**Appendix N** 

# Geomorphology, Sediment Transport, and Vegetation Assessment

Draft Program Environmental Impact Statement/Report



## Geomorphology, Sediment Transport, and Vegetation Assessment

## **Report Prepared by:**

Blair P. Greimann, P.E., Ph.D., Hydraulic Engineer Sedimentation and River Hydraulics Group, Technical Service Center

Signature:\_\_\_\_\_

Lisa Fotherby, P.E., Ph.D., Hydraulic Engineer Sedimentation and River Hydraulics Group, Technical Service Center

Signature:\_\_\_\_\_

**Peer Reviewed by:** 

Elaina Holburn, P.E., M.S., Hydraulic Engineer Sedimentation and River Hydraulics Group, Technical Service Center

Signature:\_\_\_\_\_

## **Table of Contents**

1.0	Intr	roduction	
2.0	Rea	ich Descriptions	
3.0	Desc	cription of Hydrologic Scenarios	
4.0	Met	thods	
	4.1	Geomorphic Assessment	
	4.2	Sediment Mobility Analyses	
	4.3	Sediment Transport and Erosions/Deposition	
	4.4	Vegetation	
5.0	Sum	nmary of Results	
	5.1	Reach 1a	
		5.1.1 Description	
		5.1.2 Summary of Findings	
	5.2	Reach 1b	5-9
		5.2.1 Description	5-9
		5.2.2 Summary of Findings	5-9
	5.3	Reach 2a	5-15
		5.3.1 Description	5-15
		5.3.2 Summary of Findings	5-15
	5.4	Reach 2b	5-20
		5.4.1 Description	5-20
		5.4.2 Summary of Findings	5-21
	5.5	Reach 3	5-26
		5.5.1 Description	5-26
		5.5.2 Summary of Project Impacts	5-27
	5.6	Reach 4a	5-31
		5.6.1 Description	5-31
		5.6.2 Summary of Findings	5-31
	5.7	Reach 4b1	5-34
		5.7.1 Description	5-34
		5.7.2 Summary of Findings	5-35

	5.8	Reach	4b2	
		5.8.1	Description	
		5.8.2	Summary of Findings	
	5.9	Reach	5	
		5.9.1	Description	
		5.9.2	Summary of Findings	
	5.10	Eastsic	le Bypass	5-47
		5.10.1	Description	
		5.10.2	Summary of Findings	5-47
	5.11	Maripo	osa Bypass	
		5.11.1	Description	
		5.11.2	Summary of Findings	
6.0	Sum	mary		
7.0	Refe	rences.		

#### Attachments

- Attachment 1 Bed Sediment Sampling
- Attachment 2 San Joaquin River Geomorphic Assessment Using Historical Aerial Photographs, California: Friant Dam to Route 99 Bridge

Exhibit – Historical Channel Measurements

Exhibit - Channel Mapping

- Attachment 3 Sediment Mobilization Assessment
  - Exhibit Reference Sediment Motion
  - Exhibit Average Channel Hydraulic Data
  - Exhibit Sensitivity Analysis of Sediment Transport Capacity Using Parker's Gravel-Sand-Mixed Transport Equation Combined with Engelund and Hansen's Sand Transport Equation
  - Exhibit Sensitivity Analysis of Annual Sediment Load Under Current Hydrology Using Parker's Gravel-Sand-Mixed Transport Equation Combined with Engelund and Hansen's Sand Transport Equation
- Attachment 4 Assessment of Sediment Transport and Channel Morphology on the San Joaquin River from Friant Dam to Mendota Dam
  - Exhibit Boundary Conditions Used in SRH-1D: San Joaquin River from Mendota Dam to the Merced River
  - Exhibit Computed Water Surface Profiles: San Joaquin River from Mendota Dam to the Merced River
  - Exhibit Sensitivity Analysis of Sediment Transport Modeling
- Attachment 5 Assessment of Sediment Transport and Channel Morphology on the San Joaquin River from Mendota Dam to the Merced River
  - Exhibit Boundary Conditions Used in SRH-1D: San Joaquin River from Mendota Dam to the Merced River
  - Exhibit Lateral Sediment Incoming from the Upper Reach of Eastside Bypass
  - Exhibit Computed Water Surface Profiles: San Joaquin River from Mendota Dam to the Merced River
  - Exhibit Sensitivity Analysis on Historical Hydrology Runs and Sediment Transport Parameters
  - Exhibit Sensitivity Analysis on Incoming Sediment Loads at Mendota Dam with Baseline and Alternative Hydrology
- Attachment 6 SRH-1DV Vegetation Modeling of the San Joaquin River, Friant Dam to Merced River Confluence, California

