

1 **Reintroduced large wood modifies fine sediment transport and storage**
2 **in a lowland river channel**

3

4 Chris Parker¹, Alexander J. Henshaw², Gemma L. Harvey², and Carl. D. Sayer³

5

6 ¹ Department of Geography and Environmental Management, University of the West of
7 England, Bristol, UK

8 ² School of Geography, Queen Mary University of London, UK.

9 ³ Environmental Change Research Centre, Department of Geography, University College
10 London, UK.

11

12 **Abstract**

13 This paper explores changes in suspended sediment transport and fine sediment storage at
14 the reach and patch scale associated with the reintroduction of partial LW jams in an
15 artificially over-widened lowland river. The field site incorporates two adjacent reaches: a
16 downstream section where LW jams were reintroduced in 2010 and a reach immediately
17 upstream where no LW was introduced. LW pieces were organised into 'partial' jams
18 incorporating several 'key pieces' which were later colonised by substantial stands of aquatic
19 and wetland plants. Reach-scale suspended sediment transport was investigated using
20 arrays of time-integrated suspended sediment samplers. Patch-scale suspended sediment
21 transport was explored experimentally using turbidity sensors to track the magnitude and
22 velocity of artificially generated sediment plumes. Fine sediment storage was quantified at
23 both reach and patch scales by repeat surveys of fine sediment depth. The results show
24 that partial LW jams influence fine sediment dynamics at both the patch and reach scale. At
25 the patch-scale, introduction of LW led to a reduction in the concentration and increase in

1 the time lag of released sediment plumes within the LW, indicating increased diffusion of
2 plumes. This contrasted with higher concentrations and lower time lags in areas adjacent
3 to the LW; indicating more effective advection processes. This led to increased fine
4 sediment storage within the LW compared with areas adjacent to the LW. At the reach-
5 scale there was a greater increase in fine sediment storage through time within the restored
6 reach relative to the unrestored reach, although the changes in sediment transport
7 responsible for this were not evident from time-integrated suspended sediment data. The
8 results of the study have been used to develop a conceptual model which may inform
9 restoration design.

10

11 **Keywords**

12 Large wood; organic debris; suspended sediment; fine sediment; river restoration; sediment
13 transport, sediment storage

14

15 **Introduction**

16 In-stream large wood (LW) can be defined as living or dead wood greater than 1 m in length
17 and 0.1 m in diameter (Thevenet et al., 1998) and occurs naturally in wooded river systems.
18 LW influences channel morphology (Montgomery et al., 2003; Wohl, 2016) and performs an
19 array of important ecological functions (Abbe and Montgomery, 1996; Benke et al., 1985;
20 Gurnell et al., 2005; Sweka and Hartman, 2006). LW can affect fluvial sediment dynamics
21 at a range of scales including the reach-scale and the patch-scale (Montgomery et al., 2003).
22 At the reach-scale, LW may reduce total sediment transport and increase sediment storage
23 by physically blocking sediment transport (Hart, 2002; Montgomery et al., 2003), generating
24 local flow divergence (Montgomery et al., 2003), and reducing the shear stress available for
25 sediment transport by increasing roughness (Assani and Petit, 1995; Manga and Kirchner,

1 2000). The resulting sediment storage can be highly significant (Bilby and Ward, 1989;
2 Brown et al., 1999; Hart, 2002; Montgomery et al., 2003; Mosley, 1981; Nakamura and
3 Swanson, 1993; Ryan et al., 2014; Skalak and Pizzuto, 2010). As an example, Elozegi et
4 al. (2016) projected that basin-wide restoration of LW loading would store 60% of the current
5 annual sediment yield in four streams draining into the Añarbe Reservoir in Spain. As a
6 result of this increased storage, river systems with large quantities of LW can have reduced
7 variability in sediment transport rates (Lancaster et al., 2001; Massong and Montgomery,
8 2000) and the removal of LW can result in large increases in sediment transport as stored
9 sediment is released (Beschta, 1979; Bilby, 1981; Heede, 1985; Smith et al., 1993a).

10
11 At the patch-scale, LW influences the spatial variability of sediment dynamics by inducing
12 strong spatial variations in shear stress and, therefore, sediment transport and bed material
13 size (Cherry and Beschta, 1989; Smith et al., 1993b). Flow may be concentrated in areas
14 adjacent to the LW, increasing local flow velocities (Hygelund and Manga, 2003) and
15 creating local spatial variation in sediment transport rates and storage (Hilderbrand et al.,
16 1998; Nakamura and Swanson, 1993; Skalak and Pizzuto, 2010; Trimble, 1997). For
17 example, He et al. (2009) used two-dimensional hydrodynamic modelling to show that partial
18 LW jams retarded flow and caused local deposition, whilst the flow in the rest of the channel
19 was accelerated leading to erosion. While the effects of LW depend on the structural
20 properties of the jams and the style of channel (Gurnell et al., 2002; Manners et al., 2007),
21 river channels with abundant LW tend to be more hydrogeomorphologically complex and
22 store more sediment than wood-depleted rivers and streams (Montgomery et al., 2003).

23 Despite the important contributions of LW to hydrogeomorphological processes and river
24 health (Erskine and Webb, 2003; Nakamura and Swanson, 1993; Watts, 2006), floodplain
25 development and river maintenance for navigation and flood risk management have resulted

1 in a long history of LW removal (Wohl, 2014), particularly in lowland rivers (Gippel et al.,
2 1996). More recently, increasing emphasis on improving the ecological status of water
3 bodies (European Parliament, 2000) has led to an increase in the re-introduction of LW in
4 river restoration projects (Cashman, 2014). Of the wood-based restorations in the UK's
5 National River Restoration Inventory, some 84% were in lowland rivers and channel over-
6 enlargement (38%) and fine sediment (30%) were the most commonly cited issues affecting
7 the channels to be restored using LW (Cashman, 2014). Over-enlargement, also known as
8 re-sectioning or over-widening, is where channel width is artificially increased in order to
9 increase channel conveyance capacity, but the increase in width reduces sediment transport
10 capacity so that sedimentation occurs (Brookes, 1985). The resulting fine sediment
11 deposition can alter channel morphology (Doeg and Koehn, 1994; Nuttal, 1972; Wright and
12 Berrie, 1987), reduce conveyance capacity (Singer et al., 2008), smother aquatic flora
13 (Brookes, 1986; Edwards, 1969), and reduce the availability of important habitat for benthic
14 invertebrates (Petts, 1984; Richards and Bacon, 1994; Schalchli, 1992) and fish (Armstrong
15 et al., 2003; Sear, 1993; Soulsby et al., 2001).

