

Landscape Metrics Integrated in Hydraulic Modeling for River Restoration Planning

Original

Landscape Metrics Integrated in Hydraulic Modeling for River Restoration Planning / Tamagnone, Paolo; Comino, Elena; Rosso, Maurizio. - In: ENVIRONMENTAL MODELING & ASSESSMENT. - ISSN 1420-2026. - ELETTRONICO. - (2020).
[10.1007/s10666-020-09693-y]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2789436 since: 2020-02-05T11:12:50Z

Publisher:

Springer International Publishing

Published

DOI:10.1007/s10666-020-09693-y

Terms of use:

openAccess

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

Environmental Modeling & Assessment

Landscape metrics integrated in hydraulic modeling for river restoration planning

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	ENMO-D-19-00190R2
Full Title:	Landscape metrics integrated in hydraulic modeling for river restoration planning
Article Type:	Original Research
Keywords:	landscape metrics; hydraulic numerical modeling; river restoration; riverine environment; landscape management
Corresponding Author:	Paolo Tamagnone Politecnico di Torino Torino, Piemonte ITALY
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Politecnico di Torino
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Paolo Tamagnone
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Paolo Tamagnone Elena Comino Maurizio Rosso
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	<p>Engineers have shaped the environment across the centuries in order to improve the quality and safety of human life. The unrestrained invasion of nature led to significant environmental problems, for this reason nowadays engineering projects should be based on ecological concepts to protect our environment. This paper presents an integrated methodology that involves GIS tools, hydraulic numerical models and landscape metrics to investigate ecological consequences caused by river restoration activities. The combined use of these different tools represents a bridge to connect the field of engineering with ecological techniques. The proposed method was tested to predict and assess the influence of a river restoration plan on a reach of the Orco river located in the north-west of Italy. Morphological alterations were simulated to reconnect remnant meanders and provide water to the floodplain, enhancing the ecological value of riparian ecosystems. The application of the hydraulic model permitted to evaluate the distribution of water inside the study area before and after the restoration plan. Thereafter, spatial configuration and temporal dynamics of the landscape structures were quantified using landscape metrics. The increase of patch density (PD) by 9% and edge density (ED) up to 10% highlights that restoration activities lead to a new configuration characterized by a higher level of fragmentation and heterogeneity. The characteristics of versatility, repeatability and the possibility to predict the outcomes of a specific plan make the proposed method a useful tool that could help decision-makers to manage the territory while safeguarding natural ecosystems.</p>
Response to Reviewers:	<p>The present letter reports feedback given by the advisory editor and the replies of the authors.</p> <p>The advisory editor's comments are written in black and the author's replies are written in blue.</p> <p>I would like to thank the advisory editor for further precious feedback. The revised version of the draft follows and replies all comments.</p> <p>Advisory Editor's Comments:</p>

Dear authors,

Thank you for submitting the revised version of your manuscript. You have processed all comments of the reviewer and me. I particularly like the sections you added to the discussion about the expected impact of the changes on animal. Good job.

I now consider your manuscript ready for publication, on the condition that you perform the following seven format/layout changes:

1. All variables in all equations need to be defined and (shortly) described below the equation. Please do this for the variables in equation 1.

The description of variables has been added. To avoid a repetition, the last section "Notation has been removed.

2. In our journal, each displayed mathematical expression needs to be treated as part of an English sentence and end in a comma if the sentence continues (e.g., as in (1)), or in a period if the sentence stops (e.g., as in (2)).

The authors may wish to use the following manuscript as an example of good and consistent formatting of mathematical expressions:

The Strategic Impact of Adaptation in a Transboundary Pollution Dynamic Game B Vardar, G Zaccour *Environmental Modeling & Assessment* 23 (6), 653-669.
Punctuation has been added.

3. The legends of the meshes and graphs in Figure 3 are too small; please enlarge them.

The image has been improved.

4. Line 224: Please change "the previous image" to "Fig. 6", as images might be placed in a different part of the article in the typesetted version.

The sentence has been modified.

5. In my opinion, the current Fig. 6 fits better between Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, as Fig. 6 displays the current flow regimes, and Fig. 5 the impacts of this regime on the channel activation for the two scenarios.

The Fig. 6 has been moved before the actual Fig 5, inverting the order of images.

6. Please provide the full names of the landscape metrics in the caption of Table 3, such that the table is understandable in isolation.

Full names of metrics have been added.

7. Line 286: Please only use the word significant if you actually performed a significance test.

The word "significant" has been substituted.

16 January 2020

Paolo Tamagnone

Politecnico di Torino, C.so Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy

Phone: +39 0110907631

E-mail address: paolo.tamagnone@polito.it

To

Environmental Modeling & Assessment

Dear editors,

I am writing this letter in support to the submission of the last version of my research paper.

The present paper represents the revised version of the manuscript ENMO-D-19-00190R1.

During the submission process, I have also uploaded a file reporting a detailed point-by-point reply to the advisory editor's comments (Decision letter- author's replies).

Sincerely,

Paolo Tamagnone

[Click here to view linked References](#)

Authors

Paolo Tamagnone^{1*}, Elena Comino¹, Maurizio Rosso¹

¹*Department of Environment, Land and Infrastructure Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, C.so Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy*

**Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 0110907631. E-mail address: paolo.tamagnone@polito.it (P. Tamagnone).*

**ORCID CODE:*

- *Paolo Tamagnone: 0000-0002-0485-2169*
- *Elena Comino: 0000-0002-3289-1800*
- *Maurizio Rosso: 0000-0001-9504-0512*

Title

Landscape metrics integrated in hydraulic modeling for river restoration planning

Abstract

Engineers have shaped the environment across the centuries in order to improve the quality and safety of human life. The unrestrained invasion of nature led to significant environmental problems, for this reason nowadays engineering projects should be based on ecological concepts to protect our environment. This paper presents an integrated methodology that involves GIS tools, hydraulic numerical models and landscape metrics to investigate ecological consequences caused by river restoration activities. The combined use of these different tools represents a bridge to connect the field of engineering with ecological techniques. The proposed method was tested to predict and assess the influence of a river restoration plan on a reach of the Orco river located in the north-west of Italy. Morphological alterations were simulated to reconnect remnant meanders and provide water to the floodplain, enhancing the ecological value of riparian ecosystems. The application of the hydraulic model permitted to evaluate the distribution of water inside the study area before and after the restoration plan. Thereafter, spatial configuration and temporal dynamics of the landscape structures were quantified using landscape metrics. The increase of patch density (PD) by 9% and edge density (ED) up to 10% highlights that restoration activities lead to a new configuration characterized by a higher level of fragmentation and heterogeneity. The characteristics of versatility, repeatability and the possibility to predict the outcomes of a specific plan make the proposed method a useful tool that could help decision-makers to manage the territory while safeguarding natural ecosystems.

Keywords

landscape metrics; hydraulic numerical modeling; river restoration; riverine environment; landscape management

1. Introduction

Nowadays there is a deeper sensibility toward natural spaces after many years of uncontrolled use of the territory. Anthropogenic disturbances have altered landscape structure and its ecological processes [1]. In this framework, ecologists and engineers have strived to conserve, defend and restore the “green” part of our planet.

Focusing on riverine environments, different disciplines were born in past decades trying to connect the world of hydraulics with ecological concepts such as the eco-hydraulics [2–4] and hydro-ecology [5]. Much effort has been devoted to the research of effective actions with the purpose to restore disturbed ecosystems and natural landscapes [6]. To successfully accomplish restoration techniques, it is important to understand the correlation between ecological features, physical factors (such as hydraulic behavior of rivers) and landscape patterns [7–9]. The analysis of the relationship between human disturbances and landscape structure is the key to accomplish a suitable landscape planning and management [10]. The management of the landscape structure must begin from the full comprehension of all its features because the landscape should be analyzed as a whole using a holistic approach [11,12].

A consolidated technique for the quantification of the main characteristics of a landscape such as structure, function and change is the use of ecological indicators called landscape metrics [13,14]. A large number of metrics have been developed in the past few decades able to assess landscape structure based on categorical maps [7]. Today, the combination of GIS applications and mathematical codes such as FRAGSTATS [15] are widely used in the field of ecological applications. Numerous studies have shown how landscape metrics can provide a large amount of information on landscape composition and configuration [16]. In many cases, landscape metrics are also used to assess how the landscape changes over time under human pressure or to evaluate the effectiveness of conservative plans in protected zones [17–19]. Other studies focused on fluvial landscape configuration and dynamics [20–22].

In the framework of the eco-hydraulics a number of studies have used hydraulic modelling to analyze specific ecological aspects such as the determination of the ecological flow (called also instream flow) [23–25] or the evaluation of habitats suitability [26,27]. Meanwhile, a few studies have investigated the potential advantages of the synergic application of landscape metrics and hydraulic modeling in suitable environments planning [1]. Entwistle et al. [4] used a 2D hydraulic model and FRAGSTATS to evaluate the ecological value of unbranched channels. Van Nieuwenhuyse et al. [28] has utilized landscape metrics to evaluate the degree of hydrological connectivity among artificial catchments. Rare is the application of both methodology to assess the spatial structure of a hydraulic environment [29] and the lack of spatial analysis from hydraulic assessments was previously highlighted by Newson and Newson [30].

The present paper aims to extend the field of spatial analysis application in riverine environments, introducing a methodology that integrates hydraulic modelling and landscape metrics. The proposed method allows predicting the effects of restoration plans on riverine landscapes quantifying ecological features such as connectivity and heterogeneity. Therefore, it could be a useful tool to provide important information guiding decision-makers in territorial planning.

The paper is organized into three main parts:

1. a brief contextualization describing the study area in which the work was carried out;
2. the software used are listed and the adopted methodology is described;
3. the outcomes of the study are presented and discussed, and conclusions are drawn.

46 1.1 The aim of the research

47 The objective of this work is to introduce an integrated method which has four purposes: (1)
48 linking hydraulic knowledge with ecological analysis, mainly using hydraulic models and landscape
49 metrics; (2) predicting spatial pattern changes and ecological impacts resulting from a river
50 restoration plan; (3) assessing the spatial configuration and temporal dynamics of different
51 landscape structures; (4) giving a useful tool to guide local administrations and landscape planners
52 to choose the most non-invasive plans for territory management.

53 2. Study area

54 The research is focused on the first lowland part of the Orco river's catchment, located in
55 Piedmont in the north-west of Italy. This part covers approximately 22% of the whole river basin
56 and it is characterized by a hilly and flat landscape. In this area, the Orco river flows 40 Km to
57 downstream until his confluence in the Po river and its riverbed shows a sinuous trend with an
58 alternation of braided and meandering channels. The river reach between the villages of Rivarolo
59 Canavese and Lusigliè (TO, Italy) was selected for the implementation of the hydraulic model [31].
60 The study area of 600 hectares was used to carry out hydraulic and ecological analyses [32] (see Fig.
61 1).



62 Fig. 1 Geographical location of the study area (source of the aerial image: Google Earth®, 2018)


64 From the geomorphological point of view, the chosen reach is slightly carved and its riparian
65 areas are characterized by the presence of secondary forms and relict water paths on the left and
66 steep banks on the right. Indeed, the widespread presence of banks in erosion states the planimetric
67 instability of the river. During flooding events, the river tends to restore the pre-existing braided
68 shape. This phenomenon affects variations of the main flow direction, leading to a wide range of
69 historical mobility of the riverbed [33].

70 The land cover presents a patchwork structure, typical of the fluvial plains. Agricultural lands
71 dominate the study area, almost 50% is covered by meadow and cultivated fields. Woods cover one-
72 fifth of the surveyed area and its forest vegetation is mainly composed by *Robinia pseudoacacia*
73 [34].

74 3. Materials and Methods

75 This section describes the multidisciplinary method proposed in this work, between hydraulics
76 and landscape ecology, which benefits from the combined use of software with different features.
77 It can be divided into three main steps (see Fig. 2): (1) the construction of a land cover map using
78 the overlapping of different maps and satellite images into the GIS module of SMS-11.1-Surface-

79 water Modeling System [35]; (2) the implementation of the two-dimensional hydraulic model and
 80 hydrodynamic simulations using SMS in the pre and post-processing phases and BASEMENT 2.6-
 81 Basic Simulation Environment [36] for the processing step; (3) the manipulation of categorical maps
 82 in ArcMap 10.3.1 and calculation of landscape metrics with FRAGSTATS. The current released
 83 version (FRAGSTATS v4.2) is an efficient tool able to compute a great number of landscape metrics
 84 from a wide variety of image formats [15].



85
 86 Fig. 2 Schematization of the methodology: input (orange boxes), GIS elaboration (brown box), hydrological/hydraulic
 87 calculation (light blue boxes) and ecological assessment (green box)

88 3.1 Land cover assessment

89 The first main action necessary for all following analyses was the detection of the spatial
 90 configuration of the study area. The land cover map was obtained by the combination of spatial
 91 information from CORINE Land Cover 2000, Digital Terrain Model DTM with a high resolution (on
 92 average 1 point each square meter) realized by Ministry for the Environment and the Protection of
 93 the Territory and the Sea during the extraordinary Plan of Environmental Remote Sensing with
 94 LiDAR scan and upgraded satellite images. The resulting land cover map was divided into seven
 95 categories: grassland, wood, river bank, water, factories, urban center and roads (see Fig. 3). The
 96 distribution of each land cover class in the study area is shown in Table 1.

