

QUASI-UNIVERSAL RELATIONS FOR BANKFULL HYDRAULIC GEOMETRY OF SINGLE-THREAD GRAVEL-BED RIVERS

Gary Parker¹, Peter Wilcock², Chris Paola³ and William E. Dietrich⁴

¹Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering and
Department of Geology, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801

²Department of Geography and Environmental Engineering,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD USA, 21218

³Department of Geology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN USA, 55455

⁴Department of Earth and Planetary Science, University of California,
Berkeley, CA USA, 94720

ABSTRACT Alluvial, single-thread gravel-bed rivers with definable bankfull geometries are considered. Four baseline data sets determine relations for bankfull geometry, i.e. bankfull depth, bankfull width and down-channel slope as functions of bankfull discharge and bed surface median sediment size. In appropriate dimensionless form these relations show a remarkable degree of universality. This universality applies not only within the four sets used to determine the forms, but also to two independent data sets as well. The physical basis for this universality is studied in terms of four relations that can be back-calculated from the data: a) a Manning-Strickler-type relation for channel resistance, b) a channel-forming relation expressed in terms of the ratio of bankfull Shields number to critical Shields number, c) a relation for critical Shields number as a function of dimensionless discharge and d) a “gravel yield” relation specifying the (estimated) gravel transport rate at bankfull flow as a function of bankfull discharge and gravel size. These underlying relations are used to explore why the dimensionless bankfull relations are only quasi-universal, and to quantify the degree to which deviation from universality can be expected. Finally, the analysis is used to obtain a first estimate of a partition between skin friction and form drag.

Introduction

The case of single-thread, alluvial gravel-bed rivers is considered. Here “gravel-bed” is used in a loose sense, and refers to stream reaches for which the surface median grain size D_{s50} is greater than 25 mm. Many such river reaches have a definable channel and floodplain, such that flow spills from the channel onto the floodplain at a “bankfull” discharge Q_{bf} . For such reaches it is possible to define a “bankfull channel geometry” (Leopold and Maddock, 1953; Leopold et al., 1964) in terms of a bankfull width B_{bf} , bankfull depth H_{bf} and downchannel

bed slope S . Leopold and Maddock (1953) considered the downstream variation of these parameters in terms of power relations of the form

$$B_{bf} = \chi_B Q_{bf}^{n_B} \quad , \quad H_{bf} = \chi_H Q_{bf}^{n_H} \quad , \quad S = \chi_S Q_{bf}^{-n_S} \quad (1a,b,c)$$

and offered estimates for n_B and n_H of 0.5 and 0.4, respectively.

Bray (1982) studied the bankfull geometry of single-thread alluvial gravel-bed streams, i.e. the class studied here, and further expanded the analysis to include different streams as well as different reaches of the same stream. Based on data from Canada, Bray (1982) determined the following estimates for the exponents:

$$n_B = 0.527 \quad , \quad n_H = 0.333 \quad , \quad n_S = 0.342 \quad (2a,b,c)$$

This work has been extended by Hey and Thorne (1986), who suggest the values 0.52 and 0.39 for n_B and n_H respectively, based on an analysis of British gravel-bed streams. Relations of the form of (1a,b,c) are not, however, dimensionally homogeneous, and thus may not reveal the physics underlying the relations. Parker (1979), Parker and Toro-Escobar (2002) and Parker *et al.* (2003) developed dimensionless forms for bankfull geometry of single-thread gravel-bed streams, and Ashmore and Parker (1983) developed similar dimensionless relations for anabranches of braided gravel-bed streams. These dimensionless relations have not seen much application to date. For example, contained within the comprehensive survey of Soar and Thorne (2001) is the statement: "...non-dimensional regime-type relationships are considered unsuitable for developing design equations for bankfull width..."

The present analysis is intended to provide further justification for a dimensionless formulation by a) establishing quasi-universal dimensionless relations for hydraulic geometry for the class of streams under study, and b) developing a physical basis from which these relations can be derived. Four sets of data for alluvial, single-thread gravel-bed streams are used to develop these relations. The non-dimensionalization used here for bankfull width and depth is different from (although ultimately equivalent to) that used in e.g. Parker *et al.* (2003). This modified non-dimensionalization reveals a remarkable constancy in dimensionless bankfull depth, and near-constancy in dimensionless bankfull width, over some four orders of magnitude of variation of dimensionless bankfull discharge.

Governing parameters

The following parameters are defined for reaches of alluvial, single-thread gravel-bed rivers: bankfull discharge Q_{bf} , bankfull width B_{bf} , bankfull depth H_{bf} , down-channel bed slope S , median size D_{s50} of the sediment on the surface of the bed and the acceleration of gravity S . The following relations for hydraulic geometry at bankfull flow are postulated:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{bf} &= f_B(Q_{bf}, D_{s50}, g, \text{other parameters}) \\ H_{bf} &= f_H(Q_{bf}, D_{s50}, g, \text{other parameters}) \\ S &= f_S(Q_{bf}, D_{s50}, g, \text{other parameters}) \end{aligned} \quad (3a,b,c)$$

Examples of “other parameters” include gravel supply, the type and density of bank vegetation, bank material type (e.g. Hey and Thorne, 1986) and channel planform. Here the “other parameters” are dropped with the purpose of determining how much universality can be obtained with the shorted possible list of governing parameters. These “other parameters” are reconsidered later as factors that can contribute to deviation from universality.

Each of (3a), (3b) and (3c) defines a relation involving four parameters [e.g. B_{bf} , Q_{bf} , D_{s50} and g in the case of (3a)] and two dimensions, length and time. The principles of dimensional analysis allow each relation to be expressed in terms of two dimensionless parameters. Parker (1979), Parker and Toro-Escobar (2002) and Parker *et al.* (2003) have proposed the following forms;

$$\hat{B} = \hat{f}_B(\hat{Q}) \quad , \quad \hat{H} = \hat{f}_H(\hat{Q}) \quad , \quad S = \hat{f}_S(\hat{Q}) \quad (4a,b,c)$$

where

$$\hat{B} = \frac{B_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \quad , \quad \hat{H} = \frac{H_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \quad , \quad \hat{Q} = \frac{Q_{bf}}{\sqrt{gD_{s50}} D_{s50}^2} \quad (5a,b,c)$$

Here an alternative but equivalent nondimensionalization for bankfull width and depth, originally suggested by Bray (1982), is used. Defining the dimensionless parameters \tilde{B} and \tilde{H} as

$$\tilde{B} = \frac{g^{1/5} B_{bf}}{Q_{bf}^{2/5}} \quad , \quad \tilde{H} = \frac{g^{1/5} H_{bf}}{Q_{bf}^{2/5}} \quad (6a,b)$$

relations of the following form are sought;

$$\tilde{B} = \tilde{f}_B(\hat{Q}) \quad , \quad \tilde{H} = \tilde{f}_H(\hat{Q}) \quad , \quad S = \tilde{f}_S(\hat{Q}) \quad (7a,b,c)$$

More specifically, power relations of the form

$$\tilde{B} = \alpha_B \hat{Q}^{n_B} \quad , \quad \tilde{H} = \alpha_H \hat{Q}^{n_H} \quad , \quad S = \alpha_S \hat{Q}^{n_S} \quad (8a,b,c)$$

are sought. Note that as opposed to the coefficients in the relations (1a,b,c), which have dimensions that are entirely dependent upon the choice of the exponents, the coefficients in (8a,b,c) are dimensionless.

Dimensionless relations involving the forms \tilde{B} and \tilde{H} are equivalent to corresponding relations involving \hat{B} and \hat{H} because according to (5) and (6),

$$\tilde{B} = \hat{B} \hat{Q}^{-2/5} \quad , \quad \tilde{H} = \hat{H} \hat{Q}^{-2/5} \quad (9a,b)$$

The first motivation for the choice of the forms \tilde{B} and \tilde{H} as opposed to \hat{B} and \hat{H} in the present analysis is related to the possibility of spurious correlation (e.g. Hey and Heritage, 1986). That is, \hat{B} , \hat{H} and \hat{Q} all contain grain size D_{s50} , and so allow the possibility of spurious correlation through this parameter, whereas \tilde{B} and \tilde{H} do not contain grain size D_{s50} , which only appears in \hat{Q} . As is seen below,

however, a more powerful motivation results from the analysis. It is found that within the scatter of the data, \tilde{H} shows essentially no variation with \hat{Q} , and \tilde{B} shows only weak variation with \hat{Q} .