16
17 Despite the importance of fine sediment dynamics, and the growing popularity of LW as a
18 restoration tool within lowland rivers, the majority of research into the influence of LW on
19 fluvial sediment dynamics has concentrated on naturally occurring LW in high-energy
20 channels with coarse sediment beds (Montgomery et al., 2003; Wohl and Scott, 2016) with
21 only a few exceptions (Keller and Swanson, 1979; Skalak and Pizzuto, 2010). The impact
22 of LW differs between river types (Keller and Swanson, 1979; Wohl and Scott, 2016) and
23 the lack of research on the impacts of LW on sediment dynamics in lowland rivers therefore
24 represents an important knowledge gap. Furthermore, restored LW can have different
25 structural properties to naturally occurring LW, with implications for hydromorphological

1 processes (Cashman, 2014). This paper aims to quantify the influence of reintroduced
2 partial LW jams on fine sediment dynamics in an artificially over-widened lowland river
3 reach. In particular, two key research questions are addressed:

- 4 1. How has the introduction of partial LW jams influenced the transport of suspended
5 sediment, at both the reach- and patch-scale?
- 6 2. How has the introduction of partial LW jams influenced the storage of fine sediment
7 (sand and silt), at both the reach- and patch-scale?

8 Based upon findings of previous studies of naturally occurring LW in high energy channels,
9 we hypothesised that, until a new equilibrium form is achieved, the reintroduced LW would
10 reduce reach-scale suspended sediment transport, increase reach-scale fine sediment
11 storage, and increase patch-scale variability in both suspended sediment transport and fine
12 sediment storage.

13

14 **Methods**

15 ***Field site***

16 The field site for this project was a 160 m reach of a lowland chalk stream, located at an
17 altitude of approximately 12 m AOD on the River Bure in North Norfolk, UK (Figure 1). The
18 majority of the upstream catchment land use is arable agriculture and the floodplain at the
19 study reach is wet alder (*Alnus glutinosa*) woodland. Prior to 2010, LW falling into the
20 channel had been removed as part of regular river maintenance and the channel was heavily
21 silted as a result of historic over-widening and dredging related to mill developments dating
22 back to the 18th Century. The bankfull channel width and mean depth were approximately
23 10 m and 1 m respectively, the bed slope along the reach was 0.0017, and the bed material
24 consists of fine gravel overlain by up to 0.8 m of sand and silt.

25

1 In November 2010, river restoration works were performed on the downstream 60 m of the
2 field site (by the UK National Trust) in response to concerns over the channel's ecological
3 status. The overall aim of the project was to improve the physical habitat by reinstating in-
4 stream LW features and hence natural processes. Riparian trees (Alder) were felled into
5 the river from the wooded riparian zone. A total of 22 'key pieces' (whole felled trees,
6 excluding rootwads, between 8 and 19 m in length) were organised into seven jams (Table
7 1 and Figure 1) and secured by anchoring to either the adjacent bank or the channel bed.
8 All seven jams were classed as 'partial jams' (Gregory et al., 1985) since they did not span
9 the full channel width. Following their introduction, the LW jams were colonised by aquatic
10 plants, which included floating plants (e.g. *Lemna minor*), emergent shallow water species
11 (e.g. *Nasturtium officinale*, *Apium nodiflorum*) and marginal emergent species (e.g. *Phalaris*
12 *arundinacea*, *Epilobium hirsutum*). The field site consisted of the 60 m restoration reach
13 where these partial LW jams were introduced ("R") and a further 100 m reach directly
14 upstream with no LW jams ("NR"; Figure 1). Figure 2 presents the sampling schedule for
15 the study within the context of the hydrological time series from a gauging station 2.5 km
16 downstream of the research site.

17

18 ***Time-integrated sampling of suspended sediment transport***

19 To investigate the impact of introducing partial LW jams on reach-scale suspended sediment
20 transport rates, four arrays of time-integrated suspended sediment samplers were installed
21 in May 2010, five months prior to the introduction of the LW. Each array consisted of three
22 passive samplers based upon the 'rocket' design of Phillips et al. (2000). Within each array
23 the three samplers were spaced evenly across the width of the channel and secured to the
24 bed at 0.6 of the flow depth at the mean daily flow (Q_{31}) following Phillips *et al.* (2000) using
25 steel uprights. As illustrated in Figure 1, two arrays were located upstream of where LW was

1 introduced: one at the upstream extent of the NR reach ('U1') and the other at the transition
2 between the NR reach and the R reach ('U2'). A further array was positioned within the
3 restored section, approximately halfway along the R reach ('D1') and the other downstream
4 of the R reach ('D2'). The contents of each of the arrays were emptied, dried and weighed
5 at the end of seven contiguous sampling periods (Figure 2). The first two sampling periods
6 were prior to the LW introduction (May-July 2010 and July-November 2010) and the
7 remaining five sampling periods followed the LW introduction (between November 2010 and
8 July 2012). Mean dry mass was calculated for each array (n = 3 samplers) for each sampling
9 period, and divided by the number of days in the sampling period to give the mean rate of
10 sampled suspended sediment transport (g day^{-1}).

11

12 ***In-situ experimental assessment of patch-scale suspended sediment transport***

13 To investigate the impact of individual LW jams on the transport of suspended sediment
14 plumes at the patch-scale, in-situ experiments were designed to record the downstream
15 transport of individual suspended sediment plumes created by controlled releases of silt
16 following Harvey and Clifford (2010). Similar tracer experiments have been used to explore
17 hydraulic habitat and retention in different channel types (Milner and Gilvear, 2012). Figure
18 3 illustrates the experimental set up for the release and measurement of the suspended
19 sediment plumes. Artificial plumes were generated using 100 ml containers of fine sediment
20 ($D_{50} \approx 0.25$ mm) collected from channel margins, spaced 0.1 m apart across the entire width
21 of the flow. The number of containers used varied (48-103) to account for variations in flow
22 width (4.8m-10.3m), ensuring consistent release concentrations at each cross section. The
23 containers were emptied into the water simultaneously 5 m upstream of a cross-sectional
24 array of turbidity sensors. Five infrared turbidity sensors (Left – "L", Left Centre – "LC",
25 Centre – "C", Right Centre – "RC", and Right – "R") were evenly spaced across the width of

1 the channel cross-section. They were secured to the channel bed at a height of 0.6 of the
2 water depth using steel uprights. Turbidity sensors were connected to a data logger,
3 recording data at a frequency of 5 Hz for a period of 3 minutes following the release of a
4 sediment plume. A similar experimental design has been applied in a lowland channel with
5 relatively low flow velocities and shallow water depths (Harvey and Clifford, 2010). Turbidity
6 was converted to sediment concentration (mg L^{-1}) by calibration ex-situ with known
7 concentrations of sediment collected from the field site ($D_{50} \approx 0.25$ mm). Relationships
8 between voltage output and suspended sediment concentration were quantified for each
9 sensor by fitting polynomial regression curves ($R^2 > 0.99$ for all five sensors). Plume
10 experiments were performed in triplicate at three cross-sections (Figure 1) at three times
11 throughout the study period: once before the LW was introduced (August 2010), and twice
12 following the LW introduction (April 2011 and July 2012; Figure 2). During all three
13 experimental periods river discharges were between the Q_{75} and the Q_{50} (Figure 2). The
14 three cross-sections were located as follows: one within the NR reach ('NR') and two within
15 the R reach where LW was introduced in November 2010 ('R_A' and 'R_B').

