A morphology independent methodology for quantifying planview river change and characteristics from remotely sensed imagery

Joel C. Rowland^{a*}, Eitan Shelef^a, Paul A. Pope^b, Jordan Muss^a, Chandana Gangodagamage^a, Steven P. Brumby^c, and Cathy J. Wilson^a

^a Earth & Environmental Sciences Division, MS-J495, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, 87505. (jrowland@lanl.gov, shelefeitan@gmail.com, muss@lanl.gov, chhandana@gmail.com, and cjw@lanl.gov)

^b Intelligence & Space Research Division, MS-B244, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, 87505. (papope@lanl.gov)

^c Computer, Computational, and Statistical Sciences Division, MS-B244, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, 87505. (steven@descarteslabs.com)

* Corresponding author: jrowland@lanl.gov, phone: 01 505-665-2871

Abstract

Remotely sensed imagery of rivers has long served as a means for characterizing channel properties and detection of planview change. In the last decade the dramatic increase in the availability of satellite imagery and processing tools has created the potential to greatly expand the spatial and temporal scale of our understanding of river morphology and dynamics. To date, the majority of GIS and automated analysis of planview changes in rivers from remotely sensed data has been developed for single-threaded meandering river systems. These methods have limited applicability to many of earth's rivers with complex multi-channel planforms. Here we present the methodologies of a set of analysis algorithms collectively called Spatially Continuous

Riverbank Erosion and Accretion Measurements (SCREAM). SCREAM analyzes planview river metrics regardless of river morphology. These algorithms quantify both the erosion and accretion rates of riverbanks from binary masks of channels generated from imagery acquired at two time periods. Additionally, the program quantifies the area of change between river channels and the surrounding floodplain and area of islands lost or formed between these two time periods. To examine variations in erosion rates in relation to local channel attributes and make rate comparisons between river systems of varying sizes, the program determines channel widths and bank curvature at every bank pixel. SCREAM was developed and tested on rivers with diverse and complex planform morphologies in imagery acquired from a range of observational platforms with varying spatial resolutions. Validation and verification of SCREAM-generated metrics against manual measurements shows no significant measurement errors in determination of channel width, erosion, and bank aspects. SCREAM has the potential to provide data for both the quantitative examination of the controls on erosion rates and for the comparison of these rates across river systems ranging broadly in size and planform morphology.

1. Introduction

The analysis of river planform properties and dynamics has long used aerial photography and increasingly incorporates satellite imagery. Traditionally, extracting a representation of a river, such as banklines or a centerline, relied on labor-intensive efforts by a human analyst to digitize the river channel. The development of supervised and semi-automated methodologies for extracting a binary representation of rivers from pixel-based images (e.g. Brumby et al., 1999; Dey & Bhattacharya, 2013; Dillabaugh, Niemann, & Richardson, 2002; Hamilton et al., 2007; Marra, Kleinhans, & Addink, 2014; McFeeters, 1996; Merwade, 2007; Quackenbush, 2004; Smith & Pavelsky, 2008; Xu, 2006) and the wealth of freely available imagery offers the potential to greatly expand both the temporal and spatial scale of river analysis (Fisher, Bookhagen, & Amos, 2013). In response to the greater availability of imagery, expanded use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and image processing software packages, a number of published and freely distributed methodologies for extracting river metrics from imagery have become available over the past decade. Examples of such tools include, but are not limited to, the ArcGIS-based River Planform Statistics Toolbox (Aalto, Lauer, & Dietrich, 2008), the Interactive Data Language (IDL)-based RivWidth code (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008), the Matlab-based width and centerline ChanGeom code (Fisher, Bookhagen, & Amos, 2013), and Matlab-based channel centerline and curvature codes (Legleiter & Kyriakidis, 2006). Table 1 provides a representative summary of the range of measurements these and other published methodologies generate. The ever-expanding availability of high-resolution topographic data has led to the development of geomorphic change detection (GCD) and DEMs of difference (DoD) methods to quantify both lateral and vertical changes in river systems (James et al., 2012; Wheaton et al., 2010). The temporal and spatial availability of data sets needed for this type of analysis,

however, are still limited enough that the analysis of remotely sensed imagery remains a critical tool for studies of multi-temporal river dynamics.

Current methodologies have the potential to add great efficiency to the analysis task of river planview metrics, but a lack of method standardization in river change studies still persists (Hooke, 1980; Lawler, 1993; Peixoto, Nelson, & Wittmann, 2009). This problem arises from variation in data sources, analysis tools, and the objectives of the individual studies. This lack of methodological consistency between studies greatly confounds inter-study comparisons and data compilation efforts. Furthermore, the diversity of metrics used to quantify change complicates the comparison of results of planview river changes between studies. Reported measures include: lateral migration, erosion, accretion, area change as a percentage of river area, change in area per unit river length, river path length, sinuosity, curvature, radius of curvature, width, and areal changes in river channel position (Table 1). Bank erosion and channel migration rates represent the most commonly reported metrics and can be, but are not necessarily, synonymous. Bank erosion measurements quantify the material removed from the exposed face of a riverbank, and are reported as a linear distance per interval of time (e.g., meter (m) per year (yr)). Channel migration measures the net movement of a channel resulting from the change in river location due to the combined effects of erosion and deposition (Leopold, 1973; Leys & Werritty, 1999).

Numerous studies using remotely sensed data have determined lateral migration rates based on the lateral change in the river centerline position, commonly calculated as the midpoint between opposite banks (e.g. Aalto, Lauer, & Dietrich, 2008; Constantine et al., 2014; Konrad et al., 2011; Lauer & Parker, 2008b; Legleiter & Kyriakidis, 2006; Mount & Louis, 2005; Shields, Simon, & Steffen, 2000) or directly digitized by the analyst (e.g. Brice, 1977; Constantine, Dunne, & Hanson, 2009; Hooke & Harvey, 1983; Hooke & Yorke, 2010; Micheli, Kirchner, &

Larsen, 2004; Micheli & Larsen, 2011; Micheli & Kirchner, 2002). For a single-threaded channel with a constant width and no positional errors in bank location, the change in the position of the centerline should accurately reflect bank erosion (Figure 1a). Hooke & Yorke (2010) and Parker et al. (2011), however, point out that in many migrating river channels, the erosion and accretion of banks become temporally out of phase. A channel may widen in response to bank erosion followed by a corresponding bank accretion on the opposing bank causing the channel to then narrow resulting in temporal width variations. A centerline derived from a channel in which the position of only one side of the channel has moved over the time interval examined will reflect only half the actual change in the bank erosion (or accretion) (Figure 1b). Additionally, in river channels experiencing widening or narrowing due to erosion or accretion on both sets of banks, channel migration estimates derived from centerlines will only measure the difference, not the total magnitude, in the widening and narrowing occurring on opposite banks. In a situation where the widening or narrowing occurs equally on opposing banks, there will be no recorded migration of the channel centerline (Figure 1c). Therefore, in studies and modeling efforts examining the rate of movement of a channel as a whole, migration rates derived from centerlines represent an appropriate and accurate metric. However, in studies that quantify sediment exchange to and from floodplains or the dynamics of bank erosion, migration rates of channel centerlines may not fully capture the dynamics of the system. Additionally, recent advances in modeling of river channel erosion and migration treat the dynamics of opposing banks independently (Asahi et al., 2013; Eke, Parker, & Shimizu, 2014; Eke et al., 2014; Parker et al., 2011; Zolezzi, Luchi, & Tubino, 2012a), thereby necessitating measurement techniques that quantify bank changes independent of the net movement of the channel centerline.

108 **Table 1: Summary of Representative River Analysis Methods and Metrics**

	Method									
	Planform Statistic Toolbox ¹	RivWidth ²	ChanGeom ³	Centerline Polygons ⁴	Centerline Curvature ⁵	Area Based Change ⁶	CWT ⁷	Outer bank displacement ⁸	SCREAM	SCREAM Output
Morphology	S	S/M	S	S	S	S/M	M	M	S/M	
Metric										
<i>Linear rates of lateral channel migration</i>	Intervals	--	--	Polygons	--	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Linear rate of bank erosion</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	XS	--	--
<i>Linear rate of bank accretion</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Bank pixel/ segment averages	Raster/Text
<i>Area of erosion</i>	--	--	--	--	--	Entire river reach	--	--	Entire river reach/ segments	Text
<i>Area of accretion</i>	--	--	--	--	--	Entire river reach	--	--	Entire river reach/ segments	Text
<i>Change as % of channel area</i>	--	--	--	--	--	Entire river reach	--	--	Entire river reach/ segments	Text
<i>Percentage of banks eroding and accreting</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Segments	Text
<i>Spatial and temporal patterns of bank change</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	XS	--	--	--
<i>Channel Width</i>	Intervals	CP	CP	--	--	--	--	--	Bank pixel/ Segment averages	Raster/Text
<i>Total width of multi-thread channels</i>	--	CP	--	--	--	--	--	XS	Segment averages	Text
<i>Centerline curvature</i>	Intervals	--	--	--	Continuous	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Bank curvature</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Bank pixel	Raster/Text
<i>Bank aspect</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Bank pixel	Raster/Text
<i>Sinuosity</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Continuous/ Segment averages	Text
<i>Channel Elongation</i>	Intervals	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Number of Islands</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Segments	Text
<i>Total Island Area</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Segments	Text
<i>Total Length of Banks</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Segments	Text
<i>Total Length of Island Perimeters</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Segments	Text
<i>Number and location of cutoffs and avulsions</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Entire river reach	Text

109 S – Single-thread channel

110 M – Multi-thread channel

111 XS – Cross section

112 CP – Centerline Pixel

113 ¹ (Aalto, Lauer, & Dietrich, 2008; Lauer & Parker, 2008b); ² (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008); ³ (Fisher, Bookhagen, & Amos, 2013); ⁴ (Micheli, Kirchner, & Larsen, 2004; Micheli & Kirchner, 2002); ⁵

114 (Güneralp & Rhoads, 2008; Legleiter & Kyriakidis, 2006); ⁶ (Peixoto, Nelson, & Wittmann, 2009); ⁷ Continuous Wavelet Transforms (Mount et al., 2012); ⁸ (Baki & Gan, 2012; Hossain, Gan, & Baki, 2013)

117

Figure 1: Three hypothetical changes in channel position between Time 1 and Time 2 having equal areas of erosion of the bounding floodplain but differing channel centerline migration (dashed lines). a) The channel shifts laterally 50m, with equal areas of erosion and deposition on opposite sides of the channel. b) The channel at Time 2 widens by 50 m on one side, the average linear erosion along the banks is 50 m, but the migration of channel centerlines is only 25 m. c) The channel widens by 50 m by eroding 25 m along each channel margin. The total erosion along the channel is the same as a and b, but the migration of the centerline indicates 0 m of change.

