

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

Uncertainty in Morphological Sediment Budgeting of Rivers

by

Joseph M. Wheaton

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

in the
School of Geography

Supervisors :

From School of Geography:

Dr. Stephen Darby & Professor David Sear

From Centre for Ecology & Hydrology:

Dr. Michael Acreman & Dr. Douglas Booker

May 2008

Declaration of Authorship

I, *Joseph Michael Wheaton*, declare that the thesis entitled *Uncertainty in Morphological Sediment Budgeting of Rivers* and the work presented in the thesis are both my own, and have been generated by me as the result of my own original research. I confirm that:

- this work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
- where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
- where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
- where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
- I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
- where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
- parts of this work have been published as *Wheaton et al. (2008)*.

Signed:

Date:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON
FACULTY OF SCIENCE
SCHOOL OF GEOGRAPHY

ABSTRACT

by Joseph M. Wheaton

Repeat topographic surveys are often used to monitor geomorphological change in rivers. Such surveys can yield Digital elevation models (DEMs), which are differenced against each other to produce spatially distributed maps of elevation changes called DEMs of difference (DoD). Both areal and volumetric budgets of erosion and deposition can be calculated from DoDs. However, questions arise about the reliability of the analyses and what they mean. This thesis presents two new methodological advances to address these two uncertainties.

The question of reliabilities (reliability uncertainty) was addressed through the development of a flexible technique for estimating the spatially variable surface representation uncertainties in individual DEMs. A fuzzy inference system is used to quantify uncertainty in DEMs and the individual error estimates are propagated into the DoD on a cell-by-cell basis. This is converted into a probabilistic estimate of DoD uncertainty. This estimate can be improved using Bayes theorem and an analysis of the spatial coherence of erosion and deposition units within the DoD. The resulting probabilistic estimate of DoD uncertainty reflects the spatial variability of uncertainty, and can be used to threshold the DoD at user-specified confidence intervals. This addresses reliability by allowing the distinction between real and undetectable changes.

The question of what the thresholded DoDs mean, geomorphically, is a fundamental one and what originally motivated the development of morphological sediment budgeting techniques. Herein, a range of masking tools were developed, which allow the quantitative interrogation of these rich spatial datasets and their patterns based on various classification systems and/or the expert-judgment of a trained geomorphologist. The tools extend the traditional DoD interpretation of whether a reach is net aggradational or net degradational to a detailed quantitative segregation of the DoD budget into the mechanisms responsible for the changes at the bar-scale.

The utility of both these methodological developments were tested on three different data sets representing event-based monitoring (Sulphur Creek, California), restoration monitoring (Mokelumne River, California), and annual-monitoring of a natural dynamic system (River Feshie, Scotland). One of the themes that emerges across the application of these tools in the three different settings is the sharp contrast between which geomorphological mechanisms of change are dominant in areal versus volumetric terms. The tools extend what can reliably be inferred about geomorphological change from repeat topographic surveys.

Contents

Declaration of Authorship	1
Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
List of Figures	9
List of Tables	14
Preface	16
Acknowledgements	17
List of Acronyms	19
I The Problem	1
1 Thesis Aims and Objectives	2
1.1 Chapter Purpose	2
1.2 Introduction to Problem	2
1.2.1 Motivating Problem: Monitoring Physical Habitat Restoration	3
1.2.2 Problem of Focus	7
1.3 Aim and Objectives of Thesis	7
1.3.1 Objective 1: Reliability of Monitoring Geomorphological Change	8
1.3.2 Objective 2: Meaningful Geomorphological Interpretations	10
1.4 Thesis Organization	12
2 A Broader Context for Uncertainty	14
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Uncertainty Unraveled	15
2.2.1 A Lexicon of Uncertainty	15
2.2.2 An Existing Typology for Uncertainty	19
2.2.3 How Knowledge and Uncertainty Relate	23
2.3 Scientific Tools for Communicating Uncertainty in Observations and Models	25
2.3.1 Metrics of Uncertainty as Expressions of Societal Values	25
2.3.2 Communicating Uncertainty in Observations	26
2.3.2.1 Measurement Uncertainty	26
2.3.2.2 Statistical and Probabilistic Methods	26