97 Table 1 Area, percentage cover and Manning's Roughness Coefficient of each land cover class in the study area

Land cover class	Area [ha]	Percentage cover [%]	Manning's Roughness Coefficient
Grassland	276.2	46.0	0.07
Wood	124.5	20.7	0.08
River bank	33.1	5.5	0.045
Water	41.3	6.9	0.045
Factories	8.9	1.5	0.15
Urban center	112.2	18.7	0.15
Roads	4.0	0.7	0.03
Total	600	100	

98 Then each class was matched with a Manning's Roughness Coefficient which represents the
 99 hydraulic resistance offered by each surface to the water flow. The identification of the appropriate
 100 roughness coefficient derived from a back-analysis carried out during the calibration of the hydraulic
 101 model [37]. The high-resolution data permitted also to consider the shapes and geographical

102 positions of structures within the domain such as bridge piers, levees, and road embankments. All
 103 these data were necessary to build the hydraulic model and accomplish hydrodynamic simulations.

104 3.2 Hydraulic simulations

105 The two-dimensional hydraulic model was implemented to simulate the behavior of the river
 106 reach and to estimate the amount of wetted area with specific discharges. Throughout a preliminary
 107 hydrologic analysis, we calculated the flow duration curve (FDC) and its characteristic values (Qxx)
 108 were extracted. In this paper, the value of Qxx will refer to the amount of discharge that should be
 109 present on average at least xx days per year in the analyzed river reach. The FDC was calculated
 110 from the elaboration of flow data collected from 2010 to 2016 by a gage station near to the
 111 upstream boundary of the hydraulic model domain. Each Qxx value was used as an inner boundary
 112 condition for hydrodynamic simulations. Moreover, the duration and timing of each discharge were
 113 investigated.

114 The 2D numerical model is based on the numerical resolution of the Shallow Water Equations.
 115 These equations calculate the flow field assuming a hydrostatic distribution of the pressures along
 116 the depth and neglecting the vertical component of the flow [38]. The conservative form of the
 117 equation system can be written as:

$$118 \quad U_t + \nabla \cdot (F, G) + S = 0, \quad (1)$$


119 where U_t is the derivation with respect to time (t) of the conserved variables vector, F and G are
 120 the vectors of fluxes and S is the vector of source terms, in the x and y directions, given by:

$$121 \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} h \\ uh \\ vh \end{pmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{pmatrix} uh \\ u^2h + \frac{1}{2}gh^2 - vh \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \\ uvh - vh \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$122 \quad G = \begin{pmatrix} vh \\ uvh - vh \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \\ v^2h + \frac{1}{2}gh^2 - vh \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix}, \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ gh(S_{fx} - S_{Bx}) \\ gh(S_{fy} - S_{By}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

123 where h is the water depth (m), u and v are the cartesian components of the flow velocity vector
 124 (m/s), g is gravity acceleration (m/s²), ν is the total viscosity (m²/s), S_f is the friction slope (-) and S_b
 125 is the bed slope (-).

126 The land cover map obtained in the previous step was matched with the altimetric data of the
 127 DTM to create a computational grid (mesh). This grid represents the mathematical representation
 128 of the river topography and the basic geometry of the two-dimensional hydraulic model. Two
 129 different sets of simulations were carried out: in the first, the river behavior on the actual
 130 topography was simulated, this will be called "original" scenario. In the second, the wetted area on
 131 a modified computational mesh simulating the river restoration plan was calculated, this will be
 132 called "modified" scenario. In order to obtain the "modified" scenario, a series of altimetric
 133 alterations were applied to modify the original mesh. These alterations were circumscribed along
 134 100 m of natural riverbanks digging natural levees for reconnecting remnant meanders with the
 135 main channel. These levees were created by the intensive sediment transport of floods over time.
 136 The alterations of the mesh are displayed in Fig. 3.



137
138
139
140

Fig. 3 Land cover map and morphological alterations. Top: enlargement on the original and modified mesh of the first altered site. Bottom: enlargement on the original and modified mesh of the second altered site, and two graphs that display the modified profile of the river bank.

141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159

3.3 Calculation of landscape metrics

As output of the hydraulic simulation stage, vector layers were produced from each simulation reporting the total amount of wetted area and its distribution into the study area. They have been edited through GIS tools to create raster files used as FRAGSTATS inputs. The high accuracy of the hydraulic model outcomes permitted to keep a high-resolution during the rasterization of the vector maps. The grain size of 1 m was set up during the rasterization process [39].

Landscape composition and configuration have been evaluated using FRAGSTATS for both cases, “original” and “modified” scenarios. The analyses were carried out with the standard patch neighbor 8-cell rule option. FRAGSTATS calculates a number of landscape indices but sometimes several of them are redundant, especially when two equivalent landscapes are compared. Thus, in order to choose the most representative indices, metrics that did not show a remarkable variation between the “original” and “modified” landscape ($\Delta < 0.1$) have been discarded. Furthermore, a smaller set of seven metrics have been selected according to the most used landscape indices in literature. For a comprehensive characterization of the landscape, we selected metrics belonging to three different metrics categories called Area-Edge, Shape and Aggregation. Each category reveals specific information such as: (I) Area-Edge analyzes the degree of fragmentation, (II) Shape measures the geometry complexity and (III) Aggregation quantifies the landscape configuration, namely the level of patch dispersion [7]. The classification and description of each metrics are listed as follows:

I. Area-Edge metrics:

- 160 1. ED: Edge Density equals the sum of the lengths of all edge segments in the landscape, divided
 161 by the total landscape area;
 162 2. AREA_AM: Area-weighted Mean patch Area equals the sum, across all patches in the
 163 landscape, of the patch area, multiplied by the proportional abundance of the patch;
 164 3. AREA_SD: Standard Deviation in patch Area equals the square root of the sum of the squared
 165 deviations of each patch size from the mean patch size computed for all patches in the
 166 landscape, divided by the total number of patches;
 167 4. AREA_CV: Coefficient of Variation in patch Area equals the standard deviation divided by the
 168 mean, multiplied by 100 to convert to a percentage;
 169 II. Shape metrics:
 170 5. SHAPE_AM: Area-weighted Mean Shape index equals the sum, across all patches in the
 171 landscape, of the patch perimeter divided by the square root of patch area standardized to
 172 a square, multiplied by the proportional abundance of the patch;
 173 III. Aggregation metrics:
 174 6. PD: Patch Density equals the number of patches in the landscape divided by total landscape
 175 area;
 176 7. ENN_MN: Mean Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance equals the sum, across all patches in
 177 the landscape, of the distance to the nearest neighboring patch of the same type, based on
 178 shortest edge-to-edge distance, divided by the total number of patches.
 179 The equations and the corresponding terms of these metrics are shown in Table 2.

180 Table 2 List of landscape metrics used in the study [15]

Metrics	Equations	Terms
Edge Density (ED)	$ED = E/A$	Where E is the total length of the edge in landscape and A is total landscape area
Area-weighted Mean patch Area (AREA_AM)	$AREA_AM = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[a_{ij} \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}} \right) \right]$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j
Standard Deviation in patch Area (AREA_SD)	$AREA_SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[a_{ij} - \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}}{N} \right) \right]^2}{N}}$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j and N is the total number of patches in the landscape
Coefficient of Variation in patch Area (AREA_CV)	$AREA_CV = \left[\frac{AREA_SD}{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}}{N}} \right] (100)$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j and N is the total number of patches in the landscape
Area-weighted Mean Shape index (SHAPE_AM)	$SHAPE_AM = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\left(0.25 \cdot p_{ij} / \sqrt{a_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}} \right) \right]$	Where p_{ij} is the perimeter of the patch i of the patch type j and a_{ij} is the area of patch i
Patch Density (PD)	$PD = N/A$	Where N is the total number of patches in the landscape and A is the total landscape area
Mean Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance (ENN_MN)	$ENN_MN = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij}}{N}$	Where h_{ij} is the distance from patch ij to nearest neighboring patch of the same type (class), based on patch edge-to-edge distance, computed from cell center to cell center and N is the

181

182 The set of seven ecological metrics was calculated for both “original” and “modified” scenarios
183 and for each Qxx. The difference between the two analyzed cases will be indicated with the
184 parameter Δ , calculated as follows:


185
$$\Delta = metrics_{modified\ scenario} - metrics_{original\ scenario} \quad (3)$$

186 **4. Results**

187 Results obtained in this study have both hydraulic and ecological nature. Hydraulic outputs
188 represent the input for the ecological analysis. For this reason, results will be described in two
189 different subsections.

190 **4.1 Hydraulic outputs**

191 The examined FDC represents the relationship between the amount of discharge and its
192 persistence during a mean hydrologic year [40]. The FDC and its characteristic values are shown in
193 Fig. 4.




194

195 Fig. 4 Flow duration curve and its characteristic values

196


The duration and timing of the different discharges are displayed in Fig. 5.



197
 198 Fig. 5 Timing and duration of each analyzed discharge (mean number of days per month in which that amount of
 199 discharge flows into the river).

200 Using these discharges as upstream boundary condition in hydrodynamic simulations, the
 201 numerical model produces different wetted area maps for both “original” and “modified”
 202 configurations. Hydraulic simulations on the “original” mesh depict all the same scenarios in which
 203 the total among of water flow only into the main channel (Fig. 6). Whereas, simulations on the
 204 “modified” geometry show a different behavior of the river as the flow increases:

- 205 · if the discharge is less than Q30, the water flows into the main channel and exclusively the
 206 little channel in the first modified site is reactivated (Fig. 6, Q60);
- 207 · if the discharge is greater than or equal to Q30, the discharge overtops the river bank and
 208 starts to flow not only in the original streambed but also through the floodplain bringing
 209 water to the riparian ecosystem (Fig. 6, Q30-Q1).




210
 211 Fig. 6 Hydraulic outcomes for both scenarios with increasing discharge from left to right. The reactivation of the
 212 remnant streambeds leads to an increase of the wetted surface of 1.8%, 18.9%, 21.8%, 22.1% and 23.3% respectively
 213 for the scenario with Q60, Q30, Q10, Q5 and Q1.

214 The reactivation of the remnant meanders is strictly connected with the hydrology of the Orco
 215 river, which is yearly characterized by two distinct periods of high flow (Fig. 5). The first, in which

216 the discharge grows according to spring rainfalls together with the snow melting in the headwater;
 217 the second, characterized by the occurrence of yearly flood events caused by intense autumn
 218 rainstorms. This flow pattern leads to the reactivation of the channels for 24 days from April to
 219 August, and for 6 days from October to December. June and November show the maximum duration
 220 of discharge greater than Q30.

221 The river restoration action is completely respectful of the original ecosystem since the
 222 subtracted water flows in the floodplain and then gets back to the river 1 Km downstream. This new
 223 configuration is also in accordance with the planimetric divagation range (streamway) of the river.
 224 Superimposing the wetted surface map of the “modified” scenario over the planimetric variations
 225 map of the Orco river, it is clear how the flow retraces the paths of old abandoned riverbeds (Fig.
 226 7). Reconnecting remnant meanders or rebuilding secondary channels are restoration actions
 227 widely adopted to enhance the ecological value of the riverine ecosystems and recreate the
 228 continuum with the floodplain [6,41–44].



229
 230 Fig. 7 Superimposition of the modified wetted surface map over the planimetric variations in the Orco river map
 231 (realized by Research Institute for the Hydrogeological Protection–Turin section)

232 4.2 Ecological outputs

233 In order to assess the effects of the restoration plan on the landscape structure and its riverine
 234 ecosystem, a series of comparisons were carried out. Firstly, the comparison at the class and
 235 landscape level of metrics obtained from both scenarios with Q30 aims to highlight changes in the
 236 spatial configuration due to reactivated channels. All outcomes are summarized in Table 3.

237 Table 3 The group of seven metrics (ED – Edge Density, AREA_AM – Area-weighted Mean patch Area, AREA_SD –
 238 Standard Deviation in patch Area, AREA_CV – Coefficient of Variation in patch Area, PD – Patch Density, SHAPE_AM –
 239 Area-weighted Mean Shape index and ENN_MN – Mean Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance) calculated with Q30 for
 240 both scenarios and their comparison. Factories, urban center and roads classes have been neglected since they have
 241 not been altered by the restoration plan.