16
17 Suspended sediment time series from the plume experiments were smoothed using a
18 moving average window of two seconds in order to focus analysis on the characteristics of
19 released sediment plumes rather than turbulence-driven sediment suspension events.
20 Characteristics of sediment plumes were assessed by plotting measured sediment
21 concentration against time and by calculating the peak sediment concentration and time to
22 peak following release, following Harvey and Clifford (2010). These data were used to
23 explore differences before and after LW introduction both for cross-sections and for
24 individual points within cross-sections.

25

1 ***Measurement of fine sediment bed storage***

2 To quantify the impact of introduced LW jams on the deposition and storage of previously
3 suspended sediment at both the reach- and patch-scale, surveys of fine (silt and sand)
4 sediment depth were repeated six times throughout the sampling period (Figure 2). Two
5 surveys were conducted before the introduction of LW and four surveys following LW
6 introduction. For each survey fine sediment depth measurements were taken at 34 equally-
7 spaced (5 m) cross-sections – 13 within the R reach and a further 21 in the NR reach. At
8 each cross-section, four sample points were spaced equally across the width of the channel.
9 At each sample point, a 3 mm diameter pin, 1 m in length, was pushed into the riverbed until
10 it came into contact with underlying coarse substrate (Lisle and Hilton, 1992). This provided
11 measurements of fine sediment depth at a total of 136 points during each of the survey
12 periods: 52 in the R reach and 84 in the NR reach, with 36 of the points in the R reach in
13 patches within LW jams and the remaining 16 points in the R reach in patches adjacent to
14 LW jams. These data were used to explore differences in fine sediment storage before and
15 after LW introduction, at both the reach- and patch-scale, and the trajectory of any changes
16 over the sampling period.

17

18 ***Data analysis***

19 Many of the collected data sets did not meet the assumptions of parametric tests and
20 therefore non-parametric statistical tests were applied. Correlations between variables were
21 assessed using Spearman's Rank, differences between group averages were explored
22 using Mann Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis H tests, and differences in the variability within
23 groups were explored using Levene's test. Confidence levels $\geq 90\%$ ($p \leq 0.1$) were applied
24 in all cases. Analyses were undertaken in Minitab 17 and Microsoft Excel 2010.

25

1 **Results**

2 ***Influence of LW on reach-scale suspended sediment transport***

3 The rate of suspended sediment transport at each of the sampling arrays throughout the
4 period of record is given in Figure 4. The sampled rate of sediment transport ranged from
5 0.0061 g day⁻¹ to 0.0944 g day⁻¹ over the study. There was a statistically significant
6 difference between the seven sampling periods (Kruskal-Wallis P = 0.002), but no significant
7 difference between the four sampling locations (Kruskal-Wallis P = 0.712). Whilst the rate
8 of suspended sediment transport measured at arrays downstream of LW was significantly
9 higher following LW introduction (median = 0.0546 g day⁻¹) compared to before (median =
10 0.0188 g day⁻¹; Mann-Whitney P = 0.077), a similar trend was also identified at arrays
11 upstream of LW (before median = 0.0248g day⁻¹; after median = 0.0587 g day⁻¹; Mann-
12 Whitney P = 0.040). Thus, while an increase in sediment transport following LW
13 reintroduction is apparent, it occurs both upstream and downstream of the LW.

14 15 ***Influence of LW on patch-scale suspended sediment transport***

16 Comparisons between suspended sediment plume transport characteristics at cross-
17 sections R_A and R_B before (2010) and after (2011) the LW introduction are given in Figure
18 5. There was no significant difference in peak sediment concentrations after the LW
19 introductions at either R_A (median before = 0.138 g L⁻¹; after = 0.109 g L⁻¹; Mann-Whitney P
20 = 0.927) or R_B (median before = 0.074 g L⁻¹; after = 0.095 g L⁻¹; Mann-Whitney P = 0.232).
21 There was also no significant change in times to peak following the LW introduction at R_A
22 (median before = 20.4 s, after = 27.4 s, Mann-Whitney P = 0.140), but there was a reduction
23 in times to peak at R_B (median before = 92.6 s, after = 78.0 s, Mann-Whitney P = 0.054).
24 Despite limited changes in average plume characteristics following LW introductions, there
25 were significant increases in the variability of plume characteristics at both cross-sections:

1 both for peak concentrations (R_A std. dev. before = 0.054 g L^{-1} , R_A std. dev. after = 0.096 g
2 L^{-1} , Levene's test $P = 0.054$; R_B std. dev. before = 0.025 g L^{-1} , R_B std. dev. after = 0.080 g L^{-1} , Levene's test $P = 0.018$); and times to peak (R_A std. dev. before = 3.98 s , R_A std. dev.
3 after = 21.83 s , Levene's test $P = 0.002$; R_B std. dev. before = 16.62 s , R_B std. dev. after =
4 37.06 s , Levene's test $P = 0.007$).

6
7 The spatial organisation of plume characteristics is explored for individual cross-sections in
8 Figure 6. At cross-section NR, where no wood was present, highest sediment
9 concentrations were in the centre of the channel with slightly longer times to peak towards
10 the left bank for two out of three experiments. In the 2012 experiment this pattern was
11 disrupted when the growth of emergent vegetation adjacent to the left hand bank reduced
12 the magnitude and velocity of the sediment plume on the left side of the channel. At the two
13 cross-sections where LW was introduced, the spatial pattern of sediment concentration and
14 time to peak was reorganised following LW introduction. At cross-section R_A prior to LW
15 introduction, peak concentrations were relatively similar across most of the channel but with
16 lower concentrations and longer time to peak at the margins. Following LW introduction
17 peak concentrations decreased within the LW and increased in areas adjacent to the LW.
18 There was also an increase in the time to peak within the LW. At cross-section R_B prior to
19 LW introductions, peak concentrations and times to peak were similar across the channel
20 width. Following LW introductions, the sediment plumes increased in magnitude and
21 velocity in areas adjacent to the LW but remained lower in areas within the LW.