126

While effective methodologies have been developed and applied to quantify channel widths in multi-threaded channel systems (Allen & Pavelsky, 2015; Pavelsky & Smith, 2008; Yamazaki et al., 2014), the majority of methods developed for analyzing changes in planview river properties from remotely sensed imagery were developed for and applied to single-threaded

meandering channel systems (Table 1). These methods have limited applicability to multi-threaded systems with complex planform geometries. This limitation greatly restricts the size and global extent of river analysis efforts. The earth's mega rivers (as defined by Latrubesse (2008) as having mean annual discharges $> 17,000 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$), with the exception of the Mississippi River, have complex multi-thread channel patterns (Ashworth & Lewin, 2012; Latrubesse, 2008). Many smaller river systems also have complex multi-threaded channel forms. The limited number of studies that have explored planview change in multi-threaded river systems used varied methods and metrics creating a challenge for inter-river comparisons. For example, Mount et al. (2012) provided a wavelet-based analysis of bank line retreat on the Jamuna River, Bangladesh. This study quantified the displacement of the system's outermost banks normal to the dominant orientation of the river channel belt, but did not examine bank erosion within the network of river channel threads. Similarly, measurements of outer bank displacements of the Jamuna River and the Ganges were made on evenly spaced cross-sections oriented orthogonally to the valley axis (Baki & Gan, 2012; Hossain, Gan, & Baki, 2013). Other research on the Jamuna used a network centrality approach to characterize the structure and variability of the channel belt, but did not explore bank erosion rates (Marra, Kleinhans, & Addink, 2014). Studies of the Lena River, Russia have measured bank erosion rates and bank movement rates, but the details of the methodology were not described (Costard & Gautier, 2008; Costard et al., 2007; Gautier et al., 2003).

Motivated by the need to measure planview changes of complex multi-threaded rivers, we developed a set of algorithms to analyze these changes using aerial photographs and satellite imagery. We have named this set of algorithms Spatially Continuous Riverbank Erosion & Accretion Measurements (SCREAM). Given the importance of bank properties (Thorne &

Tovey, 1981) and the local flow conditions (Darby et al., 2010; Kean & Smith, 2006a, b) on bank erosion rates, and the challenge of delineating centerlines in multi-threaded rivers, we adopted a bank-centered reference frame for measuring change. SCREAM generates a suite of measurements related to planview attributes of the channel, such as width, bank curvature, sinuosity, and bank aspects, as well as, metrics to quantify changes in channel and floodplain area and linear rates of changes in bank position over time (Table 1). These metrics may be determined at a scale as fine as the pixel resolution of the input imagery, and binned in regularly spaced intervals along the channel for examination of spatial patterns of river morphology and dynamics. Table 1 summarizes additional metrics related to planview characteristics of rivers calculated by SCREAM.

This paper aims to provide a clear description of the methodologies used to generate the range of metrics output by the SCREAM algorithms. This description will aid in the proper use of SCREAM by other researchers and allow for critical evaluation of the unique set SCREAM-generated outputs in future studies of river morphology and dynamics. Following the description of SCREAM methodologies, we apply SCREAM to a range of natural river systems to illustrate the output and place the metrics in the context of previously published methods and remote sensing based studies of rivers. We present an accuracy assessment of these example results by comparing SCREAM results to manually derived measurements. We supplement the results of this accuracy assessment with a comparison of SCREAM against existing algorithms for the measurement of lateral river channel migration, river channel curvature, and channel width. These comparisons allow for the evaluation of the comparability of SCREAM metrics relative to alternative methodologies and provide additional confidence in the reliability of SCREAM

output. We conclude with a discussion of what we perceive to be the relative strengths and limitations of SCREAM and areas for future evaluation and code refinement.

2. Methods

SCREAM incorporates a collection of scripts written in IDL, a commercially available software package licensed by ExelisVis. IDL-based applications may be run using the IDL Virtual Machine without a license. SCREAM requires two georeferenced binary masks of the river channel at two successive dates with pixels projected onto a common uniform grid of identical dimensions and resolutions. In these masks, river channel pixels have a value of one while all non-river channel pixels equal zero. Rather than digitizing the extents of river channels from imagery, we derived the channel masks from automated feature extraction software trained to identify river pixels in remotely sensed imagery. Mask generation occurs outside of SCREAM and the choice of masking methodology is not critical to the use of SCREAM. Binary masks of river channels may be generated using a variety of techniques (Brumby et al., 1999; Dey & Bhattacharya, 2013; Dillabaugh, Niemann, & Richardson, 2002; Fisher, Bookhagen, & Amos, 2013; Hamilton et al., 2007; Marra, Kleinhans, & Addink, 2014; McFeeters, 1996; Merwade, 2007; Quackenbush, 2004; Smith & Pavelsky, 2008; Xu, 2006; Zolezzi, Luchi, & Tubino, 2012b) though ones that rely on a spectral threshold for water to define the channel may suffer errors in estimating consistent bankfull extents with imagery acquired at times of differing river stages. However, if a user inputs river masks derived from the wetted extent of a river at different times with varying river stage, from other data sources, SCREAM could be used to calculate stage-area relationships useful for estimation of river discharge or hydrological modeling (Gleason & Smith, 2014; Smith & Pavelsky, 2008).

To minimize errors in bankfull channel extent associated with variations in river stage we extracted river channels based on criteria aimed at identifying the physical boundaries of the channel (Figure 2a). In our classification, we considered both open water and bare sand/gravel as river channel, while vegetated pixels were classified as non-river. Numerous prior studies of river channels have used this classification approach to delineate bankfull channel extents independent of river stage (Aalto, Lauer, & Dietrich, 2008; Fisher, Bookhagen, & Amos, 2013; Gurnell, 1997a; Gurnell, 1997b; Lauer & Parker, 2008b; Mount & Louis, 2005; Peixoto, Nelson, & Wittmann, 2009; Richard, Julien, & Baird, 2005; Winterbottom & Gilvear, 2000). While seasonal changes in vegetation cover and overhanging vegetation potentially result in uncertainty in the delineation of channel banks (Gurnell, 1997b; Mount & Louis, 2005), this method generally provides a consistent set of criteria for defining channel extents independent of river discharge. This approach inherently assumes that any region or bank within the channel that has exposed sediment experiences flow and sediment transport frequently enough to inhibit the colonization of vegetation. Therefore it experiences flow at time intervals that are within the common hydrological definition of bankfull flow (at least once every few years)(Knighton, 1998). In arid regions or other areas with sparse vegetation or infrequent channel clearing flows this assumption requires careful consideration.

To derive the binary channel masks used in this study, we used the supervised automated feature extraction software package GeniePro (Brumby et al., 1999; Perkins et al., 2005) which is commercially available from Observera Inc. and allows for the automated delineation of the full extent of a river channel (wetted and dry exposed portions of the channel bed) using all available spectral bands of the imagery based on a user defined set of training data. In addition to spectral content, GeniePro uses spatial context of pixels in the user-defined training regions to identify

distinct features within the imagery and can be trained to identify boundaries with variable attributes such as shadowing and vegetation. In our experience, GeniePro largely, but not completely, avoids the four significant hurdles to automated feature extraction of river channels raised by Priestnall & Aplin (2006): 1) determining the edge of the river; 2) channel boundaries obscured by vegetation or shadows; 3) confusion with other linear features; and 4) context.

Figure 2: a) Two binary masks of a portion of the Selawik River, Alaska derived from September 24 and 29, 2009 Geoeye images (red) and July 25, 1981 Alaska High Altitude Photography (AHAP) (blue). Areas of red not overlain by the blue mask represent areas of the

floodplain that eroded. Areas labeled “Sweep” mark places where the channel eroded more than a channel width. Areas where the channel jumped to a new location are labeled as “Avulsion” or “Cutoff”. b) Areas experiencing erosion, accretion, and both erosion and accretion.

Automated channel delineations were followed by manual edits to remove classification errors, eliminate areas affected by overhanging trees (evidenced by local outward irregularities in the bank lines and visibly tilted trees) and to trim fragments of tributary channels connected to the master channel of interest.

In addition to providing input rasters, the user needs to specify the dates of the imagery (in decimal years) and identify the corner of the raster closest to the upstream end of the channel mask. If the upstream end of the channel is near the middle of a raster boundary, then either corner of that boundary may be specified. Program options include: the ability to segment the channel rasters to calculate river change and attributes at regularly spaced intervals; specification of the interval length; and the selection of a common reference frame for multi-temporal analyses by providing an existing raster-based channel centerline for use in channel segmentation.

2.1 Delineating areas of change between time periods

SCREAM generates a map of change in a river channel location between the acquisition dates of the two images by differencing the two input rasters (Figure 2). Subtracting the Time 1 channel mask from the Time 2 channel mask generates a resultant raster with values of -1 for regions of channel accretion, 0 for no change, and 1 for erosion. Based on these values, SCREAM creates two separate change masks: erosion and accretion. Similar approaches were employed in studies of river planview change in the Amazon basin using a raster-based approach (Peixoto, Nelson, & Wittmann, 2009; Roza, Nogueira, & Castro, 2014), and Gurnell, Downward, & Jones (1994) used a comparable polygon-based approach. Each mask is analyzed separately but in an identical manner to quantify erosion and accretion, respectively. SCREAM

uses the number of pixels in each of the erosion/accretion regions to quantify areas of change and these measurements can be binned at regular intervals along the river channel (Section 2.5).

In a number of unique cases, the SCREAM analysis requires additional constraints to accurately measure erosion and accretion. If a river channel migrates more than a full channel width over the time interval between image acquisition, there will be regions of the mask that show no change between the two images but have in fact changed from non-river to river and back to non-river over this time period (Figure 2). This issue has also confounded prior area-based analyses of planview change in rapidly migrating rivers (Peixoto, Nelson, & Wittmann, 2009; Shields, Simon, & Steffen, 2000).

Identification of the regions where the channel has migrated more than a channel width becomes further complicated by instances in which the channel moves significant distances across the floodplain by abrupt jumps (cutoffs and avulsions) rather than continuous migration. The identification of such regions requires several screening steps. Areas undergoing both erosion and accretion can be identified because the river channel pixels fully enclose them when the river masks from the two time intervals are combined (Figure 2 – areas labeled “sweep”), but islands present at both time periods also meet this criteria. SCREAM, however, labels the islands in the initial input masks and excludes those pixels from further consideration. Next, to differentiate between areas over which the river continuously swept from Time 1 to Time 2 from areas where the river abruptly changed location through cutoff or avulsion, SCREAM compares the average distance across the possible area of change to the average local width of the channels bounding this area. SCREAM calculates this average distance by dividing the area of the region by half of the area’s perimeter length (Micheli, Kirchner, & Larsen, 2004). If the average distance across this bounded region is less than a user specified threshold (in units of local

channel widths), that is based on the size of the river, the rates of migration expected, and the time interval examined, then the change is considered to be a region where the channel has swept across the floodplain and SCREAM adds this area to both the erosion and accretion masks (red regions in Figure 2b). If the distance is greater than the threshold SCREAM marks these areas as either a cutoff or avulsion.

Prior to differencing the channel masks, SCREAM performs a filtering operation to remove the smallest islands in the mask. Changes associated with these features are the least accurate because they have the greatest relative error in terms of the number of potentially misclassified pixels (Supplemental Materials). The default filter threshold removes islands with areas smaller than the island area corresponding to the 0.01 percentile in the cumulative distribution of island sizes. The threshold was selected by trial and error to get rid of very small islands (a few pixels in size). To prevent the removal of significant islands in a river with a very uniform distribution of island sizes, a river must have more than 10 islands and the standard deviation in island sizes must be more than half the mean island size for filtering to be performed.

After differencing the masks, SCREAM also filters out single isolated pixels prior to calculating change in bank locations and channel areas, similar to the approach of Serra, Pons, & Sauri (2003). As with small islands, changes associated with a single pixel have the potential to have errors of similar magnitudes to the measured change due to both misregistration of imagery and/or classification errors (Supplemental Materials).

2.2 Linear rates of change

To examine the patterns and rates of change at the pixel scale and to generate metrics comparable to prior studies, we calculate linear rates of bank erosion and accretion in units of

(length (L) / time (T)) for every bank pixel in the input raster. The length used in these rates is the distance from a bank pixel at Time 1 to the closest bank pixel at Time 2 that borders the same region of channel change (Section 2.1) (Figure 3a). SCREAM employs identical methods for calculating rates of erosion and accretion, using separate erosion and accretion change masks.