Baseline data set

The baseline data set for bankfull geometry of gravel-bed streams used here is composed of four subsets. These include a) 16 stream reaches in Alberta, Canada contained in Kellerhals *et. al* (1972) (and identified in more detail in Parker, 1979), b) 23 stream reaches in Britain contained in Charlton *et. al* (1978), 23 stream reaches in Idaho, USA (Parker *et. al*, 2003) and 10 reaches of the Colorado River, western Colorado and eastern Utah, USA (Pitlick and Cress, 2002), for a total of 72 reaches. These four sets are respectively referred to as “Alberta,” “Britain I,” “Idaho” and “Colorado.” The terminology “Britain I” is used because a second set of data from Britain is introduced later.

The baseline data set is available at <http://www.cee.uiuc.edu/people/parkerg/enter-rest-of-URL>. It should be noted that the data for each of the 10 reaches of the Colorado River represent averages based on a larger number of subreaches.

- The parameters of the baseline set vary over the following ranges:
- bankfull discharge Q_{bf} varies from 2.7 to 5440 m³/s;
 - bankfull width B_{bf} varies from 5.24 to 280 m;
 - bankfull depth H_{bf} varies from 0.25 to 6.95 m;
 - down-channel bed slope S varies from 0.00034 to 0.031; and
 - surface median grain size D_{s50} varies from 27 to 167.5 mm.

Only the data set of Charlton *et al.* (1978) include measured values for sediment specific gravity. The average value for their 23 reaches is 2.63. In all other cases the sediment specific gravity has been assumed to be the standard value for quartz, i.e. 2.65.

Quasi-universal relations for hydraulic geometry

Figure 1 shows on a single plot \tilde{B} , \tilde{H} and S as functions of \hat{Q} . The relations define distinct trends across four decades of variation of \hat{Q} . Simple regression yields the following power forms for dimensionless bankfull hydraulic geometry;

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{B} &= 4.63\hat{Q}^{0.0667} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \alpha_B = 4.63 \quad , \quad n_B = 0.0667 \\ \tilde{H} &= 0.382\hat{Q}^{-0.0004} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \alpha_H = 0.382 \quad , \quad n_H = -0.0004 \\ S &= 0.101\hat{Q}^{-0.344} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \alpha_S = 0.101 \quad , \quad n_S = 0.344\end{aligned} \quad (10a,b,c)$$

These relations turn out upon reduction with (9a,b) to be very close to the relations for \hat{B} , \hat{H} and S versus \hat{Q} given in Parker and Toro-Escobar (2002) and Parker *et al.* (2003). This notwithstanding, the present formulation has at least one distinct advantage, i.e. the rather remarkable result of constant \tilde{H} .

It is seen from Figure 1 and regression relation (10b) that for all practical purposes (10b) can be replaced with the average value for the baseline data set

$$\tilde{H} \equiv \tilde{H}_o = 0.400 \quad (11)$$

over the entire range of \hat{Q} . More specifically, this yields the dimensional form

$$H_{bf} = \frac{0.400}{g^{1/5}} Q_{bf}^{2/5} \quad (12)$$

That is, within the scatter of the data, bankfull depth H_{bf} varies with bankfull discharge Q_{bf} to the 2/5 power, independently of grain size D_{s50} . Thus (12) predicts that a doubling of bankfull discharge results in an increase in bankfull depth by a factor of 1.32. A doubling of grain size D_{s50} , however, is predicted to result in no change in H_{bf} .

It is also seen from Figure 1 that dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} does not vary strongly with \hat{Q} , with typical values of \tilde{B} near 10. This notwithstanding, \tilde{B} does systematically increase with \hat{Q} ; (10a) yields the dimensioned form

$$B_{bf} = \frac{4.63}{g^{1/5}} Q_{bf}^{0.4} \left(\frac{Q_{bf}}{\sqrt{gD_{s50}} D_{s50}^2} \right)^{0.0667} \quad (13)$$

That is, B_{bf} varies with $Q_{bf}^{0.4667}$ and $D_{s50}^{-0.167}$. According to (13) a doubling of bankfull discharge results in an increase of bankfull width by a factor of 1.38; a doubling of grain size D_{s50} results in a decrease of bankfull width by a factor of 0.89.

The relation for slope takes the dimensioned form

$$S = 0.101 \left(\frac{Q_{bf}}{\sqrt{gD_{s50}} D_{s50}^2} \right)^{-0.344} \quad (14)$$

Thus S varies with $Q_{bf}^{-0.344}$ and $D_{s50}^{0.860}$. According to (14), a doubling in bankfull discharge results in a slope decrease by a factor of 0.79; a doubling of grain size results in a slope increase by a factor of 1.81.

The data are discriminated according to the four sets (Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado) in Figure 2. The data points of the four sets all intermingle one among the other, indicating a substantial degree of universal behavior among data from four distinct geographical regions.

The relations (10a), (11) and (10c) are nevertheless described as “quasi-universal” here because the effects of the “other parameters” in (3) are

discernible. Figures 3a and 3b illustrate the clearest deviation from universality; the Britain I rivers are systematically somewhat deeper and narrower than the Alberta rivers. One reason for this may be the more humid climate and consequent denser bank vegetation in the case of the Britain I streams, so increasing the effective “bank strength” relative to the Alberta streams (e.g. Charlton *et al.*, 1978; Hey and Thorne, 1986). Another reason may be the likelihood that the British streams have a lower supply of gravel than the Alberta streams. Both of these factors are discussed in more detail below.

The scatter in Figures 1, 2 and 3 also likely embodies an element of measurement error in the parameters in question. Perhaps the parameter that is most subject to measurement error is the surface median grain size D_{s50} ; in most cases the samples of bed material from which it was determined likely did not satisfy the rigorous guidelines of Church *et al.* (1987). The down-channel bed slope S is subject to error if the reach used to determine it is not sufficiently long. In addition, bankfull width and depth B_{bf} and H_{bf} are subject to error if they are not based on appropriately-defined reach averaged characteristics, and bankfull discharge Q_{bf} may be difficult to discern from a rating curve if there is not a clear break in the stage-discharge relationship as the flow spills overbank.

In Figures 1 and 2 the data for slope show the most scatter, even though there seems to be no systematic differences among the four data sets. As noted above, part of this scatter may be due to measurement error, particularly in the measurement of D_{s50} and S . There is, however, another compelling reason or scatter in the slope relation. Mobile-bed rivers are free to change their bankfull width and depth over short geomorphic time (e.g. 100's or 1000's of years). Slope changes other than those associated with changes in sinuosity, however, require a complete restructuring of the long profile of the river. Such a restructuring must occur over much longer geomorphic time scales, over which such factors as tectonism, climate change and sea level variation make themselves felt [and thus enter as “other parameters” (3)]. This notwithstanding, the slope relation still shows a considerable degree of systematic variation.

Both the predictive quality of the relations (10a), (11) and (10c) and the extent to which “other parameters” are felt can also be studied by plotting values of B_{bf} , H_{bf} and S predicted from (10a), (11) and (10c) versus the reported values. Figure 4a shows predicted versus observed values for B_{bf} . All of the 72 predicted values are between 1/2 and 2 times the reported values. Figure 4b shows predicted versus observed values for H_{bf} ; again, all of the 72 predicted values are between 1/2 and 2 times the reported values. Figure 4c shows predicted versus observed values of S ; 52 of the 72 predicted values, or 72% are within 1/2 and 2 times the reported values.