22
23 The changes to the sediment plumes are illustrated in greater detail for an example cross
24 section (R_A) in Figure 7. A progressive differentiation between sediment traces within and
25 adjacent to LW is evident following the LW introduction. Prior to LW introduction, the shape

1 of sediment traces was similar across the channel width. Following LW introduction, the
2 within-wood sensors displayed lower concentrations and longer time lags indicating less
3 effective transmission of sediment plumes. In contrast, traces from sensors positioned
4 adjacent to the LW exhibited similar or higher peak concentrations and shorter lag times
5 following LW introduction.

7 ***Influence of LW on reach-scale and patch-scale fine sediment storage***

8 Figure 8a illustrates that both the R and NR reaches experienced increases in fine sediment
9 depth following LW introduction. However, the 95 mm increase in the median depth of the
10 R reach (before = 0.175 m, after = 0.270 m, Mann-Whitney P = 0.02) was greater than the
11 35 mm increase in the median depth of the NR reach (before = 0.075 m, after = 0.110 m,
12 Mann-Whitney test P < 0.001). Fine sediment depths also became more variable in the R
13 reach (SD before = 0.166 m, std. dev. after = 0.186 m, Levene's test P = 0.074) but there
14 was no increase in the variability within the NR reach (std. dev. before = 0.110 m, std. dev.
15 after = 0.138 m, Levene's test P = 0.480).

16
17 Patch-scale sediment storage at points within and adjacent to the LW jams in reach R are
18 presented in Figure 8b. Prior to LW introductions (2010) there was no significant difference
19 between fine sediment storage in areas where LW was later introduced and the adjacent
20 channel areas (wood median = 0.180 m, adjacent median = 0.155 m, Mann Whitney P = 1),
21 but following LW introductions (2011) these LW patches became associated with
22 significantly higher sediment storage than adjacent areas (wood median = 0.320 m, adjacent
23 median = 0.170 m, Mann Whitney P = 0.008). This change reflects an increase in fine
24 sediment storage in patches where LW was introduced following the LW introductions
25 (before median = 0.180 m, after median = 0.320 m, Mann Whitney P < 0.001), while no

1 significant change was identified for patches adjacent to the LW (before median = 0.155 m,
2 after median = 0.170 m, Mann Whitney P = 1).

3
4 The trajectories of these reach-scale and patch-scale changes in fine sediment storage are
5 explored in Figure 9. Positive trends between sediment depth and time were observed for
6 both the R reach and the NR reach, and for points within the R reach both within and
7 adjacent to the wood. However, while there was a general trend for sediment accumulation
8 across the whole study site, the gradient of the trend is steeper in the R reach than the NR
9 reach, and steeper at the points within the wood than at the points adjacent to the wood.
10 Mean sediment accumulation in the R reach is at an average rate of 67 mm year⁻¹ whilst the
11 mean accumulation in the NR reach is 26 mm year⁻¹. Similarly, mean sediment
12 accumulation at the points within the wood is at a rate of 77 mm year⁻¹, while mean
13 accumulation at points adjacent to the wood is just 42 mm year⁻¹.

14

15 **Discussion**

16 The reintroduced partial LW jams altered suspended sediment dynamics at both the patch-
17 and reach-scale in the study river. At the patch-scale, results of the controlled sediment
18 release experiments illustrate differences in suspended sediment transport within LW and
19 adjacent patches, indicating spatial variability in mixing mechanisms at moderate flow levels
20 (Q₅₀ – Q₇₅). Within LW patches, sediment plumes show longer times to peak and lower
21 peak sediment concentrations, indicating a dominance of diffusion processes whereby the
22 sediment cloud spreads out vertically through the water column and/or transversely towards
23 the banks from areas of high to low concentration (Rutherford, 1994). By contrast, in areas
24 of flow concentration adjacent to the LW, shorter times to peak and higher peak turbidity
25 values suggest more effective advection processes whereby the plume is moved

1 downstream as a coherent body with less significant changes in concentration. This patch-
2 scale variability in suspended sediment transport at moderate flow levels is reflected in
3 differences in fine sediment storage between patches within LW and patches adjacent to
4 LW. In turn, increased sediment storage within the LW signals that the dispersion processes
5 lead to retention of sediment within the LW jam, while the maintenance of channel depth in
6 patches adjacent to the LW reflects more efficient transport of sediment. Increases in spatial
7 variability of sediment transport and storage caused by the reintroduced LW in this artificially
8 over-widened lowland river channel reflect previous findings from studies of naturally
9 occurring LW in higher energy environments (Montgomery et al., 2003; Nakamura and
10 Swanson, 1993; Wohl and Scott, 2016) and, by creating a more diverse array of physical
11 habitats for aquatic organisms, could help to address legislative requirements like the EU
12 Water Framework Directive (European Parliament, 2000).

13
14 At the reach-scale, a measureable reduction in sediment transport was not evident in time-
15 integrated suspended sediment data despite fine sediment storage increasing in both the R
16 and NR reaches throughout the sampling period. It is possible that short-term modification
17 of flow patterns in the R reach resulted in local sediment mobilisation during or immediately
18 following restoration in the R reach. However, given the same trends are observed in both
19 the R and NR reaches, it likely reflects the influence of catchment supply processes and the
20 supply-limited nature of suspended sediment dynamics (Amos et al., 2004; Asselman, 1999;
21 Einstein and Chien, 1953; Nicholas et al., 1995). Fine sediment storage did, however,
22 increase at a faster rate within the restored reach relative to the unrestored reach. This
23 demonstrates that the LW did reduce reach-scale sediment transport enough to encourage
24 net sediment deposition, reflecting previous findings within higher energy channels (Bilby
25 and Ward, 1989; Elosegi et al., 2016; Mosley, 1981; Nakamura and Swanson, 1993).

1 However, the reduction in reach-scale sediment transport responsible for increased storage
2 was not significant in relation to supply-driven variability in transport rates, findings which
3 differ to those from higher energy systems (Lancaster et al., 2001; Massong and
4 Montgomery, 2000).

5
6 It is important to note that extensive stands of wetland plants were associated with the
7 reintroduced LW jams at this study site. This characteristic may be expected for other
8 lowland rivers subject to restoration as management of the riparian zone can promote the
9 growth of aquatic plants by reducing shading and elevating nutrient levels (Bunn et al., 1998;
10 Duarte, 2012; Wersal and Madsen, 2011).