Figure 3: Graphical illustration of the determination of erosion distances (the method is identical for accretion). a) A distance map (the colored pixels) is generated for each unique bank segment from the Time 2 channel mask (red line) and intersected with the Time 1 bank pixels (black). A linear rate of bank change is calculated by dividing the distance values by the time interval. b) Measurement of erosion distances for an island that completely erodes between Time 1 and Time 2. The distance map is created from the pixel(s) in the interior of the island (white pixel in colored region) that were furthest from any bank on the island perimeter at Time 1. The distances from bank pixels (black) to this interior point are determined by intersection with the distance map.

SCREAM identifies the riverbank pixels by subtracting the input river masks from a copy of the river mask dilated (expanded) by one pixel. This operation will create two bank segments (a series of laterally adjacent pixels) on either side of a single-thread river with no islands, but may delineate numerous unique bank segments for complex braided or anastomosing channels with islands because our analyses include island margins as banks.

We assign erosion rates to bank pixel locations in the Time 1 raster and accretion to pixels in the Time 2 raster because the reference bank pixels are only present at one time in the case of mid-channel islands that completely erode or form between the two time intervals. In these instances, SCREAM calculates change distances from the banks of the island to the pixel in the interior of the island furthest from any of the bank pixels (Figure 3b).

2.3 Width and bank aspect

Channel width is commonly measured orthogonal to the mean downstream flow direction, which is assumed to be approximately parallel to the inferred channel centerline (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008; Shields, Simon, & Steffen, 2000). For a river channel with parallel banks and a uniform width, this width will be the minimum distance between banks on opposite sides of the river. In rivers with complex channel planforms the shortest distance between two banks may significantly differ from the flow-normal cross sectional width (Figure 4). In order to address complex river planforms, SCREAM uses both distance and bank orientation to

determine the channel width perpendicular to the inferred flow direction that is assumed to be parallel to the local bank orientation.

SCREAM sequentially calculates the channel width for each bank pixel in the river mask at each time interval. At each bank pixel (Figure 4 ‘target pixel’), SCREAM determines the distance and angle to all the other bank pixels that fall within a subset of the river mask (Figure 4

Figure 4: An illustration of the determination of channel width. The red lines represents the shortest distance from a bank pixel to another bank line; the white dashed indicate the 40-degree screening window; and the green lines are the shortest paths the screening window from a target pixel (yellow) to the other bank.

‘preliminary search window’). Any bank pixel in this window with an angle beyond that of the ‘target’ bank aspect ± 20 degrees is eliminated from further consideration (Figure 4, ‘aspect

screening window'). We define the bank aspect as the orthogonal to the bank face (parallel to the direction of bank retreat), which ranges from 0 to 359 degrees in accordance with a traditional compass rose where 0 degrees represents north. The bank aspect used to set the screening window is determined by fitting a line to five bank pixels centered on the 'target' pixel (Figure 4 'preliminary bank orientation'). From this subset of possible matching pixels, SCREAM selects the pixel with the minimum distance from the 'target' pixel, and stores the distance and angle between it and the 'target' pixel as the width and new bank aspect.

2.4 Bank curvature and radius of curvature

The determination of bank aspects at all bank pixels allows for the calculation of the change in bank orientation over user-specified distances along each bank segment. This change in bank orientation divided by distance (radians/L) provides an estimate of bank curvature and its inverse the radius of curvature (L/radians).

SCREAM calculates curvature at the channel banks, rather than along the centerline, using an approach similar to that originally proposed by Nanson & Hickin (1983). This approach calculates curvature over two intervals centered on each bank pixel and then averages the two values. We use default values of two and four local channel widths the length of the intervals, following Nanson & Hickin (1983), but the interval can also be defined by the user if desired. To reduce noise in the curvature values, we first locally smooth the bank aspects using a Savitzky-Golay filter following the approach of Fagherazzi, Gabet, & Furbish (2004). We set the default smoothing coefficients to remove high frequency and low amplitude noise resulting from the non-continuous increments in bank aspects arising from the pixel-based representation of the channel banks. Increasing or decreasing the distance interval over which the curvature is calculated provides the ability to examine the influence of different scales of roughness on bank

measurements of bank curvature and how these variations may relate to bank erosion (Darby et al., 2010; Kean & Smith, 2006a, b). The smoothing of the aspect values reduces the noise but still preserves physical location of the bank pixels, in contrast to methods that smooth the vertices (or pixel locations) of the line prior to calculating the curvature (e.g. Fagherazzi, Gabet, & Furbish, 2004; Güneralp & Rhoads, 2008; Legleiter & Kyriakidis, 2006).

SCREAM also assigns a sign value to each curvature measurement: positive for concave (typically banks on the outside of a bend) and negative for convex (typically banks found on the inside of a bend). SCREAM determines the sign of the curvature by finding the pixel that falls midway along a line connecting the endpoints of the curvature interval and testing whether this midpoint pixel falls inside or outside of the river channel. Segments with midpoints falling in the river are assigned a positive value, indicating a concave bank. Although arbitrary, this sign convention allows for a straightforward evaluation of patterns of erosion and accretion relative to the inside and outside banks of river bends.

2.5 Centerline extraction, channel segmentation, and sinuosity

To provide spatial context to the measurements of channel change, width, and other planview properties, SCREAM can segment the channel at regularly spaced, user-specified, intervals (Figure 5). The spacing of the segment boundaries uses distances measured along the channel centerline. For single-threaded channels, the centerline falls midway between the outer banks. In a multi-threaded system, the centerline represents the midpoint between the two outermost banks of the larger channel belt similar to the approach taken by the RivWidth program (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008).

Generation of the channel centerline used in the segmentation process uses a distance mask generated from the binary mask of the river channel where all of the islands have been

Figure 5: An example of a portion of the Yukon River binary channel mask showing segmentation boundaries (red) and the centerline along which channel distances were calculated (green). The sections boundaries are evenly spaced along the centerline, but do not have equal areas. The black points mark the midpoint of the section on the centerline.

removed so that the distances are measured from the outermost bank segments. The distances in this mask are analogous to elevations in a digital elevation model (DEM) in which the highest local elevations (found along the middle of the channel mask) form a drainage divide. A similar approach is used skeletonization process adopted by others (Fisher, Bookhagen, & Amos, 2013; Graham, Reid, & Rice, 2005; Pavelsky & Smith, 2008). In addition to determining unique channel centerlines at Times 1 and 2, SCREAM calculates an average centerline that lies between the two time specific centerlines. This averaged centerline may be used as a common reference for relating the spatial locations of river changes across multiple time periods.

The segmentation algorithm then uses the centerlines for each time interval to divide the river raster into segments of equal length. Due to irregularities in the width between the outermost boundaries in many rivers, these segments commonly do not have equal areas. On some wide multi-threaded rivers with irregular outer boundaries, the use of lines orthogonal to the channel centerline to segment the channel (e.g. Alber & Piégay, 2011; Gangodagamage, Barnes, & Fouloula-Georgiou, 2007; Notebaert & Piégay, 2013; Pavelsky & Smith, 2008) led to intersecting boundary lines that resulted in channel fragments isolated from the centerline. Therefore, as an alternative to centerline orthogonals, SCREAM finds matching pairs of centerline and boundary pixels that are both spaced at regular intervals and segments the channel on lines connecting these pairs. To match a centerline pixel with a boundary pixel SCREAM uses the distance maps of the filled channel and takes a steepest “walk” from the centerline to each boundary. The paths of these steepest walks do not cross (avoiding isolated fragments) but the spacing end points on the boundary may become irregularly spaced in very complex channels. In these instances, if the spacing between adjacent boundary points is less than half the specified segmentation interval SCREAM adjusts the location of the points to be evenly spaced

between its neighboring boundary points. SCREAM then segments the channel along straight lines connecting the paired boundary and centerline points. The relative downstream distance and latitude and longitude of the midpoint of each segment is calculated and recorded.

Using this segmentation, the mean, median and standard deviation of erosion/accretion rates, and channel widths may be calculated for each segment along the channel belt.

Segmentation also allows for the calculation of the total area of erosion/accretion in each segment. Additionally, SCREAM calculates the total area of water and islands, the total length of all banks and the length of island banks, and the total number of islands in each segment.

SCREAM calculates two measures of width for each segment: 1) the mean of all the widths measured in a segment, and 2) the mean ‘cumulative’ width of all channel threads in a segment. The ‘cumulative’ width is calculated by dividing the total area of river channel pixels in the segment by the length of the segment. This metric provides an estimate of the average of combined widths of all channel threads in any finite length of the river. Our cumulative width is functionally equivalent to the “effective” width of Yamazaki et al. (2014), which is calculated by dividing the total area of a segment (water and islands) by a representative width of the segment and is also similar to the approach used by Church & Xu (2015) to calculate reach averaged channel widths.

SCREAM calculates the mean sinuosity for each segment from a continuous estimate of sinuosity at every centerline pixel, using a moving window with a default value of 100 mean channel widths (Snow, 1989). SCREAM calculates sinuosity by dividing the centerline distance by the straightline Euclidian distance between the centerline endpoints within the window. In the case of multi-threaded channels SCREAM reports the sinuosity of the larger channel belt and not the sinuosity of individual channel threads within this belt.

2.6 Output

SCREAM produces two types of output: GeoTiff rasters and text files. Rasters may be output for any of the pixel-based measurements: erosion/accretion rates, width, aspect, and curvature, as well as, for the centerline pixels, associated downstream distance, and the segmented channel. Text files store measurements for every bank pixel as well as for segments along the channel, with measurements referenced to the relative downstream position and latitude and longitude of the segment (Table 1).

3. Results

3.1 SCREAM metrics

SCREAM was tested on several Arctic rivers and a tropical river (Figure 6) that ranged in width from 70 to 2000 m and varied in planform morphology from single-thread to braided. Historical aerial photographs and satellite imagery with pixel resolutions ranging from 2 to 30 m were used for these analyses. When presented in raster space, the analyses provide a very detailed view of river width, bank aspects, and the spatial patterns of erosion and accretion (Figure 7), which may be compared at different time intervals for an individual river, used to compare characteristics between river systems, or used to explore relationships between erosion and accretion rates and river geometry. For example, the distribution of channel widths could be used as an indicator of channel type, where a single-threaded river would have a normal distribution of channel widths and a multi-threaded river would have a skewed distribution. Figure 8 is illustrative of this concept, the largely single-threaded Strickland River, Papua New Guinea has a nearly normal distribution and the complex, multi-threaded Yukon River, Alaska has a highly skewed distribution of widths dominated by a large number of small channels.

The measurement of bank aspects allows a novel view of spatial patterns of change (Figure 9). On the Yukon River, plots of the distribution of bank aspect (Figure 9a) and the rates of erosion (Figure 9b) show that banks facing to the southeast had the lowest distribution, but

Figure 6: Images of portions of the river channels analyzed by SCREAM: a) the Selawik River in northwest Alaska (September 24, 2009 Geoeye 2m false color image (near infrared, red, and green bands)). b) the Strickland River, Papua New Guinea (March 26, 1993 Landsat 5 30m natural color (Bands 3,2,1), path 65, row 99). c) the Yukon River, Alaska (August 23, 2008 Landsat 5 30m natural color composite (Bands 3, 2, 1), path 69, row 13) at 30m/pixel resolution (image id: L5069013_01320080823). d) the Yukon River (1974 color infrared aerial photograph scanned with a 2.5 m/pixel resolution).