Metrics	Landscape level						
	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Original scenario	109.0	58.5	21.3	231.1	10.8	2.9	95.3
Modified scenario	119.9	55.2	19.9	235.3	11.8	3.0	84.4
Δ	10.8	-3.3	-1.4	4.2	1.0	0.2	-10.9

Class level							
Original scenario							
Land cover class	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Grassland	73.2	66.2	29.1	168.3	2.7	2.8	11.7
Wood	60.3	44.8	17.4	209.7	2.5	3.2	29.2
River bank	18.0	9.6	4.6	138.0	1.7	2.0	53.4
Water	30.8	37.5	18.1	131.2	0.5	4.7	164.0
Modified scenario							
Land cover class	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Grassland	73.5	65.9	28.4	174.9	2.8	2.8	12.3
Wood	70.2	25.6	11.0	177.8	3.2	3.2	26.6
River bank	17.8	9.7	4.5	150.3	1.8	2.0	44.2
Water	42.4	45.2	21.7	132.8	0.5	6.8	81.6
Δ							
Grassland	0.3	-0.2	-0.7	6.6	0.2	0.0	0.6
Wood	9.9	-19.1	-6.4	-31.9	0.7	0.1	-2.6
River bank	-0.2	0.1	-0.1	12.4	0.2	0.0	-9.2
Water	11.6	7.8	3.7	1.6	0.0	2.1	-82.4

242 Focusing at the landscape level, the modified landscape shows a slight increase in fragmentation
243 degree. Consistent with observations of Sowińska-Świerkosz and Soszyński [39], alterations caused
244 by the reactivated channels among the floodplain lead to a separation into a larger number of
245 smaller patches increasing the fragmentation degree. This information is justified by the growth of
246 ED and AREA_CV values and in the AREA_AM and AREA_SD decreasing. As reported by McGarigal
247 and Marks [7], the variation of AREA_CV and AREA_SD means that on the modified study area
248 patches become smaller and their distribution size is farther from the average size than in the
249 original area.


250 In the context of habitat fragmentation, the grade of patch isolation is calculated with the
251 Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance (ENN) metric [15,45]. The modified area presents a smaller
252 value of ENN_MN, with a decrease of 11.5%. This means that even if the patches are more
253 fragmented, they are less isolated.

254 Another important ecological factor is the landscape complexity. The modified landscape shows
255 a slight increase in the degree of complexity in the planar shape given by the raised value of
256 SHAPE_AM. This metrics illustrates how much the patch shape is different from the standard square
257 shape. Generally, natural shapes are not regular, therefore the restored configuration appears to
258 be more akin to a natural environment. The last analyzed ecological metrics was PD. The slight
259 increase of 9% in PD value in the modified landscape, in correlation with ED, means that the
260 modified landscape has a higher level of heterogeneity. Previous studies have confirmed the
261 effectiveness of PD and ED as indicators of the spatial heterogeneity degree in landscapes [32].

262 Landscape attributes at class level were also analyzed in order to understand in-depth the results
263 of this stage. The most modified land cover classes were wood and water because the reactivated
264 watercourses run across the floodplain covered by wood (Fig. 6). As reported in Table 3, there is a
265 substantial difference in nearest neighbor distance for water patches, from 164 to 81. While the
266 variation of AREA_AM and AREA_CV in wood class caused by the subdivision in more smaller
267 patches shows a remarkable decrease of 40%.

268 In the second stage, since in a natural river the amount of flow varies during the year, the
269 evaluation of dynamics of the landscape structure was carried out tracking the wetted area

270 distribution for the different discharges. Landscape metrics calculated at the landscape level are
271 summarized in Fig. 8.



272
273 Fig. 8 Landscape metrics representing the dynamics of landscape structure in terms of fragmentation (a: Edge
274 Density, b: Area-weighted Mean patch Area, c: Standard Deviation in patch Area), complexity (e: Area-weighted Mean Shape index) and configuration (f: Patch Density, g: Mean Euclidean Nearest
275 Neighbor Distance) as the flow increases.
276

277 For the Q60 both scenarios are very similar, whereas a considerable variation can be noticed for
278 the other discharges. ED value in the modified scenario rises and falls at each increment due to the
279 intermittent ramification of water paths creating isolated wood and river bank patches. SHAPE_AM
280 is almost unvaried meaning that neither restoration activity nor increasing discharge do not strongly
281 affect the complexity level of the landscape. However, all metrics show the same trend in both
282 scenarios stating how the restoration action have not changed the response of the riverine
283 landscape to discharge variation. Only for the maximum discharge Q1, the number of patches
284 classified as river bank increase in the original scenarios and decrease in the modified scenario
285 leading to a reversion of the value of the metric (Fig. 8c, d, f, g).

286 5. Discussion

287 The methodology presented in this study is a procedure able to assess the impacts of changes in the
288 spatial structure of riverine landscapes. Different scenarios may be developed according to different
289 strategies to achieve specific objectives [10]. Moreover, it is possible to analyze different landscapes
290 to identify needs and lacks in an attempt to apply specific restoration actions aimed at improving
291 ecological conditions [39]. Using a numerical-based approach, a wide range of scenarios can be
292 compared, and the most suitable plan may be chosen by authorities improving the management of
293 the territory.

294 In the studied case a river restoration action was carried out reactivating natural watercourses
295 among the floodplain and its impact on the landscape structure was analyzed. Results obtained in
296 the previous section are metrics used to give a quantification of four fundamental ecological
297 attributes such as fragmentation, isolation, complexity, and heterogeneity. The chosen discharges
298 have permitted to analyze the spatial configuration and dynamics of these components since the
299 hydraulic conditions that reactivate the watercourses are non-stationary. When flow rate in the

300 river is less than Q30, no water flows in the floodplain and the lower level of fragmentation means
301 a higher level of connectivity among the patches with the same class type. For some species such as
302 mammals, this landscape is more hospitable because larger areas offer stable conditions required
303 to host a flourishing population. While, when discharge is greater than the threshold Q30, flow
304 reactivates watercourses watering riparian ecosystems and increasing the degree of fragmentation
305 especially for the wood class. The landscape with a mosaic of varied ecosystems is more attractive
306 for the multi-habitat species [39]. Thus, the higher level of fragmentation does not involve habitat
307 losses or impoverishment of biodiversity but on the contrary, the modified morphology proves to
308 be more suitable for a greater variety of ecosystems [46,47].

309 The edge density is directly correlated to the grade of spatial heterogeneity and fragmentation
310 [7]. The increasing of this metrics means that when water flows into the floodplain a higher amount
311 of edges affects the landscape. The increased level of fragmentation and the reduction in patch size
312 could influence the behavior of some animal species, particularly these periodic changes can
313 support, alternately, the growth of species that prefer edge habitats or interior kinds [48]. When
314 discharge periodically increases, the variation of connections between patches with no-water
315 classification may influence the migration of terrestrial species which require connectedness. For
316 instance, the early reactivation of the remnant streambeds coincides with the hedgehog breeding
317 season (species living in the study area, [49]). Thus, the lack of connectivity within the riparian forest
318 could affect the mobility of these animals hindering them reproduction. On the contrary, in the
319 same period, the presence of new wetlands provides an attractive habitat for pond breeding
320 amphibians [50].

321 However, cyclical dry and wet periods raise the production of nutrient matter improving the
322 environmental quality of aquatic biota. The autumnal reactivation will move organic matter that
323 covers the ground, such as leaf litter, enhancing the abundance of detritivorous macroinvertebrates,
324 in particular, shredders such as Ephemeroptera and Plecoptera [51,52]. These organisms will break
325 the coarse particulate organic material up into a finer size feeding the collectors leaving in the river
326 downstream. Since the riparian area is covered by trees, the presence of coarse wood in the
327 reactivated channels provides a favorable habitat for organisms such as biofilm algae which will
328 represent a new source of food for invertebrates such as snails and beetles [53].

329 The slight increase in shape complexity shows that the applied geomorphological modifications
330 do not produce great variations in landscape structure in both landscape and class level. This
331 demonstrates how the tested river restoration plan is non-invasive towards the patch geometry.
332 Anthropogenic activities in river restoration planning should be as eco-friendly as possible in order
333 to enhance the ecological value of the landscape without leaving human evidence. The monitoring
334 of the complexity degree can be an efficient indicator to assess the interference of human activities
335 in the landscape.

336 The variation of ENN_MN is concentrated mainly in water patches until Q5 and involves markedly
337 river bank class with Q1. It represents a reduction in patch isolation, meaning that the altered
338 landscape configuration has a smaller interpatch distance. Indeed, when water flows through the
339 floodplain, the distribution of wetted surfaces is more homogeneous into the study area. Regarding
340 the wood class, several studies have claimed that patch isolation influences the life of bird
341 communities and the insularity due to fragmented habitats has a negative impact on bird species
342 [54]. In the proposed restoration plan the difference in isolation degree is favorable in most cases.
343 Only the grassland class presents a negligible increase of almost 5%. The modified configuration
344 conduces to a more heterogeneous landscape able to host a proliferation of vast varieties of animal
345 populations, both aquatic and terrestrial species. The level of heterogeneity will change over the

346 year, according to the hydrology of the river, varying ecological processes among landscape pattern
347 [55].

348 All the above-mentioned considerations derive from the interpretation of the analyzed metrics
349 and their values. The quantification of these metrics is strongly conditioned by the parameters
350 selected by the operator. Especially during the rasterization of the vector files, the choice of the cell
351 size could alter the outcome leading to an erroneous division or union of patches. This problem is
352 emphasized for landscape metrics based on the size and number of patches [7]. Many studies have
353 shown how grain size affects the outcomes of landscape metrics applications [56–58]. For this
354 reason, we chose a very fine grain size, 1 m, in order to generate a raster file representative of the
355 reality.

356 Moreover, as stated by Plexida et al. [32], some landscape metrics are influenced by the size of
357 the analyzed domain such as area-edge and shape metrics. The use of a restricted area size could
358 lead to analyze a landscape characterized by a single class, impeding the assessment of ecological
359 attributes of the study area. In addition, whether the restoration plan aims to recover plants and
360 animals, the presented methodology should be applied considering a scale compatible with the
361 species' perception of the environment [59]. For instance, an agricultural field could represent an
362 entire habitat for an insect but, simultaneously, only a single patch for a bird.

363 6. Conclusion

364 Nowadays an increased sensibility towards environment joins experts, authorities, and researchers
365 in the search for the best solutions for sustainable management of the territory. Multidisciplinary
366 approaches are needed to understand the interactions between natural processes and human
367 activities.

368 In this paper, a method was proposed that integrates hydraulic and landscape ecological
369 knowledge with the purpose of creating a tool able to simulate a river restoration plan and quantify
370 its impact on the landscape structure and its ecosystems. This methodology can predict the
371 achievement of the objectives in landscape planning and evaluate whether the proposed design is
372 suitable and valid in a cost-benefit analysis perspective. The entire procedure is based on
373 geographical information and numerical data. Therefore, it represents a significant advantage
374 because required data can be extrapolated from thematic maps or numerical simulation, reducing
375 the necessity of costly on-site surveys.

376 The feature of reusability of the hydraulic models makes it possible to simulate and compare
377 different landscape scenarios to assess the best solution. This method may be helpful for local
378 administrations to better understand the configuration of their territory and to choose the most
379 suitable plan to restore altered areas. In order to limit overengineering in restoration plans, all
380 actors should keep in mind the capabilities of the ecosystems to self-design and avoid the over-
381 engineering.

382 However, the proposed methodology highlighted two main limitations. Firstly, the choice of the
383 study area extent must be compatible with the available computational power, being it directly
384 related to the accuracy of the hydraulic numerical model. The second issue, the choice and
385 interpretation of landscape metrics are conditioned by the features of the analyzed area.

386 Future work should test this methodology on a wider range of river restoration plans. The results
387 of this study should encourage all actors to use multidisciplinary approaches in order to design and
388 manage the territory in accordance with the conservation and protection of natural ecosystems.

389 Acknowledgements

390 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or
391 not-for-profit sectors.

