tream temperature and the Hyportet Zone

Implications for stream protection and restoration

Danna B. Truslow, MS, PG

Jennifer M. Jacobs, PhD, PE

Temperature and stream health

- Temperature Range
 - Allows for adequate dissolved oxygen \checkmark
 - Stimulates biological growth and activity \uparrow
 - Promotes decomposition \uparrow
- Temperature Heterogeneity
 - Patchiness promotes biological diversity
 - Provide thermal refugia

Thermal regime and fish

- Fish Species Preference
 - Coldwater (Maximum Ave Monthly Temperature – less than 18 °C
 NH Examples: Brook Trout, Slimy Sculpin, Brown Trout, Lake Chub, Longnose Sucker, Northern Redbelly Dace







Pictures Credit: NJ Freshwater Fish Identification

Climate change, urbanization and stream temperature

• Stream temperatures will increase due to climate change and urbanization

 Groundwater in shallow aquifers will increase due to warmer recharge and ground warming

- Identify temperature sensitive habitat
- When we restore and protect streams and riparian zones
 incorporate stream temperature protection



• What is the hyporheic (streambed) zone and why is it important?

- What influences temperature in a stream?
- What instream features influence temperature and habitat?
- What riparian features contribute to stream temperature and stream flow?
- Some suggestions on getting representative temperature measurements

Methods

Geomorphology

- Stream and watershed geomorphology surveys
- LiDAR and GIS streamflow analysis

Hydrology

- Streamflow measurements
- Weather station
- Tree canopy measurements

Water Temperature

- Fiber Optic Distributed Temperature Sensor (FODTS) survey
- Hobo temperature data loggers
- Mini-piezometers with multi-depth temperature sensors

A stream is ..

Surface water



Water flowing in the stream and in the hyporheic zone, and water exchange between stream, streambed water and groundwater

What controls heat flow in streams?





Where in NH?

Wednesday Hill Brook (L-1) in Lee, NH

Part of Lamprey River Hydrologic Observatory





Geomorphology surveys

- Fluvial geomorphology survey
 - Stream cross sections
 - Longitudinal stream survey
 - Plan-form characterization
 - Pebble counts
- Streambed depth & log dam measurements
- Watershed and riparian geomorphology



Streamflow measurement

- Upstream SR-50 ultrasonic sensor
- Downstream- flume with data logger





Under-canopy weather station

- Air Temperature
- Solar and net radiation
- Humidity
- Wind speed
- Precipitation
- Can get from NOAA



Hobo[™] thermistor data loggers



0.1 °C resolution, 0.5 °C accuracy

Wells and tributaries Stream and streambed



Mini-piezometers

Installation



Thermocouple Type T-0.1 °C resolution, 0.5 °C accuracy Hydraulic head and temperature



Measurement



FODTS survey

520 m of fiber-optic cable installed at or just below streambed surface

1-m spatial resolution and 0.01 °C temperature resolution

Surveys

August 22-28, 2007

Sept 25-Oct 9, 2007



Thanks to USGS – Geophysical Branch, Storrs, CT

LiDAR (Light detecting aerial radar)



 $42 \text{ km}^2 \text{ area} - 1 \text{ elevation}$ measurement per 1 m²

NCALM equipment and processing – U of Florida, UC - Berkeley





Watershed and tributary geomorphology





N

legend

alue

CODE Alles Ium

Low : 0

Omw

Bedrock w afte r



Temperatures – late summer

- Shallow groundwater 9.5 to 14 °C
- Western tributaries and springs coolest - little diurnal variation
- Eastern tributaries warm - large diurnal variation



Fiber optic temperature survey – August 22 to 28, 2007



Tributaries and springs



What can geomorphology and hyporheic zone temperatures tell us about these temperature changes?

Reaches

25



0 5 10 20 30 40









Reach 2 – Box Valley

FODTS – Reach Temperatures



FODTS station (m)

Reach 2



Reach 2 Box Valley



Reach 5 - Floodplain



Reach 5 - Floodplain



Reach 5 – Floodplain cross section



Reach 5 - Floodplain

FODTS Temperature











Reach 5 - Floodplain

Heat budget for WHB



Heat budget model

$$\begin{split} & \underset{Condition}{\text{Boundary}} \\ & \underset{Condition}{\text{Non-advective heat flux}} \end{split} \\ & Q_{ds}T_{ds} = Q_{us}T_{us} + L\beta \Big[H_{netrad} - H_{evap} - H_{conv} - H_{cond} + H_{fr} \Big] \\ & + L \Big[q_{gw}T_{gw} + q_{hyp}(T_{hyp} - T_{us})\Big] + \sum_{i=1}^{n} Q_{trib,i}T_{trib,i} - \left[\frac{S_{end}T_{end} - S_{start}T_{start}}{\Delta t}\right] \end{split}$$

Groundwater discharge Hyporheic Tributary exchange Discharge Change in heat storage

Modeled average temperature – August 22 to 29, 2009

Input Values – Reach 2 – Box Valley Aug 22 – 29, 2007

Temperatures (°C)	Upstream Downstream Tributary Groundwater	14.8 13.5 11.9 10.0
Flow (m ³ s ⁻¹)	Upstream Downstream Tributary	0.00905 0.00972 0.00019
Heat flux (W m ⁻²)	Net Radiation Friction Evaporation Convection Streambed Conduction	33.2 0.22 -16.6 -15.0 -13.3
Unknowns	Groundwater flow	??
	Hyporheic exchange	??