11
12 The results from this study can be used to develop a model of the influence of restored,
13 vegetated, partial LW jams on suspended sediment dynamics in artificially over-widened
14 lowland rivers, which includes two form-process feedback loops (Figure 10). The first occurs
15 where the increase in local hydraulic roughness (Assani and Petit, 1995) and the physical
16 barrier caused by a partial LW jam (Montgomery et al., 2003) reduces sediment transport
17 through the LW, causing more fine sediment accumulation within the LW. This sediment
18 accumulation acts to further increase local hydraulic roughness and the physical barrier
19 created by the jam. Growth of aquatic plants around the LW, as characteristic of our study
20 site and lowland rivers more generally, may amplify this process by contributing additional
21 'ecosystem engineering' capacity (Gurnell, 2014). The second form-process feedback loop
22 occurs where the increased local hydraulic roughness and physical barrier created by the
23 LW jam increases the proportion of flow diverted around the jam and therefore increases
24 local shear stress and sediment transport around the jam (Hilderbrand et al., 1998;
25 Nakamura and Swanson, 1993; Trimble, 1997). Elevated sediment transport around the

1 jam acts to maintain the channel thalweg around the LW so that further increases in the
2 obstruction caused by the LW may be counter-balanced by increased sediment transport
3 around the LW. Based on these results, it can be hypothesised that, over time, these
4 processes will result in the previously over-widened channel becoming narrower as the LW
5 jams fill with sediment and become permanent morphological features. If this occurs, the
6 channel should eventually achieve a new equilibrium form with narrower channel
7 dimensions to support sufficient sediment transport capacity and reduce the likelihood of
8 further aggradation. Further long-term monitoring would be required to assess these
9 changes.

10

11 **Conclusion**

12 This paper shows patch and reach scale alterations to the sediment dynamics of an
13 artificially over-widened lowland river as induced by reintroduced partial LW jams. The
14 findings make an important contribution to the evidence base for using LW in lowland river
15 restoration, where limited research on LW impacts on fine sediment dynamics has been
16 performed. We show that reintroduced LW induces patch-scale changes in mixing
17 mechanisms, altering local sediment dynamics leading to a combination of increased
18 storage around LW and increased transport in intervening areas. At the reach-scale the LW
19 caused aggradation, suggesting that sediment retention within LW jams exceeded the rate
20 of sediment removal from adjacent areas of flow concentration. However, the influence that
21 this had on reach-scale suspended sediment transport was not measurable amongst the
22 supply-driven variability observed over the sampling period. The results of this study are
23 directly relevant to LW-based restoration design within over-widened lowland river channels
24 but may also provide a useful framework for assessing LW-based restoration design within
25 other channel types, and for understanding how naturally occurring LW jams influence

1 lowland river channels. Further research is now required to assess the influence of different
2 types of LW jams, including naturally occurring LW, on fine sediment dynamics in lowland
3 channels; to assess the influence of LW on suspended sediment transport across varying
4 discharges; and to provide longer-term evaluation of the trajectory of change in restored
5 channels following wood reintroductions.

7 **Acknowledgements**

8 With special thanks to Dave Brady and the UK National Trust for access to the field site,
9 providing background information and postponing the restoration to allow for baseline data
10 collection. This research was supported by a British Society for Geomorphology Research
11 Grant ('Assessing the long term influence of wood on the hydromorphology of a lowland UK
12 river') and a University of the West of England Early Career Research Starter Grants
13 scheme. The paper is dedicated to Dave Brady, the driving force behind this project.

15 **References**

- 16 Abbe TB, Montgomery DR. 1996. Large woody debris jams, channel hydraulics and habitat
17 formation in large rivers. *Regulated Rivers: Research & Management* **12**: 201–221. [online]
18 Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1646\(199603\)12:2/3%3C201::AID-RRR390%3E3.0.CO;2-A](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1646(199603)12:2/3%3C201::AID-RRR390%3E3.0.CO;2-A)
19
- 20 Amos KJ, Alexander J, Horn A, Pocock GD, Fielding CR. 2004. Supply limited sediment
21 transport in a high-discharge event of the tropical Burdekin River, North Queensland,
22 Australia. *Sedimentology* **51**: 145–162. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-3091.2004.00616.x [online]
23 Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-3091.2004.00616.x> (Accessed 1 July
24 2016)
- 25 Armstrong J., Kemp P., Kennedy GJ., Ladle M, Milner N. 2003. Habitat requirements of

1 Atlantic salmon and brown trout in rivers and streams. *Fisheries Research* **62**: 143–170. DOI:
2 10.1016/S0165-7836(02)00160-1

3 Assani AA, Petit F. 1995. Log-jam effects on bed-load mobility from experiments conducted
4 in a small gravel-bed forest ditch. *CATENA* **25**: 117–126. DOI: 10.1016/0341-
5 8162(95)00004-C [online] Available from:
6 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/034181629500004C> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

7 Asselman NEM. 1999. Suspended sediment dynamics in a large drainage basin: the River
8 Rhine. *Hydrological Processes* **13**: 1437–1450. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-
9 1085(199907)13:10<1437::AID-HYP821>3.0.CO;2-J [online] Available from:
10 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/%2528SICI%25291099->
11 [1085%2528199907%252913%253A10%253C1437%253A%253AAID-](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/%2528SICI%25291099-1085%2528199907%252913%253A10%253C1437%253A%253AAID-)
12 [HYP821%253E3.0.CO%253B2-J](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/%2528SICI%25291099-1085%2528199907%252913%253A10%253C1437%253A%253AAID-) (Accessed 1 July 2016)

13 Benke AC, Henry RL, Gillespie DM, Hunter RJ. 1985. Importance of Snag Habitat for Animal
14 Production in Southeastern Streams. *Fisheries* **10**: 8–13. DOI: 10.1577/1548-
15 8446(1985)010<0008:IOSHFA>2.0.CO;2 [online] Available from:
16 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1577/1548->
17 [8446%25281985%2529010%253C0008%253AIOSHFA%253E2.0.CO%253B2](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1577/1548-8446%25281985%2529010%253C0008%253AIOSHFA%253E2.0.CO%253B2) (Accessed
18 13 June 2016)

19 Beschta R. 1979. Debris Removal and Its Effects on Sedimentation in an Oregon Coast
20 Range Stream. *Northwest Science* [online] Available from:
21 https://www.wou.edu/las/physci/taylor/andrews_forest/refs/beschta_1979.pdf (Accessed 13
22 June 2016)

23 Bilby RE. 1981. Role of organic debris dams in regulating the export of dissolved and
24 particulate matter from a forested watershed. *Ecology* **62**: 1234–1243. DOI:
25 10.2307/1937288