Variation within the data sets can be studied in terms of the average value of the ratio $(X)_{pred}/(X)_{rep}$ for each set, where $(X)_{pred}$ denotes the predicted value of

parameter X and $(X)_{rep}$ denotes the reported value. These results are given in Table 1, and can be summarized as follows:

- Average values of $(B_{bf})_{pred}/(B_{bf})_{rep}$
Alberta: 0.83
Britain I: 1.30
Idaho: 0.97
Colorado: 0.98
- Average values of $(H_{bf})_{pred}/(H_{bf})_{rep}$
Alberta: 1.27
Britain I: 0.81
Idaho: 1.08
Colorado: 1.07
- Average values of $(S)_{pred}/(S)_{rep}$
Alberta: 1.16
Britain I: 1.32
Idaho: 1.38
Colorado: 1.00

It is seen that the Alberta streams are systematically wider and shallower, and the Britain I are systematically narrower and deeper, than that predicted by the regression relations. The average ratios $(B_{bf})_{pred}/(B_{bf})_{rep}$, $(H_{bf})_{pred}/(H_{bf})_{rep}$ and $(S)_{pred}/(S)_{rep}$ are nevertheless in all cases sufficiently close to unity to strengthen the case for quasi-universality of the relations.

Comparison of the regression relations against three independent sets of data

Three independent sets of data on gravel-bed rivers are used to test the regression relations presented above. The first of these consists of 11 stream reaches from Maryland and Pennsylvania, USA (McCandless, 2003), here referred to as “Maryland” for short. The original data set contained 14 reaches, but three of these were excluded because a) the stream was bedrock, or b) the value of D_{s50} was substantially below the range of the baseline set or c) the value of S was substantially above the range of the baseline set.

The second set of data is the British set of 62 reaches compiled by Hey and Thorne (1986). The specific reaches in this set, which is referred to as “Britain II” for short, are largely different from those in the Britain I compilation of Charlton *et al.* (1978) used earlier to derive (10a), (11) and (10b). This notwithstanding, the overall characteristics of the “Britain II” streams are, perhaps unsurprisingly in light of the correspondence in geography, quite similar to the “Britain I” streams.

The third set of data is a subset of the original set of Rinaldi (2003) for streams in Tuscany, Italy. The subset used here consists of 11 of the 14 reaches classified by Rinaldi (2003) as Type 1 (sinuous) rivers, and is referred to as “Tuscany” for short. The three excluded points are those for which D_{s50} falls

below 25 mm, and thus below the range of values of D_{s50} in the baseline data set. Rinaldi (2003) includes three other types: Type 2 (meandering), Type 3 (sinuous with alternate bars) and Type 3/4 (sinuous with alternate bars, - locally braided). The Type 2 streams were excluded because they are sand-bed; the Type 3 and Type 3/4 streams were excluded because several of them do not appear to be clearly single-thread.

The set from Tuscany is for two reasons the most problematic of the three sets. Independently determined bankfull discharge values are unavailable for these reaches, and thus bankfull discharge Q_{bf} has been estimated as the discharge at a flood with a two-year recurrence frequency Q_2 . More importantly, these streams are strongly out of equilibrium due to human interference. Indeed, Rinaldi (2003) studied these streams with the goal of quantifying the effects of human interference, including check dams in the uplands, gravel mining, water retention dams in the reaches themselves and engineering works such as straightening, diking and bank revetment. The cumulative effect of these interventions has been channel degradation and narrowing. In the case of the Type 1 streams studied here, the channels have incised into the original floodplain, and are now building a new, lower floodplain which is as yet considerably narrower than the original one. Of interest here, then, is whether or not this intervention is detectable as a systematic deviation from universality in the dimensionless plots of hydraulic geometry.

Figure 5 is an extended version of Figure 1 to which the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data have been added. The regression lines in the figure are (10a), (11) and (10c), i.e. those determined using only the baseline data set. The Maryland and Britain II data sets are seen to intermingle with the four baseline data sets without notably increasing the scatter of the plots. The trend of the Britain II data is seen to be very consistent with that of the Britain I data. Many of the points for dimensionless width and depth of the Tuscany streams, however, plot very low compared to the other six sets (Alberta, Britain I, Idaho, Colorado, Maryland, Britain II).

Figure 6 shows only the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data along with (10a), (11) and (10c) determined from regressions of the baseline data set. The Maryland data show little systematic deviation from the (10a), (11) and (10c). The Britain II data does show systematic deviation in the same way as the Britain I data: (10a) overestimates the channel width and (11) underestimates the channel depth. The systematic deviation is larger in the case of the Tuscany data, with (10a) significantly overestimating the width and (11) overestimating the depth. This systematic deviation is explored in more detail in Figures 7a, 7b and 7c, where respectively $(B_{bf})_{pred}$ is plotted against $(B_{bf})_{rep}$, $(H_{bf})_{pred}$ is plotted against $(H_{bf})_{rep}$ and $(S)_{pred}$ is plotted against $(S)_{rep}$.

In Figure 7a it is seen that all but 4 of of the 73 predicted values of bankfull width for the Maryland and Britain II sets are between 1/2 and 2 times the

reported values. The 4 exceptions are all Britain II reaches, and in all 4 cases (10a) overpredicts. Bankfull width is overpredicted for every one of the 11 Tuscany points, however, and in 7 cases width is overpredicted by over a factor of 2.

In Figure 7b it is seen that all but 1 of the 73 predicted values of bankfull depth for the Maryland and Britain II sets, as well as all 11 predicted bankfull depths for the Tuscany set are between 1/2 and 2 times the reported values. The single exception is a Britain II reach, for which (11) underpredicts. In the case of the Tuscany set, however, in 9 out of 11 cases bankfull depth is overpredicted.

In Figure 7c it is seen that 57 of the 73 predicted values for slope for the Maryland and Britain II sets, or 78%, are within 1/2 and 2 of the reported values. Of the remaining 16 values, 6 are Maryland reaches and 10 are Britain II reaches; all but three of these values correspond to underpredictions of slope. In addition, 7 of the 11 predicted values for slope of the Tuscany set, or 64%, are within 1/2 and 2 of the reported values.

Averages of the ratio of predicted to reported values for the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany sets are given in Table 1, and are also reported below. The corresponding values for the Britain I set are also given below for comparison.

- Average values of $(B_{bf})_{pred}/(B_{bf})_{rep}$
Maryland: 1.01
Britain II: 1.36 (Britain I: 1.30)
Tuscany: 2.03
- Average values of $(H_{bf})_{pred}/(H_{bf})_{rep}$
Maryland: 0.98
Britain II: 0.91 (Britain I: 0.81)
Tuscany: 1.39
- Average values of $(S)_{pred}/(S)_{rep}$
Maryland: 1.25
Britain II: 0.98 (Britain I: 1.32)
Tuscany: 0.88

A comparison of the values given above and in Table 1 allow for some tentative conclusions. The first of these is that the Maryland and Britain II data sets fit within the quasi-universal framework of the baseline data set. The Maryland data scatter about the regression relations (10a), (11) and (10c) established using the baseline set. The Britain II data also fall within the range of the scatter of the baseline set, but show the same bias toward narrower, deeper channels as the Britain I set.

The second tentative conclusion concerns the Tuscany data set. The Tuscany streams show significant deviation from universality. The average value

of $(B_{bf})_{pred}/(B_{bf})_{rep}$ for the Tuscany streams is 2.03, a value that is significantly higher than the highest value of 1.36 for any other of the data sets in Table 1. That is, the Tuscany streams are significantly narrower than the other streams. The Tuscany streams are also noticeably shallower than the other streams: the average value of $(H_{bf})_{pred}/(H_{bf})_{rep}$ is 1.39, a value that is higher than the highest value of 1.27 for any other of the data sets in Table 1.

There are three possible reasons for this deviation. The first of these involves the possibility that measurements in the Tuscany streams were performed in a way that yielded systematic underestimation of bankfull width as compared to the other six data sets. This deviation in measurement procedure would have to be rather extreme, however, to yield a systematic underestimate by a factor of about 1/2. The second of these concerns the use of the flood discharge Q_2 with a two-year recurrence as a surrogate for bankfull discharge Q_{bf} . The 2-year flood has been found to be a reasonable surrogate for bankfull discharge in other geographic locations (e.g. Soar and Thorne, 2001). If the source of the discrepancy between the Tuscany data and the other data were due to a systematic deviation between Q_2 and Q_{bf} , an appropriate adjustment of Q_2 upward or downward ought to bring the predicted values more in line with the reported values. The average of the discrepancy ratio $(B_{bf})_{pred}/(B_{bf})_{rep}$ for the Tuscany streams can be brought down from 2.03 to 1 by estimating the bankfull discharge Q_{bf} as equal to 0.22 Q_2 . The same average can be brought down to the largest average value for any other set (1.36 for the Britain II streams) by estimating Q_{bf} as equal to 0.42 Q_2 . In either case the downward adjustment the estimate of bankfull discharge is sufficiently severe to suggest that other factors merit investigation.