### Tables

Table 2-1. Reach Locations Defined by the San Joaquin River RestorationStudy Background Report (Modified from McBain and Trush, Inc.,
2002)
Table 3-1. Stream Gages Used in Historical Flow Analysis
Table 4-1. Categories of Sediment Mobilization
Table 5-1. The Average Slope and $D_{50}$ of the Bed Material
Table 5-2. Summary of Expected Deposition in the Main Channel in
Reach 2b over the 24-Year Simulation Period
Table 6-1. Summary of Effects Relative to Baseline Conditions    6-1
Figures
Figure 2-1. Overview Map of Study Area 2-2
Figure 2-2. Profile of Project Reaches
Figure 3-1. Comparison Between the Existing and Future Conditions at Friant Dam
Figure 3-2. Simulated Daily Flows from January 1, 1980, to September 30, 2003, at Friant Dam for Baseline and Project Conditions (Alternative A)
Figure 3-3. Simulated Daily Flows from January 1, 1998, to September 30, 2003, at Friant Dam for Baseline and Project Conditions (Alternative A)
Figure 3-4. Flow-Duration Curves at Friant Dam
Figure 3-5. Flow-Duration Curves at Gravelly Ford
Figure 3-6. Flow-Duration Curves at San Joaquin Below Chowchilla Bifurcation Structure
Figure 3-7. Flow-Duration Curves at San Joaquin Below Mendota Dam
Figure 3-8. Flow-Duration Curves at San Joaquin Below Sack Dam
Figure 3-9. Flow-Duration Curves Below Sand Slough Control Structure
Figure 3-10. Flow-Duration Curves Below Mariposa Bypass
Figure 3-11. Flow-Duration Curves at Stevinson
Figure 3-12. Flow-Duration Curves at East Side Bypass at El Nido Gage
Figure 3-13. Flow-Duration Curves at Mariposa Bypass Just Downstream from Mariposa Control Structure
Figure 5-1. Results of Reclamation Bed Material Sampling in Reach in 2008
Figure 5-2. Gravel Bar Below Rank Island in Reach 1a (RP 259)
Figure 5-3. Sand Bar in Reach 1a (RP 248)
Figure 5-4. Riffle just Downstream from Highway 41 in Reach 1a (RP 255.1)
,

Figure 5-5. Riffle Approximately 0.5 Mile Upstream from Highway 99 in Reach 1a (RP 245.5)
Figure 5-6. Comparison of Native Plant Productivity Width by Reach for Baseline and Alternative A Flows
Figure 5-7. Comparison of Invasive Plant Productivity Width by Reach for Baseline and Alternative A Flows
Figure 5-8. Sandy Bank at RP 241
Figure 5-9. Sand Bar Downstream from SH 145 (RP 233.9)5-11
Figure 5-10. Heavily Vegetated Banks in Reach 1b
Figure 5-11. Riffle Bed Material Between Highway 99 and Skaggs Bridge in Reach 1b
Figure 5-12. Riffle Bed Material Upstream from SH 145 in Reach 1b 5-13
Figure 5-13. Riffle Bed Material at Gravelly Ford
Figure 5-14. Native Vegetation Mortality with Baseline and Alternative A Flows
Figure 5-15. Invasive Vegetation Mortality with Baseline and Alternative
Figure 5-16. Bed Material in Reach 2a at RP 227.1, Approximately 0.25
Mile Downstream from Gravelly Ford Stream Gage
Figure 5-17. Bed Material in Reach 2a at RP 226.9, Approximately 0.5 Mile Downstream from Gravelly Ford Stream Gage
Figure 5-18. Termination of the Wet Reach of the San Joaquin River in the Transition Between Reach 1b and 2a, Approximately 0.25 Mile
Downstream from the Gravelly Ford Stream Gage (RP 227.1)
Figure 5-19. Dry Channel in Reach 2a at RP 218
Period of 300-cfs Releases in 2008 (RP 222)
Figure 5-21. Wet Channel in Reach 2a at RP 226.9, Approximately 0.7 Mile Downstream from Gravelly Ford 5-19
Figure 5-22. Typical Bank Composed of Fines Along the Outside of a
Bend in Reach 2a
Figure 5-23. Looking Downstream from Chowchilla Bifurcation
Structure at Upstream End of Reach 2b
Figure 5-24. Looking Upstream from San Mateo Crossing (RP 211.9)5-23
Figure 5-25. Looking Downstream from San Mateo Crossing (RP 211.9) 5-24
Figure 5-26. Overview of Reach 2b, Showing Large-Amplitude Meanders 5-24
Figure 5-27. Detailed Topographic Map of Bend in Reach 2b 5-25
Figure 5-28. Thalweg Profiles of Existing Conditions (1998 Topography) and of Alternative A in Reach 2b After a Simulation of 24 Years of
Alternative A Flow Regime
Figure 5-29. Looking Downstream at Reach 3 from Mendota Dam 5-29