1 Bilby RE, Ward JW. 1989. Changes in Characteristics and Function of Woody Debris with
2 Increasing Size of Streams in Western Washington. Transactions of the American Fisheries
3 Society **118**: 368–378.DOI: 10.1577/1548-8659(1989)118<0368:CICAFO>2.3.CO;2
4 [online] Available from: [http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1577/1548-
5 8659%25281989%2529118%253C0368%253ACICAFO%253E2.3.CO%253B2](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1577/1548-8659%25281989%2529118%253C0368%253ACICAFO%253E2.3.CO%253B2) (Accessed
6 13 June 2016)

7 Brookes A. 1985. Traditional engineering methods, physical consequences and alternative
8 practices [online] Available from: ppg.sagepub.com

9 Brookes A. 1986. Response of aquatic vegetation to sedimentation downstream from river
10 channelisation works in England and Wales. Biological Conservation **38**: 351–367.DOI:
11 10.1016/0006-3207(86)90060-1 [online] Available from:
12 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0006320786900601> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

13 Brown P, Douglas J, Gooley G, Tennant W. 1999. Biological assessment of aquatic habitat
14 restoration in the Broken River and Ryans Creek, North East Victoria. 137–197 pp.

15 Bunn SE, Davies PM, Kellaway DM, Prosser IP. 1998. Influence of invasive macrophytes
16 on channel morphology and hydrology in an open tropical lowland stream, and potential
17 control by riparian shading. Freshwater Biology **39**: 171–178.DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-
18 2427.1998.00264.x [online] Available from: [http://doi.wiley.com/10.1046/j.1365-
19 2427.1998.00264.x](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1046/j.1365-2427.1998.00264.x) (Accessed 1 July 2016)

20 Cashman MJ. 2014. The effect of large wood on river physical habitat and nutritional
21 dynamics. Queen Mary, University of London : 1–230. [online] Available from:
22 http://www.diss.fu-berlin.de/diss/receive/FUDISS_thesis_000000100839?lang=en
23 (Accessed 13 June 2016)

24 Cherry J, Beschta RL. 1989. COARSE WOODY DEBRIS AND CHANNEL MORPHOLOGY:
25 A FLUME STUDY. Journal of the American Water Resources Association **25**: 1031–

1 1036.DOI: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.1989.tb05417.x [online] Available from:
2 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1752-1688.1989.tb05417.x> (Accessed 23 February 2016)

3 Doeg TJ, Koehn JD. 1994. Effects of draining and desilting a small weir on downstream fish
4 and macroinvertebrates. *Regulated Rivers: Research & Management* **9**: 263–277.DOI:
5 10.1002/rrr.3450090407 [online] Available from:
6 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/rrr.3450090407> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

7 Duarte CM. 2012. Submerged aquatic vegetation in relation to different nutrient regimes.
8 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00785236.1995.10422039>

9 Edwards D. 1969. Some effects of siltation upon aquatic macrophyte vegetation in rivers.
10 *Hydrobiologia* **34**: 29–38.DOI: 10.1007/BF00040321 [online] Available from:
11 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF00040321> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

12 Einstein HA, Chien N. 1953. Can the rate of wash load be predicted from the bed-load
13 function? *Transactions, American Geophysical Union* **34**: 876.DOI:
14 10.1029/TR034i006p00876 [online] Available from:
15 <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/1953/TR034i006p00876.shtml> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

16 Elozegi A, Diez JR, Flores L, Molinero J. 2016. Pools, channel form, and sediment storage
17 in wood-restored streams: Potential effects on downstream reservoirs. *Geomorphology*
18 [online] Available from:
19 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169555X1630006X>

20 Erskine WD, Webb AA. 2003. Desnagging to resnagging: new directions in river
21 rehabilitation in southeastern Australia. *River Research and Applications* **19**: 233–249.DOI:
22 10.1002/rra.750 [online] Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/rra.750> (Accessed 13
23 June 2016)

24 EU. 2000. Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing
25 a framework for the Community action in the field of water policy

1 Gippel CJ, O'Neill IC, Finlayson BL, Schnatz I. 1996. Hydraulic guidelines for the re-
2 introduction and management of large woody debris in lowland rivers. *Regulated Rivers:
3 Research & Management* **12**: 223–236. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-
4 1646(199603)12:2/3<223::AID-RRR391>3.0.CO;2-# [online] Available from:
5 [http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/%2528SICI%25291099-
6 1646%2528199603%252912%253A2/3%253C223%253A%253AAID-
7 RRR391%253E3.0.CO%253B2-%2523](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/%2528SICI%25291099-1646%2528199603%252912%253A2/3%253C223%253A%253AAID-RRR391%253E3.0.CO%253B2-%2523) (Accessed 13 June 2016)

8 Gregory KJ, Gurnell a. M, Hill CT. 1985. The permanence of debris dams related to river
9 channel processes. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* **30**: 371–381. DOI:
10 10.1080/02626668509491000 [online] Available from:
11 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02626668509491000> (Accessed 13 June
12 2016)

13 Gurnell A. 2014. Plants as river system engineers. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*
14 **39**: 4–25. DOI: 10.1002/esp.3397 [online] Available from:
15 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.3397> (Accessed 1 July 2016)

16 Gurnell A, Tockner K, Edwards P, Petts G. 2005. Effects of Deposited Wood on
17 Biocomplexity of River Corridors. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **3**: 377. DOI:
18 10.2307/3868587 [online] Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.2307/3868587> (Accessed
19 13 June 2016)

20 Gurnell AM, Piegay H, Swanson FJ, Gregory S V. 2002. Large wood and fluvial processes.
21 *Freshwater Biology* **47**: 601–619.

22 Hart E. 2002. Effects of Woody Debris on Channel Morphology and Sediment Storage in
23 Headwater Streams in the Great Smoky Mountains, Tennessee-North Carolina. *Physical
24 Geography* **23**: 492–510. DOI: 10.2747/0272-3646.23.6.492 [online] Available from:
25 <http://bellwether.metapress.com/openurl.asp?genre=article&id=doi:10.2747/0272->

1 3646.23.6.492 (Accessed 24 October 2016)

2 Harvey GL, Clifford NJ. 2010. Experimental field assessment of suspended sediment
3 pathways for characterizing hydraulic habitat. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*
4 **Published**

5 He Z, Wu W, Douglas Shields F. 2009. Numerical analysis of effects of large wood structures
6 on channel morphology and fish habitat suitability in a Southern US sandy creek.
7 *Ecohydrology* **2**: 370–380. [online] Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/eco.60>

8 Heede BH. 1985. Channel adjustments to the removal of log steps: an experiment in a
9 mountain stream. *Environmental Management* **9**: 427–432. DOI: 10.1007/BF01866341
10 [online] Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF01866341> (Accessed 13 June
11 2016)

12 Hilderbrand RH, Lemly AD, Dolloff CA, Harpster KL. 1998. Design Considerations for Large
13 Woody Debris Placement in Stream Enhancement Projects. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1577/1548-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1577/1548-8675(1998)018<0161:DCFLWD>2.0.CO;2)
14 [8675\(1998\)018<0161:DCFLWD>2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1577/1548-8675(1998)018<0161:DCFLWD>2.0.CO;2) **18**: 161–167.