2.3.2.3	Fuzzy Set Theory	27
2.3.3	Communicating Uncertainty in Environmental Models	29
2.3.3.1	Probabilistic Uncertainty Representation in Models	30
2.3.3.2	Bayesian Frameworks	32
2.3.3.3	Monte Carlo Models	32
2.3.3.4	Fuzzy Models	35
2.4	Uncertainty about Change	39
2.5	Philosophical Treatments of Uncertainty	41
2.5.1	Embrace Uncertainty	43
2.6	Conclusion	44
3	Thesis Rationale and Scope	48
3.1	Chapter Purpose	48
3.2	Introduction - An Appropriate Scale	48
3.2.1	Spatial Scale	49
3.2.2	Temporal Scale	53
3.3	Rationale for Monitoring Geomorphological Change	56
3.3.1	Background	56
3.3.1.1	'We Can'	57
3.3.1.2	The Morphological Method	59
3.3.2	Knowledge Gaps	61
3.4	Rationale for Geomorphological Process Interpretations	62
3.5	Study Site Selection	66
3.6	Conclusion	70
II	Methodological Developments	71
4	Accounting for DEM Uncertainty in Morphological Sediment Budgeting	72
4.1	Introduction	72
4.2	River Feshie Study Site	74
4.3	Contrasting Approaches	78
4.3.1	Quantifying Surface Representation Uncertainty	78
4.3.1.1	Repeat Observation of Control Points	79
4.3.1.2	Error Budgets	79
4.3.1.3	Bootstrap Experiments	81
4.3.1.4	Repeat Survey Experiments	85
4.3.1.5	Other Methods	90
4.3.2	Propagating Uncertainty into DoD	91
4.3.3	Assessing the Significance of DoD Uncertainty	93
4.4	Methodological Development	96
4.4.1	Spatially Variable Uncertainty Quantification	97
4.4.1.1	Fuzzy Inputs and Output	99
4.4.1.2	FIS Rules	99
4.4.1.3	Application of FIS	104
4.4.2	Spatially Coherent Erosion and Deposition Units	108
4.4.2.1	Defining Coherent Units	108
4.4.2.2	Updating the Probability	110

4.4.2.3	Application	111
4.5	DoD Uncertainty Analysis Software Development	113
4.6	Application to the Feshie	115
4.6.1	Pathway 1	116
4.6.2	Pathway 2	120
4.6.3	Pathways 3 and 4	126
4.6.4	Pathway 5 and 6	135
4.6.5	Pathways Compared	139
4.7	Further Discussion	140
4.7.1	A New Preferred Methodology	140
4.7.2	Why Bother?	141
4.7.3	Interpolation Errors	142
4.7.4	Application to Other Survey Methods	142
4.7.5	Application to Non-Fluvial Environments	143
4.8	Conclusion	144
5	Geomorphological Interpretations of Morphological Sediment Budgeting	146
5.1	Introduction	146
5.2	Methodological Development - The Mask	147
5.2.1	Defining the Masks	148
5.2.1.1	Standard Classifications	149
5.2.1.2	Classification of Difference	151
5.2.1.3	Geomorphological Interpretation Classification	152
5.2.1.4	Ecologically Relevant Masks	153
5.2.2	Geomorphological Interpretation Software Extension	153
5.3	Study Sites	155
5.4	Conclusion	157
III	Case Studies: Three Examples of Geomorphic Change	158
6	Sulphur Creek	159
6.1	Introduction	159
6.2	Study Site Context	160
6.3	New Year's Eve Storm	163
6.4	Geomorphological Impact of the New Year's Eve Storm on Study Reach	166
6.5	Application of Morphological Method and DoD Uncertainty Analysis	172
6.6	Different Techniques to Interpret the DoD	176
6.6.1	Sub Reach Segregation	176
6.6.2	Classification of Difference	179
6.6.3	Expert-Based Geomorphological Interpretation	182
6.6.4	Which is Best?	190
6.7	Hypothetical Scenario: Impact on Salmonid Embryos	191
6.7.1	Salmon Spawning in Sulphur Creek	191
6.7.2	Methodology for Hypothetical Scenario	192
6.7.3	Hypothetical Results and Interpretation	193
6.8	Sulphur Creek Conclusions	198
7	The Mokelumne River	199