Figure 7: Raster-based output from SCREAM. a) Bank pixels showing erosion rates between 1986 and 2008 of a small portion of the Yukon River. The bank pixel locations correspond to the channel banks in 1986 the underlying panchromatic image was collected in 2008 by Landsat 5. b) Accretion rates between 1986 and 2008 shown at the 2008 bank locations in scaled colors overlain on the panchromatic image. c) Local channel widths for all 1986 bank pixels. d) Aspects of the banks in 1986. Discharge measured at the Stevens Village gauge 90 km downstream (USGS ID: 15453500) was 10,250 cubic meter per second (cms) on June 15, 1986 and 6,230 cms on August 30, 2008. The Landsat images were collected on June 15, 1986 (path 70, row 13) for panels b-d and August 20, 2008 (path 70, row 13) for panel a.

Figure 8: Histograms of local channel widths generated from the 1986 mask of the Yukon River and the 1993 channel mask of the Strickland River.

Figure 9: a) The distribution of all bank aspects for the 1986 mask of the Yukon River. The dashed circles indicate the count of bank aspects within each aspect bin. b) Mean erosion rates by bank aspect binned in 10 degree increments. The erosion rates were determined based on changes in the river between 1986 and 1994. The dashed inner circles indicate erosion rates ranging from 0 to 4 m/yr. the highest rates of erosion. Such information has the potential to help identify river systems where thermally controlled processes may be affected by solar radiation and influence erosion rates. These systems include permafrost-dominated rivers and temperate rivers where freeze thaw cycles may result in disaggregation of bank materials and increased net erosion (Lawler, 1986; Leopold, 1973; Pizzuto, 2009; Wolman, 1959; Wynn, Henderson, & Vaughan, 2008; Yumoto et al., 2006). Even in systems not sensitive to thermal dynamics, the analysis of erosion rates by bank aspect may provide insight into the dominant directions of meander migration and growth (Hooke, 1984).

Mean erosion and accretion rates and total area eroded/accreted with distance along a river segment provides a spatial view of variations in river dynamics, facilitates the examination of patterns of change over time, and allows for these changes to be related to sinuosity and other channel planview attributes (*e.g.*, number of islands, size of islands, and overall channel lengths in a segment) in a manner similar to the analysis of the Amazon River by Mertes, Dunne, & Martinelli (1996). For example, Figure 10 shows erosion rates along the Yukon River between 1986 and 2008. The total erosion and accretion areas can also be compared at discrete intervals along the channel to identify regions of net sediment loss or gain (Figure 11). Combined with cross-sectional data on the relative heights of eroding banks and accreting bars, this output can be used to calculate the volume of sediment entering or leaving a river section due to the lateral movement of the channel (Church, 2006; Lauer & Parker, 2008a). Erosion rates can also be scaled using measurements of channel width and radius of curvature Hooke (1980), allowing

comparison of rates along a river and between river systems of vastly different sizes and channel morphologies. The ability to examine the relationship between erosion rates and channel

Figure 10: Erosion (a) and accretion (b) rates averaged at regularly spaced intervals along the Yukon River for the time period of 1986 to 2008.

527

528 **Figure 11:** Total area of eroded and accreted floodplain for a portion of the Yukon River
529 between 1986 and 2008. The areas of accretion exceed erosion for a large portion of the reach,
530 an imbalance that reflects the infilling of the several large oxbows.
531

532 curvature at all bank pixels represents a significant opportunity to expand current datasets and
533 rigorously test the control of curvature on bank erosion rates.

534 SCREAM output allows for the examination of downstream trends in channel width with
535 two metrics: the average channel width within a segment of the channel belt; and the mean
536 cumulative width of all of the channel threads within a segment of the river (Figure 12). For a
537 single-threaded channel, the average width provides a measure of downstream trends in channel
538 width with less noise than measurements extracted from regularly spaced cross sections. The
539 mean cumulative width represents a potentially more useful estimate of the effective channel
540 cross-section of multi-threaded channels for hydrological modeling purposes (Allen & Pavelsky,
541 2015; Pavelsky & Smith, 2008; Yamazaki et al., 2014), because the presence of large numbers of
542 relatively small channels (Figure 8) will result in average widths significantly less than the
543 average cumulative width of all of the channels in a segment.

Figure 12: Measured widths for a portion of the Selawik River, Alaska from a 1981 aerial photograph-derived channel mask. The mean channel width calculated at evenly spaced intervals is shown in black and the average cumulative channel width of each segment is displayed in blue. Where there is only a single channel thread in a segment the mean and cumulative widths are equal.

3.2 SCREAM Measurement Errors

We quantified the error in measurements of erosion, local channel width, and bank aspects to assess the accuracy of the metrics generated by SCREAM. It was assumed that the error in accretion and erosion rates would be the same because they employed identical measurement methodologies. Errors in river planview properties and change may arise in each step of the image analysis and change detection process: image registration, feature classification/extraction, and analysis of the binary rasters. These errors must be accounted for and quantified (Downward, Gurnell, & Brookes, 1994), in order to have confidence that documented change in river systems are not artifacts of the analysis. Mount et al. (2003) provided a detailed methodology for quantifying the errors associated with measurements of channel bankfull width from sequences of aerial photography, and Mount & Louis (2005)

explained how to propagate errors from bankline delineation into measurements of centerline migration rates. In these analyses, the source of error falls into two categories: 1) image registration, and 2) feature identification and extraction. Errors can also arise during the generation of the binary channel masks required by our analysis, but we do not attempt to quantify this error because these masks may be generated by a number of different techniques. Instead, we only quantify error arising from our methodology and the application of SCREAM to these masks. The propagation of errors arising from image registration and feature identification into metrics generated by SCREAM is discussed in Section 5 and Supplemental Materials.

Although image resolution will dictate whether a riverbank can be delineated (Congalton & Green, 2008), the ability to accurately measure erosion, accretion and width is a function of the size of the river being analyzed, rate of the channel change, and the time interval between images (Grabowski, Surian, & Gurnell, 2014; Mount et al., 2003). For example, images with high spatial resolution would be needed to accurately measure small shifts in a slowly changing river over a short time interval, but large shifts that are greater than the error in delineating the boundaries of the same river could be detected with coarser-resolution imagery with longer time periods between images.

Ideally, quantification of error would be based on the comparison of the SCREAM results to a set of independently obtained ground-truthed values, but measurements of erosion were not available for the time periods of images. Additionally, a field-based assessment of measurement errors would require a subtraction of image registration and classification errors from the total error in order to isolate the fraction of the error associated with the SCREAM analysis. Therefore, our error assessment was performed by comparing SCREAM-generated results against manual measurements made using the measurement tool in a GIS software package at a

585 number of randomly selected locations along the river channels. The same analyst performed a
586 duplicate set of width and erosion measurements on the most complex river system on which
587 SCREAM was tested (the Yukon River) in order to quantify the human errors of interpretation
588 and precision inherent in these manually measured values. We believe these manual
589 comparisons to be a conservative estimate because they reduce judgment errors associated with
590 different analysts when there is ambiguity in deciding the correct measurement. Between 100
591 and 250 pixel locations were selected from each of three river systems that varied both in size
592 and planform morphology in order to measure local channel width, bank erosion, and aspect. The
593 imagery used for these systems ranged in resolution from 2 to 30 m/pixel.

594 Table 2 presents a summary of error assessments for SCREAM analyses; the erosion
595 values are linear distances in meters, not rates. A Wilcoxon rank sum test was performed to test

596 **Table 2: Summary of Error Quantification**

River (dates)	Measurement	Image Resolution (m/pixel)	Mean Erosion (m)	Max Erosion (m)	Mean Width (m)	Max Width (m)	n	Wilcoxon ¹	p ²	Nash- Sutcliffe EC ³	SE of RMSE ⁴	SE (pix)
Yukon (1986-2008)	Erosion (m)	30	39	932	482	2327	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Local Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	250	N	0.86	0.99	0.67	0.02
	Aspect (deg)	--	--	--	--	--	250	N	0.85	0.76	12.14	0.4
	Aspect (deg)	--	--	--	--	--	250	N	0.77	0.96	1.27	NA
Yukon (1986-2008)	Comparison of manual measurements	30	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Erosion (m)	--	--	--	--	--	250	N	0.68	0.99	0.52	0.02
	Local Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	250	N	0.82	0.87	8.89	0.30
Yukon (1974-1981)	Erosion (m)	2.5	18	543	354	2077	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Local Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	195	N	0.89	1.00	0.06	0.03
	Local Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	195	N	0.98	0.98	3.57	1.40
Selawik (1981-2009)	Erosion (m)	2.0	21	160	66	316	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Local Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	100	N	0.75	0.63	1.2	0.6
	Local Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	100	N	0.97	0.93	1.44	0.72
	Cumulative Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	219	N	0.86	0.06	0.85	0.42
Strickland (1993-2007)	Aspect (deg)	--	--	--	--	--	82	N	0.84	0.98	1.7	NA
	Erosion (m)	30	57.4	636	336	826	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Local Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	100	N	0.97	0.99	0.65	0.02
	Local Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	100	N	0.69	0.98	1.61	0.05
	Cumulative Width (m)	--	--	--	--	--	284	Y	<1e ⁻⁴	0.86	1.38	0.05
All Systems (Pixels)	Aspect (deg)	--	--	--	--	--	100	N	0.74	0.99	0.64	NA
	Erosion (pix)	--	--	--	--	--	645	N	0.93	0.86	--	0.09
	Local Width (pix)	--	--	--	--	--	645	N	0.98	0.99	--	0.47

597 Notes: all erosion values are linear distances, not rates
598 n – number of measurements in error assessment
599 1 – Wilcoxon rank sum test, reject null hypothesis at 5% significance (N – no, Y – Yes)
600 2 – p-value for Wilcoxon test
601 3 – Efficiency coefficient
602 4 – Standard Error (SE) of Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)

whether each set of SCREAM-derived values and corresponding manual measurements were from continuous distributions with equal medians (Zar, 1999), because the distributions of many of the measurement sets were right skewed and non-normal. The Wilcoxon tests only rejected the null hypothesis for the cumulative widths for the Strickland River, indicating that all of the manual and SCREAM-derived measurements were comparable except in this isolated case.

We also calculated a Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency coefficient (Nash & Sutcliffe, 1970) for each set of measurements (Table 2). The efficiency coefficient was developed for hydrological modeling and results in values ranging from $-\infty$ to 1, where a value of 1 indicates a perfect agreement between model predictions and observed data. Nash-Sutcliffe coefficients of efficiency for all measurements, excluding the cumulative widths, were greater than 0.63, with 9 of the 13 comparisons having values greater than 0.95, suggesting that SCREAM-generated measurements agree well with those made manually.

Finally, for each set of measurements, we report the standard error (SE) of the root mean square error (RMSE) of the differences between the two methods, because the SE is a more appropriate measure than the RMSE for evaluating and propagating errors in river change studies, although it is less conservative (Mount & Louis, 2005). Quantitatively, the SEs confirm that the measurement errors associated with our analysis were low. SEs for erosion distance ranged from 0.06 to 1.2 m (0.02 to 0.6 pixels), while SEs in local width ranged from 1.4 to 12.1 m (0.05 to 1.4 pixels). The larger errors associated with the width measurements do not increase with the magnitude of the measurements; there was a very weak relationship, at most, between the magnitude of the measurement and the size of the error, suggesting that the error in these measurements may be propagated as a fixed value rather than as a percent of the measurement itself. SE values for the manual measurements on the Yukon River (1986-2008) were within

30% of those for SCREAM, suggesting a significant portion of the SCREAM errors may arise from the inherent uncertainty in the manual measurement methodology. Overall, the low standard errors, the results of the statistical tests, and the errors associated with the manual measurements all indicate that SCREAM-generated width and erosion measurements do not differ significantly from those obtained by manual measurements.

