Technical Report 0605

Hydromodification Screening Tools: GIS-based Catchment Analyses of Potential Changes in Runoff and Sediment Discharge

Derek B. Booth[1], Scott R. Dusterhoff[1],
Eric D. Stein[2] and Brian P. Bledsoe[3]

[1]Stillwater Sciences, Inc., Santa Barbara, CA
[2]Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, Costa Mesa, CA
[3]Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO

Executive Summary

Managing the effects of hydromodification (physical response of streams to changes in catchment runoff and sediment yield) has become a key element of most stormwater programs in California. Although straightforward in intent, hydromodification management is difficult in practice. Shifts in the flow of water and sediment, and the resulting imbalance in sediment supply and capacity can lead to changes in channel planform and cross-section via wide variety of mechanisms. Channel response can vary based on factors such as boundary materials, valley shape and slope, presence of in-stream or streamside vegetation, or catchment properties (e.g., slope, land cover, geology).

Management prescriptions should be flexible and variable to account for the heterogeneity of streams; a given strategy will not be universally well-suited to all circumstances. Management decisions regarding a particular stream reach(s) should be informed by an understanding of susceptibility (based on both channel and catchment properties), resources potentially at risk (e.g., habitat, infrastructure, property), and the desired management endpoint (e.g., type of channel desired, priority functions; see Figure ES1).



Figure ES1: Decision nodes that influence the management prescription for a particular stream reach.

We have produced a series of documents that outline a process and provide tools aimed at addressing the decision node associated with assessing channel susceptibility. The three corresponding hydromodification screening tool documents are:

1. *GIS-based catchment analyses of potential changes in runoff and sediment discharge* which outlines a process for evaluating potential change to stream channels resulting from watershed-scale changes in runoff and sediment yield.
2. *Field manual for assessing channel susceptibility* which describes an in-the-field assessment procedure that can be used to evaluate the relative susceptibility of channel reaches to deepening and widening.
3. *Technical basis for development of a regionally calibrated probabilistic channel susceptibility assessment* which provides technical details, analysis, and a summary of field data to support the field-based assessment described in the field manual.

The catchment analyses and the field manual are designed to support each other by assessing channel susceptibility at different scales and in different ways. The GIS-based catchment analyses document is a planning tool that describes a process to predict likely effects of hydromodification based on potential change in water and sediment discharge as a consequence of planned or potential landscape alteration (e.g., urbanization). Data on geology, hillslope, and land cover are compiled for each watershed of interest, overlaid onto background maps, grouped into several discrete categories, and classified independently across the watershed in question. The classifications are used to generate a series of Geomorphic Landscape Units (GLUs) at a resolution defined by the coarsest of the three data sets (usually 10 to 30 m). Three factors: geology, hillslope, and land cover are used because the data are readily available; these factors are important to controlling sediment yield. The factors are combined into categories of High, Medium, or Low relative sediment production. The current science of sediment yield estimation is not sophisticated enough to allow fully remote (desktop) assignment of these categories. Therefore initial ratings must be verified in the field.

Once the levels of relative sediment production (i.e., Low, Medium, and High) are defined across a watershed under its current configuration of land use, those areas subject to future development are identified, and corresponding sediment-production levels are determined by substituting Developed land cover for the original categories and modifying the relative sediment production as necessary (Figure ES2). Conversely, relative sediment production for currently developed watershed areas can be altered to estimate relict sediment production for an undeveloped land use and used to assess the impact of watershed development on pre-development sediment production. The resultant maps can be used to aid in planning decisions by indicating areas where changes in land use will likely have the largest (or smallest) effect on sediment yield to receiving channels.



Figure ES2: Example of Geomorphic Landscape Units for the Escondido Creek Watershed.