The third possibility is the one suggested by Rinaldi (2003) himself. That is, anthropogenic interference has caused the Tuscany streams to degrade, and subsequently form both a channel and a floodplain that are narrower than that before the onset of degradation. The deviation from universality in the case of the Tuscany streams can thus be tentatively interpreted as a signal of notable human disturbance.

Other than the Tuscany set, the largest deviation from universality is for the case of bankfull width of the Britain II streams, where B_{bf} is on the average overpredicted by (10a) by a factor of 1.36. The Britain II data set of Hey and Thorne (1986) allows for a quantification of this deviation. The authors have classified reaches of the data set on a scale from 1 to 4 in terms of the density of bank vegetation, with 1 denoting the lowest density. In Figure 8 the predicted and reported values of B_{bf} are given with the data discriminated according to vegetation density. It is seen from the figure that (10a) mildly overpredicts the bankfull width for the streams with the least dense bank vegetation, and noticeably overpredicts bankfull width for the streams with the densest bank vegetation. The average of the discrepancy ratios $(B_{bf})_{pred}/(B_{bf})_{rep}$ for the four classes of vegetation are as follows: class 1, 0.93; class 2, 1.21; class 3, 1.45

and class 4, 1.66. As previously concluded by Hey and Thorne (1986) in regard to this data set, vegetation appears to exert a measurable control on bankfull width. In the present case this control is expressed as a deviation from universality in the dimensionless relation for bankfull width, with higher bank vegetation favoring narrower channels.

Toward the physics underlying the dimensionless relations

Equations (10a), (11) and (10c) presumably reflect the underlying physics of alluvial, single-thread gravel-bed streams. It is thus useful to ask what physical assumptions would yield these same equations as a result. The analysis presented here is of necessity “broad-brush,” but is nevertheless intended to identify the factors controlling relations for hydraulic geometry.

The following parameters are defined. Boundary shear stress at bankfull flow is denoted as $\tau_{b,bf}$, water density is denoted as ρ , sediment density is denoted as ρ_s volume gravel bedload transport rate at bankfull flow is denoted as $Q_{b,bf}$ and cross-sectionally averaged flow velocity is denoted as U_{bf} . Water conservation requires that

$$U_{bf} = \frac{Q_{bf}}{B_{bf}H_{bf}} \quad (15)$$

The normal flow approximation is used here to evaluate the boundary shear stress $\tau_{b,bf}$ and the shear velocity at bankfull flow $u_{*,bf}$;

$$\tau_{b,bf} = \rho g H_{bf} S \quad , \quad u_{*,bf} = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{b,bf}}{\rho}} = \sqrt{g H_{bf} S} \quad (16a,b)$$

The submerged specific gravity R of the gravel is defined as

$$R = \frac{\rho_s}{\rho} - 1 \quad (17)$$

For natural sediments R is usually close to the value of 1.65 for quartz. The Shields number τ_{bf}^* and Einstein number q_{bf}^* , both at bankfull flow and based in sediment size D_{s50} , are defined as

$$\tau_{bf}^* = \frac{\tau_{b,bf}}{\rho R g D_{s50}} \quad , \quad q_{bf}^* = \frac{Q_{b,bf}}{B_{bf} \sqrt{R g D_{s50}} D_{s50}} \quad (18a,b)$$

In addition, a dimensionless bankfull gravel bedload transport rate \hat{Q}_b analogous to the dimensionless water discharge \hat{Q} is defined as

$$\hat{Q}_b = \frac{Q_{b,bf}}{\sqrt{g D_{s50}} D_{s50}^2} \quad (19)$$

The relations that underlie (10a), (11) and (10b) are assumed to involve a) frictional resistance, b) transport of gravel, c) a channel-forming Shields number, e) a relation for critical Shields number for the onset of gravel motion and e) a

relation for gravel “yield” (the reason for the quotes becomes apparent below). Frictional resistance is described in terms of a relation of Manning-Strickler type:

$$\frac{U_{bf}}{u_{*,bf}} = \alpha_r \left(\frac{H_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \right)^{n_r} \quad (20a)$$

where the dimensionless parameters α_r and n_r are to be determined. Reducing with (15) and (16b),

$$\frac{Q_{bf}}{B_{bf} H_{bf} \sqrt{g H_{bf} S}} = \alpha_r \left(\frac{H_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \right)^{n_r} \quad (20b)$$

Gravel transport is described in terms of the Parker (1978) approximation of the Einstein (1950) relation applied to bankfull flow:

$$q_{bf}^* = \alpha_G (\tau_{bf}^*)^{3/2} \left(1 - \frac{\tau_c^*}{\tau_{bf}^*} \right)^{4.5} \quad (21)$$

where τ_c^* is a critical Shields number for the onset of motion and α_G is a coefficient equal to 11.2. Channel form is described in terms a relation of the form

$$\tau_{bf}^* = r \tau_c^* \quad (21)$$

as described by Parker (1978), Paola *et al.* (1992) and Parker *et al.* (1998). Equation (20) reduces with (16a), (18a) and (20) to

$$\frac{Q_{b,bf}}{\sqrt{g D_{s50}} D_{s50}^2} = \frac{\alpha_G}{R} \frac{B_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \left(\frac{H_{bf} S}{D_{s50}} \right)^{3/2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r} \right)^{4.5} \quad (22)$$

In the Parker (1978) approximation of the Einstein (1950) bedload relation τ_c^* is taken to be a constant equal to 0.03. Here it is taken to be a (weak) function of \hat{Q} such that the average value for the baseline data set is 0.03;

$$\tau_c^* = \alpha_\tau \hat{Q}^{n_\tau} \quad (23)$$

In the above relation the dimensionless constants α_τ and n_τ are to be determined. Between (5c), (16a), (18a) and (21) it is found that (23) reduces to

$$\frac{H_{bf} S}{R D_{s50}} = r \alpha_\tau \left(\frac{Q_{bf}}{\sqrt{g D_{s50}} D_{s50}^2} \right)^{n_\tau} \quad (24)$$

Finally, a gravel “yield” relation describes how the gravel bedload transport rate at bankfull flow $Q_{b,bf}$ varies with bankfull flow Q_{bf} and grain size D_{s50} ;

$$\hat{Q}_b = \alpha_y \hat{Q}^{n_y} \quad (25a)$$

where α_y and n_y are dimensionless parameters as yet to be determined. Reducing (25a) with (5a) and (19),

$$\frac{Q_{b,bf}}{\sqrt{g D_{s50}} D_{s50}^2} = \alpha_y \left(\frac{Q_{bf}}{\sqrt{g D_{s50}} D_{s50}^2} \right)^{n_y} \quad (25b)$$

Between (22) and (25b),

$$\frac{\alpha_G}{R} \frac{B_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \left(\frac{H_{bf} S}{D_{s50}} \right)^{3/2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r} \right)^{4.5} = \alpha_y \left(\frac{Q_{bf}}{\sqrt{g} D_{s50} D_{s50}^2} \right)^{n_y} \quad (26)$$

The above relations contain the unevaluated dimensionless coefficients α_r , α_τ and α_y and exponents n_r , n_τ and n_y . Here these are evaluated to as to yield precisely the coefficients α_B and α_S , exponents n_B and n_S and the constant \tilde{H}_0 determined by regression from the baseline data set, i.e. the values given in (10a), (10c) and (11). Before completing this step, however, some elaboration of the above relations is appropriate.

Equation (20a) is a Manning-Strickler relation of the general form that Parker (1991) has applied to gravel rivers; it is also similar to related logarithmic forms for gravel-bed rivers due to e.g. Limerinos (1970) and Hey (1979). As such, it is appropriate for a broad-brush formulation. There are two reasons why it cannot be accurate in detail. The first of these is the fact that the characteristic grain size on which grain roughness (skin friction) depends is a size coarser than D_{s50} ; commonly used sizes are D_{s90} and D_{s84} . The second of these is the likelihood that not all the drag in gravel-bed rivers at bankfull flow is due to skin friction. Bar structures, planform variation and bank vegetation can give rise to at least some form drag (e.g Millar, 1999). The issue of form drag is discussed in more detail below.