7.1	Introduction	199
7.2	Study Site and SHR Context	201
7.2.1	The Analysis Periods	204
7.3	Application of Morphological Method and DoD Uncertainty Analysis	205
7.4	Interpreting As-Built Surveys	206
7.4.1	What is the total volume of gravel that was placed?	206
7.4.1.1	TS1: 2003 As Built	211
7.4.1.2	TS3: 2004 As Built	212
7.4.1.3	TS5: 2005 As Built	216
7.4.1.4	TS7: 2006 As Built	217
7.4.1.5	Overall Observations of Total Volume of Gravel Placed	220
7.4.2	How Much Gravel was used to Produce what Types of Morphological Units or Habitat?	223
7.4.2.1	TS1: 2003 As Built	226
7.4.2.2	TS3: 2004 As Built	227
7.4.2.3	TS5: 2005 As Built	227
7.4.2.4	TS7: 2006 As Built	229
7.4.2.5	Summary of Gravel Consumption by Geomorphic Units	231
7.4.3	How Much Gravel was used to Produce what Quality of Habitat?	235
7.5	Interpreting Monitoring Surveys	239
7.5.1	What are the Geomorphological Interpretations?	239
7.5.1.1	TS2: 2003 Post Project to 2004 Pre Project	240
7.5.1.2	TS6: 2005 Post Project to 2006 Pre Project	244
7.5.2	What Impact did the Changes that Took Place have on Habitat Quality?	245
7.5.3	What Changes Took Place where Salmon Spawned?	251
7.6	Conclusions	254
8	The River Feshie	256
8.1	Introduction	256
8.2	Overview and Drivers of Change	259
8.3	Geomorphological Interpretation of DoDs	263
8.3.1	2003 to 2004 DoD	265
8.3.2	2004 to 2005 DoD	270
8.3.3	2005 to 2006 DoD	274
8.3.4	2006 to 2007 DoD	278
8.4	Discussion	283
8.4.1	Overall Trends on Feshie	283
8.4.2	Why is There Questionable Change?	287
8.4.3	So What?	288
8.5	Conclusion	290
IV	Synthesis	292
9	Discussion and Conclusion	293
9.1	Overview	293
9.2	DoD Uncertainty Discussion Extended to PHR	294
9.3	Robustness of the Geomorphological Interpretation Mask	295

9.4	Future Developments	297
9.4.1	Using Bigger, Mixed Datasets	297
9.4.2	Improving and Extending the DoD Uncertainty Analysis	299
9.4.3	Closing the Sediment Budget	301
9.4.4	Modelling the Morphodynamics	301
9.5	Revisiting Broader Uncertainty Context	302
9.6	Thesis Conclusions	303
V	Appendices and Bibliography	306
	Appendices	308
A	River Feshie Catchment and Acknowledgments	308
A.1	Purpose	308
A.2	Feshie Catchment Description	308
A.3	River Feshie Study Acknowledgments	310
A.3.1	Funding	312
B	Feshie Aerial Photography	314
B.1	Purpose	314
B.2	Locational Probability Analysis	314
B.3	Aerial Photographs	319
C	Feshie Digital Elevation Models and Morphometric Analyses	330
C.1	Purpose	330
C.2	Survey Data	330
C.3	Digital Elevation Models	333
C.4	Detrended Digital Elevation Models	333
C.5	Slope Analysis	333
D	Experiment Assessing Influence of Tilted Detail Pole	350
D.1	Purpose	350
D.2	Background	350
D.3	Methods	351
D.4	Results	352
D.5	Discussion	352
E	Roughness Extraction	355
E.1	Summary and Purpose	355
E.2	Background	355
E.3	Roughness Extraction Methods Explored	356
F	Sulphur Creek Aerial Photos and Acknowledgments	359
F.1	Contextual Historical Aerial Photographs	359
F.2	Sulphur Creek Study Acknowledgments	369
F.2.1	Funding	371
G	Mokelumne River Study Site	372
G.1	The Mokelumne River Catchment	372