392 Reference

- 393 1. Paudel, S.; Yuan, F. Assessing landscape changes and dynamics using patch analysis and GIS
394 modeling. *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinformation* **2012**, *16*, 66–76.
- 395 2. Lancaster, J.; Downes, B. Linking the hydraulic world of individual organisms to ecological
396 processes: putting ecology into ecohydraulics. *River Res. Appl.* **2010**, *403*, 385–403.
- 397 3. Vanzo, D.; Zolezzi, G.; Siviglia, A. Eco-hydraulic modelling of the interactions between
398 hydropeaking and river morphology. *Ecohydrology* **2016**, *9*, 421–437.
- 399 4. Entwistle, N.; Heritage, G.; Milan, D. Ecohydraulic modelling of anabranching rivers. *River Res.*
400 *Appl.* **2019**, 353–364.
- 401 5. Dunbar M. C., M.J.; A. Applied hydro-ecological science for the twenty-first century. **2001**, *266*,
402 1–17.
- 403 6. Mitsch, W.; Jørgensen, S.E. Ecological Engineering and Ecosystem Restoration; **2004**; ISBN 0-
404 471-33264-X.
- 405 7. McGarigal, K.; Marks, B. FRAGSTAT: Spatial pattern analysis program for quantifying landscape
406 structure. *U. S. Dep. Agric. Pac. Northwest Res. Stn.* **1995**.
- 407 8. Turner, M.G. Landscape Ecology: The Effect of Pattern on Process. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **1989**,
408 *20*, 171–197.
- 409 9. Leyer, I.; Mosner, E.; Lehmann, B. Managing floodplain-forest restoration in European river
410 landscapes combining ecological and flood-protection issues. *Ecol. Appl.* **2012**, *22*, 240–249.
- 411 10. Botequilha Leitão, A.; Ahern, J. Applying landscape ecological concepts and metrics in
412 sustainable landscape planning. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **2002**, *59*, 65–93.
- 413 11. Martín, B.; Ortega, E.; Otero, I.; Arce, R.M. Landscape character assessment with GIS using
414 map-based indicators and photographs in the relationship between landscape and roads. *J.*
415 *Environ. Manage.* **2016**, *180*, 324–334.
- 416 12. Venturelli, R.C.; Galli, A. Integrated indicators in environmental planning: Methodological
417 considerations and applications. *Ecol. Indic.* **2006**, *6*, 228–237.
- 418 13. Forman, R.T.T. Some general principles of landscape and regional ecology. *Landsc. Ecol.* **1995**,
419 *10*, 133–142.
- 420 14. Giaouris, E., Chorianopoulos, N., Skandamis, P. y Nychas, G. World's largest Science,
421 Technology & Medicine Open Access book publisher: *Open Sci. Minds* **2012**, 450.
- 422 15. McGarigal, K., SA Cushman, and E.Ene. FRAGSTATS v4: Spatial Pattern Analysis Program for
423 Categorical and Continuous Maps. Computer software program produced by the authors at
424 the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Available at the following web site: Available online:
425 <http://www.umass.edu/landeco/research/fragstats/fragstats.html>.
- 426 16. Uuemaa, E.; Mander, Ü.; Marja, R. Trends in the use of landscape spatial metrics as landscape
427 indicators: A review. *Ecol. Indic.* **2013**, *28*, 100–106.
- 428 17. Egbert, S.L.; Park, S.; Price, K.P.; Lee, R.Y.; Wu, J.; Nellis, M.D. Using conservation reserve
429 program maps derived from satellite imagery to characterize landscape structure. *Comput.*
430 *Electron. Agric.* **2003**, *37*, 141–156.
- 431 18. Boongaling, C.G.K.; Faustino-Eslava, D. V; Lansigan, F.P. Modeling land use change impacts on
432 hydrology and the use of landscape metrics as tools for watershed management: The case of
433 an ungauged catchment in the Philippines. *Land Use Policy* **2018**, *72*, 116–128.
- 434 19. Liu, T.; Yang, X. Monitoring land changes in an urban area using satellite imagery, GIS and
435 landscape metrics. *Appl. Geogr.* **2015**, *56*, 42–54.

- 436 20. Yang, X.; Liu, Z. Quantifying landscape pattern and its change in an estuarine watershed using
437 satellite imagery and landscape metrics. *Int. J. Remote Sens.* **2005**, *26*, 5297–5323.
- 438 21. Dufour, S.; Rinaldi, M.; Piégay, H.; Michalon, A. How do river dynamics and human influences
439 affect the landscape pattern of fluvial corridors? Lessons from the Magra River, Central-
440 Northern Italy. *Landscape Urban Plan.* **2015**.
- 441 22. Thoms, M.C.; Reid, M.; Christianson, K.; Munro, F. Variety is the spice of river life: recognizing
442 hydraulic diversity as a tool for managing flows in regulated rivers. *Sediment Dyn.*
443 *Hydromorphology Fluv. Syst.* **2006**, *306*, 169–178.
- 444 23. Papadonikolaki, G.; Stamou, A.; Dimitriou, E.; Bui, M.-D.; Rutschmann, P. Comparison of two
445 habitat modeling approaches for the determination of the ecological flow. *Eur. Water* **2017**,
446 *58*, 301–305.
- 447 24. Li, W.; Chen, Q.; Cai, D.; Li, R. Determination of an appropriate ecological hydrograph for a rare
448 fish species using an improved fish habitat suitability model introducing landscape ecology
449 index. *Ecol. Model.* **2015**, *311*, 31–38.
- 450 25. Stewart, G.; Anderson, R.; Wohl, E. Two-dimensional modelling of habitat suitability as a
451 function of discharge on two Colorado rivers. *River Res. Appl.* **2005**, *21*, 1061–1074.
- 452 26. Wang, F.; Lin, B.; Rauen, W.B. Eco-hydraulics modelling of the ecological water requirement in
453 an Eco-City. In Proceedings of the XIVth IWRA World Water Congress; Pernambuco, **2011**; Vol.
454 *30*, p. 328.
- 455 27. Parasiewicz, P. MesoHABSIM: A concept for application of instream flow models in river
456 restoration planning. *Fisheries* **2004**, *26*, 6–13.
- 457 28. Van Nieuwenhuysse, B.H.J.; Antoine, M.; Wyseure, G.; Govers, G. Pattern-process relationships
458 in surface hydrology: Hydrological connectivity expressed in landscape metrics. *Hydrol.*
459 *Process.* **2011**, *25*, 3760–3773.
- 460 29. Wallis, C.; Maddock, I.; Visser, F.; Acreman, M. A framework for evaluating the spatial
461 configuration and temporal dynamics of hydraulic patches. *River Res. Appl.* **2012**, *28*, 585–593.
- 462 30. Newson, M.D.; Newson, C.L. Geomorphology, ecology and river channel habitat: mesoscale
463 approaches to basin-scale challenges. *Prog. Phys. Geogr. Earth Environ.* **2000**, *24*, 195–217.
- 464 31. Belletti, B.; Rinaldi, M.; Bussettini, M.; Comiti, F.; Gurnell, A.M.; Mao, L.; Nardi, L.; Vezza, P.
465 Characterising physical habitats and fluvial hydromorphology: A new system for the survey and
466 classification of river geomorphic units. *Geomorphology* **2017**, *283*, 143–157.
- 467 32. Plexida, S.G.; Sfougaris, A.I.; Ispikoudis, I.P.; Papanastasis, V.P. Selecting landscape metrics as
468 indicators of spatial heterogeneity-Acomparison among Greek landscapes. *Int. J. Appl. Earth*
469 *Obs. Geoinformation* **2014**, *26*, 26–35.
- 470 33. Turitto, O.; Audisio, C.; Agangi, A. Il ruolo svolto da piene straordinarie nel rimodellare la
471 geometria di un alveo fluviale. *Il Quat. Ital. J. Quat. Sci.* **2008**, *21*, 303–316.
- 472 34. SIFOR - sistema informativo forestale regionale Carta forestale – aggiornamento 2016 2018.
- 473 35. SMS - The Complete Surface-water Solution | Aquaveo.com. Available online:
474 <https://www.aquaveo.com/software/sms-surface-water-modeling-system-introduction>.
- 475 36. BASEMENT - Basic Simulation Environment | ETH, Zurich. Available online:
476 <http://www.basement.ethz.ch/>.
- 477 37. Tamagnone, P. Numerical models for fixed and mobile bed river systems. Implementations of
478 case studies, Politecnico di Torino, **2016**.
- 479 38. Teng, J.; Jakeman, A.J.; Vaze, J.; Croke, B.F.W.; Dutta, D.; Kim, S. Flood inundation modelling: A
480 review of methods, recent advances and uncertainty analysis. *Environ. Model. Softw.* **2017**, *90*,
481 201–216.
- 482 39. Sowińska-Świerkosz, B.N.; Soszyński, D. Landscape structure versus the effectiveness of nature
483 conservation: Roztocze region case study (Poland). *Ecol. Indic.* **2014**, *43*, 143–153.
- 484 40. Leboutillier, D.W.; Waylen, P. *Regional variations in flow-duration curves for rivers in British*
485 *Columbia, Canada*; 1993; Vol. 14.

- 486 41. Burn, R. Restoring Meanders to Straightened Rivers 2013.
- 487 42. Environment Agency Bringing your rivers back to life. Available online:
488 https://www.therrc.co.uk/MOT/References/EA_Restoring_Rivers_NLondon.pdf.
- 489 43. CIRF. *La riqualificazione fluviale in Italia. Linee guida, strumenti ed esperienze per gestire i corsi*
490 *d'acqua e il territorio*; Mazzanti Editori, 2006; ISBN 88-88114-66-1.
- 491 44. River restoration in Europe: practical approaches; Institute for Inland Water Management and
492 Waste Water Treatment: Lelystad, Netherlands, 2001; ISBN 978-90-369-5377-1.
- 493 45. Leitão, A.B.; Miller, J.; Ahern, J.; McGarigal, K. *Measuring landscapes: A planner's handbook*;
494 Island press, 2012; ISBN 1597267724.
- 495 46. Whitcomb, R.F.; Robbins, C.S.; Lynch, J.F.; Whitcomb, B.L.; Klimkiewicz, M.K.; Bystrak, D. Effects
496 of forest fragmentation on avifauna of the eastern deciduous forest. In *Forest Island Dynamics*
497 *in Man-Dominated Landscapes*; Burgess, R.L., Sharpe, D.M., Eds.; Springer-Verlag: New York,
498 1981; pp. 125–205.
- 499 47. Small, M.F.; Hunter, M.L. Forest fragmentation and avian nest predation in forested
500 landscapes. *Oecologia* 1988, 76, 62–64.
- 501 48. Bender, D.; A. Contreras, T.; Fahrig, L. Habitat Loss and Population Decline: A Meta-Analysis of
502 the Patch Size Effect; 1998; Vol. 79.
- 503 49. Rosso, M.; Comino, E.; Ivo, F.; Furio, D. Programma di Gestione dei Sedimenti per il torrente
504 Orco 2008.
- 505 50. Dick, D.D.C.; Ayllón, D. FloMan-MF: Floodplain Management for the Moor Frog – a simulation
506 model for amphibian conservation in dynamic wetlands. *Ecol. Model.* 2017, 348, 110–124.
- 507 51. Laasonen, P.; Muotka, T.; Kivijärvi, I. Recovery of macroinvertebrate communities from stream
508 habitat restoration. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 1998, 8, 101–113.
- 509 52. Nakano, D.; Nagayama, S.; Kawaguchi, Y.; Nakamura, F. River restoration for
510 macroinvertebrate communities in lowland rivers: insights from restorations of the Shibetsu
511 River, north Japan. *Landsc. Ecol. Eng.* 2008, 4, 63–68.
- 512 53. Gregory, S.; Boyer, K.L.; Gurnell, A.M. Ecology and management of wood in world rivers. In
513 Proceedings of the International Conference of Wood in World Rivers (2000: Corvallis, Or.);
514 American Fisheries Society, 2003.
- 515 54. Opdam, P. Metapopulation theory and habitat fragmentation: a review of holarctic breeding
516 bird studies. *Landsc. Ecol.* 1991, 5, 93–106.
- 517 55. Ali, A.; de Bie, C.A.J.M.; Skidmore, A.K.; Scarrott, R.G.; Lymberakis, P. Mapping the
518 heterogeneity of natural and semi-natural landscapes. *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinformation*
519 2014, 26, 176–183.
- 520 56. Alhamad, M.N.; Alrababah, M.A.; Feagin, R.A.; Gharaibeh, A. Mediterranean drylands: The
521 effect of grain size and domain of scale on landscape metrics. *Ecol. Indic.* 2011, 11, 611–621.
- 522 57. Feng, Y.; Liu, Y. Fractal dimension as an indicator for quantifying the effects of changing spatial
523 scales on landscape metrics. *Ecol. Indic.* 2015, 53, 18–27.
- 524 58. Turner, M.G.; O'Neill, R. V; Gardner, R.H.; Milne, B.T. Effects of changing spatial scale on the
525 analysis of landscape pattern. *Landsc. Ecol.* 1989, 3, 153–162.
- 526 59. Wiens, J.A. Population Responses to Patchy Environments. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 1976, 7, 81–
527 120.
- 528

[Click here to view linked References](#)

Authors

Paolo Tamagnone^{1*}, Elena Comino¹, Maurizio Rosso¹

¹*Department of Environment, Land and Infrastructure Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, C.so Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy*

**Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 0110907631. E-mail address: paolo.tamagnone@polito.it (P. Tamagnone).*

**ORCID CODE:*

- *Paolo Tamagnone: 0000-0002-0485-2169*
- *Elena Comino: 0000-0002-3289-1800*
- *Maurizio Rosso: 0000-0001-9504-0512*

Title

Landscape metrics integrated in hydraulic modeling for river restoration planning

Abstract

Engineers have shaped the environment across the centuries in order to improve the quality and safety of human life. The unrestrained invasion of nature led to significant environmental problems, for this reason nowadays engineering projects should be based on ecological concepts to protect our environment. This paper presents an integrated methodology that involves GIS tools, hydraulic numerical models and landscape metrics to investigate ecological consequences caused by river restoration activities. The combined use of these different tools represents a bridge to connect the field of engineering with ecological techniques. The proposed method was tested to predict and assess the influence of a river restoration plan on a reach of the Orco river located in the north-west of Italy. Morphological alterations were simulated to reconnect remnant meanders and provide water to the floodplain, enhancing the ecological value of riparian ecosystems. The application of the hydraulic model permitted to evaluate the distribution of water inside the study area before and after the restoration plan. Thereafter, spatial configuration and temporal dynamics of the landscape structures were quantified using landscape metrics. The increase of patch density (PD) by 9% and edge density (ED) up to 10% highlights that restoration activities lead to a new configuration characterized by a higher level of fragmentation and heterogeneity. The characteristics of versatility, repeatability and the possibility to predict the outcomes of a specific plan make the proposed method a useful tool that could help decision-makers to manage the territory while safeguarding natural ecosystems.