The Parker (1978) approximation of the Einstein (1950) bedload transport relation embodied in (21) is also an appropriate broad-brush relation for gravel-bed rivers. There are at least three reasons why it cannot be accurate in detail: a) it does not account for gravel mixtures (e.g. Parker, 1990; Wilcock and Crowe, 2003), b) no attempt has been made to remove the effect of form drag (which would reduce the total bedload transport rate) and c) no attempt has been made to account for preferential “patches” or “lanes” (which would increase the total transport rate; Paola and Seal, 1995).

The original derivation of the relation for channel form (21) derived by Parker (1978) does not account for the effect of form drag or planform variation, both effects that are felt here. This notwithstanding, Paola *et al.* (1992) and Parker *et al.* (1998) have shown its value as a broad-brush relation.

According to (23) the critical Shields number τ_c^* at the onset of motion depends on dimensionless discharge \hat{Q} . In the original Parker (1978) approximation of the Einstein (1950) bedload transport relation τ_c^* is a constant equal to 0.03. It is demonstrated below, however, that the exponent n_τ in (23) is very small.

Finally, the gravel “yield” relation (25a) does not involve mean annual gravel yield, but rather the gravel transport rate at bankfull flow. One presumably

scales with the other, but the details of the scaling are not worked out here. The “yield” relation relates to processes at the scale of the drainage basin rather than local in-channel processes. More specifically, it describes how a catchment organizes itself to export gravel downstream during floods. Equation (25a) is the most empirical of the relations used here.

Substituting (10a), (11) and (10c) into (20b), (24) and (26) yields the evaluations

$$\alpha_r = \alpha_B^{-1} \alpha_S^{-1/2} \tilde{H}_o^{-[(3/2)+(5/4)n_s-(5/2)n_B]} \quad (27a)$$

$$n_r = \frac{5}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} n_s - n_B \right) \quad (27b)$$

$$\alpha_\tau = \frac{\tilde{H}_o \alpha_S}{rR} \quad (28a)$$

$$n_\tau = \frac{2}{5} - n_s \quad (28b)$$

$$\alpha_y = \frac{\alpha_G \left(1 - \frac{1}{r} \right)^{4.5} \alpha_B \tilde{H}_o^{3/2} \alpha_S^{3/2}}{R} \quad (29a)$$

$$n_y = 1 + n_B - \frac{3}{2} n_s \quad (29b)$$

The parameter r is evaluated as follows. Figure 9 shows a plot of τ_{bf}^* as computed from (16a) and (18a), i.e.

$$\tau_{bf}^* = \frac{H_{bf} S}{RD_{s50}} \quad (30)$$

versus \hat{Q} for the baseline data set. The average value $\langle \tau_{bf}^* \rangle$ for the baseline data set is found to be

$$\langle \tau_{bf}^* \rangle = 0.0487 \quad (31)$$

According to (21) and the original estimate of τ_c^* of 0.03 in the Parker (1978) approximation of the Einstein (1950) bedload transport relation, the following estimate is obtained for r :

$$r = 1.63 \quad (32)$$

Substitution of (10a), (10c), (11) and (32) into (27), (28) and (27) yields the values for α_r , α_τ , α_y , n_r , n_τ and n_y ;

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_r &= 3.43 \quad , \quad \alpha_\tau = 0.0149 \quad , \quad \alpha_y = 0.00354 \\ n_r &= 0.263 \quad , \quad n_\tau = 0.0561 \quad , \quad n_y = 0.551 \end{aligned} \quad (33a,f)$$

and thus the following evaluations for (20a), (21) and (25);

$$\frac{U_{bf}}{u_{*,bf}} = 3.43 \left(\frac{H_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \right)^{0.263} \quad (34)$$

$$\tau_c^* = 0.0149 \hat{Q}^{0.0561} \quad (35)$$

$$\hat{Q}_b = 0.00354\hat{Q}^{0.551} \quad (36)$$

In addition, between (21), (32) and (35) it is found that

$$\tau_{bf}^* = 0.0244\hat{Q}^{0.0561} \quad (37)$$

The exponent in the resistance relation (34) of 0.263 is somewhat larger than the standard Manning-Strickler exponent of $1/6 \cong 0.167$. Relations (37) for bankfull Shields number and (36) for critical Shields number show a very weak dependence on \hat{Q} . This weak dependence is reflected in the baseline data set: a direct regression of the data of Figure 9 yields a nearly identical relation with a coefficient of 0.0230 and an exponent of 0.0572. In addition, (35) represents an improvement over a constant critical Shields number of 0.03, for the following reason. Most alluvial gravel-bed rivers can be expected to be competent to move their median surface size D_{s50} at bankfull flow (e.g. Andrews, 1983; Hey and Thorne, 1986). In the case of a constant critical Shields number of 0.03, 21 of 72 reaches in Figure 9, or 29% plot below the threshold of motion at bankfull flow, whereas in the case of (35) only 13 reaches, or 18% plot below the threshold of motion. This empirically-derived weak dependence of τ_c^* on \hat{Q} may represent a consequence of form drag.

The exponent in the gravel “yield” relation of (36) indicates that the gravel transport rate at bankfull flow should increase as about the square root of the bankfull discharge. Thus the volume concentration of transported gravel should decline downstream. As noted above, this relation expresses a property of how drainage basins organize themselves, rather than local properties in the channel. It is likely, however, that as down-channel slope S drops with increasing flow discharge in accordance with (10c), the adjacent hillslopes often become less steep, so delivering less sediment (and thus less gravel) for the same unit rainfall. This reduced gravel delivery is likely mitigated by downstream fining of the gravel itself.

Quantification of deviation from universality

The derivation of the physical relations underlying hydraulic geometry allows for a quantification of deviations from similarity. This further allows for a characterization of the effect of the “other” parameters in (3a) ~ (3c). In order to do this, the physical relations of the previous section are adopted as primary. The derivation leading to (27) ~ (29) is then inverted so that the coefficients and exponents in the dimensionless relations for hydraulic geometry become functions of the parameter r , and coefficients α_r , α_τ and α_y and the exponents n_r , n_τ and n_y of the physical relations. This yields the following coefficients and exponents describing generalized power relations for hydraulic geometry;

$$\alpha_B = \frac{\alpha_y}{\sqrt{R} \alpha_G \left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right)^{4.5} (r\alpha_\tau)^{3/2}} \quad (38a)$$

$$n_B = \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{2}n_\tau - \frac{2}{5}n_r \quad (38b)$$

$$\tilde{H}_o = \left[\frac{\alpha_G \left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right)^{4.5} r \alpha_\tau}{\alpha_y \alpha_r} \right]^{\frac{1}{1+n_R}} \quad (39)$$

$$\alpha_S = R \alpha_\tau \left[\frac{\alpha_G \left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right)^{4.5} r \alpha_\tau}{\alpha_y \alpha_r} \right]^{\left(\frac{1}{1+n_R}\right)} \quad (40a)$$

$$n_S = \frac{2}{5} - n_\tau \quad (40b)$$

The effect of variation of the following parameters on the deviation from universality is studied: r , α_r and α_y . The first of these, i.e. the ratio of bankfull Shields number to critical Shields number, can be thought of as a measure of “bank strength,” channels with stronger banks can maintain higher values of τ_{bf}^* relative to τ_c^* . Using information in Rice (1979) and Ashmore (1979), Parker (1982) deduced a mean value of τ_{bf}^* of 0.420, and thus a value of r of about 1.4 for anabranches of the braided gravel-bed Sunwapta River, Jasper National Park, Canada, which flows on an unvegetated valley flat. This value represents a lower limit in the absence of vegetation and cohesive sediment to add bank strength. The average value of r of 1.63 deduced for the baseline data set presented here is considerably higher. The Britain II data can be used to provide a qualitative measure of the effect of bank vegetation density on r . Figure 10 shows a plot of the average value of r for each vegetation density class of the Britain II data. Here r is calculated in the same way as for the baseline data, i.e. from (30), (21) and an estimated value of τ_c^* of 0.03. The parameter r takes the following values in order of vegetation density: 1.49 (class 1, lowest vegetation density); 1.63 (class 2), 1.92 (class 3) and 2.67 (class 4, highest vegetation density). For reference, the value of r determined from the baseline data set is 1.63. Here r is allowed to vary from 0.9 to 1.1 times the baseline value of 1.63

Channel resistance decreases as the parameter α_r in the Manning-Strickler relation (20a) increases. This can be seen by defining a dimensionless resistance coefficient C_f as

$$C_f = \frac{\tau_{b,bf}}{\rho U_{bf}^2} \quad (41)$$

Between (15), (16a), (20b) and (41) it is found that

$$C_f = \alpha_r^{-2} \left(\frac{H_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \right)^{-2n_r} \quad (42)$$

Here α_r is allowed to vary from 0.8 to 1.2 times its baseline value of 3.43. At the lower value the resistance coefficient C_f is increased by a factor of 1.56; at the higher value C_f is decreased by a factor of 0.69.