Figure 5-30. Looking Upstream at Reach 3 near Firebaugh	5-29
Figure 5-31. Looking Downstream at Sack Dam	5-30
Figure 5-32. Discharge at Mendota Pool: Historical, Baseline, and	
Alternative A	5-30
Figure 5-33. Taken from Sack Dam Looking Downstream	5-33
Figure 5-34. Photograph Showing Pool Supplied by Seepage from Canal Flows or Irrigation Returns (RP 177.1)	5-33
Figure 5-35. Dry Section of Reach 4a (RP 172.7)	5-34
Figure 5-36. Taken Looking Downstream at Reach 4b1 from Bridge on Erreca Road at RP 157.1	5-36
Figure 5-37. Taken Looking at the San Joaquin River at RP 153.5 in Reach 4b1	5-37
Figure 5-38. Photograph Taken in Reach 4b1 in the San Luis National	
Wildlife Refuge (RP 149.1)	5-37
Figure 5-39. Main Channel in Reach 4b2 at RP 138.8 Looking Upstream	5-39
Figure 5-40. Photograph of Reach 4b2 Looking Downstream near RP	
141.2	5-40
Figure 5-41. Floodplain Terrace in Reach 4b2 at RP 138.8	5-40
Figure 5-42. Reach 4b2 Looking Upstream at an Old Ferry Dock	5-41
Figure 5-43. Looking Downstream at Reach 5 at RP 134.1	5-43
Figure 5-44. Confluence of San Joaquin and Merced Rivers	5-44
Figure 5-45. Photograph of SH 165 Bridge (RP 132.8)	5-45
Figure 5-46. Photograph of SH 165 Bridge	5-46
Figure 5-47. Looking Upstream at Eastside Bypass Approximately 1 Mile Downstream from Sand Slough Control Structure	5-48
Figure 5-48. Looking Upstream at Eastside Bypass, Approximately 4 miles Upstream from the Confluence with the San Joaquin River, Downstream from the Confluence with Bear Creek	5-49
Figure 5-49. Picture looking Downstream on Bear Creek. After Confluence of Eastside Bypass and Bear Creek, Approximately 1 Mile Upstream from Confluence with San Joaquin River	5-49
Figure 5-50. Looking Downstream from El Nido Stream Gage. Approximately 2.5 Miles Downstream from Sand Slough Control Structure	5-50
Figure 5-51 Looking Upstream at Eastside Rypass Approximately 1	
Mile Upstream from the Mariposa Control Structure	5-50
Figure 5-52. Looking Upstream at Eastside Bypass. Approximately 8 Miles Upstream from the Confluence with the San Joaquin River,	
1.5 Miles Downstream from Mariposa Bypass Channel	5-51

Figure 5-53. Looking Upstream at East Side Bypass Approximately 1.5	
Miles Upstream from Confluence with Bear Creek, 4 Miles	
Downstream from Mariposa Control Structure	5-51
Figure 5-54. Looking Downstream from Mariposa Control Structure at	
Mariposa Bypass	5-53
Figure 5-55. Looking Upstream in Mariposa Bypass	5-53
Figure 5-56. Looking Upstream from Downstream Grade Control on	
Mariposa Bypass	5-54
Figure 5-57. Looking Downstream from Downstream Grade Control on	
Mariposa Bypass	5-54