15 Hygelund B, Manga M. 2003. Field measurements of drag coefficients for model large
16 woody debris. *Geomorphology* [online] Available from:
17 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169555X02003355> (Accessed 23
18 February 2016)

19 Keller EA, Swanson FJ. 1979. Effects of large organic material on channel form and fluvial
20 processes. *Earth Surface Processes* **4**: 361–380. DOI: 10.1002/esp.3290040406 [online]
21 Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.3290040406> (Accessed 24 October 2016)

22 Lancaster ST, Hayes SK, Grant GE. 2001. Modeling sediment and wood storage and
23 dynamics in small mountainous watersheds. In . American Geophysical Union; 85–102.
24 [online] Available from:
25 <http://www.agu.org/books/ws/v004/WS004p0085/WS004p0085.shtml> (Accessed 13 June

1 2016)

2 Manga M, Kirchner J. 2000. Stress partitioning in streams by large woody debris. *Water*

3 *Resources Research* [online] Available from:

4 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2000WR900153/full> (Accessed 23 February

5 2016)

6 Manners RB, Doyle MW, Small MJCW. 2007. Structure and hydraulics of natural woody

7 debris jams. *Water Resources Research* **43**: n/a-n/a. [online] Available from:

8 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2006WR004910>

9 Massong TM, Montgomery DR. 2000. Influence of sediment supply, lithology, and wood

10 debris on the distribution of bedrock and alluvial channels. *Geological Society of America*

11 *Bulletin* **112**: 591–599. DOI: 10.1130/0016-7606(2000)112<591:IOSSLA>2.0.CO;2 [online]

12 Available from: [http://gsabulletin.gsapubs.org/cgi/doi/10.1130/0016-](http://gsabulletin.gsapubs.org/cgi/doi/10.1130/0016-7606(2000)112%253C591:IOSSLA%253E2.0.CO;2)

13 [7606\(2000\)112%253C591:IOSSLA%253E2.0.CO;2](http://gsabulletin.gsapubs.org/cgi/doi/10.1130/0016-7606(2000)112%253C591:IOSSLA%253E2.0.CO;2) (Accessed 13 June 2016)

14 Milner VS, Gilvear DJ. 2012. Characterization of hydraulic habitat and retention across

15 different channel types; introducing a new field-based technique. *Hydrobiologia* **694**: 219–

16 233. DOI: 10.1007/s10750-012-1164-3 [online] Available from:

17 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10750-012-1164-3> (Accessed 22 June 2016)

18 Montgomery DR, Collins BD, Buffington JM, Abbe TB. 2003. Geomorphic effects of wood in

19 rivers. *Ecology and Management of Wood in World Rivers* **37**: 21–47.

20 Mosley MP. 1981. The influence of organic debris on channel morphology and bedload

21 transport in a New Zealand forest stream. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **6**: 571–

22 579. DOI: 10.1002/esp.3290060606 [online] Available from:

23 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.3290060606> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

24 Nakamura F, Swanson FFJ. 1993. Effects of coarse woody debris on morphology and

25 sediment storage of a mountain stream system in western Oregon. *Earth Surface Processes*

1 and Landforms **18**: 43–61.DOI: 10.1002/esp.3290180104 [online] Available from:
2 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/esp.3290180104/abstract>

3 Nicholas APP, Ashworth PJ, Kirkby MJJ, Macklin MGG, Murray T. 1995. Sediment slugs:
4 large-scale fluctuations in fluvial sediment transport rates and storage volumes. Progress in
5 Physical Geography **19**: 500–519.DOI: 10.1177/030913339501900404 [online] Available
6 from: <http://ppg.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/030913339501900404> (Accessed 1 July
7 2016)

8 Nuttal PM. 1972. The effects of sand deposition upon the macroinvertebrate fauna of the
9 River Camel, Cornwall. Freshwater Biology **2**: 181–186.DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-
10 2427.1972.tb00047.x [online] Available from: [http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2427.1972.tb00047.x)
11 [2427.1972.tb00047.x](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2427.1972.tb00047.x) (Accessed 13 June 2016)

12 Petts GE. 1984. Impounded rivers : perspectives for ecological management . Wiley

13 Richards C, Bacon KL. 1994. Influence of fine sediment on macroinvertebrate colonization
14 of surface and hyporheic stream substrates. West N Am Naturalist. Great Basin Naturalist
15 **54**: 106–113.DOI: 10.2307/41712819

16 Rutherford JC. 1994. River mixing . Wiley: Chichester

17 Ryan SE, Bishop EL, Daniels JM. 2014. Influence of large wood on channel morphology
18 and sediment storage in headwater mountain streams, Fraser Experimental Forest,
19 Colorado. Geomorphology **217**: 73–88.DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.03.046

20 Schalchli U. 1992. The clogging of coarse gravel river beds by fine sediment. Hydrobiologia
21 **235–236**: 189–197.DOI: 10.1007/BF00026211 [online] Available from:
22 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF00026211> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

23 Sear DA. 1993. Fine sediment infiltration into gravel spawning beds within a regulated river
24 experiencing floods: Ecological implications for salmonids. Regulated Rivers: Research &
25 Management **8**: 373–390.DOI: 10.1002/rrr.3450080407 [online] Available from:

1 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/rrr.3450080407> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

2 Singer MB, Aalto R, James LA. 2008. Status of the Lower Sacramento Valley Flood-Control
3 System within the Context of Its Natural Geomorphic Setting. *Natural Hazards Review* **9**:
4 104–115. DOI: 10.1061/ASCE1527-6988(2008)9:3(104)

5 Skalak K, Pizzuto J. 2010. The distribution and residence time of suspended sediment
6 stored within the channel margins of a gravel-bed bedrock river. *Earth Surface Processes
7 and Landforms* **35**: 435–446. DOI: 10.1002/esp.1926 [online] Available from:
8 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.1926> (Accessed 24 October 2016)

9 Smith RD, Sidle RC, Porter PE. 1993a. Effects on bedload transport of experimental removal
10 of woody debris from a forest gravel-bed stream. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*
11 **18**: 455–468. DOI: 10.1002/esp.3290180507 [online] Available from:
12 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.3290180507> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

13 Smith RD, Sidle RC, Porter PE, Noel JR. 1993b. Effects of experimental removal of woody
14 debris on the channel morphology of a forest, gravel-bed stream. *Journal of Hydrology* **152**:
15 153–178. DOI: 10.1016/0022-1694(93)90144-X [online] Available from:
16 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/002216949390144X> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

17 Soulsby C, Youngson AF, Moir HJ, Malcom IA. 2001. Fine sediment influence on salmonid
18 spawning habitat in a lowland agricultural stream: a preliminary assessment. *The Science
19 of the Total Environment* **265**: 295–307.

