

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Schwendel, Arved, Fuller, Ian C and Death, Russell G (2010) Morphological dynamics of upland headwater streams in the southern North Island of New Zealand. *New Zealand Geographer*, 66 (1). pp. 14-32.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/3069/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1745-7939.2010.01170.x>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at
ray@yorks.ac.uk



Morphological dynamics of upland headwater streams in the southern North Island of New Zealand

Journal:	<i>New Zealand Geographer</i>
Manuscript ID:	NZG-2009-010.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Bedload, DEM, Gravel-bed river, Morphological budget, Sediment transfer, Stream bed stability



Manuscript Only

1
2
3
4 **Morphological dynamics of upland headwater streams in the southern**
5
6
7 **North Island of New Zealand**
8
9

10
11
12 Arved C. Schwendel

13
14 Ecology Group, Institute of Natural Resources, Massey University, Private Bag 11222,
15
16 Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand, Email: A.C.Schwendel@massey.ac.nz, phone
17
18 +64 (0)6 3569099 ext 2342, fax +64 (0)6 3505623
19
20

21
22 Ian C. Fuller

23
24 Geography Programme, School of People, Environment & Planning,
25
26 Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand
27

28
29 Russell G. Death

30
31 Ecology Group, Institute of Natural Resources, Massey University, Palmerston North,
32
33 New Zealand
34

35
36
37
38 Biographical notes:

39
40 Arved Schwendel is a PhD student at Massey University where he investigates the
41
42 influence of stream bed stability on lotic ecosystems. Ian Fuller is a Senior Lecturer in
43
44 Physical Geography at Massey University whose primary research interests lie in river
45
46 channel dynamics, slope-channel coupling and alluvial histories. Russell Death is
47
48 Associate Professor in Ecology at Massey University whose research focuses on
49
50 invertebrate community ecology and diversity-disturbance relations in stream
51
52 ecosystems.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running title: Dynamics of headwater streams

Abstract

Short-term channel dynamics of mountain stream reaches in the southern North Island of New Zealand were assessed over two successive 3 month periods using morphological budgeting. Response to floods varies between reaches, even when the catchments were located close to each other and had similar characteristics. The reaches on the Central Volcanic Plateau experienced least morphological change while streams with steep catchments and migrating planform in the Tararua and Ruahine Ranges showed frequent channel adjustments. Channel response is conditioned by intrinsic variables rendering reaches responsive or robust to the effects of floods and this is likely to reflect the degree of connectivity between slopes and channels and reaches.

Keywords

Bedload, DEM, Gravel-bed river, Morphological budget, Sediment transfer, Stream bed stability

Introduction

Mountain streams are commonly defined as having a steep gradient (e.g. > 0.002 m/m), gravel to boulder dominated substrate and spatially limited floodplain width (Wohl & Merritt 2008). Tectonic activity, glacial history, large woody debris, and sediment input from hillsides and tributaries cause segmentation of the longitudinal profile (Chin & Wohl 2005, Wohl & Merritt 2005) and result in a variety of channel types that are not positioned in a typical sequence (e.g. cascade to riffle-pool in downstream direction). Evolution of these channel typologies is rather determined by transport capacity and sediment supply which reflect local lithology (grain size and shape), slope and land cover (Thompson *et al.* 2006).

On a global scale New Zealand mountain streams are regarded as severely impacted by loss of biotic integrity, and moderately impacted by anthropogenic channel alteration and land use (including past deforestation and mining) (Wohl 2006). Despite human influence on channel dynamics headwater reaches in New Zealand are often perceived as having naturally relatively unstable beds (e.g. Mosley & Blakely 1977) which implies high rates of sediment transfer. This in turn suggests a sufficient supply of sediments from the catchment as well as competent flows to move them. The geologically young axial ranges in the southern part of the North Island consist of shattered and faulted rocks (Williams 1991) and experience high rates of uplift and erosion (Whitehouse & Pearce 1992). In addition earthquakes may trigger substantial mass movements in these catchments (Goff & McFadgen 2002) and in the central plateau volcanic activity also contributes to the potential to provide large amounts of material to river systems (Manville *et al.* 2009). Furthermore, high rainfall variability

1
2
3
4 promotes not only weathering but can also cause frequent floods and flashy discharge
5
6 regimes. Hence there is reason to believe that upland streams are morphologically
7
8 dynamic. However, to date no research has compared short-term dynamics of different
9
10 mountain stream systems in New Zealand.
11
12

13
14 This paper explores the morphological responses of twelve mountain streams to
15
16 floods and spates over seven months. We focus on topographic changes of the stream
17
18 channel rather than on bedload transport rate as an indicator of overall stream dynamic
19
20 which incorporates both morphological change of banks and bed. Morphological
21
22 budgeting is well suited for this purpose because it allows quantification of spatial
23
24 patterns in sediment transfer within the channel (Ashmore & Church 1998, Fuller *et al.*
25
26 2003a) and provides a lower bound estimate of sediment flux (Fuller *et al.* 2002,
27
28 Lindsay & Ashmore 2002). Comparison of digital elevation models (DEMs) of river
29
30 morphology before and after a flood event directly reveals processes such as erosion
31
32 and deposition while the interpretation of DEMs of change in combination with site
33
34 knowledge can lead to the identification of processes driving the topographic changes
35
36 observed.
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 The factors influencing the morphological dynamics of a reach act on different
44
45 spatial and temporal scales. While slope, substrate characteristics, connectivity and
46
47 sediment supply vary between reaches (Hooke 2003, Fryirs *et al.* 2007), the influence of
48
49 land cover (vegetation) on flood generation is higher at the catchment scale. The
50
51 magnitude and recurrence interval characterises an event but the (long-term) processes
52
53 occurring between events are also important for the morphological response to
54
55 increased flows. We used catchment parameters from the Freshwater Environments of
56
57 New Zealand (FWENZ) database (Wild *et al.* 2005) to evaluate their importance to
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 explain the differences in morphological dynamics between the twelve reaches
5
6 investigated here.
7
8

9 **Sites and methodology**

10 *Sites*

11
12
13
14
15
16 Topographic surveys were carried out at 12 second to fifth order mountain rivers and
17
18 streams in the southern part of the North Island of New Zealand. These reaches were
19
20 chosen because their catchments have relatively low anthropogenic modifications and
21
22 their position within larger catchments is comparable. Within groups of sites
23
24 geographical setting and catchment land cover are similar. They form part of the
25
26 Manawatu, Tukituki, Ruamahanga, Otaki, Tongariro and Wanganui catchments which
27
28 drain the eastern and western slopes of the northeast-southwest stretching Ruahine and
29
30 Tararua Ranges and the Central Volcanic Plateau respectively (Fig. 1). Vegetation
31
32 within the catchment upstream of the study reaches is dominated by native broadleaf-
33
34 podocarp forest in the axial ranges and by tussock grassland and scrub around Mt.
35
36 Ruapehu. Andesitic volcanic deposits constitute the bedrock on the Central Plateau
37
38 whereas folded mesozoic greywacke and argillite of varying decomposition prevail in
39
40 the Tararua and Ruahine Ranges (Mosley 1978a).
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Hydraulic and substrate characteristics of the study reaches varied considerably
48
49 representing the variety of mountain streams in the lower North Island (Table 1).
50

