson R, Brázdil R, Dobrovolný P, Luterbacher J, Böhm R, Pfister C, Riemann D, Glaser R, Söderberg J, Gonzáles-Rouco F: European temperature records of the past five centuries based on documentary/instrumental information compared to climate simulations Climatic Change, 2010.

Webpages:

British Hydrological Events database: http://www.cbhe.hydrology.org.uk/index.php, last access: 2 May 2019.

Database of the French Restauration des Terrains en Montagne services: http://rtm-onf.ifn.fr/, last access: 4 December 2017.

Database of the regional risk observatory in Provence-Alpes-Côtes-d'Azur Region (South-East of France): http://observatoire-regional-risques-paca.fr/, last access: 4 December 2017.

French historical flood database "BDHI": http://bdhi.fr/, last access: 4 December 2017.

French historical flood database: http://bdhi.fr/, last access: 4 December 2017.

HISTRHONE database: https://histrhone.cerege.fr/, last access: 4 December 2017.

InfoTerre, Internet portal managed by the French Geological Survey: http://infoterre.brgm.fr/, last access: 4 December 2017.

Program June 2013 Pyrenees' Flood: http://cruespyr2013.canalblog.com, last access: 4 December 2017.

Regional observatory of floods (Alsace region): http://orrion.fr, last access: 4 December 2017.

Figure 1: Presentation of the study area.

Source: http://orrion.fr/

Figure 2: ORRION user's interface (http://orrion.fr). A: homepage; B: presentation of the project and of the main characteristics of floods in the Alsace region; C: database's access page with a general map of all recorded events; D: example of an article corresponding to a specific event; E: contact form to post a participative contribution.

Figure 3: Maps of two class I events.

A: February 1982 event. "Alsatian tributaries of the Rhine river only – T" configuration. Extension score: 0. Damages score:
1. Overflowed Moder river caused functional damages and impacted one municipality. This event is attributed to snow
melting/thaw and to long lasting rainfall. It is known from 1 source.

B: August 1866 event. "Rhine river alone – R" configuration. Extension score: 0. Damages score: 0. Overflowed Rhine river
caused environmental, functional and material damages, and impacted 1 municipality. This event is attributed to long lasting
rainfall and is known from 43 sources.

Figure 4: Maps of two class II events.

A: February 1999 event. "Alsatian tributaries of the Rhine river only – T" configuration. Extension score: 1. Damages score: 1. Overflowed Largue, Ill and Zorn rivers caused material damages and impacted 3 municipalities. Giessen and Bruche rivers were flooded without overflow. This event has unknown causes. It is known from 7 sources.

B: September 1881 event. "Rhine river alone – R" configuration. Extension score: 0. Damages score: 2. Overflowed Rhine river caused environmental, functional and material damages, and impacted 8 municipalities. This event is attributed to heavy rainfall and is known from 5 sources.

Figure 5: Maps of two class III-IV events.

A: January-February 1801 event. "Alsatian tributaries of the Rhine river only – T" configuration. Extension score: 0. Damages score: 2. Class III event. Overflowed Largue river caused environmental damages and impacted 5 municipalities.
5   This flood is attributed to snow melting/thaw and to heavy rainfall. It is known from 1 source.

B: December 1919 event. "Rhine river and its Alsatian tributaries – RT" configuration. Extension score: 2. Damages score: 2. Class IV event. Overflowed Ill, Doller, Thur, Lauch, Fecht, Lièpvrette, Giessen, and Bruche caused human, environmental, functional and material damages, and impacted 45 municipalities. Rhine and Zorn rivers were flooded without overflow. This event is attributed to snow melting/thaw and heavy rainfall and is known from 61 sources.

Figure 6: Total number of events per municipality. For each event, only the municipalities where water overflow has been reported are considered. Most of the overflows concern the 13 rivers specifically studied in this work, but a few correspond to other rivers (smaller rivers and/or rivers with less than 10 flood events in the ORRION

Figure 7: Characterization of the events' interranual distribution. A) number of documented causes; B) number of documented damage types; number of rivers per event among the 13 rivers studied C) with water overflow, D) without water overflow, E) with and without water overflow; F) number of impacted municipalities. For the latter, only the municipalities where water overflow has been reported are considered.

Figure 8: Chronology of all recorded events: annual distribution and smooth underlying trend.

Figure 9: Chronologies according to events' hydrological configuration. Type R events correspond to flood events having affected the Rhine river alone. Type T events have affected one or several Alsatian tributaries of the Rhine river, but not the Rhine river. Type RT events have affected both the Rhine river and at least one of its Alsatian tributaries.

Figure 10: Individual chronologies for the 13 studied rivers: events with and without water overflow.

Figure 11: Individual chronologies for the 13 studied rivers: all events (with and without overflow) and underlying smooth trend.

Figure 12: Chronologies according to the events' severity class as defined in Tables 2-3.

Figure 13: Chronologies of events according to their causes. Events for which several causes are documented (Figure 7A) appear in the different corresponding plots.

Figure 14: Chronologies of events according to their consequences (documented damage types). Human damages correspond to at least one people killed.

Figure 15: Flood events seasonality (monthly distribution). A) for all events; B-D) for the "Rhine river alone – R" and "Alsatian tributaries but not the Rhine – T" events; C-E) for all events with and without water overflow that have affected the Rhine and the Bruche rivers, respectively. For all (A) and Type R (C) – Type T (D) events, by definition, water overflow has been reported in at least one river.

Figure 16: Chronologies for three specific municipalities.