## **List of Abbreviations and Acronyms**

ALS	Average Levee Setback
cfs	cubic feet per second
ka	kiloannum
Ma	megaannum
MEI	Mussetter Engineering, Inc.
MLS	Maximum Levee Setback
mm	millimeter
PEIS/R	Program Environmental Impact Statement/Report
Reclamation	U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
RP	river post
SJRRP	San Joaquin River Restoration Program
SRH-1D	Sedimentation and River Hydraulics – One Dimensional
USGS	
0000	U.S. Geological Survey
TSC	U.S. Geological Survey Technical Service Center

## 1 1.0 Introduction

2 The Denver Technical Service Center (TSC) of the U.S. Department of the Interior,

3 Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) was requested to perform an analysis of the

4 geomorphology, sediment transport, and vegetation effects in the San Joaquin River

5 between Friant Dam and the Merced River resulting from implementation of the San

- 6 Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP). This report is intended to support the
- 7 Program Environmental Impact Statement/Report (PEIS/R). Previous analyses of the
- 8 sediment transport characteristics have been performed by McBain and Trush (2002) and
- 9 Mussetter Engineering, Inc. (MEI) (2002a). The purpose of this study is to verify those

10 previous analyses and compare the conditions under the SJRRP to Baseline Conditions.

Baseline Conditions and conditions under the SJRRP are detailed in Appendix H,

12 Modeling, of the PEIS/R. Conditions under the SJRRP are termed Project Conditions in 13 this report

13 this report.

14 To perform this assessment, we compared the geomorphic, sediment transport, and

15 vegetation response to changes between Baseline Conditions and Project Conditions.

16 Baseline Conditions are defined as those conditions that will persist into the future

17 without the implementation of the SJRRP. Project Conditions are those conditions under

18 the implementation of the SJRRP. The analyses presented here focus on the difference in

responses due to the change in river flows between Baseline Conditions and Project

- 20 Conditions.
- 21 Four separate analyses were performed:

22	1.	Geomorphic assessment of the San Joaquin River from Friant Dam to
23		Highway 99 (Attachment 2). This study reviewed previous geomorphology
24		studies in this reach and analyzed changes to the river form since the construction
25		of Friant Dam. Geomorphic data in this study provide information about the
26		characteristics of the river channel, and the dominant fluvial processes operating
27		before dam construction and extensive in-channel gravel mining.
28	2.	Bed material mobility of the San Joaquin River between Friant Dam to
20		Mondota Dam (Attachment 3) This study analyzed the mobility of the had

- Mendota Dam (Attachment 3). This study analyzed the mobility of the bed
   sediment under Baseline Conditions and Project Conditions.
- 31 3. Sediment transport and erosion/deposition in all project reaches
   32 (Attachments 4 and 5). A mobile bed sediment transport model (SRH-1D) was
   33 used to estimate sediment transport rates and to predict future erosion and
   34 deposition under Baseline Conditions and Project Conditions.
- 4. Vegetation response to hydrologic changes (Attachment 6). An extension to
  the SRH-1D model, called SRH-1DV, was used to predict the vegetation response
  to Baseline Conditions and Project Conditions. SRH-1DV has a vegetation

- 1 module that computes the response of vegetation to flow and sediment transport 2 conditions.
- 3 This report summarizes the results of these investigations. Detailed descriptions of the
- 4 individual analyses are provided as attachments to this report.

## 1 2.0 Reach Descriptions

2 Project reaches are defined by changes in the channel and valley morphology or by

3 structures that significantly alter the flow regime. Locations of the project reaches are

4 shown in Figure 2-1. The profile of the project reaches is given in Figure 2-2.

5 The project area analyzed includes the main stem of the San Joaquin River and the

6 associated flood bypass system from Friant Dam to the Merced River. The main stem of

7 the San Joaquin River is divided into five main project reaches and nine subreaches

8 (1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3, 4a, 4b1, 4b2, and 5). The extent and description of each reach and

9 subreach is given in Table 2-1. More detailed descriptions of the reaches are provided in

- 10 the summary of the results section (Section 5). McBain and Trush, Inc. (2002) have
- 11 written an extensive description of the Historical and Existing conditions of these
- 12 reaches.