51 Substrate composition ranges from heterogeneous assemblages with a relatively high
52
53 proportion of boulders (e.g. Pukeonake) to well sorted gravel-dominated stream beds
54
55 (e.g. Mangapuaka) (Fig. 2). The channels comprise distinctive features including step-
56
57 pool sequences (e.g. Pukeatua), plane-bed sections (e.g. Tamaki), riffle-pool units (e.g.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Manawatu) and bedrock confined sections (e.g. Ohau). Lateral confinements by stable
5
6 banks or steep valley sides are common, although, at some sites channels could shift
7
8 freely in a wide active floodplain (e.g. Waipawa).
9
10

11 12 13 14 *Survey*

15
16 Between October 2007 and May 2008 three topographic surveys at each of the twelve
17
18 reaches were conducted. Three dimensional point coordinates were measured using a
19
20 differential GPS system (R8, Trimble Navigation Limited, Sunnyvale, USA) in RTK
21
22 mode (cf. Brasington *et al.* 2000) in combination with a electronic total station GTS 701
23
24 (Topcon Corporation, Tokyo, Japan) when satellite reception was limited. The GPS
25
26 base receiver was installed some distance from each reach in order to prevent multipath
27
28 errors (Kennedy 2002). Survey point density was terrain sensitive, i.e. adjusted
29
30 according to the surface complexity being highest at breaks in slopes (c.f. Fuller *et al.*
31
32 2003a). Consequently total point density varied between very structured sites and
33
34 relatively smooth reaches. Substrates larger than cobbles require a grain scale resolution
35
36 to be represented adequately in a DEM together with gravelly surfaces. As this is
37
38 impractical for large survey areas, boulders (b-axis >300 mm) were not considered for
39
40 the budgeting and were excluded from the DEM. Concomitant tracking of *in situ*
41
42 marked boulders showed that only 3% of them moved during floods (A. Schwendel,
43
44 unpublished data). The surveyed length of stream ranges from 30 m to 200 m and was
45
46 chosen to include all characteristic features of the reach. Survey area varies between
47
48 132 m² and 2942 m² and the average point density lies between 0.6 and 11.7 points per
49
50 square metre (Table 2).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Although, compared to errors induced by surface roughness, precision of dGPS
5 and electronic theodolites is high (Brasington *et al.* 2000), atmospheric interference and
6
7 satellite constellation can be a problem. To assess this, frequent measurements of a
8
9 limited number of independent check points during a survey were utilised (Brasington
10
11
12 *et al.* 2000) which revealed a vertical precision of 0.015 m. This compares well to the
13
14 vertical error derived from survey-specific internal quality control data generated by the
15
16 measurement device which ranges between 0.014 and 0.049 m (means per site in
17
18 Table 3). The error induced by surface roughness, e.g. if the measuring pole is set on
19
20 top of a particle or in a gap between grains, is often identified by a percentile of the
21
22 substrate size distribution (Brasington *et al.* 2000, Chappell *et al.* 2003). We used the
23
24 corrected substrate size (upper threshold 300 mm) of the surveyed bed for which 84% is
25
26 finer ($D_{84\text{corr}}$) which for each survey and site significantly exceeds instrument precision
27
28 (Table 3). Additionally, independent cross-sections and local temporary benchmark
29
30 points were measured the same day as each survey. These were used for DEM quality
31
32 analysis as recommended by Fisher & Tate (2006).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Substrate composition was assessed using the Wolman pebble count method
41
42 (Wolman 1954) which measures the b-axis of >100 randomly selected substrate
43
44 particles. The measurements were classified according to a modified Wentworth scale.
45
46
47
48

49 *Interpolation*

50
51 After a detailed check in order to eliminate gross errors and systematic errors, the data
52
53 were interpolated to a regular gridded DEM with Surfer 8.01 (Golden Software, Golden,
54
55 USA) using triangulation with linear interpolation and a grid size of 0.1 m. This grid
56
57 width has been used in similar environments (Lane *et al.* 1994) and is suitable to
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 account for small-scale variation in densely surveyed areas. It is also sufficiently large
5
6 compared with surface roughness to avoid the occurrence of spurious artefacts
7
8
9 (Brasington & Richards 1998). Preliminary analysis (A. C. Schwendel, unpublished
10
11 data) revealed that interpolation with triangulation was most effective amongst the exact
12
13 interpolation methods available in Surfer in representing the surfaces of topographically
14
15 variable stream reaches. In particular the modelling of longitudinal features (e.g. bars
16
17 and trenches), channel side walls and the channel bottom was more realistic than using
18
19 other interpolation methods without the need to introduce breaklines. The latter would
20
21 be very time intensive when analysing a large number of datasets such as 36 in this
22
23 study. Furthermore triangulation with linear interpolation is well suited for a terrain
24
25 sensitive survey (Brasington *et al.* 2000, 2003, Fuller & Hutchinson 2007) and is
26
27 unaffected by problems like over- and undershooting of surfaces near a jump
28
29 discontinuity (Gibbs phenomenon) (Florinsky 2002). Effects of anisotropy (*sensu* Fuller
30
31 *et al.* 2003a) were found to be negligible because the length of the reaches was not
32
33 much higher than the width (A. C. Schwendel, unpublished data).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Comparison of DEMs*

43
44 For each site subtraction of DEMs from successive surveys revealed areas and volumes
45
46 of change. However, DEMs and derived sediment budgets are affected by multiple
47
48 sources of error (Lane 1998) which need to be quantified in order to gain an estimate of
49
50 a threshold of detectable change in topography (Wheaton *et al.* 2007). This threshold
51
52 accounts for propagated random errors emerging from measurement as well as
53
54 interpolation errors. Thus a level of detection of genuine change was assessed
55
56 considering precision of measurement as well as interpolation errors identified by
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 residual analysis, independent data and cross-validation (quasi-independent data). Mean
5
6 errors of all three measures are mostly small (e.g. <0.02 m) and scattered around zero
7
8 indicating little overall systematic bias whereas mean deviation from independent data
9
10 is highest reaching up to 0.08 m (Pukeatua and Pukeonake) (Table 3). Standard
11
12 deviations derived from independent and quasi-independent data are significantly higher
13
14 than the standard deviation of the residuals and of similar size than the error emerging
15
16 from data acquisition ($D_{84\text{corr}}$). In contrast, the precision between surveys (e.g. mean
17
18 error $\pm 1\text{SD}$ of all subsequent surveys is 0.023 ± 0.026 m) which was measured using
19
20 local temporary benchmark points is much lower. Surface roughness is at most sites the
21
22 highest error component and was thus chosen as a rigorous means of assessing DEM
23
24 quality and used for generating a level of change detection.
25
26
27
28
29