20 Sweka JA, Hartman KJ. 2006. Effects of Large Woody Debris Addition on Stream Habitat
21 and Brook Trout Populations in Appalachian Streams. *Hydrobiologia* **559**: 363–378. DOI:
22 10.1007/s10750-005-9117-8 [online] Available from:
23 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10750-005-9117-8> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

24 Thevenet A, Citterio A, Piegay H. 1998. A new methodology for the assessment of large
25 woody debris accumulations on highly modified rivers (example of two French Piedmont

1 rivers). *Regulated Rivers: Research & Management* **14**: 467–483. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-
2 1646(1998110)14:6<467::AID-RRR514>3.0.CO;2-X [online] Available from:
3 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/%2528SICI%25291099-1646%25281998110%252914%253A6%253C467%253A%253AAID-RRR514%253E3.0.CO%253B2-X> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

4
5
6 Trimble SW. 1997. Stream channel erosion and change resulting from riparian forests. *Geology* **25**: 467. DOI: 10.1130/0091-7613(1997)025<0467:SCEACR>2.3.CO;2 [online]
7 Available from: [http://geology.gsapubs.org/cgi/doi/10.1130/0091-7613\(1997\)025%3C0467:SCEACR%3E2.3.CO;2](http://geology.gsapubs.org/cgi/doi/10.1130/0091-7613(1997)025%3C0467:SCEACR%3E2.3.CO;2) (Accessed 13 June 2016)

8
9
10 Watts K. 2006. British forest landscapes: the legacy of woodland fragmentation. *Quarterly Journal of Forestry* **100**: 273–279.

11
12 Wersal RM, Madsen JD. 2011. Influences of water column nutrient loading on growth characteristics of the invasive aquatic macrophyte *Myriophyllum aquaticum* (Vell.) Verdc. *Hydrobiologia* **665**: 93–105. DOI: 10.1007/s10750-011-0607-6 [online] Available from:
13
14 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10750-011-0607-6> (Accessed 1 July 2016)

15
16 Wohl E. 2014. A legacy of absence: Wood removal in US rivers. *Progress in Physical Geography* **38**

17
18 Wohl E. 2016. Bridging the gaps: An overview of wood across time and space in diverse rivers. *Geomorphology* DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.04.014 [online] Available from:
19 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169555X16302082> (Accessed 24 October 2016)

20
21
22 Wohl E, Scott DN. 2016. Wood and sediment storage and dynamics in river corridors. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* : n/a-n/a. DOI: 10.1002/esp.3909 [online] Available from:
23 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/esp.3909> (Accessed 24 October 2016)


24
25 Wright JF, Berrie AD. 1987. Ecological effects of groundwater pumping and a natural

1 drought on the upper reaches of a chalk stream. Regulated Rivers: Research &
2 Management 1: 145–160.DOI: 10.1002/rrr.3450010205 [online] Available from:
3 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/rrr.3450010205> (Accessed 13 June 2016)

4


5

- 1 *Figure 1: Site map for the study reach of the Bure including locations of LW pieces,*
- 2 *suspended sediment samplers, and plume experiment cross-sections.*




- 3
- 4
- 5

1 *Figure 2: Timing of LW introductions, time-integrated sediment sampling periods, sediment*
 2 *plume experiments, and fine sediment depth measurements in relation to discharge as*
 3 *measured by the flow gauge at Ingworth, 2.5 km downstream of the study site (CEH NRFA*
 4 *gauge 34003). Numbered boxes represent time-integrated suspended sediment sampling*
 5 *periods. Upper, middle and lower horizontal lines indicate the Q_{10} , Q_{50} and Q_{90}*
 6 *respectively.*




7
8
9

- 1 Figure 3: Experimental set up for the release and measurement of suspended sediment plumes – in plan (a) and profile (b)
- 2




- 3
- 4
- 5

1 *Figure 4: Mean rate of dry mass of suspended sediment collected across arrays of time-*
2 *integrated samplers during each sampling period.*



3
4
5


1 *Figure 5: Comparison between cross-section characteristics of suspended sediment plume*
 2 *transport at cross-sections R_A and R_B before (2010) and after (2011) the introduction of*
 3 *LW: (a) Peak sediment concentrations; (b) Times to peak.*



4

1

2 *Figure 6: Peak sediment concentrations and times to peak for each sensor (L, LC, C, RC*
3 *and R) during each set of sediment plume experiments (August 2010, April 2011 and July*
4 *2012) for a cross-section where no LW has been introduced (NR) and two cross-sections*
5 *where LW was introduced in November 2010 (R_A and R_B).*




6

7


8

- 1 *Figure 7: Sediment concentration readings at the R_A cross-section during the sediment*
- 2 *plume experiments conducted in 2010, 2011 and 2012. No signal from the left sensor in*
- 3 *2012.*




- 4
- 5
- 6

1 *Figure 8: Comparison between fine sediment depths before (2010) and after (2011) LW*
 2 *was introduced for points in the R and NR reaches (a), and points in patches within and*
 3 *adjacent to wood (b).*



4

1 *Figure 9: Trajectory of fine sediment depths over the sampling period.*




2

3

4

1 *Figure 10: Model of the influence of partial jams of large wood on the suspended sediment*
 2 *dynamics in artificially over-widened lowland rivers. Boxes in grey represent assumed*
 3 *changes in variables not directly measured within this study.*



4
5
6
7

- 1 *Table 1: Key properties for the seven wood jams introduced into the study reach of the*
- 2 *River Bure. Jam orientation refers to deviation from the channel centreline.*

Jam	No. wood pieces	Max piece length (m)	Max piece diameter (m)	Jam orientation (°)
A	2	10	0.5	20
B	3	14.2	0.41	15
C	3	16.2	0.5	10
D	5	19	0.65	20
E	3	15.2	0.29	170
F	3	8.2	0.35	150
G	3	10.2	0.59	20

3