

USDA
ARS
NSL
Rept. 26
2002

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE



Agricultural Research Service

**National Sedimentation Laboratory
Channel and Watershed Processes Research Unit
Oxford, Mississippi 38655**

Erodibility of Cohesive Streambeds in the Yalobusha River System



By Andrew Simon, Robert E. Thomas, Andrew J. C. Collison and Wendy Dickerson with Appendix II by Carlos V. Alonso.

Research Report No. 26

February 2002

P.C.#1497

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The general objective of this study was to provide the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg District with erodibility, erosion rates, and knickpoint migration rates for the cohesive streambeds of the Yalobusha River system. Specifically, the USDA-ARS National Sedimentation Laboratory was charged with:

1. Determining bed-material characteristics, incipient-motion criteria, and erosion rates of the clay beds in reaches targeted by the Corps of Engineers (CoE) for grade control and knickpoint areas previously identified by 1997 CoE surveys and the ARS in Simon (1998);
2. Determining the spatial distribution of the erodibility, incipient-motion criteria, and erosion rates of the clay beds;
3. Developing predictive technology for rates of erosion and knickpoint migration for the clay beds; and
4. Identifying and prioritizing clay-bed reaches in most need of erosion control;

Erosion of streambed materials in the Yalobusha River system is controlled by the nature of the two dominant geologic formations: Naheola and Porters Creek Clay. These are expressed in terms of two parameters: critical shear stress and an erodibility coefficient. Maps of the distribution of these parameters throughout the Yalobusha River system are provided in the body of the report. In general, Porters Creek Clay is extremely resistant to erosion by hydraulic stresses, requiring shear stresses in the hundreds of Pa to initiate downcutting. Given the range of representative flow depths and bed slopes, shear stresses of this magnitude probably do not occur on a frequent basis. This resistance to hydraulic erosion apparently also plays an important role in limiting knickpoint migration in two key ways. Firstly, the potential for geotechnical failure is reduced because of a lack of downcutting needed to produce a knickpoint face of sufficient height to create instability; and secondly, secondary scour, caused by pressure reduction and flow acceleration close to the brink, is reduced. Erosion of streambeds cut into the Naheola formation, however, can occur over a range of commonly occurring shear stresses. These differences lead to stark contrasts in knickpoint migration rates between the two formations, notwithstanding that the geotechnical shear strength of Naheola beds are greater than those composed of the Porters Creek Clay.

Tables are provided that classify erosion resistance (in Pascals) and erodibility (in $\text{cm}^3/\text{N}\cdot\text{s}$) for every study site. For every site, an estimate of the amount of erosion that would occur for one-day storms at a range of shear stresses is provided as a guide. In addition, shear stress-exceedance series for the intensively monitored sites, and associated erosion estimates have also been provided. These have been compared to the erosion observed in surveys and a hydraulic analysis has been performed to account for discrepancies.