30 The propagation of error during the subtraction process was calculated using
31
32 appropriate error propagation formula (Eq. 1) where δ_u is the propagated error (level of
33
34 detection) derived from the errors δ_1 and δ_2 of the input DEMs (cf. Brasington *et al.*
35
36 2003, Lane *et al.* 2003):
37
38
39
40
41

$$\delta_u = ((\delta_1)^2 + (\delta_2)^2)^{0.5} \quad (1).$$

42
43
44
45
46
47 The calculated level of detection ranges from 80 to 257 mm (Table 3) which compares
48
49 well to other studies of gravel-bed rivers, e.g. 80-82 mm (Tamaki and Mangapuaka),
50
51 80-110 mm in Fuller *et al.* (2003b) and 100 mm in Brasington *et al.* (2000).
52
53
54
55

56 *Tracer stones*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 As an independent indicator of substrate stability five tracer stones in each of three size
5
6 classes (D_{50} , D_{70} and D_{90}) were marked in riffles with RFID tags (23 mm glass tags,
7
8 Texas Instruments, Dallas, USA). The latter were attached *in situ* to the stones where
9
10 turbulence and flow velocity permitted underwater application (89% of all particles)
11
12 using wet curing epoxy-concrete (K273, Nuplex Construction Products, Hamilton, New
13
14 Zealand). The remaining stones were removed from the river bed for tag attachment and
15
16 afterwards carefully re-embedded. The percentage of entrained *in situ* marked tracer
17
18 stones was significantly correlated with the percentage of entrained re-embedded stones
19
20 (Spearman-rank correlation, $R = 0.78$, $\alpha = 0.0001$). Tracer stones were relocated and
21
22 identified up to a depth of 0.6 m in the substrate using a portable antenna and datalogger
23
24 (OregonRFID, Portland, USA). Relocation surveys which took place approximately
25
26 every two months or after high discharge events, encompassed the entire channel and
27
28 active floodplain at least 50 m downstream of the last position of each tracer particle.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Channel changes

39
40
41
42 *October/November 2007 to January/February 2008*

43
44 Between the set of first surveys in October/ November 2007 and the set of second
45
46 surveys in January/ February 2008 each catchment was influenced by at least one flood
47
48 event that was competent to move at least part of the bed (Fig. 3). The areas and
49
50 volumes of change varied considerably between sites (Table 4). Most of the reaches in
51
52 the western Tararua Range showed high changes dominated by scour under influence of
53
54 the January 8th flood. The high volume of scour at the Pukeatua site was mainly the
55
56 erosion of a fan from a steep tributary stream at the north-western margin of the site and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 was therefore not representative for the entire stream bed of the relatively steep reach
5
6 (Fig. 4). However, erosion was dominant throughout the entire site (64% of area
7
8 scoured) with only a small area on the right side of the main channel being affected by
9
10 deposition. At Waiotauru mainly the right bank was eroded, in particular at a steep
11
12 medial bar upstream of the confluence with a side channel. The latter and the left side of
13
14 the upper main channel experienced some aggradation. In the centre of the main channel
15
16 deep and swift flow prevented surveying (area excluded from the DEM and separated
17
18 from surveyed areas by a hairline in Fig. 4) but few morphological changes adjacent to
19
20 that zone indicate that no large scale sediment transfers occurred there. At the Ohau site
21
22 scouring occurred in the central areas of the channel and the western side of the lower
23
24 baseflow channel while deposition took place only locally at the margins. In contrast at
25
26 Kiriwhakapapa on the eastern side of the Tararua Range only few local morphological
27
28 changes (mainly scour) could be detected reliably.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Waipawa, Mangapuaka and Tamaki in the eastern Ruahine Range experienced
36
37 substantial topographic changes whereas at Manawatu and especially the southernmost
38
39 site there, Coppermine, few sediment transfers were detected (Fig. 5). Waipawa and
40
41 Mangapuaka were dominated by erosion while Tamaki was aggrading. At Waipawa
42
43 scour occurred throughout the reach but mainly at the channel margins, whereas some
44
45 sections of the central channel showed deposition. These patterns point towards a
46
47 widening of the riverbed, probably as an effect of previous aggradation (c.f. Grant
48
49 1977). At both the Tamaki and Mangapuaka sites the shifting of the whole channel in
50
51 the gravel body is clearly visible. The relative amount of change is probably
52
53 underestimated because, compared with sites constrained by stable vegetated banks, a
54
55 wider part of the floodplain was surveyed to capture all potential lateral migration.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Some smaller topographic changes on the floodplain relatively distant to the active
6
7 channel indicate that these zones were eventually inundated with competent flow to
8
9 entrain surface materials. The Tamaki reach is less braided than at Mangapuaka and
10
11 channel migration resulted in the abandoning and fill of an old side channel on the true
12
13 left side. The complexity of the patterns at Mangapuaka suggests several phases of
14
15 development. At the less dynamic sites of Coppermine and Manawatu, scour and fill is
16
17 limited to small zones. Bank erosion is common but depositional areas on the southern
18
19 channel margin of the Manawatu River result from bank collapse after being washed out
20
21 during a previous flood. Fresh flood debris higher on the banks than bankfull level was
22
23 found on both sides, which shows that potentially competent flows have occurred and
24
25 the absence of sediment dynamics reflects a high degree of bed stability.
26
27
28
29

30
31 All the sites on the Central Volcanic Plateau showed little detectable channel
32
33 change (Fig. 6) although a gauge downstream (Te Piripiri and Mangatoetoenui) and in a
34
35 neighbouring catchment (Pukeonake) experienced a considerable flood on December
36
37 20th (Fig. 3).
38
39
40
41