Reach 2 – heat budget model

1. Non-advective flux only Modeled Downstream T=15°C

Measured Downstream T=13.5°C

2. Non-advective and tribs Modeled=Measured DS T=13.5°C

Modeled $Q_{trib} = 10 \times Q_{measured}$

3. Non-advective, GW and tribs	$Q_{gw} + Q_{trib} = measured Q_{downstream}$	
	Modeled Downstream T = 14.7°C	
	Measured Downstream T=13.5°C	

4. Non-advective, GW, tribs and $Q_{gw}=0.00042 \text{ (m}^{3} \text{ s}^{\cdot 1}) (0.5 Q_{measured})$ Hyporheic flux $\alpha = 0.00016 \text{ (s}^{\cdot 1})$ $q_{hyp}=0.000095 \text{ (m}^{2} \text{ s}^{\cdot 1})$

Input Values – Reach 5 - Floodplain

Temperatures (°C)	Upstream Downstream Tributaries Groundwater	13.3 13.3 11.0 – W, 15.5 E 9.0
Flow (m ³ s ⁻¹)	Upstream Downstream Tributaries	0.00993 0.01079 0.00035 - W 0.00022 - E
Heat flux (W m ⁻²) List temp change	Net Radiation Friction Evaporation Convection Streambed Conduction	33.2 0.19 -17.5 -15.5 -27.0
Unknowns	Groundwater flow	??
	Hyporheic exchange	??

Reach 5 – heat budget model

1. Non-advective flux only	Modeled Downstream T=13.4°C Measured Downstream
T=13.3°C	
2. Non-advective and W trib	Modeled=Measured DS T=13.3°C
	Modeled $Q_{trib} = 1.1 \times Q_{measured}$
3. Non-advective, GW and tribs	$Q_{gw} + Q_{trib} = measured Q_{downstream}$
	Modeled Downstream T = 13.35°C
	Measured Downstream
T=13.3°C	
4. Non-advective, GW, tribs and	Q _{gw} =0.000255
Hyporheic flux	$\alpha = 0.00001 (s^{-1})$
	q _{hyp} =0.000005 (m ² s ⁻¹)

Advective discharge totals add temps only reach 2 & 5



Temperature change due to heat flux component – August 22 to 29, 2009



FODTS survey – August 22 to 28, 2007



What keeps this cold stream cold?

Non-advective heat flow



- <u>Canopy</u> shades solar radiation, net radiation low, keeps valley floor cool
- Streambed conduction where <u>streambed is cool</u>
 temperature gradient
- Evaporative, convective, friction fluxes <u>small</u>



What keeps this cold stream cold?

Advective flow



- Spring fed tributary streams – cool, constant temperature
- Large permeable zone around tributaries – widens point source
- Hyporheic cooling through exchange and streambed conduction
- Preferential GW flow in lower reaches
- Without streambed and GW-SW interaction, stream cannot stay cool

Conclusions

•Sand and gravel deposit is important groundwater source

•Small spring-fed tributaries are primary groundwater delivery system

•Hyporheic exchange most important in upper reaches – quantification still difficult

Streambed conduction plays major role in moderation
"symbiotic cooling effect" – needs further study

•Groundwater plays <u>multi-faceted</u> role in temperature reduction and maintenance



Acknowledgements

•Thanks to my advisor, Dr. Jennifer Jacobs, for her unflagging encouragement and hours of fieldwork, number crunching and reviewing.

•Dr. Matt Davis for his expertise in groundwater, field work and heat flow modeling and assistance with field equipment.

•Dr. Fred Day-Lewis, USGS for his time, expertise, and generosity in making this project happen.

•USGS, Geophysical Branch, Fred Day-Lewis and Carole Johnson for generous use of geophysical and FODTS equipment and supporting field work.

•Thanks to landowners Phillip and Gail Sanborn for the unrestricted access to their land for this research.

•Dr. Joseph Licciardi for his field visit and assistance with site geomorphology.

•Drs. Tom Ballestero and Rob Roseen for use of mini-piezometers, flumes, and data loggers.

•Dr. David Burdick for use of Lasermark survey equipment.

•Thanks for the hours of field assistance by Sam Truslow, Ellen Douglas, Dan Coons, Gary LeMay, Kerry Schorzman, Pallavi, Hwan Hee Han, Ram Ray, Lee Friess, Matt Farfour, John Reed, John Duncan.

Funding and equipment support

UNH Department of Earth Sciences – Dingman Fund Research Grant and tuition support

NSF National Center for Aerial Laser Mapping (NCALM) – LiDAR Seed Grant

USGS – Geophysical Branch, Storrs, CT FODTS and geophysical equipment and support

Questions??

51