Low SEs of measurements of bank aspects (0.64 to 1.7 degrees) on the Yukon (1986 – 2008), Selawik, and Strickland Rivers suggest that SCREAM does well at measuring the riverbank orientation. Manual evaluation of curvature and radius of curvature proved more challenging and could only be performed in a qualitative manner. Radii determined by drawing circles superimposed onto channel bends (Lagasse et al., 2004) gave values consistent with the range calculated by SCREAM. The placement and fit of circles, however, can be quite subjective in general (Hooke, 1984), and has been noted to be problematic on compound and sharp bends (Hooke & Yorke, 2010). Section 4 presents a comparison of SCREAM's curvature values with the algorithms developed by Legleiter & Kyriakidis (2006).

Manual measurements of the cumulative width on a multi-threaded river would require an analyst to measure each individual channel width and then sum these widths along a cross section that bisects the network of channels. Obtaining enough cumulative measurements to calculate a robust average width along a section can be very labor intensive and time consuming. Due to this limitation we only evaluated cumulative widths on single-threaded sections of rivers and a simple synthetic multi-thread channel that had straight segments with 1 to 4 channels of varying sizes.

Of the river systems tested, the Strickland and Selawik rivers had large numbers of segments with only one channel thread, 284 out of 428 and 219 out of 422, respectively. The SEs

in cumulative width for both systems was low: 1.38 m (0.05 pixels) for the Strickland and 0.85 m (0.42 pixels) for the Selawik. These errors, however, were not randomly distributed. The cumulative width was systematically smaller than the mean width by 6 to 7 % which appears to have resulted from an overestimation of segment length when distances were calculated along the pixel-based delineation of the segment's centerline. Despite accounting for the difference in distance between diagonally ($\sqrt{2}$) and orthogonally (1) connected pixels, centerline distances typically varied from manually measured distances by ~6%; an error consistent with those reported from other studies calculating streamline distances from raster-based data (da Paz et al., 2008; Paz & Collischonn, 2007).

3.3 Comparison of methodologies

The large diversity of methodologies for quantifying river planview change and characteristics renders comparison of metrics between studies challenging, because each was developed for different applications and is reported in different formats (Table 1). Rather than judge the relative accuracy or utility of one method over another, we provide a comparison of rate of bank erosion inferred from lateral migration made by PST (ArcGIS-based Planform Statistics Toolbox (Aalto, Lauer, & Dietrich, 2008), available at: <http://www.nced.umn.edu/content/stream-restoration-toolbox>), measurements of bank curvature using the Legleiter curvature code (LCC; Legleiter & Kyriakidis (2006), and mean cumulative width calculated by RivWidth (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008) to comparable measurements using SCREAM. A natural river channel with a range of planform patterns was used for the analysis of mean cumulative width, while a simple synthetic single-threaded test channel was created with a periodic function with constant width (Figure 13) to assess the rate of bank erosion and bank

Figure 13: Synthetic river channel generated using a periodic function with constant width

curvature because each methodology had a different measurement technique that could not be readily compared on a natural system.

3.3.1 Rate of bank erosion

PST does not directly measure rate of bank erosion; it measures channel migration rates, which can be used to infer rates of bank erosion in the controlled case of our test channel.

Specifically, erosion and accretion are equal along the channel and match centerline migration (refer to Figures 1a and 13). PST derives representative centerlines for two time intervals from vector-based representations of channel banks, and determines centerline migration by measuring the displacement in the location of the centerlines.

We applied the PST to the test channel and recorded migration rates at intervals of 25 m and 100 m intervals along the channel and plotted them against 100 m averages of the continuous SCREAM erosion measurements (Figure 14). A direct one to one comparison of rates between

Figure 14: A comparison SCREAM erosion rates for synthetic channel (Figure 13) averaged over 100 m long segments (blue line) against lateral migration rates determined using the Planform Statistics Toolbox (Aalto, Lauer, & Dietrich, 2008) calculated at evenly spaced intervals of 25 (red line) and 100 m (black line) along the channel.

the two methods was not possible because PST provides discrete measurements at fixed intervals along the centerline while SCREAM's values represent the average erosion rate of all the bank locations within each 100m long interval. In instances where channel migration directly reflects bank erosion, SCREAM's bank erosion rates appear to be directly comparable to migration rates determined using PST's centerline-based methodology (Figure 14).

3.3.2 Bank curvature

We evaluated SCREAM's estimates of bank curvature by comparing curvature from the upper bank in the Time 1 synthetic channel (Figure 13) to curvatures calculated from the second derivative of a spline generated from a digitized line segment (Fagherazzi, Gabet, & Furbish, 2004; Güneralp & Rhoads, 2008; Legleiter & Kyriakidis, 2006) as represented by LCC. In its creation of a spline, LCC produces spatial values that are not directly comparable to raster locations, requiring a transformation of the LCC curvature values into raster-space by

performing a piecewise linear interpolation of endpoints, curvature maximums, and zero crossing points matched to the SCREAM output. Figure 15a compares SCREAM curvatures calculated over bank distance intervals of 4, 2, and $\frac{1}{2}$ channel widths to bank curvature calculated using the LCC smoothed 5 times with a 1-channel width wide filtering window and fit with a 3rd order polynomial. As the length of the interval over which SCREAM calculates the curvature decreases, the peak SCREAM curvature values approach the LCC-based values (Figure 15b). Even though the LCC method allows for variation in the size of the smoothing window, the method always determines curvature over an infinitely small distance.

Figure 15: Comparison of bank curvature values from SCREAM to curvature determined using LCC (Legleiter & Kyriakidis, 2006). The comparison was performed on the top bank in the Time 1 synthetic raster (Figure 13). a) The black lines show the curvature values obtained using smoothed data, LCC, and a 3rd order polynomial to fit a line to the bank pixels and the data was smoothed 5 times prior to fitting the polynomial. The SCREAM calculated curvature values were obtained using distance intervals of $\frac{1}{2}$, 2, and 4 channel widths (red, green, and blue lines respectively). b) a scatter plot showing SCREAM bank curvature values versus the LCC-derived values. The dashed line shows where a 1:1 correlation of values would fall on the plot. As the interval over which SCREAM calculates curvature decreases the values approach those calculated by the LCC method.

3.3.3 Mean cumulative width

Assessment of error in mean cumulative width for sections of single-threaded river channel is straightforward (Section 3.2), however, the mean width and the cumulative width of channel segments will not be equivalent at any point along a multi-threaded river. To our

knowledge, RivWidth is the only other published methodology (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008) that measures the total width of all channel segments in multi-threaded river systems.

The RivWidth methodology (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008) provides a measure of channel width for both single- and multi-threaded rivers using raster-based binary river masks by determining orthogonals to the channel centerline and counts the number of river pixels that fall on each orthogonal. Assessments performed by Pavelsky & Smith (2008) and our own application of the code suggest that RivWidth provides accurate measurements of width for single-thread systems and where the individual segments of multi-threaded river run parallel to the specified centerline. In systems with non-parallel channel threads, however, the centerline orthogonal may cross the channel segments at oblique angles resulting in an overestimate of the actual channel width. To provide a comparison of SCREAM and RivWidth (version 4), we ran both on a section of the Strickland River in Papua New Guinea that encompasses single- and multi-threaded channels using the SCREAM-generated segments of the river to average RivWidth output over the same regions of channel. For narrower, single-thread reaches SCREAM and RivWidth estimates agreed closely (Figure 16a), but diverged somewhat at wider, multi-threaded reaches, but the difference between the two types of channels was not significantly different. The segment with the greatest discrepancy (SCREAM ~ 1,500 m vs. RivWidth ~ 750 m) had an irregular shape that had a short centerline relative to the total area of the segment resulting in an over-estimate of the width by SCREAM (Figure 16b). In several reaches where RivWidth estimates exceeded SCREAM measurements (points below regression line), individual channel threads ran sub-parallel to the centerline and the RivWidth orthogonals crossed channel threads at oblique angles resulting in over estimates of widths (Figure 16c).

Figure 16: A comparison of average cumulative widths (by segment) for a portion of the Strickland River, Papua New Guinea, using both SCREAM and RivWidth (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008). a) The slope (0.97) and strong fit ($R^2=0.97$, $p\text{-value} < 0.001$) indicate no significant difference between the two methods, but the plot suggests greater ability to measure width for single-threaded channels (filled circles) than for multi-threaded channels (stars). Although channel complexity was not statistically significant, regression analysis (b) indicates that the methods diverge for complex channels as width increases. Panels b and c show segments of the river where the SCREAM and RivWidth measurements provide differing width measurements.

4. Discussion

Most existing river analysis methods rely on vector-based representations of river channels for input data. SCREAM, along with RivWidth (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008) and ChanGeom (Fisher, Bookhagen, & Amos, 2013) are unique in the use of raster-based channel masks for input and analysis. Even though processing vector-based inputs could reduce computational memory requirements associated with raster-based inputs, SCREAM retains the original raster format of the data throughout the analysis, which is advantageous for several reasons. First, the conversion of raster masks, output from feature extraction software, into vector-based representations of channels has the potential to introduce additional sources of error (Congalton, 1997). Second, in several of the SCREAM analysis routines, the ability to perform computational operations on matrices (rasters) increases the efficiency and significantly reduces the number of operations (“for” loops) required. An evaluation of the performance efficiency of SCREAM relative to raster size and channel complexity is presented in Supplemental Materials Section 1. Third, our original motivation for quantifying river planview change was largely driven by questions of bank erosion dynamics, rather than river channel migration. As such, we adopted a bank-centric approach that allowed an improved ability to examine rates and patterns of bank change due to the retention of the native pixel resolution of the source imagery. By operating in raster space, SCREAM also provides a very detailed view of river width, bank aspects, and the spatial patterns of erosion and accretion rates (Figure 7), allowing direct comparison of patterns of bank change to other spatially distributed datasets such as vegetation, permafrost, or sedimentology of the floodplain. Moreover, extracting measurements at every bank pixel in an input raster generates a very large number of unique measurements to support

spatial statistical analysis of river erosion/accretion rates, widths, and bank aspects. These attributes may be compared at different time intervals for an individual river, used to compare characteristics between river systems, or used to explore relationships between erosion and accretion rates and river geometry.

In the process of developing SCREAM we have applied and tested it against a broad range of planform channel morphologies from the simple single-threaded uniform width benchmark channel to the highly complex multi-threaded Yukon River. In all but one test case, the standard error in the SCREAM output, relative to manual measurements, was a fraction of the pixel size of the imagery. We examined the relationship between the errors in width as a function of the size of the width measurement and did not find a relationship. Instead the magnitude of the width errors appears to be related to the complexity of the channel geometry with higher errors occurring for the multi-threaded Yukon River relative to the largely single-threaded Selawik and Strickland Rivers. It appears that this increase in error with channel complexity results from the greater number of islands and a more complex spatial pattern of bank pixels.

The ability to examine the relationship between erosion rates and channel curvature at all bank pixels represents a significant opportunity to expand current datasets and rigorously test the control of curvature on bank erosion rates—bend curvature has been linked to bank erosion (Begin, 1986; Hickin, 1974; Hickin & Nanson, 1975; Hooke & Yorke, 2010; Nanson & Hickin, 1986), while other studies have not found a clear relationship (Beeson & Doyle, 1995). Hooke (1980) suggested that normalizing erosion rates by channel width allows for the examination of the relative influence of other factors, such as bank materials, on erosion rates. Plotting width-

normalized erosion rates against width-normalized radii of curvature offers the potential to resolve discrepancies in this relationship.