42 *January/February 2008 to May 2008*

43
44 During the second period from January/ February to May 2008 several spates and floods
45
46 occurred, many of them visible in the hydrographs of most catchments (Fig. 3). Hence
47
48 in this second time period only the compound effects of all these events were captured.
49
50 Morphological changes were greatest at the Waipawa, Mangapuaka, Tamaki and Te
51
52 Piripiri sites (Table 4) and lowest at the remaining reaches on the Central Volcanic
53
54 Plateau. Fill at one spot where a bank collapsed was the only topographic change
55
56 registered at Kiriwhakapapa in the eastern Tararua Range (Fig. 7) although substantial
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 tracer stone movement occurred (Table 5). The Ohau reach shows mainly small
5
6 amounts of local erosion while erosion of the medial bar on the right of the upper main
7
8 channel at Waiotauru continues. At the latter site some parts in the thalweg became
9
10 scoured deeply which prevented high resolution surveying. In contrast some deposition
11
12 occurred in the centre of a shallow run between the two riffles of the reach resulting in
13
14 an overall positive sediment budget. At Pukeatua erosion of the aforementioned fan has
15
16 nearly ceased and limited deposition appears in that zone. The material could be sourced
17
18 from erosion of a riffle-pool unit further upstream causing movement of coarse
19
20 substrate. This stream, also known as “Roaring Meg”, has a very flashy flood regime
21
22 with longer periods of stable baseflow in between allowing growth of algae throughout
23
24 the wetted channel. In contrast flood discharges and water levels can be high (drift
25
26 wood deposited 1.5 m above baseflow stage, A. C. Schwendel, personal observation)
27
28 which leads, when combined with high sediment supply from the many slope failures in
29
30 the narrow valley, to a complex pattern of scour and fill. The patchy, but non-size
31
32 selective entrainment of tracer stones points also towards a irregular pattern of highly
33
34 competent discharge.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The characteristic dynamic morphologies of the first period are repeated between
43
44 January and May at the reaches in the eastern Ruahine Range (Fig. 8). Manawatu and
45
46 Coppermine are stable with only minor channel changes (mainly scour) close to the
47
48 banks. In contrast the other sites show highly dynamic morphological change. At
49
50 Waipawa erosion is dominant, again affecting point bars and the channel bottom which
51
52 causes an overall straightening of the reach. The upper middle part of the reach could
53
54 not be surveyed for logistic reasons but the subjective impression was that scour
55
56 prevailed here as well (A. C. Schwendel, personal observation). At Mangapuaka the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 channel system at the southern part of the site was filled and the flow was directed north
5
6 of this zone with locally high erosion visible. Although surface flow ceased at this reach
7
8 during summer, Mangapuaka has the highest fill dominated net budget among all sites
9
10 (Table 4). The Tamaki reach showed considerable widening of the channel with lateral
11
12 erosion and mid-channel deposition. This channel adjustment leads again to a positive
13
14 net budget.
15
16
17

18
19 In contrast to the previous period the Te Piripiri experienced aggradation which
20
21 affected nearly the entire baseflow channel. The steep banks on the left of the upper part
22
23 and the outside bend in the middle part of the reach were subject to some scour. The
24
25 flow was relatively stable but flash floods can occur which lead to erosion of the
26
27 scarcely vegetated banks of fine grained volcanic ash and provides the material for
28
29 aggradation downstream. Again the Mangatoetouenui and Pukeonake sites experienced
30
31 only few detectable topographic modifications. Especially for the Mangatoetouenui site
32
33 this finding is surprising because more than 90% of tagged tracer stones moved during
34
35 this period. It is reasonable to infer that the relatively high surface roughness which
36
37 controls the level of detectable morphological change masks these sediment fluxes (see
38
39 also at Kiriwhakapapa). In such a heterogeneous reach incorporation of the spatial
40
41 variation in substrate composition into the level of detection might improve modelling
42
43 of sediment budgets (Heritage *et al.* 2009). However, this is beyond the scope of this
44
45 paper. The Pukeonake reach cuts through lahar deposits and has a highly compacted
46
47 bed, lined with allochthonous boulders. Its substrate can be characterised as very stable
48
49 due to a strong embeddedness in a matrix of fine and coherent volcanic deposits.
50
51
52
53

54
55 Additionally flow ceased at this site over short periods during summer resulting in
56
57 ponds and puddles on the stream bed temporarily not connected by surface flow.
58
59
60

Discussion and conclusions

Over both three month study periods, few sites showed any clear trends towards incision (e.g. Waipawa) or aggradation (e.g. Tamaki), which reflects the variability in flood characteristics and sediment supply within the region's upland headwater streams. Nevertheless, some groups of reaches with distinctive adjustment to floods can be identified over this timescale. There are highly active reaches which have high erosion rates in their steep catchments (e.g. up to $10 \text{ m}^3 \text{ ha}^{-1} \text{ a}^{-1}$) (Mosley 1978a). Although most of these landslide derived sediments are momentarily stored in the upper catchment they provide an abundant long-term sediment supply (Grant 1982, Dymond & Hicks 1986). Some reaches respond dramatically by shifting channels even in smaller flood events (Mangapuaka and Tamaki) (c.f. Mosley 1978b). However, the Waiotauru, Pukeatua, Ohau and Te Piripiri sites require larger floods to trigger channel changes which usually affect only parts of the bed. The Waipawa reach, which stands in between those groups in terms of channel stability, is less responsive to floods than Tamaki and Mangapuaka, probably because of the coarser substrate compared with streams of the first group. It maintains the position of its active channel relative to the floodplain although considerable adjustments affecting the entire wetted channel occur. The stream beds of Manawatu, Coppermine and Kiriwhakapapa showed over the study period only local small scale response to floods in their laterally constrained channels, often associated with bank collapse (e.g. Mosley & Blakely 1977). However, at some streams the latter might also be influenced by infrequent stock grazing on the banks, but even so they can be still classified as relative stable. It should also be noted that there can be considerable

1
2
3
4 sediment flux within a reach (as measured with tracer stones) which is not necessarily
5 expressed as morphological change (e.g. Kiriwhakapapa or Mangatoetoenui) because of
6
7
8
9 scour-fill compensation. According to the calculated morphological change
10
11 Mangatoetoenui and Pukeonake can be classified as very stable although the question
12
13 arises whether morphological budgeting without incorporating the spatial variance in
14
15 error into the level of detection of genuine change is applicable for the former reach.
16
17

18
19 The different characteristics in sediment transfer between catchments are obvious,
20
21 even when these catchments are located close to each other and experienced comparable
22
23 flood events. Although no flow records were available from the study sites, hydrographs
24
25 from further downstream exhibit parallel occurrence of major high discharge events in
26
27 neighbouring catchments (Fig. 3). Catchment scale parameters (Table 6) can explain the
28
29 varying behaviour only partially. Average catchment slope is lowest on the Central
30
31 Volcanic Plateau where reaches are relatively stable. This is also apparent at the
32
33 Ruahine sites which are probably most comparable due to their similar catchment
34
35 characteristics although slopes are generally higher there. Low bare ground and high
36
37 tussock cover (Table 6) are typical for Pukeonake but it is rather likely that the high bed
38
39 stability **there arises from the strong embeddedness of coarse substrate particles in a**
40
41 **matrix of fine and coherent volcanic deposits.** The Ruahine Range sites with high forest
42
43 cover and less pasture (Table 6) are the least stable. An explanation would be that the
44
45 steep catchments (e.g. 62% steeper than 30° at Waipawa) are less suitable for farming
46
47 and the larger pasture land cover in the lower parts of the Manawatu and Coppermine
48
49 catchments is a result of the availability of stable floodplain at these sites. As to whether
50
51 land use variables or slope can explain the differences in the Tararua Range, it is
52
53 suggested that other factors such as connectivity and sediment supply (Fryirs *et al.*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 2007) are more important. Large landslips observed by the authors upstream of the
5
6 Pukeatua, Waiotauru and Waipawa sites offer evidence to support this. These mass
7
8 movements depend primarily on slope (Dymond *et al.* 2006) and forest cover
9
10 deterioration which is in turn influenced by weather patterns, climate change, moisture
11
12 stress and introduced mammals (Mosley 1978a, Grant 1989). However, well developed
13
14 downstream channel geometry relations found in some New Zealand headwater streams
15
16 in similar geomorphic settings indicate that channel adjustment to discharge can be
17
18 dominant despite substantial colluvial input (Wohl & Wilcox 2005 and references
19
20 therein).
21
22
23
24