G.2	Development of Mokelumne River Water Resources	372
G.2.1	Flow Regime below Camanche Dam	374
G.3	Lower Mokelumne River	375
G.4	Topographic Surveys and DoD Analysis	377
G.4.1	TS1 DEMs and DoD	380
G.4.2	TS2 DEMs and DoD	382
G.4.3	TS3 DEMs and DoD	384
G.4.4	TS4 DEMs and DoD	386
G.4.5	TS5 DEMs and DoD	387
G.4.6	TS6 DEMs and DoD	389
G.4.7	TS7 DEMs and DoD	391
G.5	Mokelumne River Study Acknowledgments	393
G.5.1	Funding	393
Bibliography		393

List of Figures

1.1	PHR is a Reach Scale Activity	4
1.2	Unknown Restoration Response	5
1.3	Example of a DEM of Difference (DoD)	9
1.4	Example elevation change distribution	12
2.1	Quantifiable Continuum of Uncertainty	19
2.2	Uncertainty Typology	21
2.3	Relationship Between Knowledge and Uncertainty	24
2.4	Crisp vs. Fuzzy	28
2.5	A Bayesian Belief Network for Environmental Management	33
2.6	Uncertainty in Habitat Suitability Curves	34
2.7	Monte Carlo Habitat Suitability Model	36
2.8	Degree of Uncertainty in Knowledge Bases	40
2.9	Philosophical Attitudes Toward Uncertainty	42
2.10	Embrace Uncertainty Strategy	45
2.11	Uncertainties Addressed in this Thesis	46
3.1	Catchment-Framed Nested Hierarchy of Scales and Salmonid Functions	50
3.2	Map of Range of Wild Atlantic Salmon	52
3.3	Schematic of Salmon Redd	53
3.4	Conceptual Model of Factors Influencing Spawning Site Selection	54
3.5	The Morphological Method	60
3.6	Contextual Photos of three Study Sites used in this Thesis.	66
4.1	River Feshie Vicinity Map	75
4.2	Detrended DEMs and DoD for 2003 to 2007	77
4.3	Bootstrapping Experiment for Estimating Elevation Uncertainty	83
4.4	Results for Individual Survey Metrics of Bootstrapping Experiment	84
4.5	Photos Depicting Repeat Survey Experiments	86
4.6	Summary Results of Repeat Survey Experiments	87
4.7	Elevation Uncertainty Histograms for Confluence Site	89
4.8	Elevation Uncertainty Histograms for Dry Bar Site	90
4.9	Example of Significance of Elevation <i>min</i> LoD Thresholds	95
4.10	Illustration of Calculation of Probability Using T-Score	96
4.11	Precision vs. Significance	98
4.12	Input and Output Fuzzy Membership Functions	100
4.13	Examples of Total Consequence of FIS Rules (2 Inputs)	102
4.14	Examples of Total Consequence of FIS Rules (three inputs)	103
4.15	Illustration of FIS Construction	106

