Sediment yield estimation from a hydrographic survey: A case study for the Kremasta reservoir, Western Greece
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Brief Outline of the Presentation

- Introduction (Sediment yield and delivery processes, sediment accumulation in reservoirs, source erosion)
- Research method (Hydrographic survey of the Kremasta reservoir, Western Greece)
- Computation of total mass of the deposited sediments for the total period of the reservoir’s operation
- Catchment’s sediment yield and delivery ratio estimation
- Comparison with other published data from the international literature

Research Project

*Appraisal of river sediment deposits in reservoirs of hydropower dams*, Funded by Public Power Corporation (PPC) and the General Secretariat of Research and Technology (GSRT), 1998-2001
Sediment delivery processes

- Sediment source (wash load versus river bed material)
- Magnitude and proximity to the outlet of the source erosion areas
- Characteristics of the drainage network (density and frequency, slope gradients, watershed area)
- Frequency, intensity and duration of the erosion producing storms (wash load)
- Geological formations and soil characteristics (erodibility)
- Geomorphologic characteristics (faults, orographic uplifting, etc.)
- Depositional potential of the catchment (surface roughness, depressions, man-made sediment storages)
Sediment yield processes

### Sediment yield characteristics...
- Temporal variability both in annual yields but also in inter-storm amounts
- Sediment yield processes as functions of spatial scale (e.g. vegetation cover for hillslope scales and partial rainfall coverage and drainage density to watershed scales)
- Precise processes still unknown, lack of mathematical expression with universal applicability
- Strongly influenced, but not completely determined, by watershed area

### Sediment yield estimates...
1. Simple statistical regression models (e.g. sediment rating curves, sediment yield with catchment area)
2. Conceptual or physically-based mathematical models (e.g. LISEM, WEPP, EUROSEM)
3. Reservoir deposits’ measurements by (repeated) hydrographic surveys
Temporal variability of sediment discharges

Sediment discharge vs discharge measurements in Aliakmonas R. at Ilarionas, Northern Greece
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Spatial variability of sediment yield (lack of universal expression)

Data from 42 international watersheds

Sediment yield (t/km²) vs. Area (km²)
Kremasta reservoir watershed

Catchment drainage network

LANDSAT 7 (ETM+) Image
Kremasta reservoir hydrographic survey

- **Positioning:** Differential Global Positioning System (DGPS) (reference station and moving receiver) with accuracy in horizontal plane 2-5 m\(^{(1)}\)
- **Distance between echo-sounding routes:** ranging from 50 to 150 m, additionally to check routes
- **Depth measurement:** Hydrographic echo-sounder Raytheon DE 719B operating at the frequency of 200 kHz\(^{(2)}\)

**Additional information...**

1. In level of significance 95% with selected availability
2. Depth measurement error: 0.5%±1 in of the total depth

**Valuable contribution by...**

Dionysos Satellites Centre, Department of Topography, Faculty of Surveying and Rural Engineering, National Technical University of Athens
Depth measurement illustration
Hydrographic routes for reservoir scanning
DTM Generation and Calculation of Deposits’ Volume

Digitization of initial topographic maps
Scale 1:5000

Extraction of spatially irregular mesh of points and creation of the Triangulated Irregular Network (TIN)

Grid formation size 6 m*6 m

**INITIAL TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS**

Union of DGPS files and echo-sounder entries in one unique ASCII file

Creation of the TIN surface and grid formation size 6 m*6 m

**HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYING**

Algorithm: Triangulation with linear interpolation (SURFER 7.0)
Typical errors of hydrographic surveying

- DGPS accuracy on horizontal plane (due to selected availability)
- Obscure definition of the water-mud interface
- Variation of the hydrographic boat speed
- Errors in x-y-z plane from the construction of the initial topographic maps prior to the dam construction
- Digitization errors both of the initial topographic maps but also from the echo-sounder charts

Significant non-typical error (uncertainty): Areas as earth material banks for dam construction not known
Indicative profile of fluvial sediment deposits (a)

Prior to the dam construction

Year of the hydrographic survey

Section near the reservoir delta at Acheloos R. branch
Indicative profile of fluvial sediment deposits (b)

Prior to the dam construction

Year of the hydrographic survey

Section at the inner part of the reservoir
Identification of reservoir segments with sediment deposits (a)
Identification of reservoir segments with sediment deposits (b)
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## Results – Deposits’ Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir Sections</th>
<th>Deposits’ Volume (hm³)</th>
<th>Deposits’ area (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHELOOS R.</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRAFIOTIS R.</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGDOVAS R.</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **INITIAL DESIGN STUDY**: Estimate for design period 50 years: 394 hm³
Results – Deposits’ Mass

- Collection of two core samples from the reservoir’s invert
  - Evaluation of deposits’ thickness
  - Analysis of sediments physical characteristics and mineral composition
  - Estimation of deposits’ density
  - Estimation of real deposition rate
  - Measurement of sediment organic content

Additional Information...

(1) Lane and Kolzer formula from percentage quantities of sand, silt and clay (correspondingly 71.9% sand, 23.3% silt and 4.8% clay)
(2) Density estimation after 34 years of reservoir operation 1692 kg/m³

TOTAL DEPOSITS’ MASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mass (Mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHELOOS</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRAFIOTIS</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGDOVAS</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

112.5 Mt
## Sediment yield of Kremasta reservoir watershed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcatchment</th>
<th>Mean annual sediment yield $S_y$ (t/km²)</th>
<th>Mean annual sediment discharge $Q_s$ (kg/s)</th>
<th>Subcatchment area $A$ (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHELOOS R.</td>
<td>1184.6</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRAFIOTIS R.</td>
<td>2034.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGDOVAS R.</td>
<td>489.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1005.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>106.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3292</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison with internationally published data

a) Sediment yield

Data from Dendy and Bolton (1976)
Comparison with internationally published data

b) Sediment delivery ratio

![Graph showing sediment delivery ratio vs area (km²)]

- **Agrafiotis R.**
- **Acheloos R.**
- **Megdovas R.**
- **Laurence, 1996**
- **Renfro, 1972**

Legend:
- Green circle: Agrafiotis R.
- Blue line: Acheloos R.
- Pink line: Megdovas R.
- Green line: Laurence, 1996
- Red line: Renfro, 1972
Soil erosion and sediment delivery ratio estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcatchment</th>
<th>Mean annual sediment yield $S_y$ (t/km²)</th>
<th>Soil erosion A (t/km²/y)</th>
<th>Sediment delivery ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHELOOS</td>
<td>1184.6</td>
<td>7077</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRAFIOTIS</td>
<td>2034.8</td>
<td>4847</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGDOVAS</td>
<td>489.4</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1005.6</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soil erosion computed from a GIS based model of the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE)
Conclusions

- Measurements of deposited sediments within a reservoir could be an effective method for reconstructing long term catchment sediment yields.
- The reservoir under study should be large enough so that trap efficiency could be assumed as unity.
- This method is unable to estimate sediment yield of finer time scales (e.g. annually) unless more frequent hydrographic surveys are accomplished.
- This method combined with sediment discharge measurements in an upstream site and/or alternative measurement techniques (e.g. turbidity) can be an effective tool on integrated catchment management.
Conclusions (cont.)

- Dead volume principle, at least for large reservoirs, should be reconsidered in terms of the spatial accumulation of deposited sediment as described.
- Catchment sediment yields under study exhibit considerably higher values than other published data from throughout the globe.
- Geomorphologic controls such as tectonic activity, orographic uplifting, hydrological parameters (e.g. intense storms) and also the dominant geological formation (e.g. highly erodible flysch) are responsible for this considerable difference.