

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