4.16	FIS Surfaces Compared	107
4.17	Example of Transform Function from Spatial Contiguity Index to Probability	108
4.18	Comparison of 5x5 and 7x7 Neighbourhood Analysis Window	110
4.19	Sensitivity of Updated Probability to Transform Function Parameters	112
4.20	Flow Chart for DoD Analysis 2.0	114
4.21	Pathway 1 Through DoD Analysis 2.0	117
4.22	Comparison of Areal and Volumetric DoD Distributions (2007-2003)	119
4.23	Pathway 2 Through DoD Analysis 2.0	122
4.24	DoDs With 10 cm <i>min</i> LoD Threshold Applied	123
4.25	Application of Pathway 2 on DoD Distributions (2007-2003)	124
4.26	Gross Budget Sensitivity to Simple <i>min</i> LoD Threshold	125
4.27	Pathway 3 Through DoD Analysis 2.0	127
4.28	Pathway 4 Through DoD Analysis 2.0	128
4.29	Comparison of Thresholded DoDs Based on Pathway 3 and Pathway 4	129
4.30	Application of Pathways 3 and 4 on DoD Distributions (2007-2003)	131
4.31	Comparison of a Priori and Posterior Probabilities	132
4.32	Pathway 4 Budget Sensitivity to Confidence Interval Threshold	133
4.33	DoD Sensitivity to Confidence Interval <i>min</i> LoD Threshold	134
4.34	Pathway 5 Through DoD Analysis 2.0	136
4.35	Pathway 6 Through DoD Analysis 2.0	137
4.36	Summary of Total Information Loss by Pathway	139
5.1	Examples of Sub-reach Masks	150
5.2	Geomorphological Analysis Extension to DoD Uncertainty Software	154
6.1	Study Site Context Photographs	161
6.2	Gravel Mining in 1974	162
6.3	Newspaper Clipping of New Year's Eve Storm	164
6.4	Contextual Hyetograph and Hydrographs for New Year's Eve Storm	165
6.5	Stage Hydrograph on Sulphur Creek for New Year's Eve Storm	166
6.6	Aerial Photographs of Sulphur Creek Before and After New Year's Flood	167
6.7	Geomorphic Unit Classification Before and After	169
6.8	Central Bar Development Photograph Sequence	170
6.9	Flood Recession Photograph Sequence	171
6.10	FIS-Derived Elevation Uncertainty for Sulphur Creek	173
6.11	Sulphur Creek DoD	175
6.12	Reach Segregation of DoD	177
6.13	CoD based on 3 Category Classification	180
6.14	CoD as a DoD Mask	183
6.15	CoD Mask Elevation Change Distributions	184
6.16	Components of the Geomorphological Interpretation	185
6.17	Geomorphological Process Mask DoD Segregation	187
6.18	Geomorphological Process Mask Elevation Change Distributions	188
6.19	Central Bar Development ECD	190
6.20	2004 Redd Survey	194
6.21	2004 Redd DoD ECDs	196
7.1	Mokelumne SHR Site Map	202

7.2	Slope Creation Design Concept	203
7.3	Hydrographs for Mokelumne River	205
7.4	Mokelumne DEMs	207
7.5	Thresholded DoDs for Mokelumne	208
7.6	Elevation Change Distributions for DoDs on Mokelumne	209
7.7	TS1 Geomorphological Interpretation Mask and DoD	212
7.8	TS1 Geomorphological Interpretation ECDs	213
7.9	TS1 Geomorphological Interpretation Mask and DoD	214
7.10	TS3 Geomorphological Interpretation ECDs	215
7.11	TS1 Geomorphological Interpretation Mask and DoD	216
7.12	TS5 Geomorphological Interpretation ECDs	218
7.13	TS5 Gravel Placed by Site	219
7.14	TS7 Geomorphological Interpretation Mask and DoD	220
7.15	TS7 Geomorphological Interpretation ECDs	221
7.16	TS5 Gravel Placed by Site	222
7.17	Comparison of Placed Gravel ECDs	224
7.18	SHR Induced Hydraulics	225
7.19	TS1 Morphological Unit Mask and DoD	226
7.20	TS1 SHR ECDs	228
7.21	TS3 Morphological Unit Mask and DoD	229
7.22	TS3 SHR ECDs	230
7.23	TS5 Morphological Unit Mask and DoD	231
7.24	TS1 SHR ECDs	232
7.25	TS7 Morphological Unit Mask and DoD	233
7.26	TS7 SHR ECDs	234
7.27	TS3 GHSI Mask ECDs	235
7.28	TS5 GHSI Mask ECDs	237
7.29	TS3 GHSI Mask ECDs	238
7.30	TS2 Masks and DoD	240
7.31	TS2 Geomorphological Interpretation ECDs	241
7.32	TS2 SHR ECDs	243
7.33	TS6 Masks and DoD	244
7.34	TS6 Geomorphological Interpretation ECDs	246
7.35	TS6 SHR ECDs	247
7.36	TS6 Derivation of GHSI CoD	249
7.37	TS6 GHSI CoD ECDs	250
7.38	ECDs from Redd Masks	253
8.1	Photographs of Glen Feshie	257
8.2	Hydrograph for Feshie Bridge during Study Period	260
8.3	Detrended DEMs	261
8.4	Feshie Geomorphological Interpretation of DoDs	266
8.5	Feshie Geomorphological Interpretation of 2003 to 2004 DoDs	268
8.6	Elevation Change Distributions of Geomorphological Interpretation of 2003 to 2004 DoDs	269
8.7	Feshie Geomorphological Interpretation of 2004 to 2005 DoDs	272
8.8	Elevation Change Distributions of Geomorphological Interpretation of 2004 to 2005 DoDs	273