The field assessment procedure is intended to provide a rapid assessment of the relative susceptibility of a specific stream reach to effects of hydromodification. The intrinsic sensitivity of a channel system to hydromodification as determined by the ratio of disturbing to resisting forces, proximity to thresholds of concern, probable rates of response and recovery, and potential for spatial propagation of impacts. A combination of relatively simple, but quantitative, field indicators are used as input parameters for a set of decision trees. The decision trees follow a logical progression and allow users to assign a classification of Low, Medium, High, or Very High susceptibility rating to the reach being assessed. Ratings based on likely response in the vertical and lateral directions (i.e., channel deepening and widening) are assigned separately. The screening rating foreshadows the level of data collection, modeling, and ultimate mitigation efforts that can be expected for a particular stream-segment type and geomorphic setting. The field assessment is novel in that it incorporates the following combination of features:

- Integrated field and office/desktop components
- Separate ratings for channel susceptibility in vertical and lateral dimensions
- Transparent flow of logic via decision trees
- Critical nodes in the decision trees are represented by a mix of probabilistic diagrams and checklists
- Process-based metrics selected after exhaustive literature review and analysis of large field dataset
- Metrics balance process fidelity, measurement simplicity, and intuitive interpretability
- Explicitly assesses proximity to geomorphic thresholds delineated using field data from small watersheds in southern California
- Avoids bankfull determination, channel cross-section survey, and sieve analysis, but requires pebble count in some instances
- Verified predictive accuracy of simplified logistic diagrams relative to more complex methods, such as dimensionless shear-stress analyses and Osman and Thorne (1988) geotechnical stability procedure
- Assesses bank susceptibility to mass wasting; field-calibrated logistic diagram of geotechnical stability vetted by Colin Thorne (personal communication)
- Regionally-calibrated braiding/incision threshold based on surrogates for stream power and boundary resistance
- Incorporates updated alternatives to the US Geological Survey (USGS; Waananen and Crippen 1977) regional equations for peak flow (Hawley and Bledsoe In Review)
- Does not rely on bank vegetation given uncertainty of assessing the future influence of root reinforcement (e.g., rooting depth/bank height)
- Channel evolution model underpinning the field procedure is based on observed responses in southern California using a modification of Schumm *et al*. (1984) five-stage model to represent alternative trajectories

The probabilistic models of braiding, incision, and bank instability risk embedded in the screening tools were calibrated with local data collected in an extensive field campaign. The models help users directly assess proximity to geomorphic thresholds and offer a framework for gauging susceptibility that goes beyond expert judgment. The screening analysis represents the first step toward determining appropriate management measures and should help inform decisions about subsequent more detailed analysis.

The GIS-based catchment-scale analysis and the field screening procedure are intended to be used as a set of tools to inform management decisions (Figure ES3). The catchment-scale analysis provides an overall assessment of likely changes in runoff and sediment discharge that can be used to support larger-scale land use planning decisions and can be applied prospectively or retrospectively. The field screening procedure provides more precise estimates of likely response of individual stream reaches based on direct observation of indicators. The field assessment procedure also provides a method to evaluate the extent of potential upstream and downstream propagation of effects (i.e., the analysis domain). In concept, the catchment-scale analysis would be completed for a watershed of interest before conducting the field analysis. However, this is not required and the two tools can be used independent of each other. It is not presently possible to describe a mechanistic linkage between the magnitude of the *drivers* of hydromodification (i.e., changes in the delivery of water and sediment to downstream channels), the *resistance* of channels to change, and the net expression on channel form. For this reason, the results of the catchment and field analyses must be conducted independently and the results cannot be combined to produce an overall evaluation of channel susceptibility to morphologic change (Figure ES3).



Figure ES3: Relationship of catchment and field screening tools to support decisions regarding susceptibility to effects of hydromodification.

Finally, it is important to note that these tools should be used as part of larger set of considerations in the decision making process (see Figure ES1). For example, the tools do not provide assessments of the ecological or economic affects of hydromodification. Similarly, they do not allow attribution of current conditions to past land use actions. Although the screening tool is designed to have management implications via a decision framework, policy/management decisions must be made by local stakeholders in light of a broader set of considerations.

Full Text

ftp://ftp.sccwrp.org/pub/download/DOCUMENTS/TechnicalReports/605_HydromodScreeningTools_GIS.pdf