Gravel supply increases linearly with increasing parameter α_y in the gravel “yield” relation (25a). Here α_y is allowed to vary from 0.5 to 1.5 times its baseline value of 0.00354.

Varied values of r , α_r and α_y cause the coefficients α_B and α_S in (38a) and (40a), respectively, and the parameter \tilde{H}_o in (39) to vary. The effects of this variation are summarized in Table 2 and Figures 11a, 11b and 11c.

The effect of varying r is studied in Figure 11a. Increasing r (i.e. increasing “bank strength”) from 0.9 to 1.1 times the baseline value results in a bankfull channel that is increasingly narrower and has an increasingly lower bed slope. A comparison with the data in Figure 11a suggests that bank strength is one reason why the Alberta reaches are wider and shallower than the Britain I reaches.

The effect of varying α_r is studied in Figure 11b. Decreasing α_r from 1.2 to 0.8 times the baseline value, and thus increasing the channel resistance coefficient from 0.69 to 1.56 times that which would be predicted using the baseline value of α_y , results in a bankfull channel that is increasingly deeper and has an increasingly lower slope. Changing α_r has no effect on channel width.

The effect of varying α_y is studied in Figure 11c. Increasing α_y (and thus gravel supply) from 0.5 to 1.5 times the baseline value results in a bankfull channel that is increasingly wider, shallower and steeper. A comparison with the data in Figure 11c suggests that another reason why the Alberta streams may be wider and shallower than the Britain I streams is that they may have a higher gravel supply.

Predictor for bankfull discharge

In general bankfull discharge should be determined from a rating curve of discharge versus stage. Bankfull discharge is indicated by the “rollover” in the plot of stage ξ versus flow discharge Q indicated in Figure 12. In practice, however, such information is often not available.

Equation (20b) along with the evaluations of α_r and n_r of (33a) and (33d), respectively, provide a means for estimating bankfull discharge Q_{bf} from

measured channel parameters B_{bf} , H_{bf} , S and D_{s50} . In Figure 13 the values of Q_{bf} predicted from (20b) are compared against the measured values for the four baseline data sets used to derive (20b). 93% of the predicted values are seen to be between 1/2 and 2 times the reported values. The scatter in the data of Figure 12 is very small for measured discharges above 500 m³/s. Most of these points refer to the Colorado River. The values for the ten reaches of the Colorado River represent averages of subreaches. Evidently the averaging has reduced the scatter.

An independent test of (20b) is given in Figure 14 using the Maryland and Britain II data sets. All the predicted values are seen to be between 1/2 and 2 times the reported values.

Form drag

An appropriate relation for the resistance coefficient C_{fs} due to skin friction alone (here applied to bankfull conditions) is

$$C_{fs}^{-1/2} = 8.1 \left(\frac{H_{bf}}{k_s} \right)^{1/6} \quad (43)$$

where H denotes flow depth and k_s is a roughness height given as

$$k_s = 2D_{s90} \quad (44)$$

and D_{s90} is the surface size such that 90 percent is finer (Parker, 1991; Wong, 2003). Total channel resistance is given by (42). The fraction of resistance ϕ_f that is form drag at bankfull flow is then given by the relation

$$\phi_f = \frac{C_f - C_{fs}}{C_f} \quad (45)$$

where C_f is evaluated from (42) and C_{fs} is evaluated from (43) and the baseline values for α_r and n_r .

The above relations allow for a specification of ϕ_f as a function of H_{bf}/D_{s50} upon specification of the ratio D_{s90}/D_{s50} . This parameter is a function of, among other things, sediment supply. Here the value $D_{s90}/D_{s50} = 3$ is used as an example. The resulting prediction for form drag is shown in Figure 15. The fraction of resistance that is form drag is predicted to decrease from 0.57 to 0.21 as H_{bf}/D_{s50} increases from 4 to 100, a range that captures the great majority of the reaches studied here. A refinement of the broad-brush analysis presented above would involve removing this form drag in the calculation of gravel transport.

Discussion

The relations presented above may be of use in stream restoration schemes for single-thread, alluvial gravel-bed streams. In the absence of gage records, (20b) along with (33a) and (33b), i.e.

$$Q_{bf} = 3.43 B_{bf} H_{bf} \sqrt{g H_{bf} S} \left(\frac{H_{bf}}{D_{s50}} \right)^{0.263} \quad (46)$$

can be used to estimate bankfull discharge from measured channel characteristics. It is emphasized that the above equation should not be applied outside the range of its derivation, or to streams that are not alluvial or do not have a definable floodplain.

Subject to these same restriction, (12), (13) and (14) may be used to estimate the bankfull dimensions of a channel with a specified bankfull discharge Q_{bf} . If Q_{bf} is changed through e.g. river regulation, the dimensions to which the channel would evolve in response can be estimated with these relations. This natural evolution might take 100's to 1000's or years, and the only way slope can change over these time scales is through change in channel sinuosity. The process might be speeded by "pre-fitting" a restored channel to the estimated equilibrium dimensions. Where possible, however, such "pre-fitting" should be as broad-brush as the relations presented here, in order to allow the channel latitude to evolve on its own. More specifically, rivers have a tendency to reject the imposition of idealized meander planforms (e.g. Kondolf, 2001), and are often better left to do their own design in this regard.

Equations (38a), (39) and (40a) used in conjunction with (8a) ~ (8c) allow for a refined design for stream restoration. In particular, these relations allow for rough estimates of the effect of changing gravel supply, "bank strength" (through e.g. vegetation) and bulk channel resistance (through e.g. change in sinuosity) on channel bankfull geometry.

It is the dimensionless formulation used here that allows backing out the physics behind the relations for hydraulic geometry. This underlying physics in turn allows the study of e.g. the dependence of hydraulic geometry on sediment supply or "bank strength." Such information cannot be obtained using dimensionally inhomogeneous equations obtained by means of regression applied directly to parameters of differing dimensions.

The analysis presented here indicates that a specification of channel-based relations for flow resistance, gravel transport and channel form alone are insufficient to derive both the coefficients and exponents governing hydraulic geometry. It has been known for some time that one more constraint is required. Many authors have taken this constraint to be an optimization condition applied to the channel itself. It has been variously proposed that channels adjust their cross-sections to a) minimize unit stream power, b) minimize total stream power, c) maximize the friction coefficient, d) maximize the sediment transport rate and e) minimize the Froude number. A survey of these constraints is given in Soar and Thorne (2001).

Here an alternative avenue is suggested. More specifically, it is suggested that the extra constraint is external to the channel itself, and instead

describes how the catchment itself functions. The constraint used here is an empirical one back-calculated from the hydraulic relations. It specifies how the gravel transport rate at bankfull flow varies with bankfull discharge and surface median grain size. In order to convert this empirical result to one with a physical basis it is necessary to model channel-hillslope interaction at the scale of the drainage basin.

Conclusions

A baseline data set consisting of stream reaches from Alberta, Canada, Idaho, USA, Britain and Colorado, USA is used to determine dimensionless bankfull hydraulic relations for alluvial, single-thread gravel-bed streams with definable channels and floodplains. These dimensionless relations show a remarkable degree of universality. Application of the regression relations to two other data sets, one from Maryland, USA and one from Britain, confirms this tendency toward universality.