8.9	Feshie Geomorphological Interpretation of 2005 to 2006 DoDs	276
8.10	Elevation Change Distributions of Geomorphological Interpretation of the 2005 to 2006 DoDs	277
8.11	Feshie Geomorphological Interpretation of 2006 to 2007 DoDs	280
8.12	Elevation Change Distributions of Geomorphological Interpretation of 2006 to 2007 DoDs	281
8.13	Low-stage Channel Network	284
9.1	The Parker Far Side Flooding Analogy	296
9.2	Comparison of TLS and GPS DoD	305
A.1	River Feshie Location Map	309
A.2	River Feshie Vicinity Map	311
B.1	Comparison of Aerial Photographs	315
B.2	Aerial Photo-Based Vegetation Classification	316
B.3	Locational Probability Analysis of Vegetation	318
B.4	Aerial Photograph from 1946	320
B.5	Aerial Photograph from 1955	321
B.6	Aerial Photograph from 1964	322
B.7	Aerial Photograph from 1989	323
B.8	Aerial Photograph from 1993	324
B.9	Aerial Photograph from 1997	325
B.10	Aerial Photograph from 2000	326
B.11	Aerial Photograph from April, 2005	327
B.12	Aerial Photograph from August, 2005	328
B.13	Aerial Photograph from August, 2007	329
C.1	GPS Base Station	331
C.2	Survey Point Density	332
C.3	DEM from 2000	334
C.4	DEM from 2002	335
C.5	DEM from 2003	336
C.6	DEM from 2004	337
C.7	DEM from 2005	338
C.8	DEM from 2006	339
C.9	DEM from 2007	340
C.10	Detrended DEM from 2000	341
C.11	Detrended DEM from 2002	342
C.12	Detrended DEM from 2003	343
C.13	Detrended DEM from 2004	344
C.14	Detrended DEM from 2005	345
C.15	Detrended DEM from 2006	346
C.16	Detrended DEM from 2007	347
C.17	Slope Analyses	349
D.1	Illustration of Horizontal and Vertical Errors due to Tilted Detail Pole	351
E.1	Roughness Surfaces Based on Moving Window Elevation Range	358

F.1	Location Map for Sulphur Creek Study Site	360
F.2	Active Channel Width Through Time	361
F.3	Aerial Photograph of Sulphur Creek: 1942	362
F.4	Aerial Photograph of Sulphur Creek: 1953	363
F.5	Aerial Photograph of Sulphur Creek: 1958	364
F.6	Aerial Photograph of Sulphur Creek: 1965	365
F.7	Aerial Photograph of Sulphur Creek: 1982	366
F.8	Aerial Photograph of Sulphur Creek: 1993	367
F.9	Aerial Photograph of Sulphur Creek: 2002	368
G.1	Location Map for Mokelumne River Study Site	373
G.2	TS1 DoD Analysis	381
G.3	TS2 DoD Analysis	383
G.4	TS3 DoD Analysis	385
G.5	TS5 DoD Analysis	388
G.6	TS6 DoD Analysis	390
G.7	TS7 DoD Analysis	392

