



Stefanie Wolf, M.Sc. wolf@iww.rwth-aachen.de Prof. Dr.-Ing. Holger Schüttrumpf Felix Steudtner, M.Sc. RWTH Institute of Hydraulic Engineering and Water Resources Management, RWTH Aachen University

Dr. rer. nat. Verena Esser Prof. Dr. Frank Lehmkuhl Chair of Physical Geography and Geoecology, RWTH Aachen University

David Stenger, M.Sc.

Content





$$SSC = \alpha \cdot Q^{\beta} + \epsilon_i$$

$$SSC_{i+1} = SSC_i + (\alpha \cdot Q_{i+1}^{\beta} - \alpha \cdot Q_i^{\beta}) + \epsilon_i$$

With:SSC
$$(e.g. \left[\frac{mg}{l}\right])$$
suspended sediment concentrationQDischarge α, β parameters fitted by least squared regression ϵ_i normally distributed independent error







Aim:

- Extend the sediment rating curve with existing knowledge
- Discuss the influence of different parameters on the sediment concentration within a river section
- 129 Rur Samples (calibration+testing) [13 pairs]
- 16 Wurm Samples (validation) [1 pair]







Process	(known) Influence on SSC
Rainfall on sub-catchment between two sampling sites	Increase, when erodibility of sub-catchment is high
Discharge-related processes over a river section	Increase, when riverbed erodes due to high discharges Decrease when sediments are deposited on floodplains or in other areas of reduced flow Decrease when only discharge increases but no sediment is entering
Damming	Decrease
Tributaries	Usually, increase

5





Terms

Data Matrix





 $SSC_{i+1} = SSC_i + \left(\begin{array}{c} \beta \\ \alpha_Q \cdot Q_2 \end{array} \right) - \left(\begin{array}{c} \alpha_Q \cdot Q_1 \end{array} \right) \cdot p_{rkm}$

 $-p_{dam} \cdot \alpha_{dam}$

[Damming]

$$-p_{rkm}\cdot \frac{Q_i}{O_{i+1}}\cdot a_{rkm}$$

[Sediment deposition]



	F	2	RM	SE
Scenario	SSC _i - SSC _{i+1}	SSC _{i+1, computed} [–] SSC _{i+1, measured}	SSC _i - SSC _{i+1}	SSC _{i+1} , computed [–] SSC _{i+1} , measured
Rur River	0.876	0.878	152.27%	131.83%
Wurm River	0.333	0.340	54.97%	55.54%

Conclusion:

- [Accuracy within the boundaries of field work and rainfall-runoff-modelling]
- Accuracy increased by linear terms
- Added terms: damming and sediment deposition along the river section's length
- Limited transferability
 - Different connectivity, different functional scales

Impact of the Rur dam - SSC







Main impacts of a dam

1. sediment deficit (Williams und Wolman 1984; Brousse et al. 2020, Kondolf 1995)

FIELD DATA

2. increase of mean grain size diameter (Williams und Wolman 1984; Kondolf 1997, Kantoush et a. 2010)

FIELD DATA

 Alteration of flow regime, often reducing the mean annual discharge (Adib et al. 2016, Brandt 2000, Rovira und Ibàñez 2007, Walling 2012, Brousse et al. 2020, Phillips et al. 2005)

NUMERICAL MODELLING

G 10 . 5 ٢m 15 20 25 30 km Urft Catchment River/Reservoir DEM **Bed Sampling** 153 m.a.s.l **Riverbed Sampling** 681 m.a.s.l.

The Rur dam, source: Wolf et al. 2022



Impact of the Rur dam – Fine fraction and discharge

	Description	Inflow - Discharge	Inflow - Sediment	Sediment settling velocity
1	Pre-dam conditions	Pre-dam discharge	No sediment deficit, SSC=0.00922 g/l	Small mean sediment diameter, v = 0.188 mm/s
2	Impacts after dam nt	Post-dam discharge	Sediment deficit, SSC=0.0018 g/l	Small mean sediment diameter, v = 0.188 mm/s
3	Techovice offunction; nas nas rras increased	Post-dam discharge	Sediment deficit, SSC=0.0018 g/l	increased mean sediment diameter, v = 0.383 mm/s



Impact of the Rur dam





Source: Wolf et al. 2022





14



Adib, Arash; Foladfar, Hesam; Roozy, Amir (2016): Role of construction of large dams on river morphology (case study: the Karkheh dam in Iran). In: Arab J Geosci 9 (15). DOI: 10.1007/s12517-016-2693-2.