Keywords

landscape metrics; hydraulic numerical modeling; river restoration; riverine environment; landscape management

1. Introduction

Nowadays there is a deeper sensibility toward natural spaces after many years of uncontrolled use of the territory. Anthropogenic disturbances have altered landscape structure and its ecological processes [1]. In this framework, ecologists and engineers have strived to conserve, defend and restore the “*green*” part of our planet.

Focusing on riverine environments, different disciplines were born in past decades trying to connect the world of hydraulics with ecological concepts such as the eco-hydraulics [2–4] and hydroecology [5]. Much effort has been devoted to the research of effective actions with the purpose to restore disturbed ecosystems and natural landscapes [6]. To successfully accomplish restoration techniques, it is important to understand the correlation between ecological features, physical factors (such as hydraulic behavior of rivers) and landscape patterns [7–9]. The analysis of the relationship between human disturbances and landscape structure is the key to accomplish a suitable landscape planning and management [10]. The management of the landscape structure must begin from the full comprehension of all its features because the landscape should be analyzed as a whole using a holistic approach [11,12].

A consolidated technique for the quantification of the main characteristics of a landscape such as structure, function and change is the use of ecological indicators called landscape metrics [13,14]. A large number of metrics have been developed in the past few decades able to assess landscape structure based on categorical maps [7]. Today, the combination of GIS applications and mathematical codes such as FRAGSTATS [15] are widely used in the field of ecological applications. Numerous studies have shown how landscape metrics can provide a large amount of information on landscape composition and configuration [16]. In many cases, landscape metrics are also used to assess how the landscape changes over time under human pressure or to evaluate the effectiveness of conservative plans in protected zones [17–19]. Other studies focused on fluvial landscape configuration and dynamics [20–22].

In the framework of the eco-hydraulics a number of studies have used hydraulic modelling to analyze specific ecological aspects such as the determination of the ecological flow (called also instream flow) [23–25] or the evaluation of habitats suitability [26,27]. Meanwhile, a few studies have investigated the potential advantages of the synergic application of landscape metrics and hydraulic modeling in suitable environments planning [1]. Entwistle et al. [4] used a 2D hydraulic model and FRAGSTATS to evaluate the ecological value of anabranching channels. Van Nieuwenhuysen et al. [28] has utilized landscape metrics to evaluate the degree of hydrological connectivity among artificial catchments. Rare is the application of both methodology to assess the spatial structure of a hydraulic environment [29] and the lack of spatial analysis from hydraulic assessments was previously highlighted by Newson and Newson [30].

The present paper aims to extend the field of spatial analysis application in riverine environments, introducing a methodology that integrates hydraulic modelling and landscape metrics. The proposed method allows predicting the effects of restoration plans on riverine landscapes quantifying ecological features such as connectivity and heterogeneity. Therefore, it could be a useful tool to provide important information guiding decision-makers in territorial planning.

The paper is organized into three main parts:

1. a brief contextualization describing the study area in which the work was carried out;
2. the software used are listed and the adopted methodology is described;
3. the outcomes of the study are presented and discussed, and conclusions are drawn.

46 1.1 The aim of the research

47 The objective of this work is to introduce an integrated method which has four purposes: (1)
48 linking hydraulic knowledge with ecological analysis, mainly using hydraulic models and landscape
49 metrics; (2) predicting spatial pattern changes and ecological impacts resulting from a river
50 restoration plan; (3) assessing the spatial configuration and temporal dynamics of different
51 landscape structures; (4) giving a useful tool to guide local administrations and landscape planners
52 to choose the most non-invasive plans for territory management.

53 2. Study area

54 The research is focused on the first lowland part of the Orco river's catchment, located in
55 Piedmont in the north-west of Italy. This part covers approximately 22% of the whole river basin
56 and it is characterized by a hilly and flat landscape. In this area, the Orco river flows 40 Km to
57 downstream until his confluence in the Po river and its riverbed shows a sinuous trend with an
58 alternation of braided and meandering channels. The river reach between the villages of Rivarolo
59 Canavese and Lusigliè (TO, Italy) was selected for the implementation of the hydraulic model [31].
60 The study area of 600 hectares was used to carry out hydraulic and ecological analyses [32] (see Fig.
61 1).



62 Fig. 1 Geographical location of the study area (source of the aerial image: Google Earth®, 2018)


64 From the geomorphological point of view, the chosen reach is slightly carved and its riparian
65 areas are characterized by the presence of secondary forms and relict water paths on the left and
66 steep banks on the right. Indeed, the widespread presence of banks in erosion states the planimetric
67 instability of the river. During significant-flooding events, the river tends to restore the pre-existing
68 braided shape. This phenomenon affects variations of the main flow direction, leading to a wide
69 range of historical mobility of the riverbed [33].

70 The land cover presents a patchwork structure, typical of the fluvial plains. Agricultural lands
71 dominate the study area, almost 50% is covered by meadow and cultivated fields. Woods cover one-
72 fifth of the surveyed area and its forest vegetation is mainly composed by *Robinia pseudoacacia*
73 [34].

74 3. Materials and Methods

75 This section describes the multidisciplinary method proposed in this work, between hydraulics
76 and landscape ecology, which benefits from the combined use of software with different features.
77 It can be divided into three main steps (see Fig. 2): (1) the construction of a land cover map using
78 the overlapping of different maps and satellite images into the GIS module of SMS-11.1-Surface-

79 water Modeling System [35]; (2) the implementation of the two-dimensional hydraulic model and
 80 hydrodynamic simulations using SMS in the pre and post-processing phases and BASEMENT 2.6-
 81 Basic Simulation Environment [36] for the processing step; (3) the manipulation of categorical maps
 82 in ArcMap 10.3.1 and calculation of landscape metrics with FRAGSTATS. The current released
 83 version (FRAGSTATS v4.2) is an efficient tool able to compute a great number of landscape metrics
 84 from a wide variety of image formats [15].



85 Fig. 2 Schematization of the methodology: input (orange boxes), GIS elaboration (brown box), hydrological/hydraulic
 86 calculation (light blue boxes) and ecological assessment (green box)
 87

88 **3.1 Land cover assessment**

89 The first main action necessary for all following analyses was the detection of the spatial
 90 configuration of the study area. The land cover map was obtained by the combination of spatial
 91 information from CORINE Land Cover 2000, Digital Terrain Model DTM with a high resolution (on
 92 average 1 point each square meter) realized by Ministry for the Environment and the Protection of
 93 the Territory and the Sea during the extraordinary Plan of Environmental Remote Sensing with
 94 LiDAR scan and upgraded satellite images. The resulting land cover map was divided into seven
 95 categories: grassland, wood, river bank, water, factories, urban center and roads (see Fig. 3). The
 96 distribution of each land cover class in the study area is shown in Table 1.

97 Table 1 Area, percentage cover and Manning's Roughness Coefficient of each land cover class in the study area

Land cover class	Area [ha]	Percentage cover [%]	Manning's Roughness Coefficient
Grassland	276.2	46.0	0.07
Wood	124.5	20.7	0.08
River bank	33.1	5.5	0.045
Water	41.3	6.9	0.045
Factories	8.9	1.5	0.15
Urban center	112.2	18.7	0.15
Roads	4.0	0.7	0.03
Total	600	100	

98 Then each class was matched with a Manning's Roughness Coefficient which represents the
 99 hydraulic resistance offered by each surface to the water flow. The identification of the appropriate
 100 roughness coefficient derived from a back-analysis carried out during the calibration of the hydraulic
 101 model [37]. The high-resolution data permitted also to consider the shapes and geographical

102 positions of structures within the domain such as bridge piers, levees, and road embankments. All
 103 these data were necessary to build the hydraulic model and accomplish hydrodynamic simulations.

104 3.2 Hydraulic simulations

105 The two-dimensional hydraulic model was implemented to simulate the behavior of the river
 106 reach and to estimate the amount of wetted area with specific discharges. Throughout a preliminary
 107 hydrologic analysis, we calculated the flow duration curve (FDC) and its characteristic values (Qxx)
 108 were extracted. In this paper, the value of Qxx will refer to the amount of discharge that should be
 109 present on average at least xx days per year in the analyzed river reach. The FDC was calculated
 110 from the elaboration of flow data collected from 2010 to 2016 by a gage station near to the
 111 upstream boundary of the hydraulic model domain. Each Qxx value was used as an inner boundary
 112 condition for hydrodynamic simulations. Moreover, the duration and timing of each discharge were
 113 investigated.

114 The 2D numerical model is based on the numerical resolution of the Shallow Water Equations.
 115 These equations calculate the flow field assuming a hydrostatic distribution of the pressures along
 116 the depth and neglecting the vertical component of the flow [38]. The conservative form of the
 117 equation system can be written as:

$$118 U_t + \nabla \cdot (F, G) + S = 0, \quad (1)$$

119 where U_t is the derivation with respect to time (t) of the conserved variables vector, F and G are
 120 the vectors of fluxes and S is the vector of source terms, in the x and y directions, given by:
 121 where

$$122$$

$$123 U = \begin{pmatrix} h \\ uh \\ vh \end{pmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{pmatrix} uh \\ u^2h + \frac{1}{2}gh^2 - vh \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \\ uvh - vh \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$124 G = \begin{pmatrix} vh \\ uvh - vh \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \\ v^2h + \frac{1}{2}gh^2 - vh \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$125 S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ gh(S_{fx} - S_{Bx}) \\ gh(S_{fy} - S_{By}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

126 where h is the water depth (m), u and v are the cartesian components of the flow velocity vector
 127 (m/s), g is gravity acceleration (m/s²), ν is the total viscosity (m²/s), S_f is the friction slope (-) and S_b
 128 is the bed slope (-).

130 The land cover map obtained in the previous step was matched with the altimetric data of the
 131 DTM to create a computational grid (mesh). This grid represents the mathematical representation
 132 of the river topography and the basic geometry of the two-dimensional hydraulic model. Two
 133 different sets of simulations were carried out: in the first, the river behavior on the actual

Formatted: Space After: 6 pt

Formatted: Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space After: 6 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Not Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: +Body (Calibri), Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold


Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Superscript


Formatted: Superscript

134 topography was simulated, this will be called “original” scenario. In the second, the wetted area on
135 a modified computational mesh simulating the river restoration plan was calculated, this will be
136 called “modified” scenario. In order to obtain the “modified” scenario, a series of altimetric
137 alterations were applied to modify the original mesh. These alterations were circumscribed along
138 100 m of natural riverbanks digging natural levees for reconnecting remnant meanders with the
139 main channel. These levees were created by the intensive sediment transport of floods over time.
140 The alterations of the mesh are displayed in Fig. 3.

141



142



143 Fig. 3 Land cover map and morphological alterations. Top: enlargement on the original and modified mesh of the first
144 altered site. Bottom: enlargement on the original and modified mesh of the second altered site, and two graphs that
145 display the modified profile of the river bank.

146 3.3 Calculation of landscape metrics

147 As output of the hydraulic simulation stage, vector layers were produced from each simulation
148 reporting the total amount of wetted area and its distribution into the study area. They have been
149 edited through GIS tools to create raster files used as FRAGSTATS inputs. The high accuracy of the
150 hydraulic model outcomes permitted to keep a high-resolution during the rasterization of the vector
151 maps. The grain size of 1 m was set up during the rasterization process [39].

152 Landscape composition and configuration have been evaluated using FRAGSTATS for both cases,
153 “original” and “modified” scenarios. The analyses were carried out with the standard patch neighbor
154 8-cell rule option. FRAGSTATS calculates a number of landscape indices but sometimes several of
155 them are redundant, especially when two equivalent landscapes are compared. Thus, in order to
156 choose the most representative indices, metrics that did not show a ~~significant, remarkable~~ variation
157 between the “original” and “modified” landscape ($\Delta < 0.1$) have been discarded. Furthermore, a
158 smaller set of seven metrics have been selected according to the most used landscape indices in
159 literature. For a comprehensive characterization of the landscape, we selected metrics belonging to
160 three different metrics categories called Area-Edge, Shape and Aggregation. Each category reveals
161 specific information such as: (I) Area-Edge analyzes the degree of fragmentation, (II) Shape
162 measures the geometry complexity and (III) Aggregation quantifies the landscape configuration,
163 namely the level of patch dispersion [7]. The classification and description of each metrics are listed
164 as follows:

165 I. Area-Edge metrics:

- 166 1. ED: Edge Density equals the sum of the lengths of all edge segments in the landscape, divided
167 by the total landscape area;
- 168 2. AREA_AM: Area-weighted Mean patch Area equals the sum, across all patches in the
169 landscape, of the patch area, multiplied by the proportional abundance of the patch;
- 170 3. AREA_SD: Standard Deviation in patch Area equals the square root of the sum of the squared
171 deviations of each patch size from the mean patch size computed for all patches in the
172 landscape, divided by the total number of patches;
- 173 4. AREA_CV: Coefficient of Variation in patch Area equals the standard deviation divided by the
174 mean, multiplied by 100 to convert to a percentage;

175 II. Shape metrics:

- 176 5. SHAPE_AM: Area-weighted Mean Shape index equals the sum, across all patches in the
177 landscape, of the patch perimeter divided by the square root of patch area standardized to
178 a square, multiplied by the proportional abundance of the patch;

179 III. Aggregation metrics:

- 180 6. PD: Patch Density equals the number of patches in the landscape divided by total landscape
181 area;
- 182 7. ENN_MN: Mean Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance equals the sum, across all patches in
183 the landscape, of the distance to the nearest neighboring patch of the same type, based on
184 shortest edge-to-edge distance, divided by the total number of patches.