That migration of some knickpoints or knickzones, particularly those cut into the Porters Creek Clay formation, has been severely limited is directly related to the hydraulic resistance of these clay beds. More than 30 years after the completion of the most recent channel dredging on the Yalobusha River main stem (1967), the major erosion zone is still just upstream of the upstream terminus of the channel work (river kilometer 27.8). With maximum critical shear stress values reaching more than 400 Pa, erosion of knickpoints cut into the Porters Creek Clay formation is marginal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The material presented here was developed as part of a program of applied research in geomorphology and erodibility of unstable river systems cut into cohesive streambeds. Funds for this work were provided by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg District under Reimbursable Agreement 00-OA-6408-008 (ARS Project No. 6408-13000-010-08R) and carried out in cooperation with the USDA Agricultural Research Service, National Sedimentation Laboratory. We would like to thank Brian Bell, Bret Bledsoe, Kari Christman, Mark Griffith, Tony Layzell, Rob Neely and Geoff Waite for assisting with fieldwork and database development. Finally, we would also like to thank Messrs. John Smith and Phillip Haskins (CoE) for supporting this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	II
LIST OF FIGURES	IV
LIST OF TABLES	VII
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	2
SITE SELECTION	3
METHODS	3
Field Methods	3
Jet-Test Device - Development & Background	4
Jet-Test Device - <i>In Situ</i> Field Techniques	4
Borehole Shear Test (BST) - Field Techniques	5
Pore-Water Pressure - Field Techniques	5
Streambed Sampling	6
Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (permeability, k_{sat})	6
Monitoring of Flow and Knickpoint Migration Rates	6
Surveys of "Intensive" Sites	6
Water Stage and Shear Stress	6
EROSION RESISTANCE AND ERODIBILITY OF STREAMBED MATERIALS BY HYDRAULIC FORCES	7
Jet-Test Results	7
Erodibility by Formation	8
Critical Shear Stress and Equivalent Particle Diameter	9
Erodibility by Wet Versus Dry Conditions	9
Erosion Rates by Hydraulic Shear	10
Erosion Amounts by Hydraulic Shear	11
KNICKPOINT EROSION AND MIGRATION	11
Knickpoint Migration Rates: Field Evidence	12
Influence of Hydraulic Stresses on Knickpoint Migration	14
Knickpoint Failures and Migration by Geotechnical Processes	15
Method	16
Results	17
Knickpoint Migration Processes: Summary	17
CONCLUSIONS	18
REFERENCES	20
FIGURES	23
TABLES	75
APPENDIX I: ARCVIEW GIS - HELP FILE	99
APPENDIX II: ON THE ORIGIN OF SECONDARY SCOUR ASSOCIATED WITH MIGRATING KNICKPOINTS BY CARLOS V. ALONSO	100

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Location map for the Yalobusha River basin and numbered study sites corresponding to site numbers in Table 1.	24
Figure 2	Schematic of jet-test device.	25
Figure 3	A - Schematic of borehole shear test (BST) assembly; B - Detail of shear head in borehole.	26
Figure 4	Calculation of apparent cohesion, c_a and effective friction angle, ϕ' from BST data.	27
Figure 5	Calculation of equilibrium matric suction, ψ from field data.	28
Figure 6	Experimental setup for falling-head permeameter	29
Figure 7	A - Example stage record from Big Creek; B - Comparison of stage records between Skuna River and Big Creek; C - Exceedance frequencies of mean daily discharges on the Skuna River, 1948-2001 and 1999-2001.	30
Figure 8	Bed slope regression calculation for Big Creek knickpoint.	32
Figure 9	Map of critical shear stress, τ_c for the Yalobusha River basin.	33
Figure 10	Map of erodibility coefficient, k for the Yalobusha River basin.	34
Figure 11	A - Histogram of critical shear stress, τ_c from all jet-tests conducted in the Yalobusha River basin; B - Histogram of critical shear stress, τ_c from jet-tests conducted on the Naheola formation; C - Histogram of critical shear stress, τ_c from jet-tests conducted on the Porters Creek Clay formation.	35
Figure 12	A - Histogram of equivalent particle diameters in the Yalobusha River basin; B - Histogram of equivalent particle diameters from the Naheola formation; C - Histogram of equivalent particle diameters from the Porters Creek Clay formation.	36
Figure 13	Critical shear stress, τ_c against erodibility coefficient, k .	37
Figure 14	Median erosion rate, ε against critical shear stress, τ_c by form and type of jet-test.	38
Figure 15	A - Bear Creek knickpoint thalweg cross-section; B - Bear Creek knickpoint planimetric view.	39
Figure 16	A - Big Creek knickpoint thalweg cross-section; B - Big Creek knickpoint planimetric view.	40
Figure 17	A - Buck Creek knickpoint thalweg cross-section; B - Buck Creek knickpoint planimetric view.	41
Figure 18	Cane Creek knickpoint thalweg cross-section.	42