25
26 This research indicates that reaches such as Tamaki and Mangapuaka could be
27
28 considered as demonstrating responsive behaviour, adjusting form via sediment
29
30 transfers accomplished by frequent and low magnitude flood events. These reaches are
31
32 presumably primed for instability (*sensu* Brewer & Lewin 1998) because availability of
33
34 highly erodible substrate, frequent variation in local channel slope and frequent floods
35
36 favour crossing of intrinsic thresholds. In contrast, reaches where minimal change has
37
38 been detected are best understood as being robust. Similar flood magnitudes and
39
40 frequencies fail to result in detectable morphological change, and whilst sediment
41
42 transport may still take place, it is not sufficient to register a morphological adjustment.
43
44 The perception that mountain streams are generally characterised by instability is
45
46 therefore inappropriate. As with any fluvial system, some systems will be primed for
47
48 instability and exist close to thresholds of change (Brewer & Lewin 1998) whilst others
49
50 are far more robust (Werritty & Leys 2001). Far more important to upland stream
51
52 behaviour is likely to be the role of sediment supply from upstream reaches and slopes
53
54 (Harvey 1991), which in turn reflects the connectivity characteristics of the discrete
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 system (Harvey 2001). Strongly coupled systems which feed sediment efficiently from
5 slope to channel and then from reach to reach (e.g. Hooke 2003, Fuller & Marden 2008)
6
7 are much more likely to behave responsively to discrete and subtle flow events. This
8
9 suggests that the catchments demonstrating such responsive behaviour are likely to
10
11 reflect higher degrees of intrinsic coupling within the fluvial system above the reach.
12
13 Robust behaviour with minimal detectable morphological change reflects a less strongly
14
15 coupled system, with fewer sediment inputs contributing to and working their way
16
17 downstream. This is based on the premise that channel morphology and morphological
18
19 change is strongly conditioned by bedload flux (Leopold 1992). This topic of responsive
20
21 and robust behaviour in association with catchment coupling characteristics demands
22
23 further attention than is feasible in this paper and is subject of further work in progress.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 This study documents the high degree of variability between short-term channel
31
32 dynamics and sediment transfers within mountain streams in the lower North Island of
33
34 New Zealand. It finds no evidence for any consistent region-wide response of these
35
36 reaches to flood events. Future research needs to better quantify the causes behind
37
38 variable reach-scale sediment transfers, especially in conjunction with catchment
39
40 connectivity characteristics. However, it is feasible to suggest that differing degrees of
41
42 catchment connectedness may underlie the high degree of variability in reach behaviour
43
44 identified.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Acknowledgements**

52
53
54
55
56 We acknowledge Horizons Regional Council, NIWA, Hawke's Bay Regional Council,
57
58 Greater Wellington Regional Council and Genesis Power Ltd for the supply of river
59
60

1
2
3
4 flow data. Field assistance was provided by Caroline Chin, Heike Schwendel, Jay
5
6 Gedir, Manas Chakraborty, Michael Smith, Rob Buxton and Zoë Dewson who are
7
8 thanked.
9