2.0 Reach Descriptions

## Table 2-1. Reach Locations Defined by the San Joaquin River Restoration Study Background Report (Modified from McBain and Trush, Inc., 2002)

Reach	Subreach	SubreachRanch Boundary (River Post)General Desc	
4	1a	267.5 – 243.2	Friant Dam to State Route 99
I	1b	243.2 - 229.0	State Route 99 to Gravelly Ford
•	2a	229.0 – 216.1	Gravelly Ford to the Chowchilla Bifurcation Structure
2	2b 216.1 – 204.8		Chowchilla Bifurcation Structure to Mendota Dam
3	3	204.8 – 182.0	Mendota Dam to Sack Dam
	4a	182.0 – 168.5	Sack Dam to the Sand Slough Control Structure
4	4b1	168.5 – 147.2	Sand Slough Control Structure to the Confluence with the Mariposa Bypass
*	4b2	147.2 – 135.8	Confluence with the Mariposa Bypass to the confluence with Bear Creek and the Eastside Bypass
5	5	135.8 – 118.0	Confluence with Bear Creek and the Eastside Bypass to the Merced River confluence

## **3.0 Description of Hydrologic Scenarios**

2 Three different hydrologic data sets were analyzed in this report: Baseline Conditions,

3 Project Conditions, and Historical Gage data (referred to as Historical Conditions).

4 Baseline Conditions refer to simulated flows developed through CalSim II, assuming that

5 current water operations would continue into the future, and the Historical hydrologic

6 conditions occur again. Monthly average flows from CalSim II were then downscaled to

7 daily flows. These daily flows were also used in HEC5Q simulations of the river

8 temperature. Additional details of the hydrologic modeling of the Baseline Conditions are

9 given in Appendix H of the PEIS/R.

10 In this report, Project Conditions are also referred to as Alternative A and represent the

11 Exhibit B flow schedule, assuming the historic hydrology inputs (e.g., annual rainfall) to

12 the system were to occur again. Alternative A represents with-project flow conditions

13 under all Program Alternatives described in the PEIS/R. Project Conditions also assume

14 that the maximum flows into Reach 2b and Reach 4b1 will be 4,500 cubic feet per second

15 (cfs) and 475 cfs, respectively. More details of the Baseline and Project scenarios are

16 found in Appendix H of the PEIS/R.

17 Two sets of Baseline and Project scenarios were developed: Future and Existing. For the

18 purposes of this report, however, the Future and Existing scenarios are considered

19 identical. This is based upon an analysis of the flow-duration curves that found no

20 significant difference between the two scenarios (Figure 3-1).

21 Historical gage data were derived from U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) stream gages

22 given in Table 3-1. A comparison between the daily average flows simulated under

23 Baseline Conditions and Project Conditions (Alternative A) is shown in Figure 3-2 from

January 1, 1980, to September 30, 2003, and in Figure 3-3 from January 1, 1998, to

25 September 30, 2003. Compared to Baseline Conditions, base flows are increased under

26 Project Conditions, and almost every year is characterized by a flow of at least 1,000 cfs.

27 However, the peak flows during the wet years under Project Conditions are generally

28 decreased from Baseline Conditions.