The SCREAM sign convention for curvature allows for erosion and accretion patterns to be assessed both by the magnitude of the curvature and location inside or outside of channels bends. It is commonly assumed that erosion occurs on outer concave banks and accretion occurs on inner convex banks (Hickin & Nanson, 1984; Wolman & Leopold, 1957), however, several studies have documented that banks with high curvature and flow separation can result in outer bank accretion creating concave bench deposits (Blanckaert et al., 2013; Nanson & Page, 1983; Nanson, 2010; Vietz et al., 2012; Woodyer, 1975). SCREAM-generated data provides a tool for a more detailed examination of these dynamics and variability in erosion patterns across a wide variety of river systems.

Section 3.2 presented the results of our error assessment of the SCREAM's measurements relative to manual measurements of the same metrics. However, to accurately assess the result of measurements derived from remotely sensed imagery, it is also necessary to account for the impact of image misregistration and classification errors. Table 3 provides a summary of the SCREAM measurements impacted by either or both misregistration and classification errors. We do not list measurements made on a single image, such as width, as affected by misregistration because we assume that the relative location between pixels within a single image is accurate. This assumption may not hold in instances where georectification errors result in local distortions at scales less than a channel width. However, in many of our study sites we do not have sufficient, or any independent ground control points, to assess the absolute accuracy of a single image. Therefore, we limited our misregistration error assessment to the

relative accuracy of one image compared to another based on the location of common features identifiable in each image in the time series being studied.

Table 3: Incorporation of Misregistration and Classification Errors

SCREAM Measurement	Misregistration	Classification	Error Incorporation
<i>Linear rate of bank change</i>	✓	✓	Error propagation of sums and differences, added in quadrature
<i>Areas of channel change</i>	✓	✓	Supplemental Materials Sections 2 & 3
<i>Channel Width</i>	--	✓	Error propagation of sums and differences, added in quadrature
<i>Cumulative channel width</i>	--	✓	Supplemental Materials Sections 3
<i>Area of Islands</i>	--	✓	Supplemental Materials Sections 3
<i>Bank Aspects</i>	--	--	Not applicable
<i>Bank Curvature</i>	--	--	Not applicable
<i>Sinuosity</i>	--	--	Not applicable

Standard error propagation methods are sufficient to assess how linear errors, such as pixel displacement due to misregistration or uncertainty in the location of a river boundary due to misclassification, impact SCREAM-generated metrics of width and erosion/accretion rates. A detailed description of how such errors may be propagated into measurements of channel width and change in positions of centerlines was provided in Mount et al. (2003) and Mount & Louis (2005) and therefore is not repeated here. Determination of how misregistration and classification errors affect area-based measurements of change, however, is a much more complex challenge. A number of studies have examined the effect of misregistration on land cover classification and change detection (Dai & Khorram, 1998; Serra, Pons, & Sauri, 2003; Van Niel et al., 2008; Verbyla & Boles, 2000; Wang & Ellis, 2005) and found that small misregistration errors may result in large classification errors particularly as the number of

classes and image heterogeneity increase (Verbyla & Boles, 2000; Wang & Ellis, 2005). While these prior studies highlighted the potential impact of misregistration errors, we are not aware of any study that provides a method for quantifying the error in change-areas given a known misregistration or classification error. In our examination of the impact of misregistration error on change-areas in the rivers we studied, we found that errors in the measurement of change-areas strongly depends on the size of the section of river being analyzed and the distribution of bank aspects in that section. Our complete analysis on the impact of misregistration and misclassification on change-areas along with a methodology for estimating the associated errors is presented in Supplemental Materials Section 2. We highlight that classification errors arising from directional biases in the image, such as shadows, may be explicitly accounted for in SCREAM output since each bank has a recorded aspect. Finally, we discovered a systematic error in measurements that was inherent to measuring distances in a raster-based system. Correcting for this discrepancy represents an area of future improvement and may be solved using Distance Transforms to better estimate actual streamline distances (Butt & Maragos, 1998; da Paz et al., 2008; de Smith, 2004; Paz & Collischonn, 2007).

5. Conclusion

The majority of methodologies developed to quantify planview river properties using remotely sensed imagery have been developed for and applied to single-thread rivers (Table 1). Quantification of the planview dynamics of single-thread rivers has commonly relied on analysis of changes in the location of river channel centerlines between successive images. SCREAM differs from most prior methods in its applicability to characterize rivers with both single and multi-threaded planform morphologies, and it uses a bank-based reference frame for quantifying planview properties and change. The utility of this reference frame in analyzing change in

complex channel systems and its provision for a detailed examination of spatial patterns of change and planview properties offers significant opportunities to gain new insights into river dynamics from as fine of a scale as an individual bank pixel to 100s and 1,000s km of a river. SCREAM provides metrics related to both the planview attributes and dynamics of river systems (Table 1). This suite of metrics allows for a detailed examination of individual rivers and for comparing SCREAM-generated results to a broad range of prior studies using alternative methodologies. For example, our comparison with other methodologies suggests that for single-threaded rivers with a stable width, SCREAM-generated rates of linear bank erosion can be accurately compared to lateral migration rates derived from methods measuring change in the lateral position of channel centerlines. Additionally, SCREAM provides area-based measurements of change for comparison to similar prior studies (e.g. Peixoto, Nelson, & Wittmann, 2009; Rozo, Nogueira, & Castro, 2014). Readily available remotely sensed imagery of the earth's surface, combined with the increasing ease and sophistication of methods for automatically extracting features from imagery represents an opportunity to quantify river dynamics and planview characteristics at global scales over decadal time spans.

Acknowledgements

Subsurface and Biogeochemical Research and the Earth System Modeling Programs within the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science, Biological and Environmental Research supported this work. Initial efforts in the development of these analysis methods were also supported by the U.S. Department of Energy through the LANL/LDRD Program. We thank Wes Lauer for sharing the Strickland River results for comparison in the development of our methods and for providing valuable insights on analysis methodologies. We also thank five anonymous reviewers and Tim McVicar for detailed and constructive comments on earlier versions of the manuscript.

References Cited

- Aalto, R., Lauer, J.W., & Dietrich, W.E. (2008). Spatial and temporal dynamics of sediment accumulation and exchange along Strickland River floodplains (Papua New Guinea) over decadal-to-centennial timescales. *J.Geophys.Res*, 113, F01S04.
- Alber, A., & Piégay, H. (2011). Spatial disaggregation and aggregation procedures for characterizing fluvial features at the network-scale: application to the Rhône basin (France). *Geomorphology*, 125, 343-360.
- Allen, G.H., & Pavelsky, T.M. (2015). Patterns of river width and surface area revealed by the satellite-derived North American River Width data set. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42, 395-402.
- Asahi, K., Shimizu, Y., Nelson, J., & Parker, G. (2013). Numerical simulation of river meandering with self-evolving banks. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 118, 2208-2229.
- Ashworth, P.J., & Lewin, J. (2012). How do big rivers come to be different? *Earth-Science Reviews*, 114, 84-107.
- Baki, A.B.M., & Gan, T.Y. (2012). Riverbank migration and island dynamics of the braided Jamuna River of the Ganges-Brahmaputra basin using multi-temporal Landsat images. *Quaternary International*, 263, 148-161.
- Beeson, C.E., & Doyle, P.F. (1995). Comparison of bank erosion at vegetated and non-vegetated channel bends. *Water Resources Bulletin*, 31, 983-990.
- Begin, Z.B. (1986). Curvature ratio and rate of river bend migration - update. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering-Asce*, 112, 904-908.
- Blanckaert, K., Kleinhans, M.G., McLelland, S.J., Uijttewaal, W.S., Murphy, B.J., Kruijs, A., Parsons, D.R., & Chen, Q. (2013). Flow separation at the inner (convex) and outer (concave) banks of constant-width and widening open-channel bends. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 38, 696-716.
- Brice, J. (1977). Lateral migration of the Middle Sacramento River, California. *USGS Water-Resources Investigations*, 77-43, 51.
- Brumby, S.P., Theiler, J., Perkins, S.J., Harvey, N.J., Szymanski, J.J., Bloch, J.J., & Mitchell, M. (1999). Investigation of image feature extraction by a genetic algorithm. In, *SPIE's International Symposium on Optical Science, Engineering, and Instrumentation* (pp. 24-31): International Society for Optics and Photonics.
- Butt, M.A., & Maragos, P. (1998). Optimum design of chamfer distance transforms. *Image Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 7, 1477-1484.

- 929 Church, M. (2006). Bed material transport and the morphology of alluvial river channels. *Annu.*
930 *Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, 34, 325-354.
- 931 Church, M., & Xu, J. (2015). Post-Regulation Morphological Change on Peace River. *The*
932 *Regulation of Peace River: A Case Study for River Management* (pp. 141-174): John Wiley &
933 Sons, Ltd..
- 934 Congalton, R.G. (1997). Exploring and evaluating the consequences of vector-to-raster and
935 raster-to-vector conversion. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 63, 425-434.
- 936 Congalton, R.G., & Green, K. (2008). *Assessing the accuracy of remotely sensed data: principles*
937 *and practices*. CRC press.
- 938 Constantine, C.R., Dunne, T., & Hanson, G.J. (2009). Examining the physical meaning of the
939 bank erosion coefficient used in meander migration modeling. *Geomorphology*, 106, 242-252.
- 940 Constantine, J.A., Dunne, T., Ahmed, J., Legleiter, C., & Lazarus, E.D. (2014). Sediment supply
941 as a driver of river meandering and floodplain evolution in the Amazon Basin. *Nature*
942 *Geoscience*, 7, 899-903.
- 943 Costard, F., & Gautier, E. (2008). The Lena River: hydromorphodynamic features in a deep
944 permafrost zone. *Large Rivers: Geomorphology and Management*, 225-233.
- 945 Costard, F., Gautier, E., Brunstein, D., Hammadi, J., Fedorov, A., Yang, D., & Dupeyrat, L.
946 (2007). Impact of the global warming on the fluvial thermal erosion over the Lena River in
947 Central Siberia. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, L14501.
- 948 da Paz, A.R., Collischonn, W., Risso, A., & Mendes, C.A.B. (2008). Errors in river lengths
949 derived from raster digital elevation models. *Computers & Geosciences*, 34, 1584-1596.
- 950 Dai, X., & Khorram, S. (1998). The effects of image misregistration on the accuracy of remotely
951 sensed change detection. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 36, 1566-
952 1577.
- 953 Darby, S.E., Trieu, H.Q., Carling, P.A., Sarkkula, J., Koponen, J., Kumm, M., Conlan, I., &
954 Leyland, J. (2010). A physically based model to predict hydraulic erosion of fine-grained
955 riverbanks: The role of form roughness in limiting erosion. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
956 *Earth Surface* (2003–2012), 115.
- 957 de Smith, M.J. (2004). Distance transforms as a new tool in spatial analysis, urban planning, and
958 GIS. *Environment and planning B: Planning and design*, 31, 85-104.
- 959 Dey, A., & Bhattacharya, R.K. (2013). Monitoring of River Center Line and Width—A Study on
960 River Brahmaputra. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing*, 1-8.
- 961 Dillabaugh, C.R., Niemann, K.O., & Richardson, D.E. (2002). Semi-automated extraction of
962 rivers from digital imagery. *GeoInformatica*, 6, 263-284.