185 The equations and the corresponding terms of these metrics are shown in Table 2.

186 Table 2 List of landscape metrics used in the study [15]

Metrics	Equations	Terms
---------	-----------	-------

Formatted: English (United States)

Edge Density (ED)	$ED = E/A$	Where E is the total length of the edge in landscape and A is total landscape area
Area-weighted Mean patch Area (AREA_AM)	$AREA_AM = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[a_{ij} \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}} \right) \right]$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j
Standard Deviation in patch Area (AREA_SD)	$AREA_SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[a_{ij} - \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}}{N} \right) \right]^2}{N}}$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j and N is the total number of patches in the landscape
Coefficient of Variation in patch Area (AREA_CV)	$AREA_CV = \left[\frac{AREA_SD}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}} \right] (100)$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j and N is the total number of patches in the landscape
Area-weighted Mean Shape index (SHAPE_AM)	$AREA_AM = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\left(0.25 \cdot p_{ij} / \sqrt{a_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}} \right) \right]$	Where p_{ij} is the perimeter of the patch i of the patch type j and a_{ij} is the area of patch i
Patch Density (PD)	$PD = N/A$	Where N is the total number of patches in the landscape and A is the total landscape area
Mean Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance (ENN_MN)	$ENN_MN = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij}}{N}$	Where h_{ij} is the distance from patch ij to nearest neighboring patch of the same type (class), based on patch edge-to-edge distance, computed from cell center to cell center and N is the total number of patches in the landscape

187
188 The set of seven ecological metrics was calculated for both “original” and “modified” scenarios
189 and for each Qxx. The difference between the two analyzed cases will be indicated with the
190 parameter ΔA , calculated as follows:

191 $\Delta = metrics_{modified\ scenario} - metrics_{original\ scenario}$ (3)

192 4. Results

193 Results obtained in this study have both hydraulic and ecological nature. Hydraulic outputs
194 represent the input for the ecological analysis. For this reason, results will be described in two
195 different subsections.

196 4.1 Hydraulic outputs

197 The examined FDC represents the relationship between the amount of discharge and its
198 persistence during a mean hydrologic year [40]. The FDC and its characteristic values are shown in
199 Fig. 4.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 16 pt




Fig. 4 Flow duration curve and its characteristic values

The duration and timing of the different discharges are displayed in Fig. 5.





Fig. 5 Timing and duration of each analyzed discharge (mean number of days per month in which that amount of discharge flows into the river).

Using these discharges as upstream boundary condition in hydrodynamic simulations, the numerical model produces different wetted area maps for both “original” and “modified” configurations. Hydraulic simulations on the “original” mesh depict all the same scenarios in which the total amount of water flow only into the main channel (Fig. 6). Whereas, simulations on the “modified” geometry show a different behavior of the river as the flow increases:


- if the discharge is less than Q30, the water flows into the main channel and exclusively the little channel in the first modified site is reactivated (Fig. 6, Q60);
- if the discharge is greater than or equal to Q30, the discharge overtops the river bank and starts to flow not only in the original streambed but also through the floodplain bringing water to the riparian ecosystem (Fig. 6, Q30-Q1).



216
217 Fig. 6 Hydraulic outcomes for both scenarios with increasing discharge from left to right. The reactivation of the
218 remnant streambeds leads to an increase of the wetted surface of 1.8%, 18.9%, 21.8%, 22.1% and 23.3% respectively
219 for the scenario with Q60, Q30, Q10, Q5 and Q1.

220 The reactivation of the remnant meanders ~~The duration and timing of the different discharges~~
221 ~~are displayed in Fig. 6.~~

Field Code Changed




222
223 ~~Fig. 6 Timing and duration of each analyzed discharge (mean number of days per month in which that amount of~~
224 ~~discharge flows into the river).~~

225 As shown by the previous image, is strictly connected with the hydrology of the Orco river, which
226 is yearly characterized by two distinct periods of high flow (Fig. 5). The first, in which the discharge
227 grows according to spring rainfalls together with the snow melting in the headwater; the second,
228 characterized by the occurrence of yearly flood events caused by intense autumn rainstorms. This
229 flow pattern leads to the reactivation of the remnant meanderschannels for 24 days from April to
230 August, and for 6 days from October to December. June and November show the maximum duration
231 of discharge greater than Q30.

232 The river restoration action is completely respectful of the original ecosystem since the
233 subtracted water flows in the floodplain and then gets back to the river 1 Km downstream. This new
234 configuration is also in accordance with the planimetric divagation range (streamway) of the river.

235 Superimposing the wetted surface map of the “modified” scenario over the planimetric variations
 236 map of the Orco river, it is clear how the flow retraces the paths of old abandoned riverbeds (Fig.
 237 7). Reconnecting remnant meanders or rebuilding secondary channels are restoration actions
 238 widely adopted to enhance the ecological value of the riverine ecosystems and recreate the
 239 continuum with the floodplain [6,41–44].



240
 241 Fig. 7 Superimposition of the modified wetted surface map over the planimetric variations in the Orco river map
 242 (realized by Research Institute for the Hydrogeological Protection–Turin section)

243 **4.2 Ecological outputs**

244 In order to assess the effects of the restoration plan on the landscape structure and its riverine
 245 ecosystem, a series of comparisons were carried out. Firstly, the comparison at the class and
 246 landscape level of metrics obtained from both scenarios with Q30 aims to highlight changes in the
 247 spatial configuration due to reactivated channels. All outcomes are summarized in Table 3.

248 Table 3 The group of seven metrics (ED – Edge Density, AREA_AM – Area-weighted Mean patch Area, AREA_SD –
 249 Standard Deviation in patch Area, AREA_CV – Coefficient of Variation in patch Area, PD – Patch Density, SHAPE_AM –
 250 Area-weighted Mean Shape index and ENN_MN – Mean Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance) calculated with Q30 for
 251 both scenarios and their comparison. Factories, urban center and roads classes have been neglected since they have
 252 not been altered by the restoration plan.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Landscape level							
Metrics	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Original scenario	109.0	58.5	21.3	231.1	10.8	2.9	95.3
Modified scenario	119.9	55.2	19.9	235.3	11.8	3.0	84.4
Δ	10.8	-3.3	-1.4	4.2	1.0	0.2	-10.9

Class level							
Original scenario							
Land cover class	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Grassland	73.2	66.2	29.1	168.3	2.7	2.8	11.7
Wood	60.3	44.8	17.4	209.7	2.5	3.2	29.2
River bank	18.0	9.6	4.6	138.0	1.7	2.0	53.4
Water	30.8	37.5	18.1	131.2	0.5	4.7	164.0

Modified scenario							
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Land cover class	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Grassland	73.5	65.9	28.4	174.9	2.8	2.8	12.3
Wood	70.2	25.6	11.0	177.8	3.2	3.2	26.6
River bank	17.8	9.7	4.5	150.3	1.8	2.0	44.2
Water	42.4	45.2	21.7	132.8	0.5	6.8	81.6
Δ							
Grassland	0.3	-0.2	-0.7	6.6	0.2	0.0	0.6
Wood	9.9	-19.1	-6.4	-31.9	0.7	0.1	-2.6
River bank	-0.2	0.1	-0.1	12.4	0.2	0.0	-9.2
Water	11.6	7.8	3.7	1.6	0.0	2.1	-82.4


253 Focusing at the landscape level, the modified landscape shows a slight increase in fragmentation
254 degree. Consistent with observations of Sowińska-Świerkosz and Soszyński [39], alterations caused
255 by the reactivated channels among the floodplain lead to a separation into a larger number of
256 smaller patches increasing the fragmentation degree. This information is justified by the growth of
257 ED and AREA_CV values and in the AREA_AM and AREA_SD decreasing. As reported by McGarigal
258 and Marks [7], the variation of AREA_CV and AREA_SD means that on the modified study area
259 patches become smaller and their distribution size is farther from the average size than in the
260 original area.

261 In the context of habitat fragmentation, the grade of patch isolation is calculated with the
262 Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance (ENN) metric [15,45]. The modified area presents a smaller
263 value of ENN_MN, with a decrease of 11.5%. This means that even if the patches are more
264 fragmented, they are less isolated.

265 Another important ecological factor is the landscape complexity. The modified landscape shows
266 a slight increase in the degree of complexity in the planar shape given by the raised value of
267 SHAPE_AM. This metrics illustrates how much the patch shape is different from the standard square
268 shape. Generally, natural shapes are not regular, therefore the restored configuration appears to
269 be more akin to a natural environment. The last analyzed ecological metrics was PD. The slight
270 increase of 9% in PD value in the modified landscape, in correlation with ED, means that the
271 modified landscape has a higher level of heterogeneity. Previous studies have confirmed the
272 effectiveness of PD and ED as indicators of the spatial heterogeneity degree in landscapes [32].

273 Landscape attributes at class level were also analyzed in order to understand in-depth the results
274 of this stage. The most modified land cover classes were wood and water because the reactivated
275 watercourses run across the floodplain covered by wood (Fig. 6). As reported in Table 3, there is a
276 **significant substantial** difference in nearest neighbor distance for water patches, from 164 to 81.
277 While the variation of AREA_AM and AREA_CV in wood class caused by the subdivision in more
278 smaller patches shows a remarkable decrease of 40%.

279 In the second stage, since in a natural river the amount of flow varies during the year, the
280 evaluation of dynamics of the landscape structure was carried out tracking the wetted area
281 distribution for the different discharges. Landscape metrics calculated at the landscape level are
282 summarized in Fig. 8.



283
 284 Fig. 8 Landscape metrics representing the dynamics of landscape structure in terms of fragmentation (a: Edge
 285 Density, b: Area-weighted Mean patch Area, c: Standard Deviation in patch Area, d: Coefficient of Variation in patch
 286 Area), complexity (e: Area-weighted Mean Shape index) and configuration (f: Patch Density, g: Mean Euclidean Nearest
 287 Neighbor Distance) as the flow increases.

288 For the Q60 both scenarios are very similar, whereas a significant considerable variation can be
 289 noticed for the other discharges. ED value in the modified scenario rises and falls at each increment
 290 due to the intermittent ramification of water paths creating isolated wood and river bank patches.
 291 SHAPE_AM is almost unvaried meaning that neither restoration activity nor increasing discharge do
 292 not strongly affect the complexity level of the landscape. However, all metrics show the same trend
 293 in both scenarios stating how the restoration action have not changed the response of the riverine
 294 landscape to discharge variation. Only for the maximum discharge Q1, the number of patches
 295 classified as river bank increase in the original scenarios and decrease in the modified scenario
 296 leading to a reversion of the value of the metric (Fig. 8c, d, f, g).

297 5. Discussion

298 The methodology presented in this study is a procedure able to assess the impacts of changes in the
 299 spatial structure of riverine landscapes. Different scenarios may be developed according to different
 300 strategies to achieve specific objectives [10]. Moreover, it is possible to analyze different landscapes
 301 to identify needs and lacks in an attempt to apply specific restoration actions aimed at improving
 302 ecological conditions [39]. Using a numerical-based approach, a wide range of scenarios can be
 303 compared, and the most suitable plan may be chosen by authorities improving the management of
 304 the territory.

305 In the studied case a river restoration action was carried out reactivating natural watercourses
 306 among the floodplain and its impact on the landscape structure was analyzed. Results obtained in
 307 the previous section are metrics used to give a quantification of four fundamental ecological
 308 attributes such as fragmentation, isolation, complexity, and heterogeneity. The chosen discharges
 309 have permitted to analyze the spatial configuration and dynamics of these components since the
 310 hydraulic conditions that reactivate the watercourses are non-stationary. When flow rate in the
 311 river is less than Q30, no water flows in the floodplain and the lower level of fragmentation means
 312 a higher level of connectivity among the patches with the same class type. For some species such as

313 mammals, this landscape is more hospitable because larger areas offer stable conditions required
314 to host a flourishing population. While, when discharge is greater than the threshold Q30, flow
315 reactivates watercourses watering riparian ecosystems and increasing the degree of fragmentation
316 especially for the wood class. The landscape with a mosaic of varied ecosystems is more attractive
317 for the multi-habitat species [39]. Thus, the higher level of fragmentation does not involve habitat
318 losses or impoverishment of biodiversity but on the contrary, the modified morphology proves to
319 be more suitable for a greater variety of ecosystems [46,47].