6

 $\begin{array}{c}
 1 \\
 2 \\
 3 \\
 4 \\
 5
 \end{array}$ 

Table 3-1.Stream Gages Used in Historical Flow Analysis

Description	Stream Gage ID	River Post	HEC- RAS XC	Agency	Description
San Joaquin River below Friant Dam	MIL	267.5	XS596	Reclamation	1944 – Present
Donny Bridge	H41	255	XS425	Reclamation	1989 – Present
Highway 145 Bridge (Skaggs Bridge)	SKB	234	XS92	Reclamation	1988 – Present
San Joaquin River near Gravelly Ford	GRF	227.5	XSA213	Reclamation	1974 – Present
Chowchilla Bypass downstream from Chowchilla Bifurcation Structure	CBP	-	-	DWR	1974 – Present
San Joaquin River downstream from Chowchilla Bifurcation Structure	SJB	216	XSA97	Reclamation	1986 – Present
				USGS	1940 –1954
San Joaquin River near Mendota	11254000	202	XS730	Reclamation	1974 – 1997 2000 – present
San Joaquin River near Dos	44050000	101	VO 4C4	USGS	1941 – 1954
Palos	11256000	181	XS464	Reclamation	1986, 1987, 1995
San Joaquin River near El Nido	11260000	168	XS304	USGS	1940 – 1949
Eastside Bypass near El Nido	ELN	N/A	N/A	DWR	1980 – present
Mariposa Bypass near Crane Ranch	N/A	N/A	N/A	DWR	1981 – 1994
Eastside Bypass below Mariposa Bypass	EBM	N/A	N/A	DWR	1980 – present
Bear Creek below Eastside Canal	BBE	N/A	N/A	DWR	1980 – present
San Joaquin River near Stevinson	SJS	133	XS199M	DWR	1981 – present
Salt Slough at HW 165 near	11261100	N/A	N/A	USGS	1986 – 1994, 1996 – present
Stevinson				DWR	1980 – present
San Joaquin River at Fremont Ford Bridge	11261500	125	XS99M	USGS	1937 – 1989
Mud Slough near Gustine	11262900	N/A	N/A	USGS	1986 – present
Merced River near Stevinson	11272500	N/A	N/A	USGS	1941 – Present
San Joaquin River near Newman	11274000	118	XS1M	USGS	1912 – present

Key:

DWR = California Department of Water Resources ID = Irrigation District USGS = U.S. Geological Survey



Simulated Daily Flows from January 1, 1980, to September 30, 2003, at Friant Dam for Baseline and Project Conditions (Alternative A)



Simulated Daily Flows from January 1, 1998, to September 30, 2003, at Friant Dam
 for Baseline and Project Conditions (Alternative A)

- 1 Flow-duration curves using the Historical Gage data, Baseline Conditions, and
- 2 Alternative A (Project Conditions) were developed. The common period used to develop
- 3 the flow-duration curves was from January 1, 1980, to May 31, 1997. This period of flow
- 4 record was available for the stream gage locations: San Joaquin River Below Friant Dam,
- 5 Gravelly Ford, Mendota Dam, and Eastside Bypass at El Nido.

6 At Friant Dam, Alternative A has an increase in flow in the range between 350 cfs and

7 2,300 cfs, as compared to Baseline Conditions (Figure 3-4). The minimum flow is

8 approximately 350 cfs under Alternative A, whereas under Baseline Conditions, the

- 9 minimum flow is approximately 100 cfs. Alternative A hydrology also has a slightly
- 10 lower frequency of flows above 2,300 cfs than Baseline Conditions. The increase in
- 11 flows below 2,300 cfs results in more available storage in Millerton Reservoir. Therefore,
- 12 during wet years, more storage would be available in the reservoir, and the dam would
- 13 spill less often.
- 14 At Gravelly Ford, a comparison between Alternative A and Baseline Conditions (Figure
- 15 3-5) shows similar patterns as those at Friant Dam. Alternative A has a higher frequency
- 16 of flows between 100 and 2,300 cfs and a lower frequency of flows above 2,300 cfs. An
- 17 important consequence of the lower frequency of flows above 2,300 cfs is that the peak

18 flood flows may be reduced under Project Conditions in Reaches 1 and 2 because there is

- 19 more storage available in Millerton Reservoir.
- 20 At San Joaquin below the Chowchilla Bifurcation Structure, Alternative A is
- 21 characterized by an increased frequency of flow at all discharges, as compared to
- 22 Baseline Conditions (Figure 3-6). Under Alternative A, the flow at this gage is above
- 23 100 cfs 90 percent of the time, whereas under Baseline Conditions, the flow is essentially
- 24 0 cfs about 44 percent of the time. Significant differences exist between Baseline
- 25 Conditions and the Historical Gage data. However, the hydrologic model is not intended
- 26 to exactly reproduce Historical Gage data because the operations at Friant Dam and the

27 Chowchilla Bifurcation Structure may have been different in the past, and Baseline

- 28 Conditions assume that operations are as they are now.
- 29 Below Mendota Dam, in Reach 3, Alternative A has a significant increase in the
- 30 frequency of flow above 250 cfs, as compared to Baseline Conditions (Figure 3-7). A
- 31 similar pattern is true below Sack Dam, in Reach 4a (Figure 3-8).
- 32 In Reach 4b1, the flows are substantially increased under Alternative A, relative to
- 33 Baseline Conditions (Figure 3-9). Under Baseline Conditions, the maximum flow in the
- 34 Sand Slough is about 4 cfs, and under Project Conditions, the maximum flow is 475 cfs
- 35 with a minimum flow of above 100 cfs.
- 36 Below the return of the Mariposa Bypass to the San Joaquin River, in Reach 4b2,
- the frequency of flow above 100 cfs and below 475 cfs is substantially increased
- 38 (Figure 3-10) under Project Conditions. Below the return of the Eastside Bypass to the
- 39 San Joaquin River (Figure 3-11), in Reach 5, the frequency of flow between 200 and
- 40 2,000 cfs is also substantially increased from Baseline Conditions to Project Conditions.