- 963 Downward, S., Gurnell, A., & Brookes, A. (1994). A methodology for quantifying river channel
964 planform change using GIS. *IAHS Publications-Series of Proceedings and Reports-Intern Assoc*
965 *Hydrological Sciences*, 224, 449-456.
- 966 Eke, E., Parker, G., & Shimizu, Y. (2014). Numerical modeling of erosional and depositional
967 bank processes in migrating river bends with self-formed width: Morphodynamics of bar push
968 and bank pull. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 119, 1455-1483.
- 969 Eke, E.C., Czapiga, M., Viparelli, E., Shimizu, Y., Imran, J., Sun, T., & Parker, G. (2014).
970 Coevolution of width and sinuosity in meandering rivers. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 760, 127-
971 174.
- 972 Fagherazzi, S., Gabet, E.J., & Furbish, D.J. (2004). The effect of bidirectional flow on tidal
973 channel planforms. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 29, 295-309.
- 974 Fisher, G.B., Bookhagen, B., & Amos, C.B. (2013). Channel planform geometry and slopes from
975 freely available high-spatial resolution imagery and DEM fusion: Implications for channel width
976 scalings, erosion proxies, and fluvial signatures in tectonically active landscapes.
977 *Geomorphology*, 194, 46-56.
- 978 Gangodagamage, C., Barnes, E., & Foufoula-Georgiou, E. (2007). Scaling in river corridor
979 widths depicts organization in valley morphology. *Geomorphology*, 91, 198-215.
- 980 Gautier, E., Brunstein, D., Costard, F., & Lodina, R. (2003). Fluvial dynamics in a deep
981 permafrost zone: the case of the Middle Lena river (central Siberia). In, *Eighth International*
982 *Conference on Permafrost, Zurich* (pp. 271-275).
- 983 Gleason, C.J., & Smith, L.C. (2014). Toward global mapping of river discharge using satellite
984 images and at-many-stations hydraulic geometry. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
985 *Sciences*, 111, 4788-4791.
- 986 Grabowski, R.C., Surian, N., & Gurnell, A.M. (2014). Characterizing geomorphological change
987 to support sustainable river restoration and management. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*,
988 1, 483-512.
- 989 Graham, D.J., Reid, I., & Rice, S.P. (2005). Automated sizing of coarse-grained sediments:
990 image-processing procedures. *Mathematical Geology*, 37, 1-28.
- 991 Güneralp, İ., & Rhoads, B.L. (2008). Continuous characterization of the planform geometry and
992 curvature of meandering rivers. *Geographical Analysis*, 40, 1-25.
- 993 Gurnell, A. (1997a). Adjustments in river channel geometry associated with hydraulic
994 discontinuities across the fluvial-tidal transition of a regulated river. *Earth Surface Processes*
995 *and Landforms*, 22, 967-985.
- 996 Gurnell, A.M. (1997b). Channel change on the River Dee meanders, 1946-1992, from the
997 analysis of air photographs. *Regulated Rivers-Research & Management*, 13, 13-26.

- 998 Gurnell, A.M., Downward, S.R., & Jones, R. (1994). Channel planform change on the River Dee
999 meanders, 1876-1992. *Regulated Rivers-Research & Management*, 9, 187-204.
- 1000 Hamilton, S.K., Kellndorfer, J., Lehner, B., & Tobler, M. (2007). Remote sensing of floodplain
1001 geomorphology as a surrogate for biodiversity in a tropical river system (Madre de Dios, Peru).
1002 *Geomorphology*, 89, 23-38.
- 1003 Hickin, E.J. (1974). Development of meanders in natural river-channels. *American Journal of*
1004 *Science*, 274, 414-442.
- 1005 Hickin, E.J., & Nanson, G.C. (1975). The character of channel migration on the Beatton River,
1006 northeast British Columbia, Canada. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, 86, 487-494.
- 1007 Hickin, E.J., & Nanson, G.C. (1984). Lateral migration rates of river bends. *Journal of Hydraulic*
1008 *Engineering*, 110, 1557-1567.
- 1009 Hooke, J. (1980). Magnitude and distribution of rates of river bank erosion. *Earth surface*
1010 *processes*, 5, 143-157.
- 1011 Hooke, J. (1984). Changes in river meanders a review of techniques and results of analyses.
1012 *Progress in Physical Geography*, 8, 473-508.
- 1013 Hooke, J., & Harvey, A. (1983). Meander changes in relation to bend morphology and secondary
1014 flows. *Modern and Ancient Fluvial Systems: Special Publication 6 of the IAS*, 121.
- 1015 Hooke, J., & Yorke, L. (2010). Rates, distributions and mechanisms of change in meander
1016 morphology over decadal timescales, River Dane, UK. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*,
1017 35, 1601-1614.
- 1018 Hossain, M.A., Gan, T.Y., & Baki, A.B.M. (2013). Assessing morphological changes of the
1019 Ganges River using satellite images. *Quaternary International*, 304, 142-155.
- 1020 James, L.A., Hodgson, M.E., Ghoshal, S., & Latiolais, M.M. (2012). Geomorphic change
1021 detection using historic maps and DEM differencing: The temporal dimension of geospatial
1022 analysis. *Geomorphology*, 137, 181-198.
- 1023 Kean, J.W., & Smith, J.D. (2006a). Form drag in rivers due to small-scale natural topographic
1024 features: 1. Regular sequences. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface (2003–2012)*,
1025 111.
- 1026 Kean, J.W., & Smith, J.D. (2006b). Form drag in rivers due to small-scale natural topographic
1027 features: 2. Irregular sequences. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface (2003–2012)*,
1028 111.
- 1029 Knighton, D. (1998). *Fluvial forms and processes: a new perspective*. Arnold, Hodder Headline,
1030 PLC.

- 1031 Konrad, C., Berge, H., Fuerstenberg, R., Steff, K., Olsen, T., & Guyenet, J. (2011). Channel
1032 dynamics in the Middle Green River, Washington, from 1936 to 2002. *Northwest Science*, 85, 1-
1033 14.
- 1034 Lagasse, P.F., Spitz, W.J., Zevenbergen, L.W., & Zachmann, D.W. (2004). Handbook for
1035 predicting stream meander migration Transportation Research Board, N.C.H.R. PROGRAM, (p.
1036 107).
- 1037 Latrubesse, E.M. (2008). Patterns of anabranching channels: The ultimate end-member
1038 adjustment of mega rivers. *Geomorphology*, 101, 130-145.
- 1039 Lauer, J.W., & Parker, G. (2008a). Modeling framework for sediment deposition, storage, and
1040 evacuation in the floodplain of a meandering river: Theory. *Water Resources Research*, 44.
- 1041 Lauer, J.W., & Parker, G. (2008b). Net local removal of floodplain sediment by river meander
1042 migration. *Geomorphology*, 96, 123-149.
- 1043 Lawler, D. (1986). River bank erosion and the influence of frost: a statistical examination.
1044 *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 227-242.
- 1045 Lawler, D.M. (1993). The measurement of river bank erosion and lateral channel change: a
1046 review. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 18, 777-821.
- 1047 Legleiter, C.J., & Kyriakidis, P.C. (2006). Forward and inverse transformations between
1048 Cartesian and channel-fitted coordinate systems for meandering rivers. *Mathematical Geology*,
1049 38, 927-958.
- 1050 Leopold, L.B. (1973). River channel change with time: an example address as Retiring President
1051 of The Geological Society of America, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 1972. *Geological*
1052 *Society of America Bulletin*, 84, 1845-1860.
- 1053 Leys, K.F., & Werritty, A. (1999). River channel planform change: software for historical
1054 analysis. *Geomorphology*, 29, 107-120.
- 1055 Marra, W.A., Kleinhans, M.G., & Addink, E.A. (2014). Network concepts to describe channel
1056 importance and change in multichannel systems: test results for the Jamuna River, Bangladesh.
1057 *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 39, 766-778.
- 1058 McFeeters, S. (1996). The use of the Normalized Difference Water Index (NDWI) in the
1059 delineation of open water features. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 17, 1425-1432.
- 1060 Mertes, L.A.K., Dunne, T., & Martinelli, L.A. (1996). Channel-floodplain geomorphology along
1061 the Solimoes-Amazon River, Brazil. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, 108, 1089-1107.
- 1062 Merwade, V.M. (2007). An Automated GIS Procedure for Delineating River and Lake
1063 Boundaries. *Transactions in GIS*, 11, 213-231.

- 1064 Micheli, E., Kirchner, J., & Larsen, E. (2004). Quantifying the effect of riparian forest versus
1065 agricultural vegetation on river meander migration rates, Central Sacramento River, California,
1066 USA. *River Research and Applications*, 20, 537-548.
- 1067 Micheli, E., & Larsen, E. (2011). River channel cutoff dynamics, Sacramento river, California,
1068 USA. *River Research and Applications*, 27, 328-344.
- 1069 Micheli, E.R., & Kirchner, J.W. (2002). Effects of wet meadow riparian vegetation on
1070 streambank erosion. 1. Remote sensing measurements of streambank migration and erodibility.
1071 *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 27, 627-639.
- 1072 Mount, N., & Louis, J. (2005). Estimation and propagation of error in measurements of river
1073 channel movement from aerial imagery. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 30, 635-643.
- 1074 Mount, N., Louis, J., Teeuw, R., Zukowskyj, P., & Stott, T. (2003). Estimation of error in
1075 bankfull width comparisons from temporally sequenced raw and corrected aerial photographs.
1076 *Geomorphology*, 56, 65-77.
- 1077 Mount, N.J., Tate, N.J., Sarker, M.H., & Thorne, C.R. (2012). Evolutionary, multi-scale analysis
1078 of river bank line retreat using continuous wavelet transforms: Jamuna River, Bangladesh.
1079 *Geomorphology*.
- 1080 Nanson, G.C., & Hickin, E.J. (1983). Channel migration and incision on the Beatton River.
1081 *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 109, 327-337.
- 1082 Nanson, G.C., & Hickin, E.J. (1986). A statistical analysis of bank erosion and channel migration
1083 in western Canada. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, 97, 497-504.
- 1084 Nanson, G.C., & Page, K. (1983). Lateral accretion of fine-grained concave benches on
1085 meandering rivers. *Modern and Ancient Fluvial Systems (Special Publication 6 of the IAS)*, 133.
- 1086 Nanson, R.A. (2010). Flow fields in tightly curving meander bends of low width-depth ratio.
1087 *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 35, 119-135.
- 1088 Nash, J., & Sutcliffe, J. (1970). River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I—A
1089 discussion of principles. *Journal of Hydrology*, 10, 282-290.
- 1090 Notebaert, B., & Piégay, H. (2013). Multi-scale factors controlling the pattern of floodplain
1091 width at a network scale: The case of the Rhône basin, France. *Geomorphology*, 200, 155-171.
- 1092 Parker, G., Shimizu, Y., Wilkerson, G., Eke, E., Abad, J., Lauer, J., Paola, C., Dietrich, W., &
1093 Voller, V. (2011). A new framework for modeling the migration of meandering rivers. *Earth*
1094 *Surface Processes and Landforms*, 36, 70-86.
- 1095 Pavelsky, T.M., & Smith, L.C. (2008). RivWidth: A software tool for the calculation of river
1096 widths from remotely sensed imagery. *Ieee Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 5, 70-73.