320 The edge density is directly correlated to the grade of spatial heterogeneity and fragmentation
321 [7]. The increasing of this metrics means that when water flows into the floodplain a higher amount
322 of edges affects the landscape. The increased level of fragmentation and the reduction in patch size
323 could influence the behavior of some animal species, particularly these periodic changes can
324 support, alternately, the growth of species that prefer edge habitats or interior kinds [48]. When
325 discharge periodically increases, the variation of connections between patches with no-water
326 classification may influence the migration of terrestrial species which require connectedness. For
327 instance, the early reactivation of the remnant streambeds coincides with the hedgehog breeding
328 season (species living in the study area, [49]). Thus, the lack of connectivity within the riparian forest
329 could affect the mobility of these animals hindering them reproduction. On the contrary, in the
330 same period, the presence of new wetlands provides an attractive habitat for pond breeding
331 amphibians [50].

332 However, cyclical dry and wet periods raise the production of nutrient matter improving the
333 environmental quality of aquatic biota. The autumnal reactivation will move organic matter that
334 covers the ground, such as leaf litter, enhancing the abundance of detritivorous macroinvertebrates,
335 in particular, shredders such as Ephemeroptera and Plecoptera [51,52]. These organisms will break
336 the coarse particulate organic material up into a finer size feeding the collectors leaving in the river
337 downstream. Since the riparian area is covered by trees, the presence of coarse wood in the
338 reactivated channels provides a favorable habitat for organisms such as biofilm algae which will
339 represent a new source of food for invertebrates such as snails and beetles [53].

340 The slight increase in shape complexity shows that the applied geomorphological modifications
341 do not produce great variations in landscape structure in both landscape and class level. This
342 demonstrates how the tested river restoration plan is non-invasive towards the patch geometry.
343 Anthropogenic activities in river restoration planning should be as eco-friendly as possible in order
344 to enhance the ecological value of the landscape without leaving human evidence. The monitoring
345 of the complexity degree can be an efficient indicator to assess the interference of human activities
346 in the landscape.

347 The variation of ENN_MN is concentrated mainly in water patches until Q5 and involves markedly
348 river bank class with Q1. It represents a reduction in patch isolation, meaning that the altered
349 landscape configuration has a smaller interpatch distance. Indeed, when water flows through the
350 floodplain, the distribution of wetted surfaces is more homogeneous into the study area. Regarding
351 the wood class, several studies have claimed that patch isolation influences the life of bird
352 communities and the insularity due to fragmented habitats has a negative impact on bird species
353 [54]. In the proposed restoration plan the difference in isolation degree is favorable in most cases.
354 Only the grassland class presents a negligible increase of almost 5%. The modified configuration
355 conduces to a more heterogeneous landscape able to host a proliferation of vast varieties of animal
356 populations, both aquatic and terrestrial species. The level of heterogeneity will change over the
357 year, according to the hydrology of the river, varying ecological processes among landscape pattern
358 [55].

359 All the above-mentioned considerations derive from the interpretation of the analyzed metrics
360 and their values. The quantification of these metrics is strongly conditioned by the parameters
361 selected by the operator. Especially during the rasterization of the vector files, the choice of the cell
362 size could alter the outcome leading to an erroneous division or union of patches. This problem is
363 emphasized for landscape metrics based on the size and number of patches [7]. Many studies have
364 shown how grain size affects the outcomes of landscape metrics applications [56–58]. For this
365 reason, we chose a very fine grain size, 1 m, in order to generate a raster file representative of the
366 reality.

367 Moreover, as stated by Plexida et al. [32], some landscape metrics are influenced by the size of
368 the analyzed domain such as area-edge and shape metrics. The use of a restricted area size could
369 lead to analyze a landscape characterized by a single class, impeding the assessment of ecological
370 attributes of the study area. In addition, whether the restoration plan aims to recover plants and
371 animals, the presented methodology should be applied considering a scale compatible with the
372 species' perception of the environment [59]. For instance, an agricultural field could represent an
373 entire habitat for an insect but, simultaneously, only a single patch for a bird.

374 6. Conclusion

375 Nowadays an increased sensibility towards environment joins experts, authorities, and researchers
376 in the search for the best solutions for sustainable management of the territory. Multidisciplinary
377 approaches are needed to understand the interactions between natural processes and human
378 activities.

379 In this paper, a method was proposed that integrates hydraulic and landscape ecological
380 knowledge with the purpose of creating a tool able to simulate a river restoration plan and quantify
381 its impact on the landscape structure and its ecosystems. This methodology can predict the
382 achievement of the objectives in landscape planning and evaluate whether the proposed design is
383 suitable and valid in a cost-benefit analysis perspective. The entire procedure is based on
384 geographical information and numerical data. Therefore, it represents a significant advantage
385 because required data can be extrapolated from thematic maps or numerical simulation, reducing
386 the necessity of costly on-site surveys.

387 The feature of reusability of the hydraulic models makes it possible to simulate and compare
388 different landscape scenarios to assess the best solution. This method may be helpful for local
389 administrations to better understand the configuration of their territory and to choose the most
390 suitable plan to restore altered areas. In order to limit overengineering in restoration plans, all
391 actors should keep in mind the capabilities of the ecosystems to self-design and avoid the over-
392 engineering.

393 However, the proposed methodology highlighted two main limitations. Firstly, the choice of the
394 study area extent must be compatible with the available computational power, being it directly
395 related to the accuracy of the hydraulic numerical model. The second issue, the choice and
396 interpretation of landscape metrics are conditioned by the features of the analyzed area.

397 Future work should test this methodology on a wider range of river restoration plans. The results
398 of this study should encourage all actors to use multidisciplinary approaches in order to design and
399 manage the territory in accordance with the conservation and protection of natural ecosystems.

400 Notations

401 $\rightarrow U$: vector of conserved variables [–]

402 $\rightarrow F, G$: flux vectors [–]

- 403 ~~— S : vector of source terms [—]~~
- 404 ~~— h : water depth [m]~~
- 405 ~~— u, v : cartesian components of the flow velocity vector [m/s]~~
- 406 ~~— g : gravity acceleration [m/s²]~~
- 407 ~~— ν : total viscosity [m²/s]~~
- 408 ~~— S_f : friction slope [—]~~
- 409 ~~— S_b : bed slope [—]~~
- 410 ~~— t : time [s]~~
- 411 ~~— $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$: derivation with respect to variable t of the \mathbf{U} vector~~
- 412 ~~— ∇ : Nabla operator~~
- 413 ~~— $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$: partial differential operator for derivation with respect to variable x~~
- 414 ~~— $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$: partial differential operator for derivation with respect to variable y~~

415 Acknowledgements

416 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or
 417 not-for-profit sectors.

418 Reference

- 419 1. Paudel, S.; Yuan, F. Assessing landscape changes and dynamics using patch analysis and GIS
 420 modeling. *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinformation* **2012**, *16*, 66–76.
- 421 2. Lancaster, J.; Downes, B. Linking the hydraulic world of individual organisms to ecological
 422 processes: putting ecology into ecohydraulics. *River Res. Appl.* **2010**, *403*, 385–403.
- 423 3. Vanzo, D.; Zolezzi, G.; Siviglia, A. Eco-hydraulic modelling of the interactions between
 424 hydropeaking and river morphology. *Ecohydrology* **2016**, *9*, 421–437.
- 425 4. Entwistle, N.; Heritage, G.; Milan, D. Ecohydraulic modelling of anabranching rivers. *River Res.*
 426 *Appl.* **2019**, 353–364.
- 427 5. Dunbar M. C., M.J.; A. Applied hydro-ecological science for the twenty-first century. **2001**, *266*,
 428 1–17.
- 429 6. Mitsch, W.; Jørgensen, S.E. Ecological Engineering and Ecosystem Restoration; **2004**; ISBN 0-
 430 471-33264-X.
- 431 7. McGarigal, K.; Marks, B. FRAGSTAT: Spatial pattern analysis program for quantifying landscape
 432 structure. *U. S. Dep. Agric. Pac. Northwest Res. Stn.* **1995**.
- 433 8. Turner, M.G. Landscape Ecology: The Effect of Pattern on Process. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **1989**,
 434 *20*, 171–197.
- 435 9. Leyer, I.; Mosner, E.; Lehmann, B. Managing floodplain-forest restoration in European river
 436 landscapes combining ecological and flood-protection issues. *Ecol. Appl.* **2012**, *22*, 240–249.
- 437 10. Botequilha Leitão, A.; Ahern, J. Applying landscape ecological concepts and metrics in
 438 sustainable landscape planning. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **2002**, *59*, 65–93.
- 439 11. Martín, B.; Ortega, E.; Otero, I.; Arce, R.M. Landscape character assessment with GIS using
 440 map-based indicators and photographs in the relationship between landscape and roads. *J.*
 441 *Environ. Manage.* **2016**, *180*, 324–334.
- 442 12. Venturelli, R.C.; Galli, A. Integrated indicators in environmental planning: Methodological
 443 considerations and applications. *Ecol. Indic.* **2006**, *6*, 228–237.
- 444 13. Forman, R.T.T. Some general principles of landscape and regional ecology. *Landsc. Ecol.* **1995**,
 445 *10*, 133–142.
- 446 14. Giaouris, E., Chorianopoulos, N., Skandamis, P. y Nychas, G. World's largest Science,
 447 Technology & Medicine Open Access book publisher: *Open Sci. Minds* **2012**, 450.

- 448 15. McGarigal, K., SA Cushman, and E.Ene. FRAGSTATS v4: Spatial Pattern Analysis Program for
449 Categorical and Continuous Maps. Computer software program produced by the authors at
450 the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Available at the following web site: Available online:
451 <http://www.umass.edu/landeco/research/fragstats/fragstats.html>.
- 452 16. Uuemaa, E.; Mander, Ü.; Marja, R. Trends in the use of landscape spatial metrics as landscape
453 indicators: A review. *Ecol. Indic.* **2013**, *28*, 100–106.
- 454 17. Egbert, S.L.; Park, S.; Price, K.P.; Lee, R.Y.; Wu, J.; Nellis, M.D. Using conservation reserve
455 program maps derived from satellite imagery to characterize landscape structure. *Comput.*
456 *Electron. Agric.* **2003**, *37*, 141–156.
- 457 18. Boongaling, C.G.K.; Faustino-Eslava, D. V; Lansigan, F.P. Modeling land use change impacts on
458 hydrology and the use of landscape metrics as tools for watershed management: The case of
459 an ungauged catchment in the Philippines. *Land Use Policy* **2018**, *72*, 116–128.
- 460 19. Liu, T.; Yang, X. Monitoring land changes in an urban area using satellite imagery, GIS and
461 landscape metrics. *Appl. Geogr.* **2015**, *56*, 42–54.
- 462 20. Yang, X.; Liu, Z. Quantifying landscape pattern and its change in an estuarine watershed using
463 satellite imagery and landscape metrics. *Int. J. Remote Sens.* **2005**, *26*, 5297–5323.
- 464 21. Dufour, S.; Rinaldi, M.; Piégay, H.; Michalon, A. How do river dynamics and human influences
465 affect the landscape pattern of fluvial corridors? Lessons from the Magra River, Central-
466 Northern Italy. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **2015**.
- 467 22. Thoms, M.C.; Reid, M.; Christianson, K.; Munro, F. Variety is the spice of river life: recognizing
468 hydraulic diversity as a tool for managing flows in regulated rivers. *Sediment Dyn.*
469 *Hydromorphology Fluv. Syst.* **2006**, *306*, 169–178.
- 470 23. Papadonikolaki, G.; Stamou, A.; Dimitriou, E.; Bui, M.-D.; Rutschmann, P. Comparison of two
471 habitat modeling approaches for the determination of the ecological flow. *Eur. Water* **2017**,
472 *58*, 301–305.
- 473 24. Li, W.; Chen, Q.; Cai, D.; Li, R. Determination of an appropriate ecological hydrograph for a rare
474 fish species using an improved fish habitat suitability model introducing landscape ecology
475 index. *Ecol. Model.* **2015**, *311*, 31–38.
- 476 25. Stewart, G.; Anderson, R.; Wohl, E. Two-dimensional modelling of habitat suitability as a
477 function of discharge on two Colorado rivers. *River Res. Appl.* **2005**, *21*, 1061–1074.
- 478 26. Wang, F.; Lin, B.; Rauen, W.B. Eco-hydraulics modelling of the ecological water requirement in
479 an Eco-City. In Proceedings of the XIVth IWRA World Water Congress; Pernambuco, **2011**; Vol.
480 *30*, p. 328.
- 481 27. Parasiewicz, P. MesoHABSIM: A concept for application of instream flow models in river
482 restoration planning. *Fisheries* **2004**, *26*, 6–13.
- 483 28. Van Nieuwenhuysse, B.H.J.; Antoine, M.; Wyseure, G.; Govers, G. Pattern-process relationships
484 in surface hydrology: Hydrological connectivity expressed in landscape metrics. *Hydrol.*
485 *Process.* **2011**, *25*, 3760–3773.
- 486 29. Wallis, C.; Maddock, I.; Visser, F.; Acreman, M. A framework for evaluating the spatial
487 configuration and temporal dynamics of hydraulic patches. *River Res. Appl.* **2012**, *28*, 585–593.
- 488 30. Newson, M.D.; Newson, C.L. Geomorphology, ecology and river channel habitat: mesoscale
489 approaches to basin-scale challenges. *Prog. Phys. Geogr. Earth Environ.* **2000**, *24*, 195–217.
- 490 31. Belletti, B.; Rinaldi, M.; Bussettini, M.; Comiti, F.; Gurnell, A.M.; Mao, L.; Nardi, L.; Vezza, P.
491 Characterising physical habitats and fluvial hydromorphology: A new system for the survey and
492 classification of river geomorphic units. *Geomorphology* **2017**, *283*, 143–157.
- 493 32. Plexida, S.G.; Sfougaris, A.I.; Ispikoudis, I.P.; Papanastasis, V.P. Selecting landscape metrics as
494 indicators of spatial heterogeneity-Acomparison among Greek landscapes. *Int. J. Appl. Earth*
495 *Obs. Geoinformation* **2014**, *26*, 26–35.
- 496 33. Turitto, O.; Audisio, C.; Agangi, A. Il ruolo svolto da piene straordinarie nel rimodellare la
497 geometria di un alveo fluviale. *Il Quat. Ital. J. Quat. Sci.* **2008**, *21*, 303–316.