Figure 3-4. Flow-Duration Curves at Friant Dam



#### Flow-Duration Curves at Gravelly Ford





1 2 3 4

Flow-Duration Curves at San Joaquin Below Chowchilla Bifurcation Structure



Flow-Duration Curves at San Joaquin Below Mendota Dam



Figure 3-8. Flow-Duration Curves at San Joaquin Below Sack Dam



#### Flow-Duration Curves Below Sand Slough Control Structure

Draft 3-8 – April 2011

5 6 7



Figure 3-10. Flow-Duration Curves Below Mariposa Bypass



#### Flow-Duration Curves at Stevinson

- 1 In the Eastside Bypass, there is a substantial decrease in the frequency of flow above 2
- 2 cfs under Alternative A, relative to Baseline Conditions (Figure 3-12). Alternative A also
- 3 experiences a slight reduction in the frequency of flow above 1,500 cfs, compared with
- 4 Baseline Conditions. In the Mariposa Bypass, Alternative A has a reduced frequency of
- 5 flow for all flows above 2 cfs (Figure 3-13).





1 2 3 4 5

This page left blank intentionally.

## 1 4.0 Methods

2 As mentioned previously, four separate analyses were performed: a geomorphic

3 assessment, a sediment mobility analyses, estimates of sediment erosion and deposition,

4 and an assessment of the vegetation response to flow alterations.

### 5 4.1 Geomorphic Assessment

6 The geomorphic assessment analyzed changes in channel planform from between 1938 7 and 2007 (Attachment 2, Geomorphology Report). The study reach extends for 8 approximately 24 miles from Friant Dam to the Route 99 bridge and is located only 9 within Reach 1a. Significant geomorphic analyses have been previously reported in Cain 10 (1997) and McBain and Trush (2002) for other reaches of the San Joaquin River. 11 Additional investigations of geomorphology are also planned to be completed in the 12 future for other downstream reaches. The assessment primarily relied upon georeferenced 13 aerial photography from 1938 and 2007 that were used to measure changes in channel 14 planform. For each year of photography, active channels, side channels, unvegetated bars, 15 vegetated bars, and flood channels were mapped. Delineation and interpretation of these 16 features identified pre-dam river conditions and post-dam river adjustments. Upon the 17 release of larger flows, this assessment can be used to predict geomorphic characteristics 18 that would most likely develop under an altered flow and sediment regime.

## 19 4.2 Sediment Mobility Analyses

20 The bed material mobility of the San Joaquin River between Friant Dam and Highway 99 21 was analyzed under Baseline Conditions and Project Conditions (Attachment 3, Sediment 22 Mobilization). The MEI hydraulic model (2002a) and the sediment sampling data from 23 Attachment 1 were used in the analysis. The sediment bed mobility analysis was focused 24 upon riffle sections of the river where the presence of gravels was identified from 25 sediment sampling and field verification. Three categories of mobilization, based upon a 26 non-dimensional number, known as Shield's number, are defined in Table 4-1. The 27 Shield's number is the ratio of shear forces acting on a sediment particle to the weight of 28 the particle. Greater Shield's numbers indicate greater amounts of sediment movement. 29 Various values of the Shield's number have been associated with sediment mobilization, 30 and this study made an initial recommendation as to the value of the Shield's number for 31 various degrees of mobilization. Field data need to be collected to verify the values in 32 Table 4-1.

Categories of Sediment Mobilization			
Shield's Number	Description		
0.03	Slight Mobilization: There is a small, but measurable, sediment transport rate.		
0.045	Significant Mobilization: Many particles are moving, and there is a significant sediment transport rate. Some sand is mobilized in the interstitial spaces of the bed.		
0.06	Full Mobilization: Practically all the bed material is in motion, and there is significant reworking of river bed sediment and mobilization of sand within interstitial spaces.		

