

## **The Channel Conditions of Upper Glade Run: A Geomorphic Assessment at the 65<sup>th</sup> Annual Conservation Camp**

By

Tim Craddock

WV Save Our Streams Program Coordinator

**Contributing Authors 2005:** Ryan Kenny; Mason Bolen; Chris Darlington; Nathaniel Linger; Heather Moore; Kevin Zorn; Jacob Lee; Monica Leigh; Beth Mazaella; Joshua Young; Zachary Rodak; Charles Richards; Will Proudfoot; Frank Joas; Kaylie Adams; Phillip Death; Nicki Blain; John Facemire; TJ Winston; Alyssa Brown; Jennifer Thayer; Alesia Baker; Ben Proudfoot; Joshua McCoy

**Contributing Authors 2006:** Tiffany Williams; John Hans; Rachel Bushong; Brain Sprouse; Rebecca Gray; Corey Kim; Rachelle Coser; Eric Blend

### **Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to establish baseline conditions and monitor the changes of the channel in the lower sections of Upper Glade Run, within the boundaries of Camp Caesar. The study was initiated through discussions with participants at the 64<sup>th</sup> Annual Conservation Camp regarding the current conditions and the possible changes that may occur based upon these conditions. The study continued the following year at the 65<sup>th</sup> Annual Conservation Camp. This report provides a summary of the results collected thus far.

Contact the WV Save Our Streams Coordinator by e-mail at ([tcraddock@wvdep.org](mailto:tcraddock@wvdep.org)) to request the 2005 information.

### **Introduction**

Fluvial geomorphology is the study of landform evolution related to rivers. Although most streambank studies or projects do not require an intensive, geomorphic analysis of the reach, any project that potentially affects natural river processes requires a basic understanding of the fluvial geomorphology principals.

A basic concept in fluvial geomorphology is that stream channels tend toward an equilibrium state in which the input of mass and energy to a specific system equals the outputs from the same system. A corollary to this condition is that the internal forms of the system (such as channel morphology) do not change in the transfer of mass and energy. The term "stream-channel equilibrium" refers to the relative stability of the channel system and its ability to maintain its morphological characteristics over some period of time and range of flow conditions. In reality, perfect equilibrium does not exist in natural streams. However, natural streams do tend to develop channel sizes and shapes that accommodate their own typical discharge levels and character and quantity of sediment supplied by the watershed. These streams are said to be in a state of dynamic equilibrium.

Streams respond to alterations (such as a change in hydrologic regime due to human activity) by modifying their size, shape and profile.

## Why is Vegetation Important to Channel Stability?

Both upland and riparian vegetation affect the geomorphology of stream channels. Vegetation plays a key role in stabilizing streambanks, dissipating energy and in maintaining a stable channel form. The growth of riparian vegetation in and adjacent to the channel **on both sides**, augments floodplain formation, increases hydraulic roughness, reduces erosion and promotes sediment transport. Upland vegetation slows hill slopes erosion, and both upland and riparian vegetation contribute woody debris to the stream system.



In the early summer of 2005 riparian vegetation was removed from the lower portions of Upper Glade Run. This picture shows a section of the stream the following year. There was very little recovery. The plants observed were mostly herbaceous and included Wood Nettle, Spiked Loosestrife, Milkweed, Joe-Pye-weed, Goldenrod and a variety of grasses. In the foreground and on the left of the picture there is some recovery of woody vegetation, mostly Rhododendron. In prior years, several additional woody varieties such as Red Maple, Silver Maple, Smooth Alder and Hemlock were also present.

## The Assessment Methods

### Characterizing Existing Channel Conditions

The initial characterization of the study reach is based on measured bed and bank profiles and maps or aerial photographs that show channel form. The project is described in terms of channel dimensions, profile, and materials (streambed composition).

### Channel Classification

A classification of the channel can aid in visualizing and describing the study site. The Rosgen classification system is the most extensive and widely applied. The Rosgen approach divides streams into eight major types based on number of active channels, presence of a floodplain, width/depth ratio and entrenchment ratio. Each major type is then subdivided, based on the channel slope and dominant type of bed and bank materials. To date, this system for stream classification is probably the most comprehensive and useful, provided that practitioners have a strong geomorphologic background.

This study uses a modified method based loosely upon the Rosgen classification system to assess the study reach. Measurements and field observations used in the initial phases of this study include the following:

- Pebble counts
- Channel cross section
- Photographs
- Sketches
- Longitudinal profile

## Results and Discussion

### Pebble Counts

In a stream that is in a state of dynamic equilibrium, there is generally little overall change in the composition size of the materials present; and if the stream is adequately moving its sediment load through the watershed. Low water conditions, changes in the channel dynamics, loss of riparian buffers are just some of the factors that increases erosion and sedimentation, and will likely cause changes in composition, which are sometimes dramatic.