10 11 12 13 14 **References**

- 15
16
17
18 Ashmore PE and Church MJ (1998). Sediment transport and river morphology: a
19
20 paradigm for study. In: Klingeman PC, Beschta RL, Komar PD and Bradley JB,
21
22 eds. *Gravel bed rivers in the environment*, Water Resources Publications, Oregon,
23
24 115-139.
25
26
27
28 Brasington J and Richards K (1998). Interactions between model predictions, parameters
29
30 and DTM scales for topmodel, *Computers & Geosciences* **24**, 299-314.
31
32
33 Brasington J, Rumsby BT and McVey RA (2000). Monitoring and modelling
34
35 morphological change in a braided gravel-bed river using high resolution GPS-
36
37 based survey, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **25**, 973-990.
38
39
40 Brasington J, Langham J and Rumsby B (2003). Methodological sensitivity of
41
42 morphometric estimates of coarse fluvial sediment transport, *Geomorphology* **53**,
43
44 299-316.
45
46
47 Brewer PA and Lewin J (1998). Planform cyclicality in unstable reach: Complex fluvial
48
49 response to environmental change, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **23**,
50
51 989-1008.
52
53
54 Chappell A, Heritage GL, Fuller IC, Large ARG and Milan DJ (2003). Geostatistical
55
56 analysis of ground-survey elevation data to elucidate spatial and temporal river
57
58 channel change, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **28**, 349-370.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Chin A and Wohl E (2005). Toward a theory for step pools in stream channels, *Progress*
6
7 *in Physical Geography* **29**, 275-296.
8
- 9 Dymond JR and Hicks DL (1986). Steepland erosion measured from historical
10
11 photographs, *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* **41**, 252-255.
12
- 13 Dymond JR, Ausseil A-G, Shepherd JD and Buettner L (2006). Validation of a region-
14
15 wide model of landslide susceptibility in the Manawatu-Wanganui region of New
16
17 Zealand, *Geomorphology* **74**, 70-79.
18
- 19 Fisher PF and Tate NJ (2006). Causes and consequences of error in digital elevation
20
21 models, *Progress in Physical Geography* **30**, 467-489.
22
23
- 24 Florinsky IV (2002). Errors of signal processing in digital terrain modelling,
25
26
27 *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* **16**, 475-501.
28
- 29 Fryirs KA, Brierley GJ, Preston NJ and Kasai M (2007). Buffers, barriers and blankets:
30
31 The (dis)connectivity of catchment-scale sediment cascades, *Catena* **70**, 49-67.
32
33
- 34 Fuller IC, Passmore DG, Heritage GL, Large ARG, Milan DJ and Brewer PA (2002).
35
36 Annual sediment budgets in an unstable gravel-bed river: the River Coquet,
37
38 northern England. In: Jones SJ and Frostick LE, eds. *Sediment flux to basins:*
39
40 *Causes, Controls and Consequences*, Geological Society, London, 115-131.
41
42
- 43 Fuller IC, Large ARG, Charlton ME, Heritage GL and Milan DJ (2003a). Reach-scale
44
45 sediment transfers: An evaluation of two morphological budgeting approaches,
46
47 *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **28**, 889-903.
48
49
- 50 Fuller IC, Large ARG and Milan DJ (2003b). Quantifying channel development and
51
52 sediment transfer following chute cutoff in a wandering gravel-bed river,
53
54
55
56 *Geomorphology* **54**, 307-323.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Fuller IC, Large ARG, Heritage GL, Milan DJ and Charlton ME (2005). Derivation of
5
6 annual reach-scale sediment transfer in the River Coquet, Northumberland, UK.
7
8 In: Blum MD, Mariott SB and Leclair SF, eds. *Fluvial Geomorphology VII*,
9
10 Blackwell, Oxford, 61-74.
11
12
13 Fuller IC and Hutchinson EL (2007). Sediment flux in a small gravel-bed stream:
14
15 Response to channel remediation works, *New Zealand Geographer* **63**, 169-180.
16
17
18 Fuller IC and Marden M (2008). Connectivity in steepland environments: gully-fan
19
20 coupling in the Tarndale system, Waipaoa catchment, New Zealand. In: Schmidt
21
22 J, Cochrane T, Phillips C, Elliott S, Davies T and Basher L, eds. *Sediment*
23
24 *Dynamics in Changing Environments*, International Association of Hydrological
25
26 Sciences, Wallingford, Oxfordshire, 275-282.
27
28
29 Goff JR and McFadgen BG (2002). Seismic driving of nationwide changes in
30
31 geomorphology and prehistoric settlement - a 15th Century New Zealand
32
33 example, *Quaternary Science Reviews* **21**, 2229-2236.
34
35
36 Grant PJ (1977). Recorded channel changes of the Upper Waipawa River, Ruahine
37
38 Range, New Zealand. Water and Soil Technical Publication, Ministry of Works
39
40 and Development New Zealand.
41
42
43 Grant PJ (1982). Coarse sediment yields from the upper Waipawa River basin, Ruahine
44
45 Range, *Journal of Hydrology (New Zealand)* **21**, 81-97.
46
47
48 Grant PJ (1989). A hydrologist's contribution to the debate on wild animal management,
49
50 *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* **12**, 165-169.
51
52
53 Harvey AM (1991). The influence of sediment supply on the channel morphology of
54
55 upland streams – Howgill Fells, northwest England, *Earth Surface Processes and*
56
57 *Landforms* **16**, 675-684.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Harvey AM (2001). Coupling between hillslopes and channels in upland fluvial
5
6 systems: implications for landscape sensitivity, illustrated from the Howgill Fells,
7
8 northwest England, *Catena* **42**, 225-250.
9
10
11 Heritage GL, Milan DJ, Large ARG and Fuller IC (2009). Influence of survey strategy
12
13 and interpolation model on DEM quality, *Geomorphology* **112**, 334-344.
14
15
16 Hooke J (2003). Coarse sediment connectivity in river channel systems: a conceptual
17
18 framework and methodology, *Geomorphology* **56**, 79-94.
19
20
21 Kennedy M (2002). *The Global Positioning System and GIS: An introduction*, Taylor &
22
23 Francis, London.
24
25
26 Lane SN, Chandler JH and Richards KS (1994). Developments in monitoring and
27
28 modelling small-scale river bed topography *Earth Surface Processes and*
29
30 *Landforms* **19**, 349-368.
31
32
33 Lane SN (1998). The use of digital terrain modelling in the understanding of dynamic
34
35 river channel systems. In: Lane SN, Richards KS and Chandler JH, eds. *Landform*
36
37 *Monitoring, Modelling and Analysis*, Wiley, Chichester, 311-342.
38
39
40 Lane SN, Westaway RM and Hicks DM (2003). Estimation of erosion and deposition
41
42 volumes in a large, gravel-bed, braided river using synoptic remote sensing, *Earth*
43
44 *Surface Processes and Landforms* **28**, 249-271.
45
46
47 Leopold LB (1992). Sediment size that determines channel morphology. In: Billi P, Hey
48
49 RD, Thorne CR and Tacconi P, eds. *Dynamics of gravel bed rivers*, Wiley,
50
51 Chichester, 297-311.
52
53
54 Lindsay JB and Ashmore PE (2002). The effects of survey frequency on estimates of
55
56 scour and fill in a braided river model, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*
57
58 **27**, 27-43.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Manville V, Segschneider B, Newton E, White JDL, Houghton BF and Wilson CJN
6
7 (2009). Environmental impact of the 1.8 ka Taupo eruption, New Zealand:
8
9 Landscape response to a large-scale explosive rhyolite eruption, *Sedimentary*
10
11 *Geology* **220**, 318-336.
12
13
14 Mosley MP and Blakely RJ (1977). The Coppermine landslide, south eastern Ruahine
15
16 Range, *Soil & Water* **16**, 16-17, 32-33.
17
18
19 Mosley MP (1978a). Erosion in the south-eastern Ruahine Range: Its implications for
20
21 downstream river control, *New Zealand Journal of Forestry* **29**, 21-48.
22
23
24 Mosley MP (1978b). Bed material transport in the Tamaki River near Dannevirke,
25
26 North Island, *New Zealand Journal of Science* **21**, 619-626.
27
28
29 Strahler AN (1952). Hypsometric (area-altitude) analysis of erosional topography,
30
31 *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America* **63**, 1117-1142.
32
33
34 Thompson CJ, Croke J, Ogden R and Wallbrink P (2006). A morpho-statistical
35
36 classification of mountain stream reach types in southeastern Australia,
37
38 *Geomorphology* **81**, 43-65.
39
40
41 Werritty A and Leys KF (2001). The sensitivity of Scottish rivers and upland valley
42
43 floors to recent environmental change, *Catena* **42**, 251-273.
44
45
46 Wheaton JM, Brasington J, Brewer PA, Darby S, Pasternack GB, Sear DA, Vericat D
47
48 and Williams R (2007). Improved Fluvial Geomorphic Interpretation Derived
49
50 From DEM Differencing. *Eos Trans. AGU*, Fall Meeting Suppl.
51
52
53 Whitehouse IE and Pearce AJ (1992). Shaping the mountains of New Zealand. In: Soons
54
55 JM and Selby MJ, eds. *Landforms of New Zealand*, Longman, Auckland, 144-160.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Wild M, Snelder TH, Leathwick JR, Shankar U and Hurren H (2005). Environmental
5
6 variables for the Freshwater Environments of New Zealand river classification.
7
8 NIWA Client Report CHC2004.086, Christchurch.
9
10
11 Williams PW (1991). Tectonic geomorphology, uplift rates and geomorphic response in
12
13 New Zealand, *Catena* **18**, 439-452.
14
15
16 Wohl E and Merritt D (2005). Prediction of mountain stream morphology, *Water*
17
18 *Resources Research* **41**, W08419
19
20
21 Wohl E (2006). Human impacts to mountain streams, *Geomorphology* **79**, 217-248.
22
23
24 Wohl E and Merritt DM (2008). Reach-scale channel geometry of mountain streams,
25
26 *Geomorphology* **93**, 168-185.
27
28 Wohl EE and Wilcox A (2005). Channel geometry of mountain streams in New
29
30 Zealand, *Journal of Hydrology* **300**, 252-266.
31
32
33 Wolman MJ (1954). A method of sampling coarse river bed material, *American*
34
35 *Geophysical Union Transactions* **35**, 951-956.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Figure 1** Study sites in the southern part of the North Island of New Zealand and
5
6 important rivers: a – Manawatu, b – Wanganui, c – Tongariro, d – Tukituki, e –
7
8 Ruamahanga and f – Otaki
9

