# Do we know how much river gravel is lost through extraction?

What do cross-section surveys tell us about gravel movement?

Les Basher<sup>1</sup>, Ian Fuller<sup>2</sup>, Eric Verstappen<sup>3</sup> <sup>1</sup>Landcare Research, Nelson; <sup>2</sup>Geography Dept., Massey University; <sup>3</sup>Tasman District Council, Richmond



Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research

MAKING A DIFFERENCE FOR A TRULY CLEAN, GREEN NEW ZEALAN

# Background

- periodic cross section surveys are the main tool used by councils to allocate gravel extraction from rivers bed by considering
  - trends in mean bed level (MBL)
  - estimates of gravel extraction
  - estimates of long-term rate of gravel supply
- debate about trends in MBL, changes in gravel storage within the Motueka, and the influence of gravel extraction on those trends



## Aims

- compile all river cross-section data for the Motueka River and provide a comprehensive analysis of all data using a consistent methodology ("end area method")
- calculate changes in mean bed levels and volume of gravel stored in the river channel through time
- compare gravel volume changes with gravel extraction rates, and determine the influence of gravel extraction on trends in riverbed levels
- consider alternatives to cross section analysis



### **Trends in gravel extraction**



#### **Upper Motueka**

#### **Lower Motueka**



Manaaki Whenua

MAKING A DIFFERENCE FOR A TRULY CLEAN, GREEN NEW ZEALAND

Landcare Research

### **Bed level and gravel storage trends**

- the river bed is degrading resulting in a loss of channel storage of gravel
  - Upper Motueka (1960-2004) –0.33 m
  - Lower Motueka (1978-2001) –0.34 m
- superficially much, but not all, the change in gravel storage can be accounted for by gravel extraction
- there are large error limits on the gravel storage volume changes derived from cross sections
- the cross sections probably underestimate the total gravel storage volume changes (and gravel transport)
  - don't account for spatial variation between the sections
  - don't account for temporal variation between surveys



Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research

#### Do the cross sections represent bed level dynamics? The cross section approach, March 2004 – May 2005



Elevation (m) March 2004 - May 2005 Distance (m)

#### Net loss 3500 m<sup>3</sup>

#### Do the cross sections represent bed level dynamics? The DEM approach, March 2004 – May 2005





naaki Whenua dcare Research

# Conclusions

- there are large error limits on the gravel storage volume changes derived from cross sections
- there may be large error limits on estimates of gravel extraction derived from resource consent applications
  - since not all allocated gravel is extracted
  - returns from extractors may not be accurate
- to better understand how much river gravel extraction affects riverbed levels we need better
  - data on changes in bed levels (e.g., from RTK-GPS or LIDAR surveys),
  - information on gravel supply
  - information on the amount and location of gravel extraction.