List of Tables

2.1	Synonyms of Uncertainty	16
2.2	Probabilistic Uncertainty	18
2.3	Simple Typology of Uncertainty	20
2.4	Influence of Uncertainties on Modeling	30
2.5	Fuzzy in the Literature	37
2.6	Schumm's 10 Ways to be Wrong	41
3.1	Physical Summary Comparison of Study Sites	68
3.2	Salmonid and Habitat Summary Comparison of Study Sites	69
4.1	The 'Benchmark' Repeat Topographic Survey Data Sets	76
4.2	Variance in Repeat GPS Observation of Control Points	80
4.3	Statistics from Bootstrap Experiments for Estimating Elevation Uncertainty	82
4.4	Bootstrap Experiment Statistics Segregated by Slope	82
4.5	Magnitude and Point Density of Repeat Surveys at Confluence Site	88
4.6	Two Input Fuzzy Inference System for Elevation Uncertainty	101
4.7	Three Input Fuzzy Inference System for Elevation Uncertainty	104
4.8	Contrasting Pathways Through DoD Uncertainty Analysis	115
4.9	Gross DoD Budget Values	116
4.10	Percentages of the DoD Elevation Change Distributions Beneath Various Thresholds	120
4.11	DoD Results and Information Loss	138
6.1	Gross DoD Results	174
6.2	Three Class CoD Budget Results	181
6.3	<i>Hypothetical</i> Embryo Impact Analysis	195
7.1	Mokelumne Analysis Periods	204
7.2	As-Built Masks Types Used	210
7.3	Design versus Calculated SHR Fill Volumes	223
7.4	Consumption of Gravel by Morphological Units	233
7.5	Consumption of Gravel by Spawning Habitat Quality	237
7.6	Monitoring Masks Types Used	239
7.7	TS6 Geomorphological Interpretation Budget Segregation	248
7.8	TS6 GHSI Classification of Difference Summary	251
8.1	Feshie Flow Statistics During Study Period	262
8.2	Gross DoD Budgets for Segregation	263
8.3	Summary of Total Areal & Volumetric Percentages by Category of Change	285
8.4	Comparison of Geomorphological Interpretation Techniques	289

B.1	Aerial Photo Availability.	317
C.1	Survey Point Density Statistics	331
C.2	Slope and Elevation Relief Statistics	348
D.1	Influence of a Titled Detail Pole on Coordinate Accuracy	352
D.2	Influence of Tilt Angle on Coordinate Accuracy	353
G.1	LMR Redd Surveys	377
G.2	LMR Escapement vs. Hatchery Take vs. Spawners	378

Preface

Some of the work presented in this thesis has been submitted for publication in peer-reviewed literature. Portions of the review in Chapter 2, is appearing in Wheaton *et al.* (2008), which acts as an introductory book chapter in an edited volume on *River Restoration: Managing the Uncertainty in Restoring Physical Habitat*. I was responsible for the research and primary writing of the manuscript.

Where data or analyses have been provided by others or prepared collaboratively, appropriate acknowledgments and/or citations are provided. Although I am grateful for the assistance and contributions of the many collaborators who have helped with this thesis, the originality of the material presented in this thesis is consistent with the requirements for doctoral research.

NOTE: If you are viewing a PDF version of this document, you will find that all the cross-referencing, indexing and footnoting throughout the thesis is hyperlinked allowing easy navigation between sections. For example, to navigate ahead to the first chapter, you can click on the one in Chapter 1.

Acknowledgements

Any time I try to write a list of people to acknowledge, I forget someone important. For example, in my Masters Thesis acknowledgments, I actually forgot to thank one of my supervisors and key collaborators, Joe Merz. Thus, the acknowledgments here are by no means a comprehensive attempt to thank everyone who helped make this a reality. I therefore first extend my apologies and thanks to the numerous individuals who helped me *finally* make this thesis a reality but that I failed to mention below.

My primary supervisors, David Sear and Steve Darby, both deserve medals for their patience and countless hours of help and ideas in the field, office, pub, and remote assistance since I took a lectureship in Aberystwyth two years ago. Their better halves have also been extremely supportive. I would like to thank my secondary supervisors from the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Mike Acreman and Douglas Booker, for their input and assistance with establishing the conceptual basis for this work. Although James Brasington was not one of my four official supervisors, he might as well have been for he has generously invested an enormous amount of time helping me with the research. Without his help, the research would not have been possible. I know of few PhD students who can claim to have been graced with the support of four to five supervisors. Amazingly, the advice they gave only occasionally contradicted each other.

Funding for this PhD was provided through a studentship, jointly funded by the School of Geography at the University of Southampton and the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology at Wallingford. An Overseas Research Studentship award from U.K. Universities made up the funding gap for international fees. Additional funding was generously provided by the Hydrology Section of the American Geophysical Union who awarded me the Horton Research Grant for Ph.D. Students in 2005, and the Saint Helena Community Forum who funded field work on Sulphur Creek, California in 2006. I am grateful to all these organisations for making this possible.