10
11
12
13
14 **Figure 2** Selection of the study reaches: Te Piripiri (A), Waiotauru (B), Coppermine
15
16 (C), Ohau (D), Waipawa (E) and Mangapuaka (F)
17
18

19
20
21 **Figure 3** Flow hydrographs of gauges in neighbouring catchments or downstream of the
22
23 study sites, arrows mark the survey dates at the respective reaches (site-gauge match: 1
24
25 – a, 2 – b, 3 – c, 4 – d, 5 – e, 6 – f, 7 and 8 – g, 9 – h, 10 and 11 – i, 12 – j)
26
27

28
29
30 **Figure 4** DEMs of topographic change (m) between October/ November 2007 and
31
32 January/ February 2008 of the reaches in the Tararua Range with application of
33
34 individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined
35
36 (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
37
38

39
40
41 **Figure 5** DEMs of topographic change (m) between October/ November 2007 and
42
43 January/ February 2008 of the reaches in the Ruahine Range with application of
44
45 individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined
46
47 (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
48
49

50
51
52 **Figure 6** DEMs of topographic change (m) between October/ November 2007 and
53
54 January/ February 2008 of the reaches on the Central Volcanic Plateau with application
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is
5
6 outlined (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
7
8
9

10
11 **Figure 7** DEMs of topographic change (m) between January/ February and May 2008
12 of the reaches in the Tararua Range with application of individual levels of detection,
13
14 wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and arrows
15
16 indicate flow direction
17
18
19

20
21
22
23 **Figure 8** DEMs of topographic change (m) between January/ February and May 2008
24 of the reaches in the Ruahine Range with application of individual levels of detection,
25
26 wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and arrows
27
28 indicate flow direction
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 **Figure 9** DEMs of topographic change (m) between January/ February and May 2008
36 of the reaches on the Central Volcanic Plateau with application of individual levels of
37
38 detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and
39
40 arrows indicate flow direction
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Hydraulic and substrate characteristics of the study reaches

site	Stream order (Strahler 1952)	Slope (m^*m^{-1})	Mean hydraulic radius at bankfull (m)	Mean bankfull width (m)	Mean substrate D_{50} (mm)	Substrate composition (in order of relative proportion of s - sand, g - gravel, c - cobbles, b - boulders)
Waipawa	3	0.032	0.481	48.6	58.5	g, c, b
Manawatu	3	0.047	0.232	7.4	64.9	c, g, b
Tamaki	2	0.021	0.195	19.0	35.2	g, c
Mangapuaka	2	0.029	0.129	25.5	28.0	g, c
Coppermine	3	0.042	0.328	7.0	51.2	g, c, b
Kiriwhakapapa	3	0.011	0.517	9.5	58.7	c, b, g
Waiotauru	5	0.012	0.803	42.8	84.4	c, g, b
Pukeatua	3	0.047	0.912	24.2	83.9	c, g, b
Ohau	4	0.012	0.701	18.0	64.0	c, g, b
Te Piripiri	3	0.014	0.198	2.8	34.9	g, c, (b, s)
Mangatoetoenui	4	0.025	0.369	11.5	97.2	c, g, b, (s)
Pukeonake	4	0.034	0.357	12.1	157.8	b, c, g

Table 2 Point density and survey area of all surveys between October 2007 and May 2008

survey	1 (October/ November 2007)		2 (January/ February 2008)		3 (May 2008)	
	area (m^2)	point density (m^{-2})	area (m^2)	point density (m^{-2})	area (m^2)	point density (m^{-2})
Waipawa	1897.22	0.58	2437.94	1.54	1467.79	1.89
Manawatu	131.84	9.41	159.69	11.73	162.84	7.48
Tamaki	902.64	2.05	886.20	3.86	917.70	3.01
Mangapuaka	1449.22	1.56	1515.63	2.04	1559.97	1.97
Coppermine	405.91	4.92	493.51	6.52	440.69	7.78
Kiriwhakapapa	278.21	1.29	310.87	1.77	259.15	3.15
Waiotauru	2892.44	0.73	2942.07	1.32	2601.62	1.20
Pukeatua	613.49	1.95	1002.41	2.11	792.17	2.17
Ohau	972.61	0.66	1113.24	1.03	1053.17	1.20
Te Piripiri	160.75	4.40	216.40	7.49	267.08	6.83
Mangatoetoenui	835.39	1.71	859.21	2.96	852.88	2.53
Pukeonake	439.74	2.85	511.57	5.24	161.21	6.31

Table 3 Mean values per site for vertical survey precision and accuracy, vertical DEM accuracy and the level of detection (LOD) of genuine change (ME: mean error, SD standard deviation)

error	survey precision			interpolation accuracy						LOD (m)
source	quality control		substrate	residuals		independent checkpoints		cross validation		
site	ME (m)	SD (m)	D _{84corr} (m)	ME (m)	SD (m)	ME (m)	SD (m)	ME (m)	SD (m)	
Waipawa	0.024	0.017	0.132	-0.001	0.009	-0.014	0.049	0.012	0.111	0.187
Manawatu	0.020	0.018	0.158	-0.003	0.054	0.027	0.147	0.004	0.155	0.223
Tamaki	0.030	0.020	0.058	0.000	0.008	-0.004	0.060	-0.001	0.062	0.082
Mangapuaka	0.024	0.016	0.057	0.000	0.007	0.009	0.046	0.002	0.067	0.080
Coppermine	0.027	0.019	0.140	-0.001	0.019	0.038	0.084	0.005	0.100	0.198
Kiriwhakapapa	0.047	0.024	0.161	-0.000	0.008	-0.012	0.125	0.016	0.201	0.227
Waiotauru	0.015	0.008	0.177	-0.000	0.007	0.007	0.133	0.006	0.073	0.251
Pukeatua	0.029	0.017	0.145	-0.000	0.013	0.080	0.153	0.005	0.122	0.205
Ohau	0.030	0.019	0.149	-0.001	0.007	-0.010	0.071	0.009	0.089	0.210
Piripiri	0.014	0.006	0.097	-0.003	0.025	0.004	0.073	0.010	0.120	0.138
Mangatoetoenui	0.015	0.012	0.182	-0.001	0.012	-0.003	0.130	0.007	0.083	0.257
Pukeonake	0.025	0.018	0.177	-0.001	0.018	0.081	0.167	0.004	0.091	0.250