The relations are, however, only quasi-universal in that some systematic deviation from universality can be detected. For example, the Alberta streams tend to be wider and shallower, and both set of British streams tend to be narrower and deeper than predicted by the regression relations. In the case of the British streams the deviation appears to be associated with differing density of bank vegetation, and thus “bank strength.”

The regression relations are used to back-calculate the underlying physical relations governing bankfull hydraulic geometry. This back-calculation results in a) a Manning-Strickler relation for channel resistance, b) a relation in which the critical Shields number for the onset of gravel motion varies weakly with dimensionless flow discharge and c) a relation for “gravel yield” which estimates the dimensionless gravel transport rate at bankfull flow to dimensionless bankfull discharge. Having specified these relations, the coefficients and exponents of the dimensionless bankfull hydraulic relations are generalized so as to determine the effect of changing “bank strength,” channel resistance and gravel supply. This calculation suggests that the difference between the Alberta and British stream is mediated by a combination of differing density of bank vegetation (the British streams likely having a higher density) and differing gravel supply (the Alberta stream likely having a higher supply).

A fairly large degree of deviation from universality is found when the regression relations are applied to a set of streams in Tuscany, Italy. These streams have undergone recent degradation in response to human interference, and as a result have incised into their former floodplains. The rivers at present have undersized channels in undersized floodplains forming below the original floodplain. The effect of human interference is detectable when the data are compared against the regression relations.

The Manning-Strickler relation back-calculated from the data provides a means for estimating bankfull discharge from measured values of bankfull depth, bankfull width, down-channel bed slope and surface median size. The predictive relation performs well against both the baseline data set and the data sets from Maryland and Britain that were not used to determine the relation.

The analysis allows an estimation of the effect of form drag in gravel-bed streams at bankfull flow. This estimation suggests that form drag becomes progressively more important as the ratio of bankfull depth to surface median size decreases.

Finally, the analysis suggests that the piece of information missing from previous analyses to close the formulation for bankfull hydraulic geometry is not some kind of extremal constraint applied to a cross-section, but rather a relation that expresses how a catchment organizes itself to deliver gravel downstream, i.e. a “gravel yield” relation.

Acknowledgements

This paper is a contribution of the National Center for Earth-surface Dynamics, a National Science Foundation Science and Technology Center. More specifically, this paper addresses the Center’s research efforts on channels and stream restoration. M. Rinaldi kindly provided the data for river reaches in Tuscany, Italy. The authors also thank S. Darby for making the British data referred to herein as “Britain II” readily available on the World Wide Web.

References

- Andrews, E. D. 1983. Entrainment of gravel from naturally sorted riverbed material. Geological Society of America Bulletin, 94, 1225-1231.
- Ashmore, P.E. 1979 Laboratory modelling of braided streams. M.S. thesis University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, 201 p.
- Ashmore, P. and Parker, G. 1983. Confluence scour in course braided streams. Water Resources Research, 19(2), 393-402.
- Bray, D. I. 1982. Regime relations for gravel-bed rivers. In Gravel-Bed Rivers, Hey, R. D., Bathurst, J. C. and Thorne, C. R., Eds., Wiley, Chichester, 517-542.
- Charlton, F. G., Brown, P. M. and Benson, R. W. 1978 The hydraulic geometry of some gravel rivers in Britain. Report INT 180, Hydraulics Research Station, Wallingford, England, 48 p.

In preparation for submission to Journal of Geophysical Research Earth Surface
February, 2006

Church, M. A., McLean, D. G. and Wolcott, J. F. 1987. River bed gravels: sampling and analysis. In *Sediment Transport in Gravel-bed Rivers*, Thorne, C. R., J. C. Bathurst, and R. D. Hey, eds., Wiley, 43-79.

Einstein, H. A. 1950 The bed-load function for sediment transportation in open channel flows. Technical Bulletin 1026, U.S. Dept. of the Army, Soil Conservation Service.

Hey, R. D. 1979. Flow resistance in gravel-bed rivers. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 105(4), 365-379.

Hey, R. D. and Thorne, C. R. 1986 Stable channels with mobile gravel beds. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 112(6), 671-689.

Hey, R. D. and Heritage, G. L. 1988 Dimensional and dimensionless regime equations for gravel-bed rivers. *Proceedings, International Conference on River Regime*, White, W. R., Ed., Wiley, Chichester, 1-8.

Kellerhals, R., Neill, C. R. and Bray, D. I. 1972 Hydraulic and geomorphic characteristics of rivers in Alberta. Report No. 72-1 River Engineering and Surface Hydrology, Research Council of Alberta, Canada.

Kondolf, G. M. 2001. Design and performance of a channel reconstruction project in a coastal California gravel-bed Stream. *Environmental Management*, 28(6) 761-776.

Leopold, L. B. and Maddock, T. 1953. The hydraulic geometry of stream channels and some physiographic implications. Professional Paper, United States Geological Survey, 252, 57 p.

Leopold, L. B., Wolman, M. G. and Miller, J. P. 1964 *Fluvial Processes in Geomorphology*. W. H. Freeman and Company, London, 522 p.

Limerinos, J. T. 1970. Determination of the Manning Coefficient from Measured Bed Roughness in Natural Channels. Water Supply Paper 1898B, United States Geological Survey.

McCandless, T. L. 2003 Maryland stream survey: bankfull discharge and channel characteristics of streams in the Allegheny Plateau and the Valley and Ridge hydrologic regions. Report No. CBFO-S03-01, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Chesapeake Bay Field Office, 33 p.

Millar, R. G. 1999. Grain and form resistance in gravel-bed rivers. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, 37(3): 303-312.

In preparation for submission to Journal of Geophysical Research Earth Surface
February, 2006

Paola, C., Heller, P. L. and Angevine, C. L. 1992 The large-scale dynamics of grain-size variation in alluvial basins. I: Theory. Basin Research, 4, 73-90

Paola, C. and Seal, R. 1995. Grain size patchiness as a cause of selective deposition and downstream fining. Water Resources Research, 31(5), 1395-1407.

Parker, G. 1978 Self formed rivers with stable banks and mobile bed: Part II, the gravel river. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 89(1), 27-148.

Parker, G. 1979 Hydraulic geometry of active gravel rivers. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 105(9), 1185-1201.

Parker, G. 1982. Discussion of: Regime relations for gravel-bed rivers, by D. I. Bray . In Gravel-Bed Rivers, Hey, R. D., Bathurst, J. C. and Thorne, C. R., Eds., Wiley, Chichester, 542-552.

Parker, G. 1990 Surface-based bedload transport relation for gravel rivers. Journal of Hydraulic Research, 28(4), 417-436.

Parker, G. 1991 Selective sorting and abrasion of river gravel: theory. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 117(2), 131-149.

Parker, G., Paola, C., Whipple, K, and Mohrig, D. 1998 Alluvial fans formed by channelized fluvial and sheet flow: theory. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 124(10), 1-11.

Parker, G., and Toro-Escobar, C. M. 2002, Equal mobility of gravel in streams: the remains of the day. Water Resources Research, 38(11), 1264, doi:10.1029/2001WR000669.

Parker, G., Toro-Escobar, C. M., Ramey, M. and Beck S. 2003. The effect of floodwater extraction on the morphology of mountain streams. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 129(11), 885-895.

Pitlick, J. and Cress, R. 2002 Downstream changes in the channel of a large gravel bed river. Water Resources Research 38(10), 1216, doi:10.1029/2001WR000898.

Rice, R. J. 1979 The hydraulic geometry of the lower portion of the Sunwapta River Valley train, Jasper National Park, Alberta. M.S. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Rinaldi, M. 2003 Recent channel adjustments in alluvial rivers of Tuscany, central Italy, Earth Surf. Process. Landforms 28, 587-608.

In preparation for submission to Journal of Geophysical Research Earth Surface
February, 2006

Soar, P. J. and Thorne, C. R. 2001 Channel restoration design for meandering rivers. Report ERDC/CHL CR-01-1, Coastal Hydraulics Laboratory, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Engineer Research and Development Center, 416 p.

Wilcock, P. R., and Crowe, J. C. 2003 Surface-based transport model for mixed-size sediment. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 129(2), 120-128.