Figure 19 A - Johnson Creek knickpoint thalweg cross-section; B - Johnson Creek knickpoint planimetric view.	43
Figure 20 A - Mud Creek knickpoint thalweg cross-section; B - Mud Creek knickpoint planimetric view.	44
Figure 21 North Topashaw Creek knickpoint thalweg cross-section.	45
Figure 22 A - Topashaw Creek knickpoint thalweg cross-section; B - Topashaw Creek knickpoint planimetric view.	46
Figure 23 A - Topashaw Creek Tributary 1A knickpoint thalweg cross-section; B - Topashaw Creek Tributary 1A knickpoint planimetric view.	47
Figure 24 Yalobusha River knickpoint thalweg cross-section.	48
Figure 25 A - Comparison of migration rates since 1999 for the ten “intensive” sites showing the difference between Porters Creek Clay and Naheola formations. B - Comparison of migration rates since 1997 for the ten “intensive” sites showing the difference between Porters Creek Clay and Naheola formations.	49
Figure 26 Bear Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1999.	50
Figure 27 A - Big Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - Big Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	51
Figure 28 A - Buck Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - Buck Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	52
Figure 29 A - Cane Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - Cane Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	53
Figure 30 A - Johnson Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - Johnson Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	54
Figure 31 A - Mud Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - Mud Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	55
Figure 32 A - North Topashaw Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - North Topashaw Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	56
Figure 33 A - Topashaw Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - Topashaw Creek knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	57
Figure 34 A - Topashaw Creek Tributary 1A knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - Topashaw Creek Tributary 1A knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	58
Figure 35 A - Yalobusha River knickpoint migration rates since 1999; B - Yalobusha River knickpoint migration rates since 1997.	59
Figure 36 Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for Bear Creek, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	60
Figure 37 Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for Big Creek, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	61
Figure 38 Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for Buck Creek, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	62
Figure 39 Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for Cane Creek, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	63

Figure 40	Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for Johnson Creek, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	64
Figure 41	Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for Mud Creek, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	65
Figure 42	Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for Topashaw Creek, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	66
Figure 43	Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for Topashaw Creek Tributary 1A, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	67
Figure 44	Average boundary shear stress, τ_o against time and critical shear stress for the Yalobusha River, showing periods of exceedance and predicted erosion amount.	68
Figure 45	Water surface profiles for Johnson Creek. Percentages represent the fraction of the upstream stage produced by the peak storm on record.	69
Figure 46	Photograph of Bear Creek knickpoint taken 03/05/99. Note the active knickpoint in the foreground but also the dark ledge towards the center of the image. Since this time, the knickpoint in the foreground has washed through, and the upstream ledge is now actively migrating. This change was associated with a switch from the Naheola formation to the Porters Creek Clay Formation.	70
Figure 47	A - Typical finite-element modeling mesh for Big Creek; B - Typical pore-water pressure output with predicted failure surface for Big Creek.	71
Figure 48	Sensitivity analysis of the effect of stage height on factor of safety.	72
Figure 49	Observed and predicted failures of knickpoint face on Big Creek.	73
Figure 50	Example factor of safety relation over the course of a modeled storm event on Big Creek.	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Numbered list of study sites corresponding to the site numbers shown on Figure 1.	76
Table 2	Number of “general” study sites sorted by stream where erodibility measurements were made.	78
Table 3	Summary of all jet-test results.	79
Table 4	Jet-test results averaged for each site.	82
Table 5	Mean and median values of τ_c and k for the Porters Creek Clay and Naheola formations.	84
Table 6	Average boundary shear stress for a range of flow depths and bed slopes.	85
Table 7	Mean and median values of τ_c and k for the Porters Creek Clay and Naheola formations showing the differences caused by perennially wet and intermittently dry conditions.	86
Table 8	Calculated potential rates of erosion (in mm/s) due to hydraulic stresses for all sites and for median values of the Porters Creek Clay and Naheola formations using Equation (5).	87
Table 9	Calculated potential amounts of erosion (in m) for a storm of one-day duration at the specified shear stresses for all sites and for median values of the Porters Creek Clay and Naheola formations using Equation (5).	89
Table 10	Rates of knickpoint migration at the ten “intensive” sites and average values for the Porters Creek Clay and Naheola formations.	91
Table 11	Geotechnical strength parameters for the Naheola and Porters Creek Clay formations showing the generally greater strengths of the Naheola formation.	92
Table 12	Summary of all BST data.	93
Table 13	Summary of k_{sat} values	96
Table 14	Summary of modeling results.	97
Table 15	Results of knickpoint stability modeling on Big Creek.	98