Table 4 Volume and area of geomorphic change relative to the planar DEM area between October/ November 2007 and January/ February 2008 and between January/ February 2008 and May 2008 (bold)

Site	Volume				Area		
	fill (10 ⁻³ m ³ *m ⁻²)	scour (10 ⁻³ m ³ *m ⁻²)	net (10 ⁻³ m ³ *m ⁻²)	total change (10 ⁻³ m ³ *m ⁻²)	fill (%)	scour (%)	total change (%)
Waipawa	15.529	31.114	-15.585	46.643	11.4	18.9	30.3
	1.469	42.794	-41.325	44.264	3.3	23.7	27.0
Manawatu	1.930	3.035	-1.105	4.965	1.3	3.9	5.2
	0.295	0.625	-0.330	0.920	0.4	0.6	1.0
Tamaki	54.202	15.025	39.177	69.228	32.3	13.7	46.0
	32.510	14.568	17.943	47.078	27.6	17.1	44.7
Mangapuaka	25.301	38.828	-13.526	64.129	22.8	23.5	46.3
	41.328	5.068	36.260	46.395	25.1	5.8	30.9
Coppermine	0.372	0.420	-0.048	0.793	0.7	0.6	1.3
	0.203	0.513	-0.310	0.715	0.3	0.6	0.9
Kiriwhakapapa	0.024	1.818	-1.794	1.842	0.1	2.7	2.8
	0.274	0.000	0.274	0.274	0.5	0.0	0.5
Waiotauru	3.801	26.532	-22.731	30.334	4.5	17.3	21.8
	3.762	1.925	1.837	5.687	4.3	2.4	6.8
Pukeatua	24.327	284.250	-259.922	308.577	10.8	63.6	74.4
	8.816	10.362	-1.546	19.178	9.1	8.4	17.5
Ohau	0.809	4.617	-3.808	5.426	2.5	8.5	11.1
	0.248	0.400	-0.152	0.647	0.5	1.2	1.6
Piripiri	0.867	0.762	0.105	1.629	1.1	0.8	1.9
	40.795	5.252	35.543	46.048	39.6	5.6	45.3
Mangatoetoeui	0.075	0.029	0.046	0.104	0.1	0.0	0.1
	0.000	0.053	-0.053	0.054	0.0	0.2	0.2
Pukeonake	0.282	0.102	0.181	0.384	0.5	0.1	0.6
	0.000	0.003	-0.003	0.003	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5 Mean percentage of entrainment and mean travelled distance of *in situ* marked tracer particles in each of the size classes D_{50} , D_{70} and D_{90} of the substrate

	Entrainment (%)			Travelled distance (m)		
	D_{50}	D_{70}	D_{90}	D_{50}	D_{70}	D_{90}
Waipawa	100.0	100.0	100.0	85.3	76.3	79.2
Manawatu	50.0	40.0	0.0	19.8	5.3	0.0
Tamaki	100.0	100.0	100.0	68.3	72.6	59.0
Mangapuaka	87.5	75.0	33.3	25.9	28.1	16.7
Coppermine	88.9	70.0	20.0	22.6	11.0	0.2
Kiriwhakapapa	66.7	70.0	37.5	29.3	17.1	18.8
Waiotauru	100.0	75.0	87.5	40.2	41.3	36.6
Pukeatua	57.14	50.0	55.6	22.1	8.4	12.1
Ohau	100.0	60.0	20.0	43.6	28.0	1.3
Piripiri	40.0	20.0	40.0	5.8	1.1	3.4
Mangatoetoenui	83.3	62.5	55.6	37.2	31.9	6.6
Pukeonake	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 6 Catchment characteristics of the study reaches derived from FWENZ database (Wild *et al.* 2005). Mean slope and land cover are runoff weighted within the catchment.

site	Mean slope (degrees)	Bare ground (%)	Pasture (%)	Tussock (%)	Forest (%)	Catchment area (10^3 km^2)
Waipawa	30.4	10.0	1.0	9.0	77.0	15.1
Manawatu	23.2	0.0	33.0	0.0	66.0	5.2
Tamaki	27.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	99.0	14.8
Mangapuaka	28.8	0.0	0.1	0.0	99.0	6.5
Coppermine	23.1	0.0	16.0	0.0	82.0	4.5
Kiriwhakapapa	24.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	99.0	11.0
Waiotauru	28.1	0.6	1.0	3.0	94.0	244.0
Pukeatua	23.0	0.8	0.1	0.0	98.0	24.1
Ohau	28.5	0.2	0.2	0.9	98.0	84.6
Piripiri	5.5	48.0	0.0	51.0	0.0	13.6
Mangatoetoenui	13.8	84.0	0.0	13.0	1.9	62.6
Pukeonake	4.7	0.5	0.7	98.0	0.0	23.4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1 Study sites in the southern part of the North Island of New Zealand and important rivers: a - Manawatu, b - Wanganui, c - Tongariro, d - Tukituki, e - Ruamahanga and f - Otaki
108x87mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 2 Selection of the study reaches: Te Piripiri (A), Waiotauru (B), Coppermine (C), Ohau (D),
Waipawa (E) and Mangapuaka (F)
151x170mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3 Flow hydrographs of gauges in neighbouring catchments or downstream of the study sites, arrows mark the survey dates at the respective reaches (site-gauge match: 1 – a, 2 – b, 3 – c, 4 – d, 5 – e, 6 – f, 7 and 8 – g, 9 – h, 10 and 11 – i, 12 – j)
 191x271mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 4 DEMs of topographic change (m) between October/ November 2007 and January/ February 2008 of the reaches in the Tarrarua Range with application of individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
107x85mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 5 DEMs of topographic change (m) between October/ November 2007 and January/ February 2008 of the reaches in the Ruahine Range with application of individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
138x142mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 6 DEMs of topographic change (m) between October/ November 2007 and January/ February 2008 of the reaches on the Central Volcanic Plateau with application of individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
125x142mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 7 DEMs of topographic change (m) between January/ February and May 2008 of the reaches in the Tararua Range with application of individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
107x85mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 8 DEMs of topographic change (m) between January/ February and May 2008 of the reaches in the Ruahine Range with application of individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
138x142mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 9 DEMs of topographic change (m) between January/ February and May 2008 of the reaches on the Central Volcanic Plateau with application of individual levels of detection, wetted channel zone at the more recent survey is outlined (broken line) and arrows indicate flow direction
125x142mm (600 x 600 DPI)