Wong, M. 2003 Does the bedload equation of Meyer-Peter and Müller fit its own data?, Proceedings, 30th Congress, International Association of Hydraulic Research, Thessaloniki, J.F.K. Competition Volume: 73-80.

Notation

TO BE COMPLETED

TABLE 1: Average values for $(X)_{\text{pred}}/(X)_{\text{rep}}$ for seven data sets, where X = bankfull width B_{bf} , bankfull depth H_{bf} and down-channel slope S .

Average discrepancy ratio	of $(B_{\text{bf}})_{\text{pred}}/(B_{\text{bf}})_{\text{rep}}$	$(H_{\text{bf}})_{\text{pred}}/(H_{\text{bf}})_{\text{rep}}$	$(S)_{\text{pred}}/(S)_{\text{rep}}$
Alberta	0.83	1.27	1.16
Britain I	1.30	0.81	1.32
Idaho	0.97	1.08	1.38
Colorado	0.98	1.07	1.00
Maryland	1.01	0.98	1.25
Britain II	1.36	0.91	0.98
Tuscany	2.03	1.39	0.88

TABLE 2: Effect of variation of the parameters r , α_r and α_y on the parameters \tilde{H}_o , α_B and α_S .

r	r factor	\tilde{H}_o	α_B	α_S	
	1.79	1.1	0.696	2.19	0.0578
	1.63	1	0.400	4.63	0.101
	1.47	0.9	0.184	12.97	0.218
α_y	α_y factor	\tilde{H}_o	α_B	α_S	
	0.00531	1.5	0.290	6.95	0.139
	0.00354	1	0.400	4.63	0.101
	0.00177	0.5	0.692	2.32	0.0581
α_r	α_r factor	\tilde{H}_o	α_B	α_S	
	4.11	1.2	0.346	4.63	0.134
	3.43	1	0.400	4.63	0.1001
	2.74	0.8	0.477	4.63	0.0707

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Figure 1 Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} . The Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado subsets of the baseline data set have been lumped together. Also shown are power relations derived from regression on the lumped data set.
- Figure 2 Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , in which the Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado data subsets of the baseline data set are distinguished by different symbols.
- Figure 3 a) Plot of \tilde{B} versus \hat{Q} for the baseline data set, in which the Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado data subsets are distinguished by different symbols.
b) Plot of \tilde{H} versus \hat{Q} for the baseline data set, in which the Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado data subsets are distinguished by different symbols.
- Figure 4 a) Predicted versus reported bankfull width B_{bf} for the baseline data set.
b) Predicted versus reported bankfull depth H_{bf} for the baseline data set.
c) Predicted versus reported down-channel bed slope S for the baseline data set.
- Figure 5 Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , in which the baseline data set has been augmented by the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany subsets. All subsets are distinguished by different symbols.
- Figure 6 Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} for the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data subsets, along with the power regression lines determined from the baseline data set.
- Figure 7 a) Predicted versus reported bankfull width B_{bf} for the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data subsets.

- b) Predicted versus reported bankfull depth H_{bf} for the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data subsets.
- c) Predicted versus reported down-channel bed slope S for the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data subsets.

Figure 8 Predicted versus reported bankfull width B_{bf} for the Britain II data stratified according to vegetation density. Class 1 refers to the lowest, and Class 4 refers to the highest vegetation density.

Figure 9 Plot of the bankfull Shields number τ_{bf}^* for the baseline data set. Also included are a) the line $\tau_{bf}^* = 0.0487$ corresponding to the average value for the baseline data set, b) relation (37) for τ_{bf}^* , c) the estimate of critical Shields number $\tau_c^* = 0.03$ and d) the relation (35) for critical Shields number.

Figure 10 Plot of the parameter r estimating the ratio of bankfull Shields number to critical Shields number as a function of vegetation density for the Britain II data. Class 1 refers to the lowest, and Class 4 refers to the highest vegetation density.

Figure 11 a) Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , showing the predictions of the generalized hydraulic geometry relations as the parameter r is varied from 0.9 to 1.1. Increasing r is associated with increasing “bank strength.” Also shown is the baseline data set discriminated according to subset.

b) Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , showing the predictions of the generalized hydraulic geometry relations as the parameter α_r is varied from 0.8 to 1.2. Increasing α_r is associated with decreasing channel resistance. Also shown is the baseline data set discriminated according to subset.

c) Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , showing the predictions of the generalized hydraulic geometry relations as the parameter α_y is varied from 0.5 to 1.5. Increasing α_y is associated with increasing gravel supply. Also shown is the baseline data set discriminated according to subset.

- Figure 12 Definition diagram for determining bankfull discharge from a stage-discharge curve.
- Figure 13 Predicted versus reported bankfull discharge for the baseline data set, discriminated according to subset.
- Figure 14 Predicted versus reported bankfull discharge for the Maryland and Britain II subsets.
- Figure 15 Estimated fraction of the resistance coefficient that is form drag versus the ratio H_{bf}/D_{s50} , based on the assumption that D_{s90}/D_{s50} is equal to 3.

Figures for: QUASI-UNIVERSAL RELATIONS FOR BANKFULL HYDRAULIC
GEOMETRY OF SINGLE-THREAD GRAVEL-BED RIVERS




Figure 1 Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} . The Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado subsets of the baseline data set have been lumped together. Also shown are power relations derived from regression on the lumped data set.




Figure 2 Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , in which the Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado data subsets of the baseline data set are distinguished by different symbols.




Figure 3 a) Plot of \tilde{B} versus \hat{Q} for the baseline data set, in which the Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado data subsets are distinguished by different symbols.




Figure 3 b) Plot of \tilde{H} versus \hat{Q} for the baseline data set, in which the Alberta, Britain I, Idaho and Colorado data subsets are distinguished by different symbols.




Figure 4 a) Predicted versus reported bankfull width B_{bf} for the baseline data set.




Figure 4 b) Predicted versus reported bankfull depth H_{bf} for the baseline data set.




Figure 4 c) Predicted versus reported down-channel bed slope S for the baseline data set.





Figure 5 Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , in which the baseline data set has been augmented by the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany subsets. All subsets are distinguished by different symbols.






Figure 7 a) Predicted versus reported bankfull width B_{bf} for the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data subsets.




Figure 7 b) Predicted versus reported bankfull depth H_{bf} for the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data subsets.





Figure 7 c) Predicted versus reported down-channel bed slope S for the Maryland, Britain II and Tuscany data subsets.






Figure 9 Plot of the bankfull Shields number τ_{bf}^* for the baseline data set. Also included are a) the line $\tau_{bf}^* = 0.0487$ corresponding to the average value for the baseline data set, b) relation (37) for τ_{bf}^* , c) the estimate of critical Shields number $\tau_c^* = 0.03$ and d) the relation (35) for critical Shields number.




Figure 10 Plot of the parameter r estimating the ratio of bankfull Shields number to critical Shields number as a function of vegetation density for the Britain II data. Class 1 refers to the lowest, and Class 4 refers to the highest vegetation density.




Figure 11 a) Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , showing the predictions of the generalized hydraulic geometry relations as the parameter r is varied from 0.9 to 1.1. Increasing r is associated with increasing “bank strength.” Also shown is the baseline data set discriminated according to subset.




Figure 11 b) Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , showing the predictions of the generalized hydraulic geometry relations as the parameter α_r is varied from 0.8 to 1.2. Increasing α_r is associated with decreasing channel resistance. Also shown is the baseline data set discriminated according to subset.





Figure 11 c) Dimensionless bankfull width \tilde{B} , dimensionless bankfull depth \tilde{H} and down-channel bed slope S as functions of dimensionless bankfull discharge \hat{Q} , showing the predictions of the generalized hydraulic geometry relations as the parameter α_y is varied from 0.5 to 1.5. Increasing α_y is associated with increasing gravel supply. Also shown is the baseline data set discriminated according to subset.






Figure 13 Predicted versus reported bankfull discharge for the baseline data set, discriminated according to subset.




Figure 14 Predicted versus reported bankfull discharge for the Maryland and Britain II subsets.




Figure 15 Estimated fraction of the resistance coefficient that is form drag versus the ratio H_{bf}/D_{s50} , based on the assumption that D_{s90}/D_{s50} is equal to 3.