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Thousands of kilometers of cohesive-bed stream channels in the Midwestern United States are incised and eroding at accelerated rates due to human disturbances imposed near the turn of the 20th century (Simon and Rinaldi, 2000). The Yalobusha River of north-central Mississippi (upstream of Grenada Lake) is one of these systems and poses particular concerns to river managers because of downstream flooding problems in the vicinity of Calhoun City. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CoE), Vicksburg District is charged with alleviating the downstream flooding problems resulting from a massive debris dam (see Simon, 1998) while protecting middle and upper reaches from further streambed and streambank erosion. Before the CoE can consider removing the debris dam or re-routing downstream flows, they are protecting reaches upstream from this zone by constructing grade-control and other structures. Prediction of future channel responses and the effects of potential mitigation measures are difficult, however, because of an incomplete knowledge of erodibility and erosion mechanisms in cohesive streams.

The detachment and erosion of cohesive (silt- and clay-sized) material by gravity and/or flowing water is controlled by a variety of physical, electrical, and chemical forces. Identification of all of these forces and the role they play in determining detachment, incipient motion, and erodibility of cohesive materials is incomplete and, at least, still poorly understood. The behavior of cohesive materials in flowing water is important in estimating erosion and sedimentation in a variety of types of waterways, and in the associated transport of adsorbed constituents. Sub-aerial behavior of cohesive materials is important in determining soil detachment and erosion from channels, upland areas (by overland flow or raindrop impact), and with regards to mass movements on hillslopes and channel banks.

Assessing erosion resistance of cohesive materials by flowing water is complex due to the difficulties in characterizing the strength of the electro-chemical bonds that define the resistance of cohesive materials. The many studies that have been conducted on erodibility of cohesive materials have observed that numerous soil properties influence erosion resistance including antecedent moisture, clay mineralogy and proportion, density, soil structure, organic content, as well as pore and water chemistry (Grissinger, 1982). Furthermore, field evidence indicates that cohesive streambeds erode by a variety of mechanisms including particle-by-particle detachment, geotechnical failure of knickpoint faces, and possibly, by upward-directed seepage forces. Studies of streambank stability in cohesive materials have led to recognition of the importance of positive and negative pore-water pressures in accurate numerical analysis of mass-wasting processes and channel widening (Casagli *et al.*, 1997; Simon and Curini, 1998; Rinaldi and Casagli, 1999; Simon *et al.*, 1999). Negative pore-water pressures increase the shear strength of unsaturated, cohesive materials by providing tension between particles. These studies led to the idea that positive and negative pore-water pressures may play an important role in the entrainment and erosion of cohesive streambed particles or aggregates (Simon and Collison, 2001).

The need for evaluation of cohesive streambed erodibility in the incised channels of the Midwestern United States led to initial field testing of the hydraulic stresses required to erode cohesive streambeds (critical-shear stresses; Hanson and Simon, 2001). As part of this effort, a number of sites in the Yalobusha River system were tested during the spring of 1998. The preliminary results from several streams in the Yalobusha River basin along with the location and size of major knickzones were reported to the CoE in Simon (1998) and showed that some of