Table 4-1.

3

4 The degree of mobilization between Alternative A and Baseline Conditions was analyzed

5 using an index that is a measure of the time that the bed material experiences given

6 degrees of mobilization. To develop this index, the fraction of sediment sample sites

7 experiencing various degrees of mobilization was computed using the MEI hydraulic

8 model (2002a), sediment sampling data in Attachment 1, and pebble counts from

9 Stillwater Sciences (2003). Hydraulic conditions and bed mobility were analyzed at each

10 site where sediment samples were collected. The fraction of sites experiencing specific

11 amounts of mobilization was computed for a range of flows, and an empirical function

12 was fit to the results. This empirical function was then used in conjunction with the

13 simulated daily average flows from the Baseline and Alternative A conditions to compute

14 the mobilization index.

#### 4.3 Sediment Transport and Erosions/Deposition 15

16 The bed erosion and deposition from Friant Dam to Mendota Dam was analyzed and 17 described in detail in Attachment 4, Sediment Transport Modeling Friant to Mendota. 18 SRH-1D (Huang and Greimann 2007) was used to estimate erosion and deposition under 19 Baseline and Project conditions. SRH-1D requires several types of input: hydrology data, 20 geometry data, and sediment data. Hydrology data were obtained from the simulated 21 daily average flows from the Baseline and Alternative A scenarios for the Historical 22 hydrologic period from January 1, 1980, to September 30, 2003 (see Appendix H, 23 "Modeling"). Geometry data were extracted from MEI (2002a), and sediment data were 24 derived from the sampling efforts described in Attachment 1. Measured Historical stream 25 gage data were also used to simulate the behavior of the river. Bed erosion and deposition 26 from Mendota Dam to the Merced River were analyzed in a similar manner, as described

27 in Attachment 5, Sediment Transport Modeling Mendota to Merced.

#### 4.4 Vegetation 28

29 An analysis of vegetation response to flow regimes and mechanical actions of the

30 alternatives is presented in Attachment 6, Vegetation Analysis. A vegetation module was

- 31 added to the sediment transport program, SRH-1D, which uses the same hydrology,
- 32 geometry, and sediment inputs described in Attachments 4 and 5. Vegetation parameters
- 33 were also incorporated that describe six vegetation types: Fremont cottonwood (*Populus*

1 *fremontii*), Goodings black willow (*Salix gooddingii*), narrow-leaf willow or sandbar

2 willow (*Salix exigua*), scarlet wisteria or red sespania (*Sesbania punicea*), arundo or giant

3 reed (*Arundo donax*), and a generic grass. Fremont cottonwood, Goodings black willow,

4 and narrow-leaf willow represent native plants; red sespania and arundo represent

5 invasive plants; and the generic grass is used to identify ground cover for high, dry areas.

6 Grass is the only vegetation type not subject to desiccation in the models. Mechanics of

the establishment, growth, and mortality of these vegetation types are tracked daily by
 SRH-1DV at every point of every cross section, over the period of the hydrologic record.

8 SRH-1DV at every point of every cross section, over the period of the hydrologic record.
9 One point in a cross section can support the growth of multiple vegetation types and

represents the vegetative cover for the area surrounding the point. The plant productivity

11 area is computed by independently summing the total area where each vegetation type

12 grows and then summing areas of native or invasive plant types. Because each plant type

13 is computed independently, the total native or total invasive plant productivity area can

14 be as much as two (invasives – red sespania and arundo) to three (natives – cottonwood,

15 black willow, and narrow-leaf willow) times larger than the actual predicted area in the

16 field. The plant productivity area divided by reach length provides a second indicator

17 (plant productivity width) to compare vegetation conditions between reaches of the river.

18 Both sediment models, Friant Dam to Mendota Pool and Mendota Pool to Merced, were

19 used in the vegetation analysis to provide an assessment of vegetation response to

20 program actions in Reaches 1 to 5. The greatest strength of this tool is in predictive

21 comparisons, rather than predictions of absolute values. Quantitative values of plant

22 productivity are sometimes presented as ratios or percentages based on total plant

23 productivity predicted for Historical flow conditions. Predicted outcomes are therefore

24 described as relative increases or decreases with respect to Historical Conditions.

2

This page left blank intentionally.