Indirectly, the Institute of Geography and Earth Sciences at Aberystwyth University helped support this PhD by graciously paying my salary and patiently wait for over two years for me to finish this thesis. I owe all my colleagues at Aberystwyth a huge thank you for giving me space and picking up my slack to allow me to finish.

As the three study sites used in the thesis involved funding and support from very different sources and teams of people, acknowledgments for each of the specific study sites can be found in § A.3 (River Feshie), § F.2 (Sulphur Creek) and § G.5 (Mokelumne River).

Key informant interviews with a number of individuals who gave their time and thoughts were instrumental for identifying the key issues with respect to uncertainty. These included: Andrew Brookes, Jacobs Consultancy; Paul Carling, University of Southampton; Mike Clark, University of Southampton; Mark Diamond, UK Environment Agency; Martin Doyle, University of North Carolina; Henry Pollack, author of *Uncertain Science Uncertain World*; Giles Foody, formerly University of Southampton; Nick Jackson, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology;

Matt Kondolf, University of California at Berkeley; Jeffrey Mount, University of California at Davis; Douglas Shields, US Department of Agriculture; Kevin Skinner, Jacobs Consultancy, Ltd.; Phillip Williams, Phillip Williams and Associates; among others. I also wish to thank the over 500 participants in the International River Restoration Survey (Wheaton *et al.* 2006), whose views have helped obtain a clearer synopsis of the restoration community.

At Southampton, I would like to thank Jim Milne for his countless hours and expertise on any and everything related to programming and web-editing, his excellent help in the field, and for his failed attempt to teach an American how to play and appreciate cricket with a piece of driftwood and a tennis ball on a beach in California. I owe Charlie Kerr enormously for help with everything IT related. Thank you to Paul Carling who was an excellent sounding board at the pub, and the reason Aberystwyth even considered hiring me. In addition, Paul's excellent editorial comments and proofreading of the thesis were very helpful. Paul Carling and David Gilvear both gave very helpful feedback and I thank them for a stimulating and engaging viva. I thank Mike Clark for his insight and wisdom during the upgrade process. I would also like to thank all of the excellent support staff at the School of Geography (e.g. Stef Webb, Adam Corres, Maggie Harris, Denise Pompa, Ruth Calver...), who really make Southampton a great place to study. I also thank all of the School of Geography postgraduates (particularly Julian Leyland), who aside from exchanging ideas with, were great company at the pub.

Although not reported in this thesis, a significant portion of the PhD was spent attempting to develop a morphodynamic model and I owe James Brasington, Tom Coulthard, Marco van de Wiel, Christel Prudhomme and Mike Bithel many thanks for their time helping me pursue this.

Finally, I would like to thank my entire family for their amazing support and patience while I indulged myself in this PhD. You all made sacrifices to allow me to pursue this, and I am forever indebted to you for that. Adrea, in particular you have been so amazingly patient and understanding. Luke and Cadel, you kept me smiling even when things were dragging on. Anne, Mom and Dad thanks for everything. Even Booker, my dog, has been a great sounding board for ideas and a most enthusiastic assistant in the field (despite his selective hearing).

Thank you everyone. I am very grateful.

List of Acronyms

- 1D: One Dimensional
- 2.5D: Two and a half Dimensional
- 2D: Two Dimensional
- 3D: Three Dimensional
- CFD: Computational Fluid Dynamics
- CoD: Classification of Difference
- DEM: Digital Elevation Model
- DEMs: Digital Elevation Models
- dGPS: differential Global Positioning System
- DoD: DEM of Difference
- DoDs: DEMs of Difference
- DSS: Decision Support Systems
- ECD: Elevation Change Distribution
- FIS: Fuzzy Inference System
- GHSI: Global Habitat Suitability Index
- HSC: Habitat Suitability Curve
- HSI: Habitat Suitability Index
- $_{min}$ LoD: Minimum Level of Detection
- PHR: Physical Habitat Restoration
- rtkGPS: real-time kinematic Global Positioning System
- SHIRA: Spawning Habitat Integrated Rehabilitation Approach
- SHR: Spawning Habitat Rehabilitation

Dedicated to my family, who put up with me 'almost being done' for way too long.