Brandt, S.Anders (2000): Classification of geomorphological effects downstream of dams. In: CATENA 40 (4), S. 375-401. DOI: 10.1016/S0341-8162(00)00093-X.

Borrelli, P.; Robinson, DA.; Fleischer, LR.; Lugato, E.; Ballabio, C.; Alewell, C.; Meusburger, K.; Modugno, S.; Schütt, B.; Ferro, V.; Bagarello, V.; van Oost, K.; Montanarella, L.; Panagos, P. (2013): An assessment of the global impact of 21st century land use change on soil erosion. Nat Commun 8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02142-7

Brousse, Guillaume; Arnaud-Fassetta, Gilles; Liébault, Frédéric; Bertrand, Mélanie; Melun, Gabriel; Loire, Remi et al. (2020): Channel response to sediment replenishment in a large gravel-bed river: The case of the Saint-Sauveur dam in the Buëch River (Southern Alps, France). In: River Res. Applic. 36 (6), S. 880–893. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3527.

Campbell. FB.; Bauder, HA. (1940): A rating-curve method for determining silt-discharge of streams. Trans. AGU 21:603. https://doi.org/10.1029/TR021I002P00603.

Ferguson, RI. (1986): River Loads Underestimated by Rating Curves. Water Resour. Res. 22:74–76. https://doi.org/10.1029/WR022i001p00074

Kondolf (1997): PROFILE: Hungry Water: Effects of Dams and Gravel Mining on River Channels. In: Environmental management 21 (4), S. 533–551. DOI: 10.1007/s002679900048.

Kondolf, G. Mathias (1995): Managing bedload sediment in regulated rivers: Examples from California, U.S.A. In: John E. Costa, Andrew J. Miller, Kenneth W. Potter und Peter R. Wilcock (Hg.): Natural and Anthropogenic Influences in Fluvial Geomorphology, Bd. 89. Washington, D. C.: American Geophysical Union (Geophysical Monograph Series), S. 165–176.

Sources



Panagos P, Ballabio C, Poesen J, Lugato E, Scarpa S, Montanarella L, Borrelli P (2020) A Soil Erosion Indicator for Supporting Agricultural, Environmental and Climate Policies in the European Union. Remote Sensing 12:1365. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12091365

Phillips, Jonathan D.; Slattery, Michael C.; Musselman, Zachary A. (2005): Channel adjustments of the lower Trinity River, Texas, downstream of Livingston Dam. In: *Earth Surf. Process. Landforms* 30 (11), S. 1419–1439. DOI: 10.1002/esp.1203.

Rovira, Albert; Ibàñez, Carles (2007): Sediment management options for the lower Ebro River and its delta. In: J Soils Sediments 7 (5), S. 285–295. DOI: 10.1065/jss2007.08.244.

Walling, D. E. (2012): The role of dams in the global sediment budget. Erosion and Sediment Yields in the Changing Environment (Proceedings of a symposium held at the Institute of Mountain Hazards and Environment, CAS-Chengdu, China, 11-15 October 2012). In: IAHS Publ. (356), S. 3–11.

Williams, Garnett P.; Wolman, Markley Gordon (1984): Downstream effects of dams on alluvial rivers. Hg. v. U.S. Departement of the Interiour (GEOLOGICAL SURVEY PROFESSIONAL PAPER, 1286).

Wolf, S.; Esser, V.; Schüttrumpf, H.; Lehmkuhl, F. (2021): Influence of 200 years of water resource management on a typical central European river. Does industrialization straighten a river? Environ Sci Eur 33. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-021-00460-8.