- 1097 Paz, A.R., & Collischonn, W. (2007). River reach length and slope estimates for large-scale
1098 hydrological models based on a relatively high-resolution digital elevation model. *Journal of*
1099 *Hydrology*, 343, 127-139.
- 1100 Peixoto, J.M.A., Nelson, B.W., & Wittmann, F. (2009). Spatial and temporal dynamics of river
1101 channel migration and vegetation in central Amazonian white-water floodplains by remote-
1102 sensing techniques. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 113, 2258-2266.
- 1103 Perkins, S.J., Edlund, K., Esch-Mosher, D., Eads, D., Harvey, N., & Brumby, S. (2005). Genie
1104 Pro: Robust image classification using shape, texture, and spectral information. *Proceedings of*
1105 *SPIE*, 5806, 139-148.
- 1106 Pizzuto, J. (2009). An empirical model of event scale cohesive bank profile evolution. *Earth*
1107 *Surface Processes and Landforms*, 34, 1234-1244.
- 1108 Priestnall, G., & Aplin, P. (2006). Spatial and temporal remote sensing requirements for river
1109 monitoring. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 27, 2111-2120.
- 1110 Quackenbush, L.J. (2004). A review of techniques for extracting linear features from imagery.
1111 *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 70, 1383-1392.
- 1112 Richard, G.A., Julien, P.Y., & Baird, D.C. (2005). Statistical analysis of lateral migration of the
1113 Rio Grande, New Mexico. *Geomorphology*, 71, 139-155.
- 1114 Rozo, M.G., Nogueira, A.C., & Castro, C.S. (2014). Remote sensing-based analysis of the
1115 planform changes in the Upper Amazon River over the period 1986–2006. *Journal of South*
1116 *American Earth Sciences*, 51, 28-44.
- 1117 Serra, P., Pons, X., & Sauri, D. (2003). Post-classification change detection with data from
1118 different sensors: some accuracy considerations. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 24,
1119 3311-3340.
- 1120 Shields, F.D., Simon, A., & Steffen, L.J. (2000). Reservoir effects on downstream river channel
1121 migration. *Environmental Conservation*, 27, 54-66.
- 1122 Smith, L.C., & Pavelsky, T.M. (2008). Estimation of river discharge, propagation speed, and
1123 hydraulic geometry from space: Lena River, Siberia. *Water Resources Research*, 44.
- 1124 Snow, R.S. (1989). Fractal sinuosity of stream channels. *pure and applied geophysics*, 131, 99-
1125 109.
- 1126 Thorne, C.R., & Tovey, N.K. (1981). Stability of composite river banks. *Earth Surface*
1127 *Processes and Landforms*, 6, 469-484.
- 1128 Van Niel, T.G., McVicar, T.R., Li, L., Gallant, J.C., & Yang, Q. (2008). The impact of
1129 misregistration on SRTM and DEM image differences. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112,
1130 2430-2442.

- 1131 Verbyla, D., & Boles, S. (2000). Bias in land cover change estimates due to misregistration.
1132 *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 21, 3553-3560.
- 1133 Vietz, G.J., Rutherford, I.D., Stewardson, M.J., & Finlayson, B.L. (2012). Hydrodynamics and
1134 sedimentology of concave benches in a lowland river. *Geomorphology*, 147, 86-101.
- 1135 Wang, H., & Ellis, E.C. (2005). Image misregistration error in change measurements.
1136 *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 71, 1037-1044.
- 1137 Wheaton, J.M., Brasington, J., Darby, S.E., & Sear, D.A. (2010). Accounting for uncertainty in
1138 DEMs from repeat topographic surveys: improved sediment budgets. *Earth Surface Processes
1139 and Landforms*, 35, 136-156.
- 1140 Winterbottom, S.J., & Gilvear, D.J. (2000). A GIS-based approach to mapping probabilities of
1141 river bank erosion: regulated River Tummel, Scotland. *Regulated Rivers: Research &
1142 Management*, 16, 127-140.
- 1143 Wolman, M. (1959). Factors influencing erosion of a cohesive river bank. *American Journal of
1144 Science*, 257, 204-216.
- 1145 Wolman, M.G., & Leopold, L.B. (1957). River flood plains; some observations on their
1146 formation, .
- 1147 Woodyer, K. (1975). Concave-bank benches on Barwon River, NSW. *Australian Geographer*,
1148 13, 36-40.
- 1149 Wynn, T., Henderson, M., & Vaughan, D. (2008). Changes in streambank erodibility and critical
1150 shear stress due to subaerial processes along a headwater stream, southwestern Virginia, USA.
1151 *Geomorphology*, 97, 260-273.
- 1152 Xu, H. (2006). Modification of normalised difference water index (NDWI) to enhance open
1153 water features in remotely sensed imagery. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 27, 3025-
1154 3033.
- 1155 Yamazaki, D., O'Loughlin, F., Trigg, M.A., Miller, Z.F., Pavelsky, T.M., & Bates, P.D. (2014).
1156 Development of the global width database for large rivers. *Water Resources Research*, 50, 3467-
1157 3480.
- 1158 Yumoto, M., Ogata, T., Matsuoka, N., & Matsumoto, E. (2006). Riverbank freeze-thaw erosion
1159 along a small mountain stream, Nikko volcanic area, central Japan. *Permafrost and Periglacial
1160 Processes*, 17, 325-339.
- 1161 Zar, J.H. (1999). *Biostatistical analysis*. (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc..
- 1162 Zolezzi, G., Luchi, R., & Tubino, M. (2012a). Modeling morphodynamic processes in
1163 meandering rivers with spatial width variations. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 50, RG4005.

1164 Zolezzi, G., Luchi, R., & Tubino, M. (2012b). Modeling morphodynamic processes in
1165 meandering rivers with spatial width variations. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 50.
1166
1167

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Three hypothetical changes in channel position between Time 1 and Time 2 having equal areas of erosion of the bounding floodplain but differing channel centerline migration (dashed lines). a) The channel shifts laterally 50m, with equal areas of erosion and deposition on opposite sides of the channel. b) The channel at Time 2 widens by 50 m on one side, the average linear erosion along the banks is 50 m, but the migration of channel centerlines is only 25 m. c) The channel widens by 50 m by eroding 25 m along each channel margin. The total erosion along the channel is the same as a and b, but the migration of the centerline indicates 0 m of change.

Figure 2: a) Two binary masks of a portion of the Selawik River, Alaska derived from September 24 and 29, 2009 Geoeye images (red) and July 25, 1981 Alaska High Altitude Photography (AHAP) (blue). Areas of red not overlain by the blue mask represent areas of the floodplain that eroded. Areas labeled “Sweep” mark places where the channel eroded more than a channel width. Areas where the channel jumped to a new location are labeled as “Avulsion” or “Cutoff”. b) Areas experiencing erosion, accretion, and both erosion and accretion.

Figure 3: Graphical illustration of the determination of erosion distances (the method is identical for accretion). a) A distance map (the colored pixels) is generated for each unique bank segment from the Time 2 channel mask (red line) and intersected with the Time 1 bank pixels (black). A linear rate of bank change is calculated by dividing the distance values by the time interval. b) Measurement of erosion distances for an island that completely erodes between Time 1 and Time

2. The distance map is created from the pixel(s) in the interior of the island (white pixel in colored region) that were furthest from any bank on the island perimeter at Time 1. The distances from bank pixels (black) to this interior point are determined by intersection with the distance map.

Figure 4: An illustration of the determination of channel width. The red lines represents the shortest distance from a bank pixel to another bank line; the white dashed indicate the 40-degree screening window; and the green lines are the shortest paths the screening window from a target pixel (yellow) to the other bank.

Figure 5: An example of a portion of the Yukon River binary channel mask showing segmentation boundaries (red) and the centerline along which channel distances were calculated (green). The sections boundaries are evenly spaced along the centerline, but do not have equal areas. The black points mark the midpoint of the section on the centerline.

Figure 6: Images of portions of the river channels analyzed by SCREAM: a) the Selawik River in northwest Alaska (September 24, 2009 Geoeye 2m false color image (near infrared, red, and green bands)). b) the Strickland River, Papua New Guinea (March 26, 1993 Landsat 5 30m natural color (Bands 3,2,1), path 65, row 99). c) the Yukon River, Alaska (August 23, 2008 Landsat 5 30m natural color composite (Bands 3, 2, 1), path 69, row 13) at 30m/pixel resolution (image id: L5069013_01320080823). d) the Yukon River (1974 color infrared aerial photograph scanned with a 2.5 m/pixel resolution).

Figure 7: Raster-based output from SCREAM. a) Bank pixels showing erosion rates between 1986 and 2008 of a small portion of the Yukon River. The bank pixel locations correspond to the channel banks in 1986 the underlying panchromatic image was collected in 2008 by Landsat 5. b) Accretion rates between 1986 and 2008 shown at the 2008 bank locations in scaled colors overlain on the panchromatic image. c) Local channel widths for all 1986 bank pixels. d) Aspects of the banks in 1986. Discharge measured at the Stevens Village gauge 90 km downstream (USGS ID: 15453500) was 10,250 cubic meter per second (cms) on June 15, 1986 and 6,230 cms on August 30, 2008. The Landsat images were collected on June 15, 1986 (path 70, row 13) for panels b-d and August 20, 2008 (path 70, row 13) for panel a.

Figure 8: Histograms of local channel widths generated from the 1986 mask of the Yukon River and the 1993 channel mask of the Strickland River.

Figure 9: a) The distribution of all bank aspects for the 1986 mask of the Yukon River. The dashed circles indicate the count of bank aspects within each aspect bin. b) Mean erosion rates by bank aspect binned in 10 degree increments. The erosion rates were determined based on changes in the river between 1986 and 1994. The dashed inner circles indicate erosion rates ranging from 0 to 4 m/yr.

Figure 10: Erosion (a) and accretion (b) rates averaged at regularly spaced intervals along the Yukon River for the time period of 1986 to 2008.

Figure 11: Total area of eroded and accreted floodplain for a portion of the Yukon River between 1986 and 2008. The areas of accretion exceed erosion for a large portion of the reach, an imbalance that reflects the infilling of the several large oxbows.

Figure 12: Measured widths for a portion of the Selawik River, Alaska from a 1981 aerial photograph-derived channel mask. The mean channel width calculated at evenly spaced intervals is shown in black and the average cumulative channel width of each segment is displayed in blue. Where there is only a single channel thread in a segment the mean and cumulative widths are equal.

Figure 13: Synthetic river channel generated using a periodic function with constant width

Figure 14: A comparison SCREAM erosion rates for synthetic channel (Figure 13) averaged over 100 m long segments (blue line) against lateral migration rates determined using the Planform Statistics Toolbox (Aalto, Lauer, & Dietrich, 2008) calculated at evenly spaced intervals of 25 (red line) and 100 m (black line) along the channel.

Figure 15: Comparison of bank curvature values from SCREAM to curvature determined using LCC (Legleiter & Kyriakidis, 2006). The comparison was performed on the top bank in the Time 1 synthetic raster (Figure 13). a) The black lines show the curvature values obtained using smoothed data, LCC, and a 3rd order polynomial to fit a line to the bank pixels and the data was smoothed 5 times prior to fitting the polynomial. The SCREAM calculated curvature values were obtained using distance intervals of $\frac{1}{2}$, 2, and 4 channel widths (red, green, and blue lines

respectively). b) a scatter plot showing SCREAM bank curvature values versus the LCC-derived values. The dashed line shows where a 1:1 correlation of values would fall on the plot. As the interval over which SCREAM calculates curvature decreases the values approach those calculated by the LCC method.

Figure 16: A comparison of average cumulative widths (by segment) for a portion of the Strickland River, Papua New Guinea, using both SCREAM and RivWidth (Pavelsky & Smith, 2008). a) The slope (0.97) and strong fit ($R^2=0.97$, p-value < 0.001) indicate no significant difference between the two methods, but the plot suggests greater ability to measure width for single-threaded channels (filled circles) than for multi-threaded channels (stars). Although channel complexity was not statistically significant, regression analysis (b) indicates that the methods diverge for complex channels as width increases. Panels b and c show segments of the river where the SCREAM and RivWidth measurements provide differing width measurements.