Pebble counts were collected in 2005 and 2006 using a zigzag pattern. Particle sizes were recorded using the general size classes of silt/clay (< .062 mm); sand (.062–2 mm); fine gravel (3–24 mm); coarse gravel (24 – 64 mm); cobble (65–255 mm); boulder (256–2048 mm); and bedrock (> 2048 mm). Percentages a particle indices and D50's are reported in the Table 1.

**Table 1.** Pebble count percentages

2005					
Silt	Sand	Fine Gravel	Coarse Gravel	Cobble	Boulder
0	33	42	6	7	12
2006					
Silt	Sand	Fine Gravel	Coarse Gravel	Cobble	Boulder
7	14	14	23	28	14
2005			2006		
Particle Index = 2.24 D50 = 7			Particle Index = 2.93 D50 = 28		

Table 2 uses a relative percent difference (RPD) statistic to compare the above percentages, D50 and the particle index.

**Table 2.** Comparison of the 2005 and 2006 pebble count percentages

Materials	2005	2006	RPD
Silt + Sand	33	21	29.6
Gravel	50	37	29.9
Cobble	7	28	120.0
Boulder	12	14	15.4
Particle Index	2.24	2.93	26.7
D50	7	28	120.0

RPD of > 30 are considered to be significant

## Channel Dimension (Cross-Section)


Channel cross section reflects the two-dimensional view of the channel, typically viewed in the downstream direction. Points collected from a surveyed cross section should at a minimum contain floodplain elevation, top of bank, bank toe, bank full, water surface elevations and thalweg. Typical dimensions measured from a channel cross section include top and bank full width, bank height, bank slope and channel depth. By convention, the right and left banks reflect the sides of the channel as viewed in the downstream direction.

Measurement of the channel cross section at a riffle is the key ingredient in channel classification and provides a wealth of information regarding the current condition of the channel. At the initial study phase a relatively stable riffle cross section was



surveyed for classification purposes. Figure 1 shows this same cross section measured again in 2006. Table 3 compares the cross-section measurements from 2005 and 2006.

**Figure 1.** Graph of the Upper Glade Run riffle cross section



**Table 3.** Comparison of the 2005 and 2006 cross-section measurements

Dimensions and ratios	2005	2006	RPD
Cross sectional area (feet <sup>2</sup> )	21.0	12.3	52.1
Width (feet)	18.4	19.2	4.3
Mean depth (feet)	1.1	0.6	58.8
Width-depth ratio	16.1	30.1	60.6
Flood prone width (feet)	26.0	20.9	21.7
Entrenchment ratio	1.4	1.1	23.1

In 2005 this section of Upper Glade Run classified as a B type channel, but there was a change to an F channel type in 2006.

Type B channels have a broad valley but not a well developed flood plain. These channels are moderately entrenched with moderate to steep slopes. Type B channels are often rapid dominated streams with step/pool sequences. Bank


heights are typically low if the channel is stable. This stream type is quite resilient to moderate changes, especially if riparian buffers remain intact.

Type F channels are usually deeply entrenched. These stream types are typically working to create a new floodplain at a lower elevation and will often evolve into C and then E stream types. This evolutionary process leads to very high levels of bank erosion, bar development, and sediment transport.

## Longitudinal Profiles

Channel slope is defined as the vertical fall of a stream over a given distance. It is typically reported as a percentage (ft/ft) or as feet of drop per mile (ft/mile). Longitudinal profiles depict slope trends on a stream reach. The most accurate means of determining the slope of the channel bed is by surveying the channel thalweg elevation (the deepest point in the channel bed) over a given distance.

**Figure 4.** Longitudinal profile





# The Mountain State Monitor

Summer Edition

2006

4. Harvey, M. D. and C. C. Watson. 1986. [Fluvial processes and morphologic thresholds in incised channel restoration](#). Water Resources Bulletin. 22(3): 359-368.
5. Schumm, S. A. 1980. [Some applications of the concepts of geomorphic thresholds](#). In: D. R. Coates and J. Vitek, editors. Thresholds in Geomorphology. Allen & Unwin, London, UK. Pp. 473-485.
6. Rosgen, D. L. 1994. [A classification of natural rivers](#). Catena. 22: 169-199.
7. Bain, N. B. and N. J. Stevenson, editors. 1999. [Common Methods of Aquatic Habitat Assessment](#). American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.

The **Mountain State Monitor** is a publication of the West Virginia Save Our Streams Program. Ideas for topics, or submission of articles are encouraged. Recent editions are available at: <http://www.wvdep.org/dwvm/wvsos> or back issues can be requested by sending e-mail to the coordinator at: [tcraddock@wvdep.org](mailto:tcraddock@wvdep.org).