Wolf, S.; Esser, V.; Lehmkuhl, F.; Schüttrumpf, H. (2022): Long-time impact of a large dam on its downstream river's morphology: determined by sediment characteristics, pollutants as a marker, and numerical modelling. J. Sediment. Environ. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43217-022-00103-9.

Wolf, S.; Stenger, D.; Steudtner, F.; Esser, V.; Lehmkuhl, F. ; Schüttrumpf, H. (2023): Modeling anthropogenic affected sediment transport in a mid-sized European river catchment–extension of the sediment rating curve equation. Modeling Earth Systems and Environment. DOI: 10.1007/s40808-023-01703-

8.

Introduction: Human impact on the Rur River







All Images from Wolf et al. 2021

16

Methods: Impacts of a dam



Flow alteration



Timelines of discharge for the simulation.

- a) tailored timeline resembling pre-dammed conditions (grey dashed) and simplified timeline for simulation (black), MQ=9.4 m³/s.
- b) timeline showing dam discharge (grey dashed) and simplified timeline for simulation (black), MQ=11.3 m³/s.



Aim:

- Extend the sediment ration curve with existing knowledge
- Discuss the influence of different parameters on the sediment concentration within a river section
- 129 Rur Samples (calibration+testing) [13 pairs]
- 16 Wurm Samples (validation) [1 pair]

	Volume Error [%]	Hydrological Deviation [-]	Nash Sutcliffe Efficiency [-]
Rur River sub-model 1	9.93	0.72	0.37
Rur River sub-model 2	1.57	0.32	0.89
Rur River sub-model 3	-0.79	0.47	0.97
Rur River sub-model 4	5.37	0.27	0.98
Rur River sub-model 5	24.41	0.56	0.85
Wurm River	7.98	0.62	0.71



Study area; (1) sampling sites and (2) rainfall-runoff model Source: Wolf et al. UNDER REVIEW



Possible extension	Term	Purpose	Composition
Ext-I	$\begin{pmatrix} \beta Q & \beta Q \\ \alpha Q \cdot Q_{i+1} & -\alpha Q \cdot Q_i \end{pmatrix} p_{rkm}$	Scaling discharge related transport processes over river section	Multiplication
Ext-II	$p_{d} \cdot \alpha_{d} $ (1) $p_{d} \cdot (Q_{i+1} - Q_{i}) \cdot \alpha_{d} $ (2)	Sediment deposit due to damming	Subtraction
Ext-III	$p_t \cdot p_r \cdot a_t \tag{1}$ $p_t \cdot p_{EROS} \cdot p_r \cdot a_t \tag{2}$	2) Sediment entry by tributaries2)	Addition
Ext-IV	$p_{EROS} \cdot \left(\frac{p_{rkm}}{p_{subc}}\right) \cdot p_r \cdot a_{subc} \qquad (1)$	 Sediment entry due to hillslope erosion 	Addition
Ext-V	$p_{rkm} \cdot \frac{Q_i}{Q_{i+1}} \cdot a_{rkm} \qquad (1)$ $p_{rkm} \cdot (Q_{i+1} - Q_i) \cdot a_{rkm} \qquad (2)$	Riverbed erosion or floodplain deposition	Addition or Subtraction



$$p_{rkm} = \frac{\Delta_{rkm}}{rkm_{total}} \qquad p_{d}$$

$$p_{subc} = \frac{\Delta_{Area,subc}}{Area_{total}} \qquad p_{r}$$

$$p_{t} = \frac{\sum MQ_{Tributaries}}{MQ_{local}}$$

$$p_d = rac{rkm_{dammed}}{\Delta_{rkm}}$$

 $p_r = \sum Rainfall, 3d$

$$p_{EROS} = \overline{RUSLE_{Subc}}$$

or
 $p_{EROS} = \overline{GLOSEM_{Subc}}$

(Panagos et al 2020)

(Borelli et al. 2013)







Impact of the Rur dam - Riverbed





Source: Wolf et al. 2022