- 498 34. SIFOR - sistema informativo forestale regionale Carta forestale – aggiornamento 2016 2018.
- 499 35. SMS - The Complete Surface-water Solution | Aquaveo.com. Available online:
500 <https://www.aquaveo.com/software/sms-surface-water-modeling-system-introduction>.
- 501 36. BASEMENT - Basic Simulation Environment | ETH, Zurich. Available online:
502 <http://www.basement.ethz.ch/>.
- 503 37. Tamagnone, P. Numerical models for fixed and mobile bed river systems. Implementations of
504 case studies, Politecnico di Torino, 2016.
- 505 38. Teng, J.; Jakeman, A.J.; Vaze, J.; Croke, B.F.W.; Dutta, D.; Kim, S. Flood inundation modelling: A
506 review of methods, recent advances and uncertainty analysis. *Environ. Model. Softw.* 2017, 90,
507 201–216.
- 508 39. Sowińska-Świerkosz, B.N.; Soszyński, D. Landscape structure versus the effectiveness of nature
509 conservation: Roztocze region case study (Poland). *Ecol. Indic.* 2014, 43, 143–153.
- 510 40. Leboutillier, D.W.; Waylen, P. *Regional variations in flow-duration curves for rivers in British*
511 *Columbia, Canada*; 1993; Vol. 14.
- 512 41. Burn, R. Restoring Meanders to Straightened Rivers 2013.
- 513 42. Environment Agency Bringing your rivers back to life. Available online:
514 https://www.therrc.co.uk/MOT/References/EA_Restoring_Rivers_NLondon.pdf.
- 515 43. CIRF. *La riqualificazione fluviale in Italia. Linee guida, strumenti ed esperienze per gestire i corsi*
516 *d'acqua e il territorio*; Mazzanti Editori, 2006; ISBN 88-88114-66-1.
- 517 44. River restoration in Europe: practical approaches; Institute for Inland Water Management and
518 Waste Water Treatment: Lelystad, Netherlands, 2001; ISBN 978-90-369-5377-1.
- 519 45. Leitão, A.B.; Miller, J.; Ahern, J.; McGarigal, K. *Measuring landscapes: A planner's handbook*;
520 Island press, 2012; ISBN 1597267724.
- 521 46. Whitcomb, R.F.; Robbins, C.S.; Lynch, J.F.; Whitcomb, B.L.; Klimkiewicz, M.K.; Bystrak, D. Effects
522 of forest fragmentation on avifauna of the eastern deciduous forest. In *Forest Island Dynamics*
523 *in Man-Dominated Landscapes*; Burgess, R.L., Sharpe, D.M., Eds.; Springer-Verlag: New York,
524 1981; pp. 125–205.
- 525 47. Small, M.F.; Hunter, M.L. Forest fragmentation and avian nest predation in forested
526 landscapes. *Oecologia* 1988, 76, 62–64.
- 527 48. Bender, D.; A. Contreras, T.; Fahrig, L. Habitat Loss and Population Decline: A Meta-Analysis of
528 the Patch Size Effect; 1998; Vol. 79.
- 529 49. Rosso, M.; Comino, E.; Ivo, F.; Furio, D. Programma di Gestione dei Sedimenti per il torrente
530 Orco 2008.
- 531 50. Dick, D.D.C.; Ayllón, D. FloMan-MF: Floodplain Management for the Moor Frog – a simulation
532 model for amphibian conservation in dynamic wetlands. *Ecol. Model.* 2017, 348, 110–124.
- 533 51. Laasonen, P.; Muotka, T.; Kivijärvi, I. Recovery of macroinvertebrate communities from stream
534 habitat restoration. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 1998, 8, 101–113.
- 535 52. Nakano, D.; Nagayama, S.; Kawaguchi, Y.; Nakamura, F. River restoration for
536 macroinvertebrate communities in lowland rivers: insights from restorations of the Shibetsu
537 River, north Japan. *Landsc. Ecol. Eng.* 2008, 4, 63–68.
- 538 53. Gregory, S.; Boyer, K.L.; Gurnell, A.M. Ecology and management of wood in world rivers. In
539 Proceedings of the International Conference of Wood in World Rivers (2000: Corvallis, Or.);
540 American Fisheries Society, 2003.
- 541 54. Opdam, P. Metapopulation theory and habitat fragmentation: a review of holarctic breeding
542 bird studies. *Landsc. Ecol.* 1991, 5, 93–106.
- 543 55. Ali, A.; de Bie, C.A.J.M.; Skidmore, A.K.; Scarrott, R.G.; Lymberakis, P. Mapping the
544 heterogeneity of natural and semi-natural landscapes. *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinformation*
545 2014, 26, 176–183.
- 546 56. Alhamad, M.N.; Alrababah, M.A.; Feagin, R.A.; Gharaibeh, A. Mediterranean drylands: The
547 effect of grain size and domain of scale on landscape metrics. *Ecol. Indic.* 2011, 11, 611–621.

- 548 57. Feng, Y.; Liu, Y. Fractal dimension as an indicator for quantifying the effects of changing spatial
549 scales on landscape metrics. *Ecol. Indic.* **2015**, *53*, 18–27.
- 550 58. Turner, M.G.; O'Neill, R. V; Gardner, R.H.; Milne, B.T. Effects of changing spatial scale on the
551 analysis of landscape pattern. *Landsc. Ecol.* **1989**, *3*, 153–162.
- 552 59. Wiens, J.A. Population Responses to Patchy Environments. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **1976**, *7*, 81–
553 120.
- 554

[Click here to view linked References](#)

The present letter reports feedback given by the advisory editor and the replies of the authors. The advisory editor's comments are written in black and the author's replies are written in blue.

I would like to thank the advisory editor for further precious feedback. The revised version of the draft follows and replies all comments.

Advisory Editor's Comments:

Dear authors,

Thank you for submitting the revised version of your manuscript. You have processed all comments of the reviewer and me. I particularly like the sections you added to the discussion about the expected impact of the changes on animal. Good job.

I now consider your manuscript ready for publication, on the condition that you perform the following seven format/layout changes:

1. All variables in all equations need to be defined and (shortly) described below the equation. Please do this for the variables in equation 1.

The description of variables has been added. To avoid a repetition, the last section "Notation has been removed.

2. In our journal, each displayed mathematical expression needs to be treated as part of an English sentence and end in a comma if the sentence continues (e.g., as in (1)), or in a period if the sentence stops (e.g., as in (2)).

The authors may wish to use the following manuscript as an example of good and consistent formatting of mathematical expressions:

The Strategic Impact of Adaptation in a Transboundary Pollution Dynamic Game B Vardar, G Zaccour
Environmental Modeling & Assessment 23 (6), 653-669.

Punctuation has been added.

3. The legends of the meshes and graphs in Figure 3 are too small; please enlarge them.

The image has been improved.

4. Line 224: Please change "the previous image" to "Fig. 6", as images might be placed in a different part of the article in the typesetted version.

The sentence has been modified.

5. In my opinion, the current Fig. 6 fits better between Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, as Fig. 6 displays the current flow regimes, and Fig. 5 the impacts of this regime on the channel activation for the two scenarios.

The Fig. 6 has been moved before the actual Fig 5, inverting the order of images.


6. Please provide the full names of the landscape metrics in the caption of Table 3, such that the table is understandable in isolation.


Full names of metrics have been added.


7. Line 286: Please only use the word significant if you actually performed a significance test.


The word "significant" has been substituted.


Best regards,
The AE




















Table 1 Areas, percentage cover and Manning's Roughness Coefficient of each land cover class in the study area

Land cover class	Area [ha]	Percentage cover [%]	Manning's Roughness Coefficient
Grassland	276.2	46.0	0.07
Wood	124.5	20.7	0.08
River bank	33.1	5.5	0.045
Water	41.3	6.9	0.045
Factories	8.9	1.5	0.15
Urban center	112.2	18.7	0.15
Roads	4.0	0.7	0.03
Total	600	100	

Table 2 List of landscape metrics used in the study [15]

Metrics	Equations	Terms
Edge Density (ED)	$ED = E/A$	Where E is the total length of the edge in landscape and A is total landscape area
Area-weighted Mean patch Area (AREA_AM)	$AREA_AM = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[a_{ij} \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}} \right) \right]$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j
Standard Deviation in patch Area (AREA_SD)	$AREA_SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[a_{ij} - \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}}{N} \right) \right]^2}{N}}$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j and N is the total number of patches in the landscape
Coefficient of Variation in patch Area (AREA_CV)	$AREA_CV = \left[\frac{AREA_SD}{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}}{N}} \right] (100)$	Where a_{ij} is the area of patch i of the patch type j and N is the total number of patches in the landscape
Area-weighted Mean Shape index (SHAPE_AM)	$AREA_AM = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\left(0.25 \cdot p_{ij} / \sqrt{a_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}} \right) \right]$	Where p_{ij} is the perimeter of the patch i of the patch type j and a_{ij} is the area of patch i
Patch Density (PD)	$PD = N/A$	Where N is the total number of patches in the landscape and A is the total landscape area
Mean Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance (ENN_MN)	$ENN_MN = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij}}{N}$	Where h_{ij} is the distance from patch ij to nearest neighboring patch of the same type (class), based on patch edge-to-edge distance, computed from cell center to cell center and N is the total number of patches in the landscape

Table 3 The group of seven metrics (*ED* – Edge Density, *AREA_AM* – Area-weighted Mean patch Area, *AREA_SD* – Standard Deviation in patch Area, *AREA_CV* – Coefficient of Variation in patch Area, *PD* – Patch Density, *SHAPE_AM* – Area-weighted Mean Shape index and *ENN_MN* – Mean Euclidean Nearest Neighbor distance) calculated with Q30 for both scenarios and their comparison. Factories, urban center and roads classes have been neglected since they have not been altered by the restoration plan.

Landscape level							
Metrics	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Original scenario	109.0	58.5	21.3	231.1	10.8	2.9	95.3
Modified scenario	119.9	55.2	19.9	235.3	11.8	3.0	84.4
Δ	10.8	-3.3	-1.4	4.2	1.0	0.2	-10.9
Class level							
Original scenario							
Land cover class	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Grassland	73.2	66.2	29.1	168.3	2.7	2.8	11.7
Wood	60.3	44.8	17.4	209.7	2.5	3.2	29.2
River bank	18.0	9.6	4.6	138.0	1.7	2.0	53.4
Water	30.8	37.5	18.1	131.2	0.5	4.7	164.0
Modified scenario							
Land cover class	ED	AREA_AM	AREA_SD	AREA_CV	PD	SHAPE_AM	ENN_MN
Grassland	73.5	65.9	28.4	174.9	2.8	2.8	12.3
Wood	70.2	25.6	11.0	177.8	3.2	3.2	26.6
River bank	17.8	9.7	4.5	150.3	1.8	2.0	44.2
Water	42.4	45.2	21.7	132.8	0.5	6.8	81.6
Δ							
Grassland	0.3	-0.2	-0.7	6.6	0.2	0.0	0.6
Wood	9.9	-19.1	-6.4	-31.9	0.7	0.1	-2.6
River bank	-0.2	0.1	-0.1	12.4	0.2	0.0	-9.2
Water	11.6	7.8	3.7	1.6	